

from innocence may go side by side with progression from ignorance.

And while science may be admitted to have proved that man is inconceivably older than our fathers dreamed, the striking fact that four thousand years ago the Semite had found God, while the Fetish-worshipper of to-day is as far from him as ever, would seem to prove that more than mere development is needed to explain the history of the human race. There is a striking confirmation of that in the account Mr. Tennant gives in his second volume of 'Fall-stories' in other religions. He is candid enough to confess that the Bible story cannot be derived from any of these, though he thinks it will yet be. That may be, but if so, it will be found that in the derivation it has been infinitely purified and elevated. Certainly, as compared with the fantastic and often filthy mythologies collected by Mr. Tennant, it stands out, not as a 'parallel,' but rather as a noble contrast.

Professor Bruce used to tell his students he found no proof of the inspiration of the true Gospels so satisfying as a perusal of the apocryphal ones. To a less extent perhaps, but as fairly, one might say that nothing will commend the Bible Fall-story more than a perusal of Mr. Tennant's 'parallels.' Even if, as he says, its only value were as a history of its authors, it would not be without value as suggesting the question: 'Whence hath this people these noble thoughts?'

It may be admitted that the doctrine of Original Sin is, as Pascal said, in some of its aspects 'an incomprehensible mystery.' It may be further admitted that, as it came from the hands of Augustine, it was far from perfect. To our thinking we are indebted to modern science for placing the doctrine on its true basis. That doctrine, as

we believe the Bible as a whole would teach it, is not one of imputed guilt. Original sin is not a crime of Adam, for which his posterity are held responsible. It is a hereditary taint which entered humanity at its dawn in some mysterious way, which we can never perhaps fully understand, save that reason and faith alike demand that it could not have been by the will of the Creator. This is the Christian doctrine of Original Sin. It may be described as a *hereditary soul-sickness*.<sup>1</sup> Biological science teaches us what a mighty principle heredity is in the building up of the physical structure of life. Medical science adds further the contribution that heredity is of vast importance as a means of the transmission of moral qualities from father to son. Surely it is in the line with all these teachings, when we believe that a disease so deep as sin, a disease which changes man's whole relations to God and his fellow-men, should participate in the same law of inheritance.

Mr. Tennant tries to minimize hereditary sin, but in this we think he is untrue to that very science of which he professes to be the exponent, and for our part, while mysteries remain, we venture to believe that the explanation which the Bible gives is the truest to the facts of life—facts which make us agree with the profoundest of our modern poets,<sup>2</sup> when he said of our Christian faith—

I still to believe it true  
See reasons and reasons—this to begin  
'Tis the faith that launched point-blank her dart  
At the head of a lie, taught *Original Sin*  
The corruption of man's heart.

<sup>1</sup> So Beirard, article 'Fall,' in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*. It was also practically the view of Zwingli and Melancthon.

<sup>2</sup> Browning, 'Gold Hair; a Story of Pornic.'

## Recent Literature on the Religions of Greece and Rome.

WHAT is the meaning of the recent rush of books on the Religions of Greece and Rome? If it is the operation of the law of supply and demand, which even books and authors bow to, the question is not answered. What has raised the demand? Is it the new conception of what Religion is? With that there has certainly come a new joy in the

study of it. For since it is no longer necessary to think of God as requiring every prayer to be translated into Hebrew until Christ came; since it is possible to believe that the prayers of even the Egyptians who were drowned in the Red Sea entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth, new life has flowed into the study of the Egyptian Book

of the Dead. There is the joy of science also. For there is no science where there is no order; and there is no order where there is not a God of order. The Religions of Greece and Rome are literally in some phases 'a worship of devils,' but even the worship of devils takes its place in a movement which may be ascent or descent, but which has its causes and consequences, and is watched over by the only living and true God.

The most recent book on the Religion of Greece or of Rome is Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*.<sup>1</sup> It is also the book to begin with, in a survey like this. It sets one right at once with the progress of this study; and there is a prophetic vitality about it which not only excites keen interest in the moment of reading, but opens up avenues of eager hope for future research. The immediate impression made by the book is that this is the study in which one's life ought assuredly to be spent.

In the way of scientific progress what a stride it records from our schoolboy lessons on the Olympian gods. As in so many other branches of knowledge, the world has grown millenniums older within the last few years. Homer and the Olympians are now quite modern. Their manners are in accordance with the latest requirements of the world of fashion. Once in a way (as we see them in the new light) they betray an earlier origin, even an earthly one, by the persistence of some curious chthonic ceremony, or even by the unexpected use of some outlandish word. But they are civilized gods. They have taken on culture and the arts of etiquette. They have almost entirely forgotten the hole of the pit whence they were digged.

