

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

1873A

VOL. X.

JANUARY, 1906.

No. 1.

FAITH.

Grace expresses the attitude and relation of God to a sinner. And grace justifies and saves the sinner. However, saving grace is not an irresistible fiat of the Almighty. Grace may fail of its aim and end. No sinner is justified and saved parforce. There must be a proper attitude and an adequate relation of the sinner who is being justified and saved to God who justifies and is saving him. Faith expresses this latter attitude and relation. "By grace are ye saved through faith," Eph. 2, 8. This means that salvation in individual instances, the saving of this or that particular sinner, requires the effectual operation of *two* forces. True, "the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men," Tit. 2, 11, regardless of men's attitude toward it. The word of grace has been issued to all men prior to their knowledge and wish, Matt. 28, 19. There is a salvation, perfect and complete in itself, independent of the faith of the saved; comp. Acts 4, 12: "Neither is there salvation in any other," etc. Neither man's faith nor man's unbelief alter the fact of this salvation. The *Τετέλεσται* on Golgotha, John 19, 30, was spoken before unbelievers and scoffers. This cry has been ringing through the centuries. The "word of reconciliation" conjures up no mirage to pilgrims through this desert of sin, but points to the *fact* that "God was in Christ, *reconciling the world unto Himself*, not imputing their trespasses unto them," 2 Cor. 5, 19. This salvation "is finished." Whether its tidings are carried to the husbandman on his farm or to the trader

SOME PARALLELS TO ROM. 1, 18 ff.

It is clear that the second half of the first, the entire second, and part of the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans serve as an introduction to St. Paul's exposition of the doctrine of Justification by Faith in chapters 3 to 8. The argument of this introduction is summed up in the proposition: Neither Jew

nor Gentile can escape the judgment of God, since the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all who "*hold the truth in unrighteousness.*" Israel cannot escape, though it has the Law and knows the will of God (2, 18), because Israel transgresses that Law (2, 21—27). Indeed, Israel is the more inexcusable, since it alone among the nations possessed the revealed religion — "unto them were committed the oracles of God" (3, 2). The Gentile world is likewise under the curse and cannot escape the wrath of God. They "have not the Law," theirs are not the oracles of God, but the Law of God is "written in their hearts" (2, 14. 15). Moreover, they also *know God, but worship Him not*, and this is the principal cause for their condemnation in the judgment of God, as exhibited in 1, 18—32. Thus (3, 9) "we have proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin." Hence, both Jew and Gentile (3, 29) are justified before God by faith only (3, 28).

It is our present purpose to adduce parallels from the ethnic writers and from the modern authorities on matters of Natural Religion, in elucidation of St. Paul's words concerning the status of pagan theology (in its narrower sense), 1, 18 sqq. The structural arrangement of these verses seems sufficiently clear. Verses 18 to 20 contain a statement of the general truth, applicable to all mankind ("men," v. 18), that they "know God, but worship Him not." Verses 21 to 32 relate, historically, the results of this denial of the truth, as they appeared in the life and morals of the nations in the days of St. Paul. It is of first importance to note, 1) that the idolaters which "God gave up to the lusts of their flesh" are included in "men," v. 18, which is the antecedent of *αὐτοῖς* and *αὐτοῦς* (vv. 19, 20, 24, 26, etc.), and the subject of the verbs in vv. 21 to 32. That is to say, *even after* men refuse to worship God, after they "have become fools," idolaters, and slaves of unnatural lusts, they are still said to retain within them that knowledge of God, "that which may be apprehended concerning Him" (*τὰ νοούμενα*) in the works of creation. They still retain "the truth" (v. 18. 25!). Against that they are sinning; *therefore* they have "no excuse"

