

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

EARLY GENTILE CHRISTIANITY AND ITS HELLENISTIC BACKGROUND



HARPER TORCHBOOKS



The Clarendon Library / 90 111 - 83 83

Early Gentile Christianity
and its Hellenistic Background

Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

ὅπη ἀν ὁ λόγος ὡσπερ πνεῦμα φέρη, ταύτη ἰτέον

WITH AN INTRODUCTION TO THE TORCHBOOK EDITION
BY THE AUTHOR, 1962, AND TWO ADDITIONAL ESSAYS,
'A NOTE ON THE RESURRECTION' AND 'HELLENISTIC
MYSTERIES AND CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS'

HARPER TORCHBOOKS



The Cloister Library

Harper & Row, Publishers

New York, Evanston and London

EARLY GENTILE CHRISTIANITY
AND ITS HELLENISTIC BACKGROUND

Introduction to the Torchbook edition copyright ©1964 by The Estate of Arthur
Darby Nock.

Printed in the United States of America.

“Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background” and “A Note on the Resurrection” both originally appeared in *ESSAYS ON THE TRINITY AND THE INCARNATION*, edited by A. E. J. Rawlinson, and published by Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., London, in 1928. They are here reprinted by arrangement.

“Hellenistic Mysteries and Christian Sacraments” was first published in *Mnemosyne*, S. IV, Vol. V, 1952, issued by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands. It is here reprinted by arrangement.

First HARPER TORCHBOOK edition published 1964 by
Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated
49 East 33rd Street
New York 16, N. Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION TO THE TORCHBOOK EDITION	vii
BIBLIOGRAPHY	xviii
I. EARLY GENTILE CHRISTIANITY AND ITS HELLENISTIC BACKGROUND .	I
I. THE BACKGROUND.	
II. THE THEOLOGY OF CHRISTIANITY AS A MISSION-RELIGION.	
III. THE PRACTICE OF CHRISTIANITY.	
IV. CHRISTIANITY IN THE COMMUNITIES.	
V. RELATIONS TO PHILOSOPHY.	
VI. CONCLUSIONS.	
II. A NOTE ON THE RESURRECTION .	105
III. HELLENISTIC MYSTERIES AND CHRIS- TIAN SACRAMENTS	109
I. MYSTERIES AND INITIATIONS IN CLASSICAL GREECE.	
II. MYSTERIES IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD: THE METAPHORICAL USE OF MYSTERY TERMINOLOGY.	
III. MYSTERION AND THE METAPHOR OF MYS- TERIES IN JUDAISM.	
IV. BAPTISM AND THE EUCHARIST AS <i>DONA DATA</i> .	
V. DEVELOPMENT IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES.	
VI. DEVELOPMENT IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.	
INDEX	147

ABBREVIATIONS.

A.R.W. = *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.*

C.Q. = *Classical Quarterly.*

C.R. = *Classical Review.*

J.H.S. = *Journal of Hellenic Studies.*

J.T.S. = *Journal of Theological Studies.*

R.G.V.V. = *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* (Giessen, 1903-).

Z.N.W. = *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

Clemen = C. Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des neuen Testaments*, ed. II (Giessen, 1924).

E.R.E. = *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. J. Hastings.

P.W. = Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.*

Reitzenstein, *Myst.*² = R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, ed. II (Leipzig, 1920).

—————*Myst.*³ = ed. III (Leipzig, 1927).

Strack-Billerbeck = *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, von H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, I— (München, 1922-).

INTRODUCTION

to the Torchbook edition

FROM the University of Oxford there issued in 1860 *Essays and Reviews*, in 1889 *Lux Mundi*, in 1912 *Foundations*, each the product of a number of minds and each in its own way a landmark in the theological thinking of the English-speaking world. In 1924 A. E. J. Rawlinson (later Bishop of Derby), who had contributed to *Foundations*, K. E. Kirk (later Bishop of Oxford) and some of their colleagues decided on a new venture, to be named *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*.

One topic which to them seemed to call for treatment was the relation of Christianity in the Apostolic age to its non-Jewish environment. For a generation this subject had been actively canvassed, and it was energetically maintained that the idea of a Resurrection on the third day had its origin in Near Eastern myths of dying and rising gods, and that the description of Jesus as Lord and again the sacramental character of baptism and the Eucharist were likewise importations from the Gentile world. In the second century of our era Justin Martyr had noted pagan analogies to the sacred story and to the rites of the Christians: he explained them by the theory that the demons had produced a counterfeit in advance. The modern supposition that Christianity had borrowed substantially from paganism is in no sense comparable with the notion that Jesus never existed (which may aptly be compared with the Bacon-Shakespeare theory and its successors). The idea of such borrowing was initiated and developed by notable scholars who made serious and solid observations and who substantially enlarged our horizon of knowledge.

Rawlinson and his associates turned first to Edwyn Bevan, whose *The House of Seleucus, Jerusalem under the High Priests, Stoics and Sceptics*, and *Hellenism and Christianity* marked him as a natural choice. Bevan declined, and suggested my name. I was then teaching Classics at the University of Cambridge, and spending all my free time studying various aspects of religious development in the Graeco-Roman world. Gilbert Murray's *Four Stages of Greek Religion* (later to be expanded to *Five Stages of Greek Religion*) had come into my hands at school and left on me a permanent impress and impulse.

To try to rewrite or even to revise something composed so long ago would be foolish even if it were possible; it would mean putting new wine into old bottles. The shorter essay on mysteries and sacraments (from *Mnemosyne* 1952) included in this volume does in a measure supplement and correct what was written earlier. (So do my *Conversion*¹ and *St. Paul*,² and my chapters in *Cambridge Ancient History*, vols. X and XII, all of which were likewise produced in response to external stimuli.)

I venture to hope that this reprinting may have its relevance today. Not a few of the theories which more than thirty years ago seemed to call for scrutiny continue to have a wide circulation. Take the *Paulus* of H. J. Schoeps, published in 1959.³ It is a brilliant and learned book, doing justice to the Apostle's thought as rooted in Pharisaic tradition and as determined by his personal experience and by eschatology; Schoeps has moreover seized on the fundamental significance of Schweitzer's *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Yet even Schoeps maintains that 'Son of God' and all that goes with the belief, e.g. the descent of a heavenly figure (*Philippians* ii) takes us 'into the neighborhood of pagan ideas of the time'. What were these 'pagan ideas of the time'? Certain historical persons were thought to be sons of deities, but as such they were human, though specially endowed. They could be raised to the level of

¹ Oxford University Press, 1933; paperback edition available.

² Harper & Brothers, 1938; Harper Torchbook edition, 1963.

³ *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth, 1961.

the gods: they had not voluntarily come down from that level and they were not thought to have had a pre-existence on a heavenly plane. In fact, almost all the gods worshipped in antiquity (including the 'dying and rising gods') were thought to have been born in time and place (often here on earth). Gods could take human shape, but they were hardly ever thought to assume 'la condition humaine', with all its liabilities, and the idea of Incarnation was a stumbling block and not a point of attraction to the Greeks.

Let us now consider briefly certain topics on which the last thirty years have brought a better understanding. (The selection and emphasis are necessarily personal.)

§ 1. *Judaism*.—First, our knowledge of Judaism in the first centuries of our era has been greatly enriched. The documents found at and near Qumran, commonly called the Dead Sea Scrolls, have brought before us the books and the life of a sect, identified beyond doubt with the Essenes as known from Philo and Josephus. This sect had a strict communal organization, and combined a meticulous zeal for the observance of the Law with a lyrical enthusiasm shown in their psalms. They had a great preoccupation with secret knowledge, above all secret knowledge of God's plans, i.e. eschatology, and their solemn communal meals were probably taken in anticipation of the fulfilment of their Messianic hopes and beliefs. Repentance and baptism were prerequisites for admission into 'the eschatological community of God'.¹ Their picture of the world was characterized by various contrasts—the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Perversity, the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness (predestined to be such), and (occasionally, and not precisely in a Pauline sense) flesh and spirit. In spite of the secrecy which all members were solemnly bound to observe as to the teachings of the sect (including the names of the angels), the general character of these teachings was known outside the movement, and the new information about it is pertinent to the study of Paul as well as to that of Jesus.

¹ F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and modern Biblical Studies*, 177. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1958; Anchor paperback edition, 1961.

A point of special interest is that among the very numerous Biblical texts belonging to the sect there are some in Greek. This is one more indication that we must not draw too sharp a distinction between the Judaism of the Holy Land and the Judaism of the Dispersion. There was much coming and going between Jerusalem and Alexandria, and the quasi-monastic Therapeutai described by Philo look as though they were in some sense related to the Qumran sect. Again, knowledge of the Greek language was not uncommon in Palestine, and where there was the language there could be some of the thought. On the other side Philo, with all his knowledge of Greek philosophy and his willingness to read some of its insights into Scripture, was Jewish to the core. It should be remembered that Judaism was at all times a religion of orthopraxy and not a religion of orthodoxy—as also that it was in the main a religion of the family, of the congregation, of the race, not of an organized church, and that missionary effort was rare (proselytes were people who had ‘come in’).

Even in orthopraxy there was an appreciable range of variation, as has been brought home to us in the most marked way by the excavations at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates. This had been a Macedonian military colony: it passed for a time under Parthian control, and was finally the seat of a Roman frontier garrison. Towards the end of its existence, in the third century, the meeting place of the local Jews was decorated with a series of notable mural paintings of scenes from the Old Testament. At various times, earlier and later, such art would have seemed to violate the Second Commandment: at Dura it was clearly regarded as an appropriate way to ‘magnify God’, a work of piety like the mosaic floor of the synagogue at Apamea in Syria, where inscriptions record that this and that section were given by individuals for the wellbeing (*soteria*) of their kinfolk.

Literary and archaeological evidence alike have brought home to us the loyalty to tradition as well as the numerical strength and wide dissemination of the Jews outside Palestine. At the same time, we have been made increasingly aware of the existence of Jews who did not cleave strictly

to the Law. Many of the magic spells and amulets which combine the Sacred Name of God and Old Testament material with pagan elements may with reason be ascribed to men like the seven sons of Sceva mentioned in *Acts* xix. 14. Jewish deviationism of a more reputable type may well lie behind part of the Hermetic literature (see p. xvi).

§ 2. *The Graeco-Roman World*.—Second, archaeological finds have continuously enlarged our knowledge of the world in which Christianity spread. The synagogue at Dura has been mentioned; we have here also, apart from the predominantly Semitic cults, a Mithraeum (twice rebuilt) and a Christian church. (The remains of both can be seen in the Yale University Art Gallery.)

The steadily growing body of inscriptions referring to the local affairs of cities and other communities in the Near East supplies a salutary corrective to the idea that, after the new world situation which succeeded the conquests of Alexander took shape, local loyalties lost much of their meaning. To be sure, a reflective Greek in the time of Paul could not but realize that the great days of his land were past: like the recognized masterpieces of literature and art, they belonged to the lost radiance of a classic epoch. Yet the inscriptions show men's pride in holding office, their public benefactions, and their care for traditional rituals. The old gods counted, as dedications and priestly records show: people do not keep up appearances indefinitely. The great temples of Western Asia Minor flourished remarkably under Roman rule. As for civic affairs in general, we must not forget that Plutarch's *Precepts of Statecraft* was written to give counsel to Greeks as to public duty in their own communities. We may think of their affairs as 'parish pump': but people in a parish pump draw their water from the pump, and they meet and talk around it.