Miss Harrison begins long before the days of Olympus. She follows the gods away back to their earth-born and under-world originals. She has no respect for dignities. Even the great god Zeus must either cut himself off from half his altars, or else admit that in the early days 'upon his belly did he go and dust did he eat,' being one of the numerous snake deities. On the whole, the study of the Religion of Greece shows that the

Olympian Zeus has appropriated to himself a great number of altars and offerings which did not originally belong to him.

And, when these altars and offerings are separated from Zeus, a whole world of gods, goddesses, and godlings, a whole world of rites and ceremonies, earthly and unearthly, but not at all heavenly, spreads itself before us. For here also it seems to be true, as far back as evidence carries us, that not that is first which is heavenly but that which is earthly, and afterward that which is heavenly. The process is expressed in one sentence: 'To mark the transition from rites of compulsion to rites of supplication and consequent thanksgiving is to read the whole religious history of primitive man.' In the rites of compulsion the gods are still malignant, in the rites of supplication they are merciful and kind.

But the Olympian divinities are not all merciful and kind. The progress of sublimation was not always direct towards heavenly things. To Miss Harrison the highest reach of Greek religion is found in the Orphic mysteries, and there the earthly and the heavenly are inextricably blended. The Olympus of Homer was more an advance in culture than in religion. If the Olympian Zeus does not descend to the Thracian beastliness and blood-thirstiness of Dionysos, neither does he ever bring the inspiration, the sudden illumination, the large human charity and understanding which come with the moment of initiation.

The revolution in the study of the Religion of Greece, for it is nothing short of a revolution, has been wrought by the monuments. It is, no doubt, a good many years since Schliemann laid bare the Troy which Homer sang. It has taken all these years for the explorers and the classical scholars to come together. Indeed, Professor Ridgeway claims that his *Early Age of Greece*<sup>2</sup> is the very first attempt that has been made to bring the archaeological and the literary evidence together and test the one by the other. Professor Ridgeway has, at any rate, the right to claim that he is the first classical scholar who has worked the subject from the side of the monuments. His results are quite revolutionary.

<sup>1</sup> *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. By Jane Ellen Harrison, Hon. D.Litt. (Durham), Hon. LL.D. (Aberdeen), Fellow and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1903. 8vo, 15s. net.

<sup>2</sup> *The Early Age of Greece*. By William Ridgeway, M.A., Disney Professor of Archæology in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1901. Vol. i. 8vo, 21s.

The discoveries belong to what is called the Mycenaean Age in Greek history. And the question is, Who were the heroes of the Mycenaean Age? Whose is the civilization which has been laid bare by the pick and the spade at Mycenæ, Tiryns, Hissarlik, and elsewhere? When Professor Ridgeway began to write he could say, 'Scholars are practically unanimous in regarding the civilization of the Mycenaean age as the product of that Achæan race whose deathless glories are enshrined in the Iliad and the Odyssey.' But there is no such unanimity now. For Professor Ridgeway has used the monuments and interpreted the literature by their aid, and he has come to the conclusion that the Mycenaean artists were not Achæans but Pelasgians. And he has persuaded a great many of the classical scholars that he is right. The revolution is understood when it is remembered that some time ago it was not considered safe for a man who believed in the existence of the Pelasgians to mix freely with his neighbours.

The evidence largely belongs to Religion. For it is man's relation to his God that begins earliest and lasts longest. The greater number of the remains have been found in tombs, and they were placed there for religious purposes. And the evidence deeply affects our knowledge of Religion. If Professor Ridgeway had not brought archæology and literature together, Miss Harrison could not have written her *Prolegomena*. The Homeric religion has been shown to be more modern than the Mycenaean. It has been shown to be more aristocratic. It has been shown, in short, that Homer does not describe the religion of Greece in any age, but only the Religion of a select few of the cultured people of Greece in an age that was already far advanced in syncretism and self-esteem.

The classical work on the classical Religion of Greece is Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States*.<sup>1</sup> Miss Harrison's book is prolegomena; Professor Ridgeway's is pioneer. Dr. Farnell has no discoveries to startle the world with, he has no red-handed revolutionary instincts. He describes the worship of the great Greek gods and goddesses from the earliest historical times to the latest, and throughout

<sup>1</sup> *The Cults of the Greek States*. By Lewis Richard Farnell, M.A., Litt.D., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896. Vols. i. and ii. 8vo, 32s. net.

the whole Greek world. He is very careful to distinguish between what is native and what is foreign, and to show what the Greeks did for any worship that was introduced among them. He leaves the worship to explain the god, but then he makes so scientific a selection of the statues and has them engraved so artistically that the most striking feature of his book is its presentation of the way in which the Greeks of historical times conceived their deities to live and love in the likeness of mortal men.