when called to judgment. 2) The order of climax in vv. 21—32 must be considered. The first consequence of this denial of the divine truth revealed in nature, is moral decay (v. 24). This is followed by further religious degeneration (v. 25), this, by still greater moral decay (vv. 26. 27), this, again, by idolatry (v. 28), and idolatry, once more, becomes the cause of further moral corruption (vv. 29—32). There is here a constant *retrogression* from the knowledge of God as innate in the human mind, — a knowledge, however, which is never entirely lost (v. 19: *φανερὸν ἐστίν*, and v. 20: *καθορᾶται*), — accompanied by a blunting of the moral faculties, which, in turn, becomes the cause of further religious loss, until the worshiper has become a “hater of God” (v. 30) and a “lover of sin” (v. 32). This relation of cause and effect is sufficiently clear from the terms *διὸ καί* in v. 24, *διὰ τοῦτο* in v. 26, and *καθώς* in v. 28. There is not *sequence* merely, but *consequence*.

Proceeding on the basis of this structural arrangement of the passage, we shall exhibit from the sources indicated: the universality of religion, as implied in the entire passage; the *contents* of that knowledge which St. Paul predicates of the natural mind, vv. 18. 19; the *method* by which man arrives at it, vv. 19. 20, and its gradual *decay* — the result of persistent denial — adumbraged in vv. 21—32.

There is one fact which stands out in bold relief in St. Paul’s argument for the inexcusableness of the pagan world — the universality here predicated of religion. Those who are in v. 21 said to have “knowledge of God,” and the “truth” (v. 18), are the “men” of v. 18, mankind in general. Even theoretically to admit the existence of nations or tribes of men, no matter how completely degenerate culturally, possessing no knowledge of God, would vitiate our conception of St. Paul’s argument, and is contrary to the plain statements of this passage. It is no longer necessary to inquire into the credibility of the reports of early explorers and missionaries among the tribes of central Africa, Central and South America, and Australia, recording the discovery of peoples “without a vestige of reli-

gion," "having no name for 'God,' 'soul,' etc." These reports were eagerly seized upon by a sect of ethnologists,¹⁾ who had an interest in asserting their confidence in them, and who welcomed them as completing the chain of Evolution in Religion. Subsequent research, however, has demonstrated all such reports to be unsupported by the facts. Recent investigators have in some cases found highly developed systems of mythology and worship, where their predecessors failed to note "an inkling of religious cognition." The Australian aborigines are a case in point. It was the fashion, among ethnologists of a generation ago, to refer to the Papuans as a people "so low in the ladder of development, that they had not yet reached the first conceptions of a divinity." Every student of anthropology now knows that these tribes have not only a religion and religious festivals, but have a highly specialized and detailed system of worship, have a belief, similar to that of the ancient Egyptians, and, possibly, of the American Indians, in the resurrection of the dead, "which they symbolize at their festivals by burying a living elder, who then rises from the grave."²⁾ These observations may or they may not be based on fact as to every particular — though the testimony seems unimpeachable; what we would emphasize is this, that the universality of religion is to-day recognized by ethnologists the world over, and that the notion of an "endemic atheism" has long since been consigned to the *limbus fatuorum*.

Now, St. Paul goes a step farther than our ethnologists. Not only have all men some religious intuition, or cognition, or impulse. Not only do men the world over recognize the existence of the spiritual, the extra-mundane, the transcendental as opposed to the material, the experimental, and their own dependence upon it, but they "know God" (*γινόντες τὸν θεόν*); "that which may be known (*τὸ γνωστόν*) concerning God is revealed to them." They possess what "God has revealed to

1) Spencer, *Sociology* III, § 584. J. Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, p. 574. Cf. Bastian, *Vorgeschichtl. Schoepfungsglieder*, p. 41. Jastrow, *Study of Religion*, p. 34.