Again, the inscriptions illustrate notably the spread of the Greek language and the pervasive influence of Greek education, literary and physical. It was the schoolmaster and the teacher of athletics who carried on the process of Hellenization which took its impetus from the founding of cities and veteran settlements by Alexander and his successors,

notably the Seleucids. The papyri of Egypt show that a surprising range of literature was copied for reading. In the countryside local languages continued to be in use and could revive, but, generally speaking, the progressive dissemination of Greek was remarkable.

The effect of this upon the Jews has been noted. Elsewhere also there could be a seepage of ideas to people who did not read literary works, and this is to be borne in mind with reference to what is said later about philosophy in relation to the rise of Gnosticism. Here again the inscriptions help us by indicating that philosophers were men of consequence in their communities: which is also shown by the work of Artemidorus on the interpretation of dreams, one of our best aids in trying to put a finger on the pulse of the man in the street.

Where inscriptions (or other sources) are concerned, the argument from silence is one to be used with caution, since unexpected finds do turn up. Nevertheless, the fact that Mithraism (a notable new creation on the basis not of Zoroaster's teaching, but of popular Iranian belief outside Persia) is almost absent from Western Asia Minor and is but sparsely represented in Syria and Egypt should make us reluctant to ascribe to it any influence on the evolution of early Christianity.

Let me close this section with some general remarks on the implications of the phrase 'Hellenistic background' in the title of my monograph. Between Alexander and Augustus, between Augustus and Julian, a great deal happened in religion and philosophy as well as in political and economic life. To be sure, when we divide history into periods, we are liable to make too much of new factors and too little of things that remained relatively constant. So, for example, men might give complete intellectual endorsement to what philosophy said about the gods without thereby obliterating the fables and fears which their nurses had taught them or the impress of the traditional profiles of the gods as enshrined in poetry and art. On the other hand, we must be very cautious as to any use of evidence from later centuries to explain phenomena of the time of Paul. The chronological differentiation of data in Martin P. Nilsson's *Geschichte der*

griechischen Religion, vol. II,¹ is one of the inestimable contributions of that masterpiece of patient brilliance.

§ 3. *The Language of Religion*.—Third, our lexicographical aids for the study of vocabulary of the New Testament have been notably enriched and a better understanding of its character is now possible. It is clear that the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, commonly called the Septuagint, exercised a great influence on the choice and use of words; it is clear also that certain words (e.g. *pleroma*) previously neutral acquired a new sense or overtone. Further, the attempt to show that the Christians adopted a technical vocabulary from the piety of Greek or Graeco-Oriental mysteries breaks down completely; in fact they failed to use certain Greek words which were undeniably familiar in the context of religious thought and practice and which would have been appropriate. So again there is a world of difference between the use of *euangelion* in the New Testament and its occasional use in expressions of loyal devotion to an Emperor; I doubt whether any early Christian knew that the term had been so employed.

Just as Hellenistic Judaism supplied the Septuagint, so also it could mediate Greek philosophic ideas: the speech before the Aeropagus in *Acts* xvii is probably an illustration of this. (It should perhaps be added that there is no need to see an echo, however remote, of Heraclitus—or even of Philo—in the opening of the Fourth Gospel, and that *logos* is one of the many Greek words which have a wide range of meaning.)

§ 4. *Gnosticism*.—Fourth, we come to the question of Gnosticism, which may fairly be called the crucial issue today in the study of early Christianity. Traditionally the term has been applied to a wide variety of Christian sects, claiming to possess a special esoteric knowledge; their various deviations were in a large part ascribed to the influence of Greek philosophy. In the last fifty years, however, it has been widely held that there was an independent entity which may be called Gnosticism, this being as Rudolf Bultmann puts it, 'a religious movement of pre-Christian origin which in various forms invaded the West from the East as a rival

¹ Published in 1950: a revised and enlarged edition appeared in 1961.

of Christianity. In general it can be defined as a dualistic piety of redemption.' Bultmann credits it with a myth about the destiny of the soul, which is very much like the 'Iranian' idea of Reitzenstein's discussed later in the main essay.

Gnosticism would on this view be a concrete phenomenon from which were derived not only specific sects but also substantial elements in early Christianity. But what was its *Sitz im Leben*, or, if you prefer, its 'place in the sun'? Would you have found a church or conventicle of some type or other of Gnostics in Corinth at the time of Paul's correspondence with his converts there? Alternatively, did this supposed original Gnosticism take shape in a literature analogous to those which passed under the names of Orpheus and Hermes, or in a book, comparable with the *Chaldaic Oracles*? Evidence for something of the sort might conceivably appear. In the meantime, since originality is not necessarily confined to movements or authors that have disappeared, I must continue to hold that in the environment of early Christianity there were materials which could be built into Gnostic systems—but no Gnostic system; that there was an appropriate mythopoeic faculty—but no specific myth; that there was a 'Gnostic' state of mind—but no crystallized formulation of that state of mind and no community or communities clinging to the formulation. In short, there was a climate of opinion, and Judaism and Hellenism alike (with such foreign ideas as had found some home in either of the two) helped to shape it. (These are categories with which we can operate; the word 'Oriental' is not, for in this context it has no specificity save by contrast, i.e. as meaning 'non-Greek'.)

Reference has already been made to the varieties of Judaism, and to the esoteric interests of the Essenes. Thanks to Gershom Scholem we know also of a type of Jewish thought, dating back long before the time of the Kabbala, which may fairly be regarded not only as cognate to that of Gnosticism as traditionally conceived, but also as one of its sources. (This is so in spite of the fact that what this kind of Judaism sought was to get, here and now, inside the terrifying splendor of the angelic and heavenly world, whereas the Christian Gnostics sought to get out of

the familiar world of matter and sin and suffering.) Moreover, even a cursory examination of the systems constructed by some of the Gnostic Christians strikes the observer by the prominence of themes which could have been suggested by the early chapters of Genesis. There you find the original chaos, the first bisexual man (as *Genesis* 1, 26 f. was often understood), the taking from man of the rib from which Eve was created, the jealous God who will not have man eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the serpent who plays a part like that of Prometheus, the Fall, the succeeding shame at nakedness, the curse of pain in bringing forth children, Cain and Abel, the mysterious Seth, the privileged Enoch, the sons of God who mate with the daughters of men, the Flood. All this had a wealth of suggestiveness. As for Hellenism, from the time of Socrates it was widely held that right thinking and right opinion supplied the key to right living, and the various philosophic schools offered their differing ways of deliverance from the uninformed and mentally footloose life. This deliverance lay in a reasoned conviction as to values—the highest good, the extreme evil—and as to the scheme of things and the place (and it might be, the purpose) of man within that scheme.

Indeed Tertullian says (*Praescr. haer.* 7), 'Heretics and philosophers ponder on the same topics—whence is evil, and why? and whence is man, and how?—Men needed to understand 'their going hence, even as their coming hither', the goal of life, what came after death. Gnosticism gave assured answers to these questions (just as it also satisfied a widespread concern with cosmogony). Not a few of the Gnostic answers show the influence of Platonism as it came to be understood. So it could be held that life in the body implies a descent and an imprisonment of the soul and that evil is inherent in matter. After all, Plato had said that evils must necessarily hover around mortal nature and this earth. Therefore we ought to try to escape from here to there (i.e. to the dwelling of the gods) as quickly as possible (*Theaetetus* 176 A), and Plato was also interpreted as saying that there is an evil World Soul. Many Platonists held that there are imperfect supernatural powers, and that the

Supreme Being is wholly remote from the world of sense-experience. To be sure, in later Platonism, when the Creator is distinguished from Ultimate Deity, it is by way of subordination, and not, as in some Gnostic teaching, of alienation. Nevertheless, one can see why Simone Pétrement once called Gnosticism 'un platonisme romantique', for which we might be tempted to substitute 'Platonism run wild'.

A fusion of these two components, Judaism and Greek philosophy, is found in some of the tractates associated with the name of Hermes Trismegistus, which denotes the Egyptian god Thoth, scribe of the gods and reputed author of the ancient sacred literature kept in the temples as also of pseudoscientific works in Greek. So is the idea that knowledge (or self-knowledge) delivers man from his inherited plight and raises him to a higher plane of existence, so also a sense of estrangement from the world and a missionary zeal to save humanity from the besotted sleep of ignorance. This is excellent evidence for a climate of opinion, but very far from affording anything like probable indications of a pre-Christian *Weltreligion*.

In any event, all that we know suggests that the figure of Jesus—appearing, teaching, dying, and (according to the belief which touched off the Christian movement) rising—and the conviction that this Jesus was the Heavenly Lord caused the raw material of Gnosticism to take definite shapes, some closer to the central stream of Christian thinking, some more remote. (The tradition about Simon Magus may well represent a very early attempt to overtrump the claims of the Christians.) The attitudes which Paul criticizes at Corinth, the thinking which he criticizes at Colossae, suggest its rudimentary beginnings. It could not have been difficult for some Gnostic ideas to arise out of reflection on his own teachings. If the Law was regarded as a second best, and if you could speak of 'the god of this world' (II *Cor.* iv. 4), might it not be that the God of the Law and of Creation was a second best? If you accepted the distinction between spiritual and natural persons, was there not reason to speculate on how they happened to be as they were? If Paul had heard unspeakable things in the third heaven,

might not others have an inkling of those secrets? And there was the sophisticated Judaism, brought, say, by Apollos. Paulinism without Paul presented many difficulties.

There's a great text in Galatians,
Once you trip on it, entails
Twenty-nine distinct damnations,
One sure, if another fails.

The case for this traditional view of Gnosticism has been greatly strengthened by the discovery in Upper Egypt of a large collection of Gnostic books in Coptic, which was the new shape of the vernacular language of the land. The collection does indeed include Hermetic treatises as well as other pseudepigraphic texts mentioned by Porphyry in his account of the intellectual war which his master Plotinus, the founder of Neoplatinism, waged against the Gnostics at Rome in the middle of the third century of our era. (Porphyry, be it remarked, makes it clear that he regarded them as Christian sectaries who could also be thought to have roots in the old philosophy, i.e. as renegade Platonists.) Otherwise all the texts on which information is available either give embroideries on the Genesis story or show acquaintance with our New Testament or do both. The *Gospel of Thomas* may twist sayings of Jesus known from the Synoptic Gospels, but they afford its principal point of departure. So again the doctrines of Basilides were put forth in the form of *Comments on the Gospel*. Such facts speak for themselves. Let me add that it seems to me wholly unwarranted to take Gnostic or Manichaen texts which quote the New Testament and to reconstruct from them a hypothetical forerunner of Christianity in general and of Paulinism or the Fourth Gospel in particular. After all, Mani began each of his Epistles by describing himself as 'Apostle of Jesus Christ'.

It is time to close this retrospect, and I do so in deep thankfulness to all those, dead and living, old and young, who have given me generous aid and encouragement over the years and who have so often saved me from error.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

§ 1. *Judaism*.—George Foot Moore, *Judaism* (1927-1931), describes with no less sympathy and understanding than learning and penetration what he calls 'normative Judaism'; the preface to the third volume tells the reader what he will and what he will not find in this masterpiece. For Qumran, apart from F. M. Cross, as cited earlier, and Millar Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls* (1955) and *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1958), let me mention *The Scrolls and the New Testament* ed. Krister Stendahl (1957). For cultural contacts, cf. Saul Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (1942) and *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (1950); Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (E. T. 1959). For the Jews at Alexandria cf. W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization* (ed. 3, with G. T. Griffith, 1952), ch. vi; H. I. Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (1953), ch. ii; Tcherikover in *Harvard Theological Review*, LI (1958), 59-85; Tcherikover and A. Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* I—(1957—).