Dr. Farnell is too good a scholar to rush after every novelty. But he is also too independent a thinker to have no novelties of his own. He shows, for example, that there was a goddess called Nemesis, who was a real personality to the pious Greek, and quite distinct from the abstract idea of Retribution. It is in this line of things—in his exposition of the Greek ideas of Fate, Fortune, Retribution, and the like—that Dr. Farnell seems to be most original and to have rendered most service to the study of the Religion of Greece. For it is here that our modern monotheistic minds find most difficulty in getting alongside the Greek way of thinking. Even in the days of the great tragedians there was no sharp line of division between vengeance and the avenger. Personality was not yet clearly marked off from what was impersonal. And so it is not at all correct to speak of abstract qualities like Justice, Destiny, Fidelity as personified by the Greeks. Justice, Destiny, and Fidelity were both gods and virtues, and the virtues and the gods were distinct. Deification was a political device of the Roman emperors; personification was never practised or conceived by Roman or by Greek.

While all the rest are revelling in the results of exploration, Professor Lewis Campbell deliberately turns his back upon the shovel and gives his whole mind to the pen. He calls his book *Religion in Greek Literature*.<sup>2</sup>

That the progress of the Science of Religion demanded a new working of the religion to be found in Greek Literature there can be no question. The question is whether such a working is possible, or at least productive of much good, if the literature is not checked and interpreted by the monuments. Dr. Campbell's methods look old-

<sup>2</sup> *Religion in Greek Literature*. A Sketch in Outline. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D. Longmans, 1898. 8vo.

fashioned, his results are foreseen, his book is somewhat dry.

The volume is History. It is History with a capital letter. There are no surprises, there is no offence. All that popular religion which the poets ignored and the philosophers frowned upon, is kept out of sight. The religion of Homer was never the religion of Greece, but it is the religion Dr. Campbell chooses to describe for us. There is much dignity in the theme, some grandeur also (though not always moral grandeur), and the style of the historian agrees with the respectability of the theme.

And yet it has insight. Professor Campbell is too good a classic not to see and separate the essential things from the accidental. 'What is essential in Homer,' he says in one place, 'is not always that which has left the most lasting impression on mankind. The beauty of Helen, of the "face which launched a thousand ships," has passed into the "world's desire"; but the remorse of Helen, her misery, and feeling of her own condition, on which the poet lays at least equal stress, have been little noticed. The meeting of Paris in the field with the man whom he has wronged, which "cows his better part of man," has also a profound significance. It is indeed within the human sphere that the *divine* in Homer is to be found.'

Professor Jevons has edited a volume which has been published anonymously under the title of *The Makers of Hellas*.<sup>1</sup> Anonymous books rarely succeed. This is one of the most searching and helpful volumes dealing with Religion which we have seen, yet it will have a fierce battle to fight before it wins its way. The name, and still more the excellent work, of Professor Jevons will do something for it. But even in that there is disadvantage. A book with an Introduction by another is supposed to need all the recommendation it can get.

The plan of the book is original. The author's interest is in Religion. The Makers of Greece are its religious thinkers, whether poet or philosopher, whether unknown or well known. But no thinker stands alone. He owes half of his thinking to his

<sup>1</sup> *The Makers of Hellas*. A Critical Inquiry into the Philosophy and Religion of Ancient Greece. By E. E. G. With an Introduction, Notes, and Conclusion by Frank Byron Jevons, M.A., Litt.D. Griffin, 1903. 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

environment. Accordingly, before Religion is introduced, there are three long chapters on the Land, the Language, and the People. These chapters are skilfully written, and in accord with the latest knowledge. Then the great writers are introduced. Each is himself, yet he is of his age, his country, his language. His religious ideas are the ideas of mankind at a certain stage of culture, a certain range of hope and faith. These ideas are described separately. Under 'Æschylus,' for example, there is a discussion of his ideas of God, Sin, the Great Unwritten Laws, and the like. It is all sound work and highly instructive. The book deserves recognition, hearty and widespread.

In his *Myths of Greece*,<sup>2</sup> Mr. George St. Clair challenges the whole tendency of modern Greek scholarship. He challenges every attempt that has ever been popular, almost every attempt that has ever been made, to explain the Mythology of Greece and Rome. He offers an explanation of his own.