2) Brinton, *Myths of the New World*, p. 295 sqq.

them," that is to say, "the Truth" (v. 25). This knowledge, moreover, is not represented as having been given in time past, and as now lost, but is predicated of the world in terms as general as the proclamation of God's wrath in v. 18. Hence, a primeval knowledge,³⁾ given in the beginning of history, cannot be inferred from the text. If such were meant, we should not read the present tenses in vv. 19 and 20, but the past, and not ἐφανερώσε in v. 19, but the perfect. (In v. 21 the subject, "men," is narrowed down to those nations whose moral degeneration is surveyed in this and the following verses; hence the change of tenses.) Besides, vv. 19 and 20 distinctly assert that the knowledge here spoken of is gained from a contemplation of nature; it is a knowledge gained through human reasoning, *a posteriori*, proceeding from an apperception of the divine attributes, — both quiescent and operative, as Unity, Infinity, Will, Power, — as revealed in the forms, forces, and phenomena of nature. This knowledge⁴⁾ men possess, and because they refuse Him worship whom they know, they shall have no excuse in the judgment of God's wrath.

3) We fail to understand what "revelation" Rawlinson possibly could have had in mind when he wrote (*Rel. of the Ancient World*, § 232): "The theory to which the facts . . . point, is the existence of a *primitive religion* communicated to man from without, whereof monotheism and expiatory sacrifice were parts, and the gradual clouding over of this *primitive revelation* everywhere, unless it were among the Hebrews." The revelation granted to man at the creation was not "clouded over gradually," but was lost in the Fall, as certainly as that other part of the divine image, man's holiness. And Israel did not preserve a "primitive revelation," but a later, particular revelation granted to Abraham *some two thousand years after* the primeval revelation had been given to man at his creation.

4) Eph. 4, 18 St. Paul speaks of the "ignorance that is in them;" similarly Gal. 4, 8: "When ye *knew not* God;" cf. Eph. 2, 12. But this is the ignorance to which Christ refers John 8, 19: "Ye neither know me nor my Father." Neither the Pharisees nor the Gentile world possessed the spiritual saving knowledge of God, that revelation of God's grace in Jesus Christ "which no eye hath seen, no ear hath heard, neither hath entered the heart of man." To obtain this knowledge, man must first be known of God, Gal. 4, 9: "But now, after that ye have known God, *or rather are known of God*, how turn ye again," etc.

Ethnic literature, whether classical, Vedic, Egyptian, Babylonian, Parsec, or Finnic, abounds in parallels to St. Paul's "Knowing God, they worshiped Him not as God." They meet us wherever we hear the pagan speak the thoughts which are in his heart, and at all stages of cultural development. Even the casual reader cannot fail to note the fact, that all the hideous cults of pagan idolatry were continued *in spite of* a better knowledge, in spite of the conviction that there is a Supreme Power above and beyond the figures of mythology.

The inhabitants of ancient Egypt had at an early age fallen into a polytheistic system of worship which contained fetishistic elements. Their prayers were addressed to the sun, to the Nile, and to a host of abstract divinities. But even in the age of greatest decay, a God Untar was conceived to be of a higher, more sublime character. Untar, moreover, means "power," and the phrase Untar Untra is exactly equivalent to El Shaddai — God Almighty.⁵⁾ Now, what seems much to the point, Untar Untra, the Lord God, is referred to in a great number of Egyptian texts, as Renouf informs us, which otherwise contain manifestly polytheistic views. In such contexts we read, for instance: "God knows the wicked; He smites the wicked, even to blood." Again, we are reminded of the inscription on the altar at Athens, as we hear the Egyptian priest exclaim: "Ah, great God, whose name is unknown —!"⁶⁾ This in an age of advanced polytheism; the same text which contains these words concludes with prayers to the popular divinities. Renouf⁷⁾ quotes the following from the maxims of Ani: "The God of the world is in the light above the firmament; his emblems are on earth; it is to *them* (the emblems) that worship is rendered daily," and not to the Lord God in heaven. And when Amenhotep IV (ca. 1400 B. C.) instituted a monotheistic form of worship, — though of a solar character, — and attempted to destroy the popular faith by abolishing the images of the divin-

5) Le P. Renouf, *Rel. of Anc. Egypt*, p. 103.