For Philo cf. E. R. Goodenough, *Introduction to Philo Judaeus* (1940); H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (1947); Philo, *Selections* edited by Hans Lewy (1946; in the series *Philosophia Judaica*, ed. H. Bergmann). The Loeb edition, with translation etc. by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, and R. Marcus (1929—), is indispensable, for in Philo it is particularly dangerous to consider a phrase without its context. For Dura, cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and its Art* (1938); C. H. Kraeling, *The Synagogue [Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report, VIII, i, 1956]*. For other Jewish art, cf. E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* I— (1953—), with my remarks in *Gnomon* xxvii (1955), 558 ff., xxix (1957), 524 ff., xxxii (1960), 728 ff. For Judaism in general cf. *The Jews* ed. L. Finkelstein (1949); *The Jewish*

Encyclopaedia (1901—); L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (1909-1938; abridgement, as *Legends of the Bible*, with introduction by S. Spiegel, 1956). Cf. also section 4 later.

§ 2. *The Graeco-Roman World*.—M. Rostovzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (1926; revised edition by P. M. Fraser, 1957) and *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (1941; revised edition, 1953) are the two most remarkable works of our time in this field. Tarn's book, mentioned earlier, and *Cambridge Ancient History* are also indispensable. F. van der Meer-Christine Mohrmann, *Atlas of the Early Christian World* (translated and edited by Mary F. Hedlund and H. H. Rowley; 1958) and Michael Grant, *The World of Rome* (1960) will both enrich the reader's picture of life as it was lived in this milieu. So will T. Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (1933-1940) and A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937) and *The Greek City* (1940). Martin P. Charlesworth, *The Roman Empire* (1951), mainly concerned with later times, is a masterpiece of understanding and sympathy.

On education, cf. H. I. Marrou *History of Education in Antiquity* (E. T. 1956); M. P. Nilsson, *Die hellenistische Schule* (1955), which should be translated.

On philosophy, A. H. Armstrong, *Introduction to Ancient Philosophy* (ed. 2, 1949); A. J. Festugière, *Epicurus and his Gods* (E. T. 1956) and *Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste I*—(1944—); E. R. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics* (1913); D. R. Dudley, *History of Cynicism* (1937); my *Posidonius in Journal of Roman Studies* XLIX (1959), 1 ff. and *Sallustius Concerning the Gods and the Universe* (1926), ch. i.

Useful selections of the source material for philosophy and religion alike, will be found in Bevan, *Later Greek Religion* (1927) and F. C. Grant *Hellenistic Religions* (1953). Otherwise, let me mention F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (ed. 4, 1929: this contains much that is not in the second edition, available in English as *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, 1911); A. J. Festugière—P. Fabre, *Le monde gréco-romain au temps de Notre-Seigneur* (1935); Festugière, *Personal Religion among the Greeks* (1954); Martin P. Nilsson *Greek Piety* (E. T. 1948).

Nilsson's *Greek Folk Religion* (1940; reprinted in the Torchbook series, 1961) gives the older Greek background, as does, from a different angle, E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (1951). In this connexion I may refer to my *Religious Attitudes of the Ancient Greeks*, in *Proc. Am. Philosophical Soc.* LXXXV, 1942, 472 ff.

The *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1949) will be found a convenient work of reference.

§ 3. *Lexicography, etc.*—Arndt and Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (1957), a translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, is a mine of accurate and well digested information. A number of the major articles in G. Kittels' monumental *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (1932) have been rendered into English in *Bible Key Words*, tr. J. R. Coates and H. T. Kingdon (1951, 1958). On the character of N. T. vocabulary cf. my article in *Journal of Biblical Literature* LII (1933), 131 ff.; on *euangelion* cf. *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. XI (1960), 64 ff. On the Areopagus speech cf. Bertil Gärtner, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (*Acta Seminarii Upsaliensis*, XXII, 1955), and my remarks in *Gnomon* XXV (1953), 504 ff.

§ 4. *Gnosticism.*—For the topic in general cf. F. C. Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees* (1925) and *Church and Gnosis* (1932); R. P. Casey, *Journal of Theological Studies* XXXVI (1935), 45 ff.; H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (1958); R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (1959) and *Gnosticism: A Source Book* (1961); R. McL. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem* (1958).

For Bultmann's point of view cf. his *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting* (E. T. 1956) and *Theology of the New Testament* (E. T. 1951-3). For a brilliant criticism of the idea that Gnosticism was an independent entity, cf. S. Pétrement in *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 1960, 385 ff.

For Jewish Gnosticism, cf. the pioneer works of Gershom G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (1941) and *Jewish Gnosticism* (1960), with G. Quispel's review of the latter in *Vigiliae Christianae* XV (1961), 117 ff.

For the Hermetica cf. *Hermès Trismégiste* 1—(1945—), by Festugière and myself, and Festugière's *Révélation* cited earlier.

The fullest account of the new Coptic find is given by J. Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics* (E. T. 1960; much enlarged by the author, as compared with the French original). Cf. also *The Jung Codex*, ed. F. L. Cross (1955) and W. C. van Unnik, *The Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (E. T. 1960). For individual texts cf. K. Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth* (1960; on this document cf. also my remarks in *Journal of Theological Studies*, N. S. ix, 1958, 314 ff.); A. Guillaumont etc., *The Gospel according to Thomas* (1959); R. M. Grant and D. N. Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (1960); B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas* (E. T. 1961).

Let me remark that J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, as cited in the pages which follow is available in two volumes, with an introduction and bibliography by F. C. Grant, under the title *Earliest Christianity* (in the Torchbook series). There is much that is suggestive in *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (1944) by W. L. Knox, and *The Root of the Vine* (1953), by Anton Fridrichsen and others. Finally, for the whole complexity of the relations of Christianity, down to the seventh century, to its background and to its environment we have now the monumental *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (1941), brilliantly edited by Theodor Klauser and supplemented by the new *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*: 'here is God's plenty.'

I

EARLY GENTILE CHRISTIANITY AND ITS HELLENISTIC BACKGROUND

To determine with accuracy the influence on early Christianity of its Hellenistic background is impossible. Our material does not enable us to define in detail all the stages through which early Christianity developed, and we do not know the Hellenistic background nearly as well as we could wish. What is here attempted is a provisional treatment of this great subject. That such a treatment is possible is due to the labours of many scholars; the writer's debt to some of them, and in particular to the friends who have criticised earlier drafts of this paper or discussed with him aspects of the question, is not adequately represented by the references given in the footnotes.¹

We have to deal on the one hand with assured facts, on the other with more or less probable explanations of or inferences from them. With the latter there must come in an element of subjectivity and room for honest divergence of opinion. Few critics, whether conservative or radical, can hope to be free from preconceived ideas and from the desire to find in the facts something which they wish to find. The

¹ I should here wish to express my thanks to Professor F. C. Burkitt, Prof. R. P. Casey, Dr. A. B. Cook, the Rev. Prof. J. M. Creed, Mr. H. T. Deas, the Rev. W. L. Knox, Dr. R. B. Onians, Prof. H. J. Rose, Mr. F. H. Sandbach, Mr. C. T. Seltman, Mr. W. Spens, the Rev. Dr. H. F. Stewart, the Rev. W. Telfer. The reader who desires a good general account of the first century of our era would do well to turn to W. R. Halliday, *The Pagan Background of Early Christianity* (University of Liverpool Press, 1925), to ch. iv. of Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* ⁴ (available in translation), to Cumont's brilliant book, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (available in translation), and to Wendland's admirable *Hellenistisch-römische Kultur* ² (1912). Early Gentile Christianity for the purposes of this essay does not in general embrace more than the period to about A.D. 80.

I should remark that Dr. Rawlinson's Bampton Lectures, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, and Reitzenstein's third edition of *Myst.*, were not available till this essay was completed. *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, I.—(Münster, 1921—), deserves a special mention for its excellent *bibliographie raisonnée*.

present essay represents an attempt to preserve a judicial tone in the separating of data and opinions and in its deductions ; how far it has succeeded is for others to say.

I

THE BACKGROUND

§ 1. *Jews and sympathisers.*—The Christian teacher who addressed himself to devout Jews had the way to some extent prepared for him. He found in his hearers a strict monotheistic faith, commonly some kind of Messianic expectation, and always a belief in God's law and in the moral requirements of religion. He told them that the cherished expectations of their race had been gratified, though in an unexpected way, that God had not waited for the perfection of Israel before sending the Messiah but had already sent Him, that this Messiah had died, had risen, and would come again in glory, and that in the light of the rising of the Messiah and the expectation of His second coming they were called to a new life. Such instruction would be suitable not merely to Jews in Judaea but also to the numerous Jews of the Dispersion. It would reach also the many Gentiles who, without formally becoming proselytes, felt drawn to Judaism ; we find them called *Sebomenoi*, ' worshippers,' and the ' worshippers of the Highest God ' (*Theos Hypsistos*) in the Hellenised East were probably in large part Judaising Gentiles and Hellenising Jews.¹ Jewish religious propaganda at this time reached all classes of society ; it may be remarked that various passages in the New Testament imply that many Gentiles might come to a synagogue when a

¹ See F. Cumont, *P.W.* ix. 444 sqq. ; A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, ii. 876 sqq. Lydia (Acts xvi. 14) is described as *σεβομένη τῶν θεῶν*. The representation of Noah and the ark on coins struck at Apameia in Phrygia in the third century A.D. under Septimius Severus, Philip Senior and Macrinus, but probably copying some earlier painting which existed in the city (W. M. Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Asia Minor*, i. 669 ; Usener, *Siniflutsagen*, 48 sqq. ; a good specimen struck under Septimius is illustrated in *Catal. Hirsch*, xiii. (Rhosopolos) 250, no. 4098, pl. xlviij ; specimens from Philip are *B.M.C. Phrygia*, 101, no. 182, cf. xxxix., and *Inventaire Waddington*, 5731, and from Macrinus, *Inv. Wadd.* 5723), has often been adduced as evidence of Jewish influence ; but it may be due to a combination of Jewish and Phrygian stories (cf. A. J. Reinach, *Noe-Sangariou*, Paris, 1913, reprinted from *Revue des études juives*, lkv. and lxvi.).

famous preacher was expected.¹ There can be little doubt that the first Gentiles to be converted were almost without exception men and women who had fallen under Jewish influence. They were now offered something which afforded the spiritual satisfaction which they had sought and found in Judaism, and which had the further advantage of not treating them as 'lesser breeds without the law.'