The oldest way of regarding the myths is to take them literally. But Mr. St. Clair does not believe that Ædipus killed his father and married his mother; he does not believe that Antigone was built into a wall to perish; he does not believe that Dirce was tied by the hair to a bull and dragged to death.

Next came Euhemerus and the philosophers with their human explanation of all the divinity and the mystery in the myths. Zeus was a king of Crete, who had been a great warrior in his day, and whose exploits had got much magnified, and he himself deified by subsequent admirers. Mr. St. Clair does not believe in Euhemerism, though Herbert Spencer did.

Then the phenomena of the natural world were called upon to furnish an explanation. Orpheus is the wind sighing through the forest; the clouds, as they hurry past, are poetically conceived as the cattle of Apollo, which Hermes the fleet has stolen. Mr. Fiske, in 1870, described this theory as 'now victorious along the whole line.' It is the theory of the dictionaries to this day.

But the etymologists have driven it hard. Max Müller looked upon mythology 'as an affection

<sup>2</sup> *Myths of Greece Explained and Dated*. An Embalmed History from Uranus to Perseus, including the Eleusinian Mysteries and the Olympic Games. By George St. Clair. Williams & Norgate, 1901. 2 vols. 8vo.

or disorder of language.' 'Language,' said Sir George Cox, 'is the only trustworthy basis for the science of Comparative Mythology.' Linked to the poetical treatment of natural things, it was beautiful and plausible. We see the lovely evening twilight die out before the coming night, and prosaically speak of it so; the Greeks said that Eurydice had been stung by the serpent of darkness, and Orpheus was gone to fetch her back from the land of the dead. But the etymologists and all the heavenly music which they made are out of court to-day. Max Müller lived long enough to see the myths of the Dawn perish before the satirical pen of Mr. Andrew Lang.

Mr. Andrew Lang is a folklorist, and nearly all the scholarship of to-day has bowed down before the latest application of the theory of evolution. Etymology has given place to anthropology. The Greek myths describe what the Greeks of the time in which they arose believed and lived. There are savage tribes to-day who think and worship in the language of the most incredible mythology. But Mr. St. Clair believes no more in Andrew Lang than in Max Müller.

He holds that the mythology of Greece and Rome was built upon Astronomy and the Calendar. The signs of the zodiac are in it. Taurus is the bull that swam across the sea with Europa; Capricornus the goat fought with Jupiter against the Titans. The stars are in it and all the planets. The great bear is Callisto, who was changed into a she-bear by Zeus. The Pleiades were the daughters of Atlas and Pleione, and were seven in number; but we see only six, because one of them, whose name was Sterope, hides her face for shame. So the voyage of the Argonauts was an astronomical quest, 'as we must surely recognize as soon as we learn that the golden fleece which they sought belonged to the ram of the zodiac.'

Will Mr. St. Clair win? Lang and Tylor and Frazer are doughty combatants. But we saw Max Müller all victorious once.

With Macmillan's 'Handbooks of Archæology and Antiquities' one is mostly safe. With Mr. Warde Fowler one is in the hands of the foremost English expositor of the religion of Rome. The book has a modest title. The *Roman Festivals* it is called.<sup>1</sup> But round the festivals Mr. Warde  
*Handbooks of Archæology and Antiquities: The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic.* An Introduction to

Fowler has gathered a very full and illuminating account of the religion of the Roman republic.

If one were beginning the study of Comparative Religion one could not begin with a better book than this. Every sentence is exact in statement, all is built on the most recent literary and monumental knowledge, and all is touched with an interest that constantly suggests the nearness of divinity, and yet is delightfully human. The volume may not give us a complete account of the religion of Rome, but we take the whole volume with us, and what we learn we shall not have to unlearn.

In the time of so many reversals of human judgment it is no surprise to find Plutarch exalted and extolled and made very high. Dr. Oakesmith has a little grudge against Christianity, not for refusing Plutarch his own exactly, but rather apparently for setting up its own brilliant light to the loss of his weaker luminary. He does not believe that Plutarch ever treated Christianity badly. He does not think he ever knew anything about it. Whether it would have been better for him if he had, Dr. Oakesmith seems to doubt. He scarcely could have been wiser or more moderate. He who did so well by an outworn creed might have lost himself if the knowledge of a new vigorous and glorious creed had been made known to him.