6) Strauss-Torney, *Altägypt. Goettergl.* I, 345.

7) l. c., p. 106; also quoted by Strauss-Torney, *op. cit.*, p. 346.

ities, his plan proved a disastrous failure: the grosser cults were revived, and the very statues of the "reformer" were destroyed by an angry populace.⁸⁾

A similar reform, instituted by the Peruvian Inca Yupanqui, will be detailed in another paragraph. A temple was built by him to "the Creator" in a vale by the sea. But when the Spaniards came in 1525, they "found an ugly idol of wood representing a colossal *human person* and receiving the prayers of the votaries."⁹⁾—"They changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like the corruptible man" (v. 23). The detail of a somewhat related story concerning the Mexican King Nezahuatl will also be given in a subsequent chapter. Like Yupanqui, the Mexican ruler acknowledged publicly his belief in "the true God, the invisible and unknown, the universal Creator," and dedicated an altar which bore the inscription: "To the Unknown God." Yet we are informed that the king "continued to receive prayers directed to himself as a brother of the sun, and the regular services to that luminary were never interrupted in his temple." Nor are these examples unique in the history of native American religions. The words of Renouf concerning ancient Egypt may be applied to the American Indian: "No facts appear to be more clearly proved than these: 1) *That the doctrines of one God and that of many gods were taught by the same men.*"

Castren, the recognized authority on everything connected with Finnic systems of belief, has the following: The Ostjaks, Samoyedes, Tunguses, and many other Siberian tribes have a very crude form of polytheism, almost amounting to fetish-worship, and permeated with Shamanism. Yet they acknowledge a God higher than the sun, moon, sacred mountains, etc. This God, however, is not represented by images, receives no sacrifice, no prayers, *no worship of any kind. Instead, they*

8) Hommel, *Hist. of the Orient*, p. 80 sq.

9) Quoted by Brinton from contemporary Spanish records. Brinton says that the facts are undoubtedly historical and the evidence unimpeachable.

adore images of wood, or tin, *representing the human form and the human face*¹⁰⁾ — images of corruptible man. Of the Tunguses especially Castren notes that they “are a people ruled by Shamanism; still they acknowledge a Highest Being under the name of Buga, but *at the same time* adore their images and fetishes, and turn in veneration to the sun, moon, stars, earth, fire, etc.” “The Samoyedes also acknowledge a Supreme Being, Nun, and worship *at the same time* their idols and various natural objects.”¹¹⁾ Thus Bastian¹²⁾ has observed, as an eye-witness, the fact that among the negroes of Fernando Po “every hut generally contains small idols which receive sacrifice *together with Rupe, the Great Spirit.*” Similarly, W. W. Gill, the greatest authority on the mythology of the Pacific Islanders, relates¹³⁾ that among the Hawaiians “Vatea, the father of gods and men, possessed no morae, had no wooden or stone representations, *nor was any worship ever paid to him.*” Concerning certain tribes of Africa, P. Baudin reports, also from personal observation, that they have “a confused idea of the only God, Olorun, *who receives no worship.*” Still “they invoke him in sudden danger and great affliction.”¹⁴⁾ Of another African tribe Winwood Reade says (*Savage Africa*, 1863): “The equatorial savages *do not worship* the Good Spirit, nor pronounce his name; once only, when we were in a dangerous storm, the men threw their clenched hands upwards and cried it twice.” And concerning the Polynesians we are told, on good authority, that “the highest Divinity to whom the creation of all things, including the lesser divinities, is ascribed, received very little veneration, while the local deities were worshiped *almost exclusively* on the Society Islands.¹⁵⁾ Among the early Chaldeans, Il or Ra, “a sort of fount and origin of Deity,” was “too remote from man to be much worshiped. . . . There is *no evidence*

10) Castren, *Finn. Mythol.*, ch. III, pp. 191—236.

11) l. c., pp. 2. 3.