§ 2. *Hellenistic belief*.—In spreading from this well-prepared ground the Christian movement encountered new tasks. It faced a world which did not know Judaism or which hated and despised it, a world which was unacquainted with the prophets and familiar with cults not pretending to exclusiveness, with mysteries not always requiring a moral standard of their devotees, with an unchangeable and unmoral order of destiny determined, or at least indicated, by the stars, with magic of various kinds.² We must make some attempt to grasp the salient features of this religious situation, having in view Asia Minor, Syria, and Greece.³

The culture of the nearer East had two faces, the life of the Greek cities, whether early settlements or later foundations due to Alexander the Great, to his successors, and to their great heir, Rome, and the life of the undeveloped countryside. The latter does not concern us much. In the first century city life flourished, and the country is subordinate; it was, moreover, in the city populations that Christianity first spread. The contribution of the non-Greek element in the population to religion was important: in Asia Minor it meant the Anatolian cult of a mother-goddess (Meter, Leto, Ma, or Artemis) and a son or youthful

¹ Cf. Acts xiv. 1, xviii. 4. On Jewish converts at Antioch, cf. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 45. A significant illustration of the diffusion of Jewish ideas is the superstitious feeling commonly attached to the Sabbath in pagan circles (cf. F. H. Colson, *The Week*, 11 sqq.). On the reasons for the attraction exercised by Jewish propaganda, cf. H. Gressmann, *Zeitschr. f. d. alltest. Wiss.*, N.F., II. (1925), 9 (he notes the economic strength of the Jews, their freedom from crude mythology, their Book, their ethical standards, and their social rest-day).

² It is significant that Tatian, while ridiculing mythology, directs his serious attacks against astrology and magic (A. Puech, *Recherches sur le discours aux Grecs de Tatien*, 43).

³ Christian beginnings in Egypt are shrouded in darkness: Rome for our purposes is on a par with the Hellenistic cities of the East, since much of its population, and in particular the circles in which Christianity first took root there, drew their mental and religious colour from the Greek East rather than from Italian sources.

and subordinate consort (Attis, Tyrimnos, etc.), sometimes of mother, consort, and son,¹ together with beliefs coming from the Persians who had ruled the land; in Syria it meant the local Baal and the local mother-goddess. Yet it was, though non-Greek, given a Greek dress. The mother-goddess could be called Artemis, the young god Apollo.² Baal could be called Zeus, with some local epithet or other.

These Hellenistic cities worshipped the Greek gods, Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, Dionysus, Asclepius and the like. They worshipped also the Emperor (either by himself or in association with the goddess Roma, the divine personification of the imperial city's power). Both types of worship could express sincere belief. But they need not. Neither required more than the performance of certain observances; they were without a theology, though susceptible of theological interpretation.³ Their religious content would, according to the mind of the individual, be of a high order or of a low. Some who sacrificed to Zeus would do it as a mere matter of form or social decency, with no more religious sentiment than is involved in the payment of tithes to a lay rector. Some, again, in doing sacrifice to him would feel that they were doing homage to the great power that rules the

¹ J. Keil's study of the cults of Lydia (in *Anatolian Studies presented to Sir William Ramsay*, 239 sqq.) is particularly helpful. For the Persian element in Cappadocia cf. H. Grégoire, *Comptes rendus de l'académie des inscriptions*, 1908, 434 sqq. (Greek-Aramaic bilingual in honour of Mithras); R. Reitzenstein, *Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift*, 1922, 102₁; *Myst.*³ 215 sqq. On the survival of small communities of magi in Asia Minor cf. Cumont, *Les mystères de Mithra*³, 11 sqq., and in general O. G. von Wesendonk, *Über georgisches Heidentum* (1924), 7 sqq. For Persians in Egypt, cf. Reitzenstein, *Gnomon*, 1927, 278₁.

² So earlier on coins of Side struck in the fourth century B.C. a Semitic inscription, 'lord of Side,' is put beside the figure of Apollo, who is both Greek and indigenous (C. T. Seltman, *A Hoard from Side*, 10 sq.; cf. Keil, *op. cit.* p. 262).

³ Thus in the account which Eusebius gives of the martyrdom of Procopius, the governor Flavianus does not dispute the Christian's statement that there is one god; he only asks him to offer incense to the Emperor (F. Salisbury—H. Mattingly, *Journ. Rom. Stud.* xiv. 11). This partly accounts for the rarity of protests against Emperor-worship, for which cf. my *Sallustius* (Cambridge, 1926), lxxxix. n. 210, and Pausan. VIII. 2. 5. In this connexion we may note G. F. Hill's excellent observation (*Some Palestinian Cults of the Graeco-Roman Age*, off-printed from *Proc. Brit. Ac.* v, p. 2): 'We may rest assured that the people who believed in, or worshipped, these deities were hardly more clear than ourselves about their significance and origin.' On the importance of state-cults as traditional, cf. E. Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, 21₁.

universe, the beginning and end of all, 'father of men,' as Cleanthes sang of him in his hymn. Such would reverence the image of Zeus as a symbol, and as an expression of deity in terms of beauty. This sentiment is well expressed, with reference to the image of Zeus by Phidias at Olympia, in a passage of Dion of Prusa, who said in the first century of our era, 'I think that a man who is altogether burdened in soul and has endured many misfortunes and griefs in his life and does not enjoy sweet sleep, would, if he stood before this image, forget all the grievous and dreadful things it may befall one to suffer in human life.'¹ And again, others, in sacrificing to Zeus, would think that they were making an offering to a deity identical with or residing in the cult-statue before them, that this deity would be angry and visit them with ill weather if he did not receive the usual respect, and that he was distinctly more effective than the Zeus of the next city.

Side by side with the civic cults flourished certain forms of worship which were of wider extension, as, for instance, the cult of Apollo at Delphi with his famous oracle, which seems to have enjoyed renewed prosperity under the Empire; that of Asclepius at Epidaurus, with its healing activities; that of Zeus at Olympia. There flourished also mysteries.² As these will occupy not a little of our attention, it is desirable to define their general characteristics. A *mysterion* is a secret rite, in which the individual participates of his own free choice, and by which he is put into a closer relation with the deity honoured; normally he must undergo ceremonies of initiation (not usually capable of repetition) conferring a new and indelible spiritual condition and commonly giving an assurance of happiness hereafter. Those being initiated, says Aristotle, need not to learn something, but to receive an experience, and to be put into a frame of mind. The experience of the initiate may consist of acts done to him or by him, or again of the watching of a

¹ This and other passages are given by Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen*, 138 sqq.; the point in question is well made by Th. Zielinski, *La Sibylle*, 13 sq. The ancient apologetic for image-worship is very like that used elsewhere (cf. E. R. Bevan, *Edinburgh Review*, February 1926).

² The reader who desires a good general account of these may turn to A. Loisy, *Les mystères païens et le mystère chrétien* (1919), and to R. Pettazoni, *I misteri* (1923).

sacred drama. Thus at Eleusis the initiate (who might, in the fifth century B.C. and later, be a member of any Greek state, might be male or female, slave or free), having been first admitted to the lesser mysteries at Agrae, received a preliminary purification, witnessed the sacred drama, and performed certain ritual acts. On a second visit he reached the higher grade of *epoptes*, 'one who has seen.' Thereafter he looked to a brighter future in the next world, being endowed with a 'good hope.'¹ Of these mysteries there were offshoots elsewhere in Greece. Again, at Samothrace in the cult of the Cabiri, deities of whose nature we are ill-informed, mysteries were celebrated involving a preliminary confession of sins. Those who had been initiated were held to become 'more religious and upright and altogether improved.' The rhetorician Aristides, in the second century of our era, speaks of these mysteries as second only to those of Eleusis in honour.² Demeter is probably pre-Greek, in spite of her name: the Cabiri were non-Greek, but both had long found their place in the Greek religious world. Later came the mysteries of Phrygian Cybele, of Syrian Adonis, of Egyptian Isis, of Persian Mithras. These rites were, in spite of their differences, fundamentally akin; with various speeds and in various ways they had been spiritualised out of primitive ritual meant to serve practical ends. At the time which we are studying they share the notes of universality, of conversion,³ in part of moral basis⁴; further, they all involve a joining in the sorrows and in the joys of the god. We know them best from sources of the second century A.D. and later, and it is fairly clear that they rose in importance in the second century, but there can be little doubt that much of what

¹ Cf. in general L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, iii. 126 sqq., and Pettazoni, *op. cit.*

The quotation from Aristotle is from his lost work *On prayer*, fr. 45, p. 1483 a. 19, καθάπερ Ἀριστοτέλης ἀξιοῖ τοὺς τελουμένους οὐ μαθεῖν τι δεῖν ἀλλὰ παθεῖν καὶ διατεθῆναι, δηλονότι γενομένους ἐπιτηδέλους.

² Diodorus Siculus, v. 49; Aristid. *Or.* xiii. (vol. i. 308, Dindorf): cf. O. Kern, *P.W.* x. 1433 sq.

³ That is, speaking generally of these cults as disseminated outside their original homes. Adonis at Byblus, Isis in Egypt receive *general* worship like civic or Panhellenic gods in Greece. As disseminated among members of other nations they are mission-religions (cf. an interesting point in Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 102s).

⁴ See pp. 71 sqq. later.

is then characteristic of them had taken shape earlier. Mithras seems not to have come westwards except sporadically till the end of the first century A.D. and is therefore to be separated from the others, but we must in general speak with Reitzenstein of 'Hellenistic mystery-religions.'¹

Civic cults, Caesar-worship, Mysteries, these make up the public religion of the Hellenistic world. In the resulting picture there is much which was foreign to the Greeks of the classical age, and, if we turn from public and official religion to the indications which we possess of more individual religious development, of currents of belief growing in small groups or disseminated by literary propaganda, there is more. What had happened so to change the face of the world?

§ 3. *The transformation of Greek belief.*—The germs of most of this new development are to be found in the centuries succeeding the conquests of Alexander. The closer contact now made possible between East and West, the extension of men's mental horizon, and the growth of individualism are all factors of moment. Let us consider each of these in turn.

A traveller like Herodotus had been received by priests in Egypt, but as a tourist in whom they had little interest, and the priests of whom he speaks were probably underlings.² The new contact and the inevitable realisation of the Greek's superiority in worldly matters led to a corresponding desire on the part of the Oriental to emphasise the greater antiquity of his religious traditions.³ Keen-sighted individuals like Manetho in Egypt and Berossus in Babylon followed this course: the former wrote in Greek of Egyptian belief and history, the latter of Babylonian astrology. Most of their colleagues in the native priesthoods were no doubt less learned, and cannot be credited with similar activities, though their religious attitude may well have been more enlightened and less seldom speculative than that of the masses of their countryfolk. Nevertheless, the rapid diffusion of the Greek

¹ Cf. now *Myst.*³, 95 sqq. His polemic against E. Meyer's denial of the justness of the term seems to me completely successful.

² W. Spiegelberg, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit von Herodots Bericht über Ägypten im Lichte der ägyptischen Denkmäler (Orient und Antike, 3; 1926)*, 18; the monograph as a whole is most helpful.

³ This has been well set forth by Th. Hopfner, *Orient und griechische Philosophie (Beih. z. Alten Orient, 4, 1925)*, 27 sqq.

language (probably also of a modicum of Greek culture) in the Egyptian priesthood must have helped to make the Greeks more at home in beliefs partly new to them.¹ They for their part were not unacquainted with Eastern gods and Eastern astrology; they were, moreover, prone to idealise foreigners when they did not despise them.² A great impetus was therefore given to the study and further development of Babylonian beliefs in the power of the stars, to the study and philosophic interpretation of Egyptian tradition, and to the worship of Egyptian and other Oriental gods. That worship, while retaining its fundamental character, was subjected to Greek influences which humanised its mythology and caused it to be less other-worldly and to stress mystic redemption in this life and not exclusively happiness hereafter. The product was something neither wholly Oriental nor wholly Greek, but new; in Egypt the cults of this character emanating from Alexandria asserted themselves over the older worships of the land.³

From Homeric times the Greeks who thought on such matters had in general assumed two things: 'The first is that the gods are real and care more or less for all men, not simply for the Greeks. The second, that the deities of foreign nations are simply the familiar Greek gods under new names.'⁴ Foreign gods were therefore in their eyes worthy of worship; so, for instance, we find in the Delta a bronze statuette of the bull Apis dedicated by a Greek in the sixth century B.C.⁵ This tendency developed rapidly. Thus Timotheus, a religious official at Eleusis at the end of the fourth century B.C., appears as one of Ptolemy I's advisers in the shaping of the new cult of Sarapis, the god who was to be an Egyptian to the Egyptians and a Greek

¹ Cf. Reitzenstein, *Kyrk. Ars.* 1922, pp. 98 sqq.; W. Otto, *Priester und Tempeln im hellenistischen Agypten*, ii. 235 sqq.