But in this it is hard to follow Dr. Oakesmith. Not only because Christianity uplifts always and perplexes never; but also because Plutarch's creed, on Dr. Oakesmith's showing, is often just a little less than Christian. Dr. Oakesmith makes him out to be one of those who were not far from the Kingdom. And it is clear to every reader of the book that it would have been an incalculable gain to Plutarch if he had entered it. The title is *The Religion of Plutarch*.<sup>2</sup>

Professor Hardie's lectures<sup>3</sup> are not wholly religious. The religious lectures are the second

the Study of the Religion of the Romans. By W. Warde Fowler, M.A. Macmillan, 1899. Crown 8vo, 6s.

<sup>2</sup> *The Religion of Plutarch.* A Pagan Creed of Apostolic Times. An Essay. By John Oakesmith, D.Litt., M.A. Longmans, 1902. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

<sup>3</sup> *Lectures on Classical Subjects.* By W. R. Hardie, M.A., Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh. Macmillan, 1903. Crown 8vo, 7s. net.

and third—'The Beliefs of the Greeks and Romans concerning a Life after Death,' and 'The Supernatural in Ancient Poetry and Story.' Nor is the religious interest even in these very keen. Professor Hardie is a literary rather than a religious critic. Extremely pleasant to read is his volume throughout, and that is all that Professor Hardie sets out to do for us. Besides the two essays named there is another which comes close up to the religious sentiment, and contains perhaps the deepest thinking in the book. It is the essay on 'The Feeling for Nature.' Mr. Hardie sees and shows that, to the Greek, Nature rather more than 'half revealed the Soul within.'

Now end with two useful schoolbooks, both handling the Mythology rather than the Religion.

Mr. Berens<sup>1</sup> describes the myths separately and simply. No ætiology is obtruded. There are some useful little woodcuts scattered throughout the text.

Two American writers have published a cheap and unbound volume in 'The Students' Series of Latin Classics,' on Greek and Roman mythology.<sup>2</sup> The little volume is based on Steuding, and is written with considerable grace. One useful feature is the quotation of the most important passages in the classics which describe the gods and goddesses and heroes.

<sup>1</sup> *The Myths and Legends of Ancient Greece and Rome.* By E. M. Berens. Blackie. 2s. 6d.

<sup>2</sup> *Greek and Roman Mythology.* By K. P. Harrington and H. C. Tolman. Amer. School and College Text-Book Agency.

## Christ's 'Yea.'

BY THE LATE REV. W. A. GRAY, ELGIN.

'But in Him was yea.'—2 Cor. i. 19.

ST. PAUL is here vindicating himself from a charge of inconstancy. He had promised a visit to Corinth, but had changed his mind. And he feared lest his enemies might avail themselves of the fact to lower his character and depreciate his apostolic authority. 'He is a trifler,' they might say. 'He is a trimmer.' 'He is a shuffler.' 'He is a man who does not know his own mind, saying Yea in one breath, Nay in another.' 'Impossible,' says St. Paul, 'impossible that fickleness like that should account for my change of plan. In doing as I did, I took my orders from Christ, following the leading He afforded, the path He revealed. And with Him there is no instability, with Him there is no double-mindedness, with Him there is no hesitation. He knows neither variableness nor shadow of turning.' With men, in the execution of their own plans and the achievements of their own ends, it may often be 'yea, nay'—'yea' first, and 'nay' afterwards. But in Him, that is Christ, through all His actions and through all His dealings it is absolute, uniform, and perspicuous, 'yea.'

'In Him is yea,'—the phrase finds an echo in modern literature. In that powerful and suggestive book in which Carlyle depicts the history of a human soul, there is a chapter of peculiar impres-

siveness which he terms the 'Everlasting yea.' In that chapter he brings the life he delineates through the stages of negation and doubt to the secret and centre of ultimate certainty and of ultimate calm. What was that secret? What was that centre? In what, after searching, did he reach and lay hold of the 'Everlasting yea'? In contempt of pleasure, in annihilation of self, in submission to circumstances, and in earnest, strenuous, and useful work. True so far as it goes! Stimulating so far as it goes! I believe the teaching of Carlyle at this point has awakened not a few who have read it to a deeper conception of duty, a higher ideal of life. But the fault of Carlyle's message lies in this, that he places the ground of the certainty and calm inside a man himself, his views and his efforts; whereas that certainty and that calm find their basis outside of man—on an external foundation, in an external source. For perfect certainty and for perfect calm we need a something or a someone beyond us as our standard, our security, our rule. And He whom we need is revealed to us, He whom we need is commended. It is Christ. Get hold of Christ, and along with Christ, you get hold of what? All that enables you to brave life, all that enables you to face death,—the reconcilia-