12) *African Travels*: San Salvador, 1859, p. 317.

13) *Myths and Songs of the South Pacific*. London, 1876. p. 17.

14) *Fetichism*, p. 10.

15) Rawlinson, *Chaldea*, p. 73.

of his having had any temple in Chaldea."¹⁶) Finally a story from Plutarch may serve as an instance in point: the great Timoleon († 337), at the end of his remarkable military career, "would write to his friends in Corinth, and in the speeches he made to the people of Syracuse would say, that he was thankful unto God, who, designing to save Sicily, was pleased to honor him with the name and title of the deliverance he vouchsafed it." But did Timoleon render homage to that Being to whose agency he attributed all the glory of his career? "Having built a chapel in his house, he there sacrificed to *Good Luck*, as a deity that had favored him, and devoted the house itself to the *Sacred Genius!*"

The relevancy of these and similar instances, their bearing upon the matter under consideration, is evident. They must certainly be admitted as proof for the presence, in the natural mind, of that knowledge concerning an all-powerful Creator, different in essence from the divinities of mythology, who received no worship though he overshadowed the entire religious life of man, — a knowledge which would reassert itself whenever the fabric of myth and superstition was shaken by imminent danger and sudden misfortune, and whenever the mind would dwell upon the workings of that eternal Power in the phenomena of sky, earth, and sea, and in the lives of men.

The instances cited above, however, merely serve to show the *presence* of such knowledge. It is to the literature of Greece that we must look for proof of its depth, intensity, and extent. At a time when the Hellenic mind, to all appearances, still regarded the gods of its Aryan inheritance as actually existent, monotheistic views found emphatic expression in the so-called Orphic hymns. The question of authorship need not detain us here. It is well agreed that these hymns are relics of a very early age.¹⁷) We have space only for a few extracts. Compare

16) Wegener, *Hist. of the Christian Church in the Society Islands*. Berlin, 1844. p. 158.

17) See Mullachins, *Fragm. Phil. Græc. ante Socr.*, vol. I, p. 162 sqq. Ruhnken says (*Ep. Crit.* II, 69): "Scriptor certe est vetustissimus. Ne

the traditional ideas concerning the Hellenic Zeus with the tenor of the following lines:

“He (Zeus) is One, Self-created; by One all things are fashioned;
In them he moves (*περινόσεται*); none among mortals
Has seen him; but He sees them all.” (*Hymn. Orph.* 1, 8 sq.)

And who is this One? *μῦθος κόσμου ἀναξ*—the One ruler of the universe. Of him it is said, v. 13: “Nor is there another besides this great Ruler;” and the sky is called “the work of the great and wise God.”

St. Paul, in his oration on Mars Hill, reminded the Athenians¹⁸⁾ of that which “some of their own poets had said, ‘For we are also his offspring.’” The author in question is Cleanthes, and the poem cited by St. Paul is a hymn to Zeus: “Mightiest of the immortals, *known by many names*, ever almighty, Zeus, author of the universe, ruling all things by Thy law, hail to Thee; all men may address Thee, for we are all Thine offspring.” Shall we suppose that Cleanthes had in mind the profligate tyrant of Olympus, the Don Juan of mythology, whom Aristophanes considered “ridiculous to the knowing ones” (Clouds, v. 1240)? It is in distinct reference to the “Author” of this quotation that St. Paul says, “For in *Him*” [the Lord, v. 27] “we live, and move, and have our being, as certain also of your poets have said: For we are also *his* offspring.”¹⁹⁾ All of which proves that the divine Essence, the “author of the universe,” occasionally was in the mind of the writers *where the undiscerning reader sees merely a reference to the popular divinities*. “One in essence, he has many names,” says Aristotle,²⁰⁾ “which are given him according to his operations.” And since the original (Aryan) character of Zeus exhibited several divine attributes in a high degree, the name

ullum quidem recentioris ætatis vestigium per totum poema reperies. Dicitio fere est Homericæ.”