² Cf. H. Gressmann, *Die hellenistische Gestirnsreligion (Beihefte zum Alten Orient*, v. 1925); W. Roscher, *Lexikon für griechische und römische Mythologie*, iii. 2525; p. 66 later; on the Greek attitude to non-Greeks cf. J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechischen Apologeten*, ix.; on foreign gods in fifth-century Athens cf. H. Herter, *De dis Atticis Priapi similibus* (Bonn, 1926), 6.

³ So W. Weber, *Ägyptisch-griechischer Götter* (Groningen, 1912), and H. Gressmann, *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, 1923-4, p. 188 sqq.; on myth cf. also p. 61, n. 1.

⁴ H. J. Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch*, 53.

⁵ Cf. thereon V. Ehrenberg, *Alexander und Agypten (Beih. z. A. O.* vii. 1926), 19.

to the Greeks, and again as writing on the myth of Cybele of Pessinus in Phrygia.¹ To all three forms of religion he brought no doubt the same religious attitude.

This identification of deities enabled Greeks and Orientals to find a meeting-place in worship.² It further increased the tendency towards monotheism. In the late first or early second century of our era Plutarch writes, 'There are not different gods in different nations, barbarians and Greeks, southerners and northerners. Just as sun and moon and sky and earth and sea are common to all, though named differently by different peoples, so the one Reason ordering this world, the one Providence governing it, and the subordinate powers set over all have different honours and titles among different peoples according to their customs. Some men, whose lives are sanctified, use faint symbols, others use clearer ones; these guide the mind towards things divine, but not without danger, since there are those who go completely wrong and slip into superstition, and again there are others who avoid superstition as though it were a marsh and then fall unawares over the precipice of godlessness.'³ The progress of this tendency may be connected with a rising interest in divine power rather than divine personalities; it is of course the stronger deities who absorb and are not absorbed. The full development of this comes later in the second century A.D. and afterwards.⁴

¹ The legend is, of course, part of the cult (F. Pfister, *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1926, p. 282 ff.), though it may well pass into something purely literary, as in the second and fourth hymns of Callimachus (R. Reitzenstein, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1924, 40). Zielinski's interesting suggestion (*La Sibylle*, pp. 83 sqq.) that Timotheus reformed the cult, and did for Lysimachus something like what he did for Ptolemy is unfortunately only a conjecture. Doubtless he Hellenised the story: thus the story of the council of the gods at which the other deities are uncertain what to do with the dangerous bisexed Agdistis, and Liber undertakes to deal with him (Arnob. v. 6), seems to owe something to Plato, *Symp.* p. 190 c. Timotheus seems to have been interested in Iranian belief also (Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, p. 225). For his position as religious adviser, cf. that of Pachrates in Hadrian's entourage (W. Weber, *Sitzungsber. Ak. Heidelb.*, 1910, vi. 618).

² It is possible that we can exemplify this under Alexander. His tetradrachm types meant to a Greek Heracles and Zeus, to an Oriental Melkarth and Baal of Tarsus (C. T. Seltman *ap.* A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, II. 762).

³ *De Iside et Osiride*, 67, p. 377 f. Cf. Liechtenhan, pp. 58 sqq. of the work mentioned, p. 147, n. 2 later; and on the common belief in ancient imageless cult, cf. M. Pohlenz, *Gött. gel. Ans.*, 1913, 640 sqq.

⁴ Cf. *J.H.S.* 1925, 85 sqq., and, to illustrate the degree to which syncretism advanced, contrast the Orphic Hymns (perhaps first century A.D.) and the Orphic *Argonautica* (fourth-fifth). On the part which later Platonists had

Thus the East gave to the Greeks new gods, identified with the old gods but tenacious of their own characteristics. Isis is identified with Aphrodite and with Demeter, but her cult as it spreads over the world is and remains Egyptian. Another growth of this period and of its blending of cultures is the deification of kings. Divine honours were given to Alexander in his lifetime by the Greek cities; his official consecration came after his death, as did that of Ptolemy I; the regular cult of the living ruler is later. Many factors contributed to this evolution, the Greek belief that men could for their services attain the rank of hero or demi-god on death, a sporadic Greek tendency to recognise very eminent men as divine in life, the overpowering impression made by the personality and achievements of Alexander, the strong impression made by the other great figures of the age, the Egyptian belief that divinity rests in the kingship, and the rivalries of dynasties finding expression in this sphere. The Greek elements in this are not to be under-estimated.¹ Yet it must be remembered that the one early Hellenistic monarchy which is without apotheosis is the Macedonian, which was removed from Eastern influences, and that, where such influences are lacking, as in Sicily (where the Carthaginians would not contribute anything of the sort), the appearance of royal portraits on coins, itself a claim to deity, is later.² This kind of homage must at times have been the genuine expression of grateful reverence, but often

in this development, cf. G. Beyerhaus, *Rheinisches Museum*, 1926, p. 32 sqq. Of the swallowing of weaker gods by a stronger an admirable example is afforded by the history of the cult of Priapus, who took the place of various kindred figures (H. Herter, *De dis Atticis Priapi similibus*, 8). The identification and blending of deities is old in the East; the wars and racial movements of the second millennium B.C. produced much fusion of religion. Thus the presence of the Egyptians at Byblus introduced an alien element in Syria; we find such a representation as H. Gressmann, *Altorientalischer Bilder zum a. T.*², 101, no. 354, of a Semitic deity in an Egyptian shrine (of the Persian period, 525-332).

¹ Cf. E. Kornemann, *Klio*, i. 51 sqq.; E. R. Bevan, *E.R.E.* iv. 525 sqq.; L. R. Taylor, *J.H.S.* 1927, 53, and my *Notes on Ruler-cult* (to appear in *J.H.S.*).

² So G. Macdonald, *Coin Types*, 150 sq., and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, I. i. 98. The Sicilian instance is the more interesting because the Sicilians were not unwilling to accord heroic honours (cf. F. Pfister, *Reliquienkult im Altertum*, pp. 586 sq.). In Persia the king was not deified, but his *Hvarenó* or radiance was honoured; cf. R. Zahn, *Anatolian Studies*, 450^b, for references and Cumont's study, *Textes et monuments*, i. 279 sqq.

it could be an empty form, and in an age strongly coloured by scepticism it both encouraged and was encouraged by the rationalistic hypothesis (commonly associated with the name of Euhemerus but not originated by him) that all the gods were human beings deified for their achievements.

To pass to the second point, the conquests of Alexander and the political and commercial relations which followed them had made the Eastern Mediterranean, and most of the wide expanses of the old Persian Empire, into what was for all its diversities a single cultural unit. Sophistic and Cynic speculations as to the brotherhood of man gained a new reality and diffusion¹; the basis for Stoic speculation was in no small part created by the facts of the time. The missionary spirit, seen clearly in the Cynics and in Epicurus, was present, and religions became mission-religions, seeking adherents everywhere. The cult of Dionysus had been this in its early march through Greece, but that original impetus was a thing of the past: still earlier were the conquests of Apollo's cult. Orphism was not the force it had been in the sixth century B.C.; its missionary activities were weakened and, if one may say it, subterranean. At this time no form of belief took the offensive with more energy and effect than the Hellenised but Egyptian cult of Isis and Sarapis, which spread freely in Greece and the Greek islands, as it did later in the West also. Other mysteries gained in importance: those of Samothrace enjoyed the patronage of Lysimachus and of the Ptolemies and acquired international significance. Alexander had destroyed many barriers of race: Rome proved a worthy heir.

Thirdly, the growth of individualism had marked effects. The Greek had always been intensely personal; the pages of Herodotus show this with particular clearness. Further, the intellectual movement towards enlightenment in the

¹ On the Stoic ideal of the world as a great city, cf. Hatch, *Influences*, pp. 211 sq., and Wendland, *Hellenistisch-römische Kultur*², 41 sqq.; on the history of the idea, J. Mewaldt, *Die Antike*, ii. 177 sqq.; on the notion of the world as a whole, J. Kaerst, *Die antike Idee der Oekumene* (1903), 10 sqq., with the modification necessitated by W. W. Tarn's paper, *J.H.S.* 1921, pp. 1 sqq. (which shows that there is no reason to suppose that Alexander aimed at world-dominion).

A striking illustration of this general attitude is Tatian, 28, p. 29, 17: *μίαν γὰρ ἐχρῆν εἶναι καὶ κοινὴν ἅπαντων τὴν πολιτείαν.*

fifth century had asserted the right of the individual to self-expression and the purely relative validity of convention, and the Cynic preaching in the fourth century had been a powerful solvent of civic ideals. Now, with the break-up of the old order and the establishment of a new, the old local cults and ties were greatly weakened. Many might live on in unintelligent conservatism, but the souls of the more thinking men were in a way untenanted. Religion or philosophy might occupy the vacant habitations, but it must be a religion of the individual soul or a religion of humanity, not a local traditional faith, a philosophy again of conduct rather than an intellectual system. The need for something was real. Life was so uncertain, so liable to sudden and violent changes of fortune.¹

None of these factors was quite new, but all had attained new proportions. In the earlier part of the Hellenistic age the tendency of the more significant circles was towards scepticism. This we see no less in Stoics than in Epicureans. If the latter denied the concern of the gods with humanity, the former saw in the traditional mythology nothing more than allegorical explanations of physical phenomena. 'Do not,' says Zeno, 'build temples to the gods; for a temple which is not of much worth is not holy, and nothing which is constructed by builders and labourers is of much worth.' 'Yet,' continues Plutarch, after quoting this saying, 'those who approve this remark are initiated in temples, go up to the Acropolis, do reverence to the seats of the gods, and wreath the temples; though these are the works of builders and labourers.'² It is in full accordance with the creedless character of ancient civic religion that neither Stoics nor Epicureans abstained from participation in public worship. Of course, while thinking men for the most part turned to philosophy rather than to religion, the conservatively minded retained their beliefs and busied themselves with the founding of temples and processions,³ perhaps with the

¹ Cf. E. R. Bevan's essay in *The Hellenistic Age*. On the earlier history of individualism cf. E. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften z. Geschichtstheorie*, pp. 205 sqq., and in general cf. Wendland, *op. cit.*, pp. 45 sqq.

² *De Stoicorum repugnantibus*, 6, p. 1034 B.

³ K. Latte, *Die Antike*, i. 146 sqq. gives a fine analysis of the various tendencies of the time.

greater zeal because of the unbelief around ; the belief of the uneducated and unthinking town-dwellers, as also of most of the country folk, remained much as it had ever been.¹

Such in its broad outlines is the picture which we can draw of the religious and speculative outlook of the end of the fourth and the first half of the third centuries B.C. Greek elements are fusing with Oriental, Greek individualism with Oriental faith, but the process has not gone far.

Out of this picture another develops. The mystery and missionary religions grow,² and, in addition to the cultus in temples open to the public, we become aware of interesting esoteric rites carried on by small private societies. The cult society as a corporation is an old institution in Greece : now it becomes important as affording suitable soil for the growth of religious ideas. We learn at some date between 222 and 204 B.C. of private ritual for Dionysus in Egypt from a rescript of Ptolemy IV to secure its regulation, in 189 of Dionysiac ritual in Etruria and at Rome, under the empire of the Dionysiac mummery of a society called the Iobacchi at Athens.³ Some such sodality doubtless met or intended to meet at Rome in the first century of our era in the underground basilica near the Porta Maggiore ; their common beliefs seem, from the mural decoration, to have been clearly concerned with the hereafter, though it is difficult to be sure of the extent to which the symbolism employed had kept its meaning.⁴

Furthermore there was a growth of mysticism. In the

¹ Thus Polybius, iv. 20, praises the piety of the Arcadians.

² A small illustration is the reorganisation in 92 B.C. of mysteries (akin to the Eleusinian) at Andania in the Peloponnese (Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*³, 736). On the rise of the Egyptian cults cf. O. Weinreich, *Neue Urkunden zur Sarapis-religion*, 1919 ; A. M. Woodward, *J.H.S.* 1926, 249 (imposition of Isis and Sarapis on an earlier cult at Cyne in Aeolis).

³ Cf. *C.R.* 1924, 105 *sqq.*, for references. The later diffusion of private mysteries is well illustrated by Apuleius, *Apol.* 55, 8 : A. is there confident that *Liberi patris mystae* will be present in court at Sabrata in Africa.

⁴ For these decorations see E. Strong and N. C. Jolliffe, *J.H.S.* 1924 (much of the symbolism there read into them is not easy to accept) ; J. Carcopino, *Études Romaines*, I (1927). The view here taken agrees with Lietzmann, *Vorträge d. Bibliothek Warburg*, 1922-3, i. 66 *sqq.* I do not now think (as when I wrote *C.R.* 1924, 106 *sqq.*) that Orphic is the right label for this community, pending evidence for its use, and should prefer to use the term Neopythagorean suggested by Cumont, at least provisionally : at this time Orphic ideas flourished in Neopythagorean circles particularly.

second century B.C., if not earlier, we can date the rise of what is called Hermetic literature—that is, books on various subjects (first of all astrology) combining ‘the religious and scientific traditions of Egypt at one and the same time with the astrology which came from Babylon and with Greek philosophy,’¹ and professing to give their teaching as that of Thrice-greatest Hermes, the Greek name for the Egyptian god Thoth. Thoth was the god of arts and sciences, and was thought to have written books.² Of this first species of Hermetic writing we have several specimens.³ Philosophic teachings also were put forth as being revelations of this sort; how early we cannot say. We have many specimens of this kind of writing, in the so-called *Corpus Hermeticum* and as quoted by Stobaeus. Some of them seem to contain nothing more than Greek philosophic commonplaces, but a group cleverly distinguished by Bousset⁴ is marked by Oriental ideas akin to Gnosticism. Of these more will be said later.⁵ There is little in these writings which can be called specifically Egyptian, apart from mystical tendencies found in the piety of that country and in Plotinus; there is much Platonising thought, some Stoic, some Judaic, as well as the Gnostic strain and possible contacts with Christian ideas. The Egyptian setting gives to them the halo of Eastern wisdom; it was in the Hellenistic age that the tradition of the pre-Socratics and Plato having learned their wisdom from Egypt and Babylon arose.⁶ Nevertheless, the tone of them as a whole is not in sympathy with popular worship: we may speak of Hermetism as a theosophy. Two of them are in a sense mysteries; but they are mysteries of the word, sacramental acts of baptism and of rebirth described and explained. The baptism may have been performed in act, after some such exhortation as we read

¹ The phrase is translated from F. Cumont, *Journ. Rom. Stud.* xv. 273 (in an instructive review of Scott's *Hermetica*).

² Roeder in Roscher's *Lexikon*, v. 849.

³ References in W. Kröll, *Pauly-Wissowa*, viii. 797 sq. An early instance of a literary fiction of this kind is [Plat.] *Axiach.* p. 371; cf. Cumont, *Cat. codd. astr. gr.* viii. 4, 102 sq.

⁴ *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1914, pp. 697 sqq. How early this strain is remains uncertain.

⁵ Pp. 149 sqq.

⁶ XVI, in which the supposed translation from the Egyptian is emphasised, contains nothing but Greek popular philosophy (Reitzenstein, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1924, 42). In general cf. Hopfner's work, quoted p. 59, n. 3 above.

in the tractate; the rebirth is something done by word alone.¹ In this form we know it from texts of the second century A.D. and later; but our texts postulate earlier originals, and a similar kind of mystical writing seems to lie behind some of Philo's works. There must have been many undercurrents in religion and theosophy which we do not know. Not the least important were Hellenising tendencies in Judaism, particularly in Egypt.² In one or another of these movements such terms as *gnosis*³ (knowledge conceived not as a mere intellectual attainment but as a vehicle of power or regeneration), *photismos* (inward illumination), *pneumatikos* (spiritual), hardened into the significance they later have: a theological terminology which Christianity could appropriate was in process of formation. It is above all Reitzenstein who has brought these facts to light and who has emphasised the importance of terminology. The words a man uses do in religion also use him. We must therefore avoid an over-intellectual attitude in exegesis, particularly of St. Paul. One idea carries on to another, and that other follows: the *Epistles* are not deliberately planned writings with logical sequence.

The mystical tendencies are apparent also in other developments, as, for instance, in the writing of apocryphal works ascribed to Orpheus and in the revival of Pythagoreanism which we observe from about 100 B.C. onwards. This Neopythagoreanism was of wide influence, and is of particular interest in its combination of asceticism and interest in wonder-working, for which latter we may use the convenient term *theurgy*. In this union it is the spiritual ancestor of the Platonism of the second century A.D. represented by Apuleius, of much Neoplatonism, and of the piety of the Egyptian ascetic legends preserved in the Lausiac History and in the *Apophtheg-*

¹ IV. and XIII. Cf. F. Bräuninger, *Untersuchungen zu den Schriften* (Diss. Berlin, 1926), pp. 14 sqq. on IV; Reitzenstein, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, 97, on XIII. I is rightly described by Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 10, as 'a purely internal experience' (cf. *ibid.*, 51, on IV).

² On Philo, cf. Reitzenstein, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1918, 253; on Hellenising Judaism, his *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus*, 31, and *Myst.*³, 417 sq.

³ On this cf. p. 151, n. 1 later. Bräuninger has made the interesting observation that the technical use of the word in the *Corpus Hermeticum* is confined to the 'orientalising' group; *γνώσις* is something neither wholly Greek nor wholly oriental; it is a product of the contact of Greek thought and oriental belief.

mata Patrum.¹ The mystical tendency showed itself also in Platonising modifications of Stoicism and in other forms of thought.² In the same period Graeco-Egyptian magic grew. In this Egyptian and Greek elements were combined, and gods of all sorts (Jewish, Babylonian, and so on) were invoked. Men sought thereby to harness great combinations of divine energy to their purposes, good or bad. It matters to us here, because religious and mystical men, Neopythagoreans and Neoplatonists, used it just like the unenlightened, and because in many ways it shows the same ways of thinking as we find in loftier forms of contemporary belief.³

All this esoteric development may well seem to denote a 'failure of nerve,' as Gilbert Murray calls it. In a sense Hellenism was declining, as we seem to see in the triumph of the Egyptian element under the later Ptolemies, and in the orientalising tendency of such a monarch as Antiochos I of Commagene. But we must not think of this precisely as decadence. Oriental beliefs, not discredited as was so much traditional Greek faith, and semi-oriental mysticism met a spiritual need of the times, a demand for something clear and dogmatic which explained the universe, and for an assured hope of immortality. The East conquered the West because it had something to give. In the widest sense the tide was turning from rationalism to faith in the first century B.C. : even where there was not a definite return to religious observances, there was an antiquarian interest in old cults, which we may perhaps compare with the so-called romantic interest in the Middle Ages which preceded the revival of Catholicism in the nineteenth century.⁴ Rustic piety 'and

¹ So Hermetism came to find room for popular belief, cf. *J.T.S.* xxvi. 173 sq. The development of Christian Gnosticism is in some ways parallel. For the continued existence of Neoplatonism combined with magic in Arabic texts, cf. H. Ritter, *Bibl. Warb.* i. 97.

This Neopythagorean movement has affinities with Hermetism (cf. the combination of Hermes, Pythagoras, and Plato in Arnob. *Adu. nat.* II. 13).

² As, for instance, the glorification of *Aion* (Eternity) in a text at Eleusis dated in 74-3 B.C. by Cichorius, *Römische Studien*, 301, Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ 1125, 'Eternity remaining the same and unchanged always by divine nature, and the universe one and the same as it is and was and shall be, not having beginning, middle or end, with no portion of change, creator of divine nature, eternal in all.'

³ Cf. A. Dieterich, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 513, also my remarks in *J.H.S.* 1925, 84 sq.

⁴ Cf. *C.R.* 1925, 60 sqq., and for Rome, G. Boissier, *La religion romaine*.

old-time morality had a certain appeal, even for those who could not or would not practise them. Though to the educated philosophy rather than religion was still generally the refuge from life's hardness, new currents of religious life were in motion; the way was being prepared for the piety of the second century of this era, of which Apuleius again affords interesting evidence.¹

§ 4. *What conversion meant to a pagan.*—In this Hellenistic world there was then a great and confusing array of cults, old civic worship, sometimes now recovering after generations of decay, new Caesar-worship, and also the now rising religions of the individual. In a way they were competing for his attachment: at the same time they were ready to blend or be equated, and showed little tendency to that exclusiveness which was a distinctive feature of Judaism and of Christianity. The convert to Christianity had to learn what was to him surprising, that he could not draw on this new source of divine power, illumination, salvation—to speak of it as he sometimes might—and at the same time on those he had known earlier. Further, he had to learn that adherence to the new creed meant a rigorous standard of life, preached as he had heard it before by philosophers who had no concern with temples, and now enforced with a binding sanction. Morality had very little connection with the old civic gods at this time of day, except perhaps in the use of their names in oaths in court: naturally the regular practice of religious observances, even if as little spiritualised as those of the Roman Republic, has an effect on the individual's character, but it might not be a strong one. If you had incurred certain pollutions you were excluded from the temple: if you were living in sin, that would not always bar you. 'You must not enter within three days of eating goat's flesh, one day of eating cheese, forty days of abortion, forty days of bereavement of a relation; from lawful sexual intercourse you are purified on the same day by a

¹ Thus *Apol.* 55, 4-6; he taunts his adversary with the fact that he has never prayed to any god or gone to a temple or kissed his hand to any rustic shrine, does not make the right offerings to the gods of country life, who feed him and clothe him, has no shrine or consecrated spot or grove on his estate, no, not even an anointed stone or a wreathed bough.

lustral sprinkling and anointing with oil.' 'You must abstain from intercourse with your own husband or wife for one day, from any other for two days: so also you are excluded for two days after bereavement or contact with a woman who has given birth to a child; from burial and funeral procession you are pure the same day after a lustral sprinkling and passing through the gate where means of purification are set.' 'You are to be pure from garlic and pig's flesh and women: after washing with water poured over your head you may go in the same day; menstruation requires an interval of seven days, contact with a corpse of ten, abortion of forty before washing and entry.' 'You must abstain from women, from pig's flesh, from visiting the barber or the public baths, for three days.'¹ In short, certain immoral practices are clearly deprecated, but not more so than mere violations of taboo, and all that is required is a period of isolation and perhaps some kind of religious disinfection to put you into a fit state to worship. Out of such beliefs, which are in essence magical, ethical considerations can grow: in a large measure it is from the notion of the avoidance of ritual defilement and of loss of magical force that the idea of chastity develops.² The Greeks went far with this spiritualisation of the raw material of religion: Delphi in particular, with its great position of divine adviser in religious matters, fostered a real conception of personal holiness and sanctity as the god's requirements.³ Men are bidden to enter the sanctuary of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia at Delos 'with pure hands and soul'; later an inscription of Hadrian's time in a temple at Lindos in Rhodes enjoins that worshippers shall come 'firstly and chiefly, pure and clean in hand and

¹ Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*³, 983 (Lindos: second cent. A.D.), 982 (temple of Athena at Pergamon: after 133 B.C.); 1042 (Men Tyrannus at Sunium: second/third cent. A.D.); *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions*, 1916, 262 sqq. (temple of Aesculapius at Thuburbo Majus in Africa). Cf. Th. Wächter, *Griechische Reinheitsvorschriften (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, ix. 1); J. Zingerle in *Strena Buliciana*, 171 sqq., and in *Jahreshefte*, xxiii. *Beibl.* 24 sqq. (abstinence from washing).