18) Additional proof of the wide dissemination of such doctrines among the common people.

19) Acts 17, 28.

20) *De mundo* 7, 1: *Εἰς ἓν, πολυώνυμός ἐστι, κτλ.* Similarly, God is defined as *πολυώνυμος δὴναμις* by Secundus, § 3.

was applied to the God of all gods in an attempt to supply the lack of an unequivocal term. He is "Father of gods and men" in Homer,²¹⁾ and "the greatest of the gods" in Hesiod,²²⁾ and as such he is represented generally in the mythology of Greece. Naturally, then, his name was applied to the divine Being whose existence was recognized in nature and in the life of man. Hence Pindar²³⁾ calls him simply "the Father," in Arianus²⁴⁾ he is identified with *ὁ θεός*, by the Roman Ennius,²⁵⁾ with the "Creator of all things," and by Valerius Soranus²⁶⁾ he is termed

Juppiter omnipotens, rerum regumque repertor,
progenitor genitrixque deum, *deus unus et idem.*

Thus Cicero²⁷⁾ identifies "summus Jupiter" with "coelum atque terras tuens et regens deus," and Seneca²⁸⁾ says that the Jupiter of the early Etruscans "was *not he whom we adore* on the Capitoline hill, but he whom *also we recognize*²⁹⁾ in Jupiter — the ruler and guardian of the universe, the mind and spirit of the world, the lord and creator of this work, *to whom every name applies*. . . . He is the cause of causes; by his breath we live."

St. Augustine repeatedly refers to this phase of the ethnic systems of theology. He recognizes the doctrine of one God in the mythological vocabulary of ancient Rome and Greece. "The multitude of names does not prove a multitude of divinities,"³⁰⁾ and he specifies particularly the case of "Jupiter." "All of these gods and goddesses are the one Jupiter, representing either his parts or his attributes,"³¹⁾ in fact, "Jupiter" is the universe (mundus)³²⁾ in which God has revealed Himself to the pagan nations or, as Seneca has it, "Vis illum [Jovem]

21) Though *Odyss.* 14, 444 sq., has clearly *θεός* = God.

22) *Theogonia* 44, 71, 885, and elsewhere.

23) *Olymp.* II, 49.

24) *Dissert.* I, 3, quoting Epictetus.

25) Quoted by Varro, *de L. L.*, V. 71.

26) Augustinus, *De Civ. Dei*, VII, 9.

27) *De Legg.* II, 9. 10.

28) *Natur. Quest.* II, 45.

29) Note that Seneca includes himself among those who worship the traditional god, while he recognizes Another in the works of nature.

30) *De Civ. Dei* VII, 24.

31) *l. c.* IV, 11.

32) *l. c.* VII, 16.

'naturam' vocare, non peccabis: hic est, ex quo nata sunt omnia, cuius spiritu vivimus; vis illum vocare 'mundum,' non falleris: ipse est enim . . . et se sustinens et sua,"³³⁾ for he says,³⁴⁾ "Tot appellationes ei possunt esse, quot munera" — as many names as he has activities.

We have here presented only such passages as may be said to exhibit without ambiguity or vagueness a cognition of God the Creator and Preserver of all things, a cognition (or intuition) which occasionally sought expression in terms (Zeus, Jupiter) long sacred to the ancient mind. That these appellations, in the instances cited, are emptied of all mythological meaning and are deliberately and designedly applied to a Being conceived as infinitely greater than the popular gods and goddesses, is evident to every reader; the statements are too definite and explicit in character to permit any other construction; when Hermesianax³⁵⁾ says:

Pluto, Persephone, Demeter, Kypris, Erotes,
Artemis, and the protector Apollo — εἰς θεός ἐστι —

the monotheistic views of the writer and the supersession of traditional terms are equally apparent. From out the shattered structure of classical mythology, allegory, and legend,³⁶⁾ the recognition of a personal Creator, of his "eternal power and Godhead," rose to assert itself in the consciousness of the Roman and the Greek. They possessed "the truth," but "held it in unrighteousness;" "knowing God, they worshiped Him not as God," but continued to adore the gods upon Olympus, and erected shrines to "Good Luck" and to the "Genius," or — as in the case of the Stoics — for the knowledge so clearly conceived and expressed, substituted a pantheistic theory of God and the world. "To be an equal of God, *and not a worshiper*

33) *Nat. Quest.* II, 45, 3.