² Cf. E. Fehrle, *Die kultische Keuschheit*, R.G.V.V. vi.; my note, *A.R.W.* xxiii. 29 sq.; and a complementary point of view in H. J. Rose, *Class. Phil.* xx. 238 sqq.

³ Cf. L. R. Farnell, *Higher Aspects of Greek Religion*.

heart'; Porphyry quotes one from Epidaurus: 'You must be pure when you go within the incense-laden temple, and purity lies in thinking holy things.'¹

We must do full justice to this development within Greek religion. At the same time, it does not appear that moral considerations played in it as large a part as in the new beliefs which came from the East. A prayer to Isis (dated in the second century B.C.) on behalf of two maidens who are twins says 'If they are defiled, they will never become pure again'²; a contemporary inscription at Delos in honour of Isis and Sarapis says that 'they protect good men, who in all respects think holy thoughts'³; Lucius on his conversion puts aside the sinful pleasures of his youth, and the priest who guides him refers to them in severe terms.⁴ It is perhaps safe to infer that Isis and Sarapis did, at their best, exact from their adherents an ethical standard in addition to ritual observances. On the other hand, we have a number of allusions in the Roman poets to temples of Isis as places of ill repute, where amours might commence, and a story in Josephus of her priests in a temple in Rome consenting for gain to assist in an unsavoury intrigue under the cloak of religion. To some extent we must discount these aspersions, to which any new religion, above all an Oriental religion, was liable. Yet it must be remarked that the devotion of Delia to Isis, while imposing on her certain periods of abstinence, did not prevent her irregular relations with Tibullus. Where the Egyptian cult in the Graeco-Roman world differed from Greek religious practice was in its authoritative disciplining of the individual's life. Juvenal speaks of penances for sins, and we may compare the Lydian confession-inscriptions to which we shall come shortly. Isis becomes with time more and more the protectress of purity.⁵ A solar *Theos Hosios kai Dikaios* ('the holy and just god') rises in prominence in and beyond Asia

¹ References in Wächter's book and in *C.R.* 1924, p. 59.

² U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, i. no. 78, l. 27 sq., p. 360.

³ O. Weinreich, *Neue Urkunden*, 31, l. 33 sq. It is important to note that both texts are pre-Christian; there is no question of imitation of or rivalry with Christianity.

⁴ *Apul. Met.* xi. 15.

⁵ Juvenal, vi. 522; pp. 73 sq. below; F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales*², pp. 136 sqq.

Minor ; the all-seeing orb becomes the watcher of justice.¹ Mithras in his turn exacts a high moral standard of his adherents :

‘ Mithras, also a soldier, keep us pure till dawn.’

‘ Do you keep his commandments,’ says Hermes to Julian, ‘ preparing an anchorage and a safe harbour for yourself, and when you have to go hence, you will do so with a good hope and have a god as a kindly leader for yourself.’²

Authority is another of the notes of the new creeds. Here and there we find signs of the giving of such a basis to morality. In the ordinances of a private shrine of the goddess Agdistis, containing also altars of other deities, which was founded at Philadelphia in Lydia about the beginning of the first century B.C.,³ we read ‘ Let men and women, slave and free, as they come into this shrine swear by all the gods that they will not knowingly devise any evil guile or harmful poison against man or woman ; that they will neither know nor employ baneful spells ; that they will neither themselves use nor recommend to others nor be accomplices in love charms, abortives, contraceptives, robbery, murder ; that they will steal nothing and will be well disposed towards this shrine, and if any man does or purposes any of these prohibited acts, they will not allow him or keep their peace, but will make the fact manifest⁴ and will avenge it. No man shall have intercourse with any married woman other than his wife, neither free nor slave, nor with any boy, nor with any virgin, nor advise another to do so, but if he shares another’s guilty secret, he shall make public such an one, both the man and the woman, and shall not conceal or be silent. Let not woman or man, who do any of the aforementioned acts, come into this shrine : for in it are enthroned mighty deities, and they take notice of such offences, and will not suffer those who transgress their commands. A married woman who is free

¹ See F. Cumont, *Atti della Pontificia Accademia di Archaeologia, Serie III. Memorie I.* (1923), 65 sqq.

² Julian, *Convivium*, p. 336 c.

³ O. Weinreich in Dittenberger, *Sylloge*², 985. The date given rests on the lettering of the inscription.

⁴ To the god (Weinreich).

must be chaste, and know the bed of no man but her husband: if she know another, she is not chaste but impure, infected with incestuous pollution and unworthy to venerate this god whose shrine is here erected, or to be present at the sacrifices, or to see the solemn rites being performed: if she does any of these things after the day when the commands are thus set up she shall incur evil curses from the gods for disregarding these commands¹: for the god does not wish or desire these sins to happen at all, but rather that obedience should be given. To those who obey, the gods will be propitious, and will give them all the blessings gods give to men they love: if any transgress, they will hate them and inflict great punishments on them. These commands were set up by Agdistis the most holy guardian and mistress of this shrine. May she put good intentions in men and women, free and slave alike, that they may abide by what is here inscribed; and may all men and women who are confident of their uprightness touch this writing, which gives the commandments of the god at the monthly and at the annual (?) sacrifices, in order that those who abide by them and those who do not may be made manifest. O Saviour Zeus, hear our words and give us a good requital, health, deliverance, peace, safety on land and sea.'

Here sins are definite and final barriers between man and god. Though Zeus appears as the author of these commands, their background is in the main not Greek but Lydian. In Lydia we have a number of inscriptions in the form: 'I did . . . and the goddess punished me with. . . . I erect this stele in commemoration of the manifestation of her power.' The sins recorded relate more to ritual than to ethical standards; we find among them perjury, failure to return money entrusted after an oath to the deity to do so, appropriating three stray swine, making another go mad by magical means, reviling, the wronging of orphans, felling trees in a holy grove, stealing sacred pigeons, going into the temple in dirty clothes, not observing the ritual continence

¹ Earlier described, l. 11, as commands given by Zeus. This notion of divine commands is in general Oriental, cf. *J.H.S.* 1925, 96 sq.; Stoicism encouraged it, cf. Epictet. iii. 24, 110.

or abstinence from washing required during service in the temple.¹ The founder of the shrine at Philadelphia has spiritualised this.²

It would be a mistake to lay too much stress on his idiosyncrasies if they stood by themselves. In reality they are a striking illustration of a widespread change of moral outlook. The Stoics who argued for a purer ethic, the Cynics who in the guise of begging friars preached virtue and contentment, were seeking to do by philosophy what we here see religion doing. Their standard, and the standard of the oriental religions, was not as high as that which Christianity was impelled to demand, but they made the task of the latter easier. Those who frequented the shrine at Philadelphia might easily become the Christians described by the younger Pliny, who 'met on a fixed day before dawn, and sang an antiphonal hymn to Christ as a god, and bound themselves by an oath, not indeed to join in any crime, but rather that they would not commit theft, robbery or adultery, would not break faith, would not refuse to return what had been entrusted to them when called upon to do so.' The masses of town-dwellers must have been neither on the level of Epictetus nor on that of the writers of the epigrams in the fifth book of the Palatine Anthology, with their *religion de la chair*, the product of a decadent intellectualism, but rather on the plane of their present-day analogues, with, however, a larger acquiescence in the idea that a young man may sow his wild oats before marriage; the existence of slavery also made for laxity.³

¹ Cf. F. Steinleitner, *Die Beicht* (1913), *passim*, and in particular pp. 85 *sqq.*; W. H. Buckler, *Annual of the British School at Athens*, xxi. 69 *sqq.*; J. Zingerle, *Jahreshefte*, xxiii. *Beibl.* pp. 5 *sqq.*; Reitzenstein, *Myst.*², 137 *sqq.* The extant texts were composed in the second and third centuries of our era; nevertheless, it is likely that they represent an old local tradition, not without its parallels in Greece (cf. Plutarch, *De superstitione*, 7, p. 168 D, and K. Latte, *A.R.W.* xx. 293₁) and in Egypt; there is excellent Babylonian analogy (Reitzenstein, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, 252 *sqq.*; *Myst.*³ 161 *sqq.*).

² Possibly, as Weinreich thinks, under Neopythagorean influence.

³ Cf. in general Deissmann's chapter mentioned p. 53, n. 1, and my note, *C.R.* 1924, pp. 58 *sq.*; on pagan standards of sexual morality, J. W. Hunkin, *J.T.S.* xxvii. 282 *sqq.* (and note *Anth. Pal.* vii. 222, where Philodemus describes a prostitute as 'her whom the Mother of the gods loved,' a strong phrase even in an unbeliever). For *religion de la chair* George Moore's study of Théophile Gautier in *Confessions of a Young Man*, ch. i, is very illuminating. The reference for Pliny is *Ep. ad Traianum*, 76, 7; the

The change of attitude which the Christian missionary had to effect was immense. He had to touch not merely people of devout character, but also the masses of those who yielded an unintelligent homage to local deities who evoked little religious feeling and no sense of moral obligation, of those again who sought and found in mysteries gratification of the emotions, of those also who believed in divinity as a superhuman form of energy to be coaxed or cajoled into doing man's will. There was indeed what Zielinski calls a psychological preparation for Christianity, but it was sporadic. The sense of guilt at Rome after Julius Caesar's death, illustrated by Horace and Virgil, was doubtless confined in range, and must have vanished under the good rule of Augustus, whose revival at the correct time of the Secular Games was the outward and visible sign of the putting away of the evils which had marred the city. In so far as a sense of sin existed, it was for the most part in the East, or in circles influenced by Eastern ideas.