34) *De benefic.* IV, 7.

35) Quoted by Villoison, *Theol. Phys. Stoic.*, p. 505. Villoison demonstrates the existence of undeniably monotheistic conceptions as attaching to such expressions as *μοῖρα*, *fatum*, *αἴρῆα*, *necessitas*, *fortuna*, *ratio*, *anima mundi*, and many others. They all "represent that which we call God." (p. 499, op. cit.)

36) "Hallucinationes;" Seneca, *De Vita Beata*, ch. 26.

(non supplex),” was the *summum bonum* of Seneca; “to rise an equal to God,” the end and aim of his system.³⁷⁾

St. Paul says that God had made of one blood all the nations of the earth and appointed the bounds of their habitation, “that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might — *φηλαφήσειαν* — find him *by groping about* [with outstretched hands];”³⁸⁾ but more than this was vouchsafed the dwellers in ancient Greece. What little remains of their literary productions fairly abounds in passages which illustrate the wonderful insight they possessed into the nature of the Divine Essence. So great is the number of passages which explicitly express a knowledge of the Creator and of His attributes, — a knowledge sometimes divested, it seems, of all polytheistic reminiscences, — that we occasionally are on the point of losing sight of the idolatrous practices and superstitions of the writers, as members of a people which offered up sacrifice and prayer to “images of corruptible man” at a thousand shrines. This remarkable clarity of religious intuition may be equally observed in the works of the poets, philosophers, and historians, more especially, however, in the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Pindar, Demosthenes, Xenophon, of the pre-Socratic philosophers, and of the dramatists.

There is no longer any trace of the mythic element in the following specimen — selected from the Orphic hymns:³⁹⁾

“Not one of mortal men might see the Ruler (*κράινοντα*)

Except an only-begotten one (*μονογενής τις*), a descendant, from above
(*ἀπορρῶξ ἄνωθεν*),

Of the Chaldean race.”

The author of these lines lived possibly six hundred, certainly not less than three hundred years before Christ. Of the “Ruler” v. 15 said, “There is no other,” and in v. 9 he is spoken of as “the immortal maker (*τυπωτής*) of the world,” of whom there

37) *Epist.* 31: “Par deo surges!” Similar expressions are numerous both in the *Epistles* and in the treatises.

38) Homer has the word (*Od.* IX, 416), when speaking of blind Cyclops in the cave.

39) II, 22.

is "an ancient report" (*λόγος*). The lines are in every way remarkable. Whom did the ancient poet have in mind when he spoke of "the only-begotten one of the Ruler; a descendant, from on high, of the Chaldeans"? The coincidence of "Chaldean people" with the fact that Chaldea was the original home of Israel, need hardly be pointed out.

There are passages in the writings of Plato which are quite as mysterious in their consonance with revealed truth. Concerning the work of Creation we read that "the father, having created [the Cosmos], was delighted (*ἡγάσθη*);"⁴⁰ "God intended to create everything good and nothing evil."⁴¹ The traditional cosmogony has been definitely given up by the author. The world is created "by the word of the everlasting God,"⁴² who is still "the preserver of us men,"⁴³ and who shall finally "liberate us from our body."⁴⁴ The existence of One God, of a *personal* God, is here taken for granted, as generally in Plato, and the simple term *ὁ θεός* is applied to him, whom others still sought to recognize in the nature and attributes of Zeus.

Red Wing, Minn.

THEO. GRAEBNER.

(To be continued.)