II

THE THEOLOGY OF CHRISTIANITY AS A MISSION-RELIGION

§ I. *Jesus and Paul*.—There is on the face of it a cleavage between the Palestinian Gospel of Jesus, seen in or behind

parallel with the text at Philadelphia was noted before me by O. Casel (cf. *Jahrb. f. Lit.* iv. 285, no. 261). W. R. Halliday, *op. cit.* pp. 302 sq., compares the oath imposed by a Christian sect, the Elchasaites, on candidates for baptism: 'I call these seven witnesses to witness that I will sin no more. I will commit adultery no more, I will not steal, I will not act unjustly, I will not covet, I will not hate, I will not despise, nor will I have pleasure in any evil' (Hippol. *Ref.* ix. 15); but it should be noted that this is strictly a declaration, not an oath, the witnesses are heaven, water, the holy spirits, the angels of prayer, oil, salt, earth; and the baptism is a special rite for those who have fallen into post-baptismal sin or been bitten by mad dogs, etc. There is evidence for some such declaration in baptism proper in the *Contestatio* prefixed to the Clementine Homilies (cf. G. Salmon, *Dict. Chr. Biog.* ii. 97). Hatch's view of the Elchasaite oath (*Influence* 337) is most questionable. The form of the contestation is very like the Orphic oath of secrecy by fire, water, earth, heaven, moon, sun, Phanes and night (cf. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 737 sq.; Reitzenstein, *Studien*, 73 sq.; Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 226 sq.); cf. rather the Essene oath (Hippol. *Ref.* ix. 23). On the oath of the initiate in the mysteries cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³ 192 sqq.

the Synoptists, and the Greek teaching of St. Paul. Nevertheless, while we can hardly fail to reject any notion of a complete and original revelation of Christianity as it was to be,¹ we must not overstate the gap. Nor must we overconfidently excise as the product of later development sayings of Jesus which imply a corporate existence and increase of His disciples after the close of His ministry, or again sayings which discourage their purely Jewish anticipations of the character of the Kingdom.² The veil which covers Christian development from the appearances of the risen Jesus³ to the commencement of St. Paul's mission activity lifts but slightly; the account in Acts i.-xii, fragmentary as it is and coloured by the ideas of a generation which knew its religion as an articulate whole and had forgotten not a few tentative stages, leaves us very much in the dark. As J. Weiss remarks,⁴ in that narrative everything works as on a divine plan, unfolding in clear and consequent stages. Historic evolution in things of the spirit cannot often be so simple except in retrospect.

We cannot form a true picture of these years if we do not do justice to the enthusiasm which marked them. That Jesus was not dead but living, and living in the movement; that He would come again; that to others also the new revelation must be imparted; these are the things that made the life and thought of the little community.⁵ That its activities had, in spite of hesitations, extended to non-Jews (perhaps in the casual way indicated in Acts xi. 20) is not unlikely; nevertheless, adhesion to Christianity meant entrance into a strict body, so that it is almost certain that

¹ Such a conception certainly arose early, cf. Jude 3, 'the faith once delivered to the saints.'

² Cf. E. C. Hoskyns in *Essays Catholic and Critical* (1926), 164 sqq., for some useful criticism of recent studies in this direction, and Sanday's remarks, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, 28 sqq. If y sayings imply a view which though not implied in x — y is not incompatible with them, it is *a priori* hazardous to cut out y . It is here that I respectfully disagree with Loisy, deeply indebted as I feel to his work. On the way in which Jesus diverged from traditional ideas of the kingdom, cf. E. F. Scott, *First Age of Christianity*, pp. 92 sqq. Into the possibility of two widely differing schools of Palestinian Christianity, raised by R. Bultmann, *Z.N.W.* xxiv. 144 sqq., we cannot here enter.

³ On which cf. my postscript to Mr. Narborough's essay.

⁴ *Urchristentum*, pp. 3 sqq.

⁵ On the growth of the idea of the community as a Church, cf. R. Bultmann, *A.R.W.* xxiv. 147.

the rites of entrance and table-fellowship would have been in high regard.

From such a state of things to the mission religion of St. Paul is not a far cry. But here the converts as a whole have come from wider circles. To him and to them the idea of the world as a unity, of mankind as a brotherhood, came naturally.¹ St. Paul's interests must be in humanity as a whole, not merely in the scattered members of Judaism. To him, when converted, the obvious duty would be to preach to *all* the world, just as other men of Greek culture had sought to disseminate the saving truths which they had learnt. The missionary ideal was inevitable to him. He had been a Pharisee, and the Pharisees were noted for proselytism. The Judaising Christians of Jerusalem wished to make converts, but converts who should fulfil the obligations of Judaism. How strong the missionary impulse was in them we do not know. With St. Paul a real offensive began. This is a turning-point in history.² 'Paul,' says Wilamowitz, 'has unconsciously completed the legacy of Alexander the Great.'

With this missionary purpose, and with the conflict with the more conservative members of the community at

¹ P. 63 *supra* and C.R. 1924, p. 59. On the possibility of St. Paul having received liberal ideas in Jewish circles at Jerusalem, cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, p. 94. The universalism of such texts as Ps. lxxvi. 4 must have had some influence. One consequence of this universalism was the view that Christianity had always been latent everywhere, for which cf. G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, i. 162. It is a Christian appropriation of the claims of this or that pagan cultus to be the original religion of which all others are offshoots, for which cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, p. 240 *sqq.*

² This is not to make St. Paul the initiator of Christian universalism. St. Mark with his stories of the Syrophenician woman (vii. 24-30), St. Luke with the story of the Gadarene (viii. 26-39), seem to give quite unconscious testimony of the universalism implicit in the behaviour of Jesus. Mr. Narborough, in his essay, pp. 34 *sqq.*, has drawn attention to other indications of a mission to Gentiles intended to follow the death of Jesus. In the community at Jerusalem the group represented by St. Stephen seems to have made a move in the direction of universalism before St. Paul's conversion, rousing thereby Jewish animosity previously not felt by the disciples (cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*). I suspect that his death was followed by a hardening of conservatism in the Christian community, which pursued its *vie intérieure* and awaited the Second Coming (so also A. Ehrhard, *Urchristentum und Katholizismus*, p. 48). The relations of Jesus and of His rejection to Old Testament prophecy must have busied the earliest Jewish Christians, as Ehrhard remarks (p. 44). On St. Paul's historical significance cf. von Dobschütz, *Der Apostel Paulus*, i. 33 *sqq.*

Jerusalem in which it involved its holders so soon as it became evident that St. Paul's policy involved the freeing of Gentile converts from the obligations of the law, came the need for a formulation of belief and experience, in fact for a theology which should expound God's plan in history. St. Paul must state why Gentile converts are to be free from the law and not treated like Jewish proselytes. To do this he must find an explanation of the law's place in God's scheme, and he does it in thoroughly Rabbinic fashion. His polemic is long and fierce on this subject, because of the menace in the Judaizing view to the universality of the new faith. The same purpose is served by his theory of justification. Those people whom God has chosen He has justified—that is, He has made them just (on the alternative explanation he has 'acquitted' them). In St. Paul's belief Jews needed this *justification* as much as Gentiles and being a Christian meant normally being a perfect Christian. When all were alike justified, no one had a right to make distinctions; this accounts for St. Paul's indignation with St. Peter for refusing to eat with Gentile converts (Gal. ii. 12).¹ Again, he must explain to his pagan converts in a manner intelligible to them what is the basis, what are the implications, of Christian rites. He must enunciate and render reasonable moral and other pre-suppositions which would to Jews seem self-evident.² The community at Jerusalem had believed that Jesus gave His life as a ransom for many and took away our sins: St. Paul cannot be content with this unreflective attitude; he must give a *how* and a *why*.³

¹ The notion of the deity's choice of those who are to know him is familiar in the mystery-religions; thus at Tithorea Isis summoned by dream all who should enter her temple (Pausan. x. 32, 13). The term *δικαιῶ* is found in *Corp. Herm.* xiii. 9; cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 257 sqq. Still justification is a Jewish idea, and the divine choice is the calling of a new Israel; the old had *claimed* to be a righteous nation called by God, the new *is* so. The word *δικαιῶ* normally means either 'acquit' or 'punish' or 'think fit.' The sense 'acquit' is clear in the LXX and Matt. xii. 37. But in 1 Cor. vi. 11 'make just' seems the best interpretation; 'acquit' would be an anticlimax. On the use of the word cf. Preuschen-Bauer, *Wörterb. z. N.T.* pp. 307 sq. For Jewish predestination cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, I 981 sqq.; II 726 sq.; for 'calling,' III 22. On Christian perfection cf. Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde* (admirable).

² So, for instance, on fornication and on the eating of meats offered to idols. J. W. Hunkin, *J.T.S.*, xxvii. 272 sqq., has shown that Christian requirements were here taken over from Jewish prohibitions.

³ Cf. Loisy, *Mystères*, p. 328. It is important that St. Paul gives a satisfactory explanation of the *rôle* of Israel in the working out of God's

The result of this is that Christianity passed from what was apparently a sect of Judaism into an independent world-religion. It might have seemed the former even after the conflict with the Jewish authorities provoked by the activities of the Hellenistic Jews and resulting in the martyrdom of St. Stephen ; the fact that the Essenes are spoken of as a Jewish sect illustrates the possibilities of latitude. But the broad stream of later development was along Pauline lines.

Such in its main outlines is the view which we may take of the place of St. Paul in the development of Christianity. How far his apostolate was prepared for by pre-existing tendencies in the movement we cannot say : the question does not greatly matter for our estimate of his rank in the story of mankind.

The universality of Christianity as now taught took it further and further from Judaism, not completely at once but more and more clearly with time. It also meant a change of emphasis in relation to the Founder. The community at Jerusalem, while living in the Spirit of Jesus, lived also in the recollections of His earthly life. When the religion went further, the living transcendental Jesus could not but become more important than the ' Jesus of history ' : the Jesus who is the living Lord of the community is more prominent than the great Leader who had died and had been glorified.¹ A sharp distinction is sometimes drawn between the Pauline and the Jerusalem attitude. St. Paul is regarded as contemptuous of knowledge of Jesus ' after the flesh.' Yet he quotes sayings uttered by Jesus on earth and speaks of His humble self-emptying, and in reprobating Corinthian disorders refers to an institution of the Eucharist

purpose, while the earlier Hellenistic movement represented by St. Stephen seems to have adopted a negative position. Yet, as von Dobschütz observes (*op. cit.* i. 25), he does not, like a Philo, allegorise the law into something fitting his idea of Christianity.

¹ Loisy, who makes the Pauline transformation something much larger, says what is in his view perfectly true : ' C'est le mystère qui a sauvé l'Évangile ' (*Mystères*, pp. 340 *sq.*). I am not here discussing the vision-experience of St. Paul ; Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, p. 415 *sqq.*, has reaffirmed its kinship to Hellenistic religious experience ; von Dobschütz (*op. cit.* i. 22 *sq.*) has given a Rabbinic parallel. To treat the question properly requires psychological knowledge I do not possess. (Fr. Smend's argument ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ, I 34 *sqq.*, that the story in Acts is particularly to be connected with the *Bacchae* of Euripides seems to me fanciful.)

by Him in the flesh. When he says 'Henceforth we know no man after the flesh: even if we have known Christ after the flesh we do so no longer' (2 Cor. v. 16) he is laying down a principle for future use. He does not underrate human knowledge of the historic Jesus. The argument of the context is that we have all died in Christ: our fleshly existence is something past. St. Paul introduces one of his characteristic parentheses. We do not live for ourselves: we do not know anyone after the flesh (no, not even Christ now). Life in Christ is a new creation. The new life is contrasted with all previous life and experience, even earthly experience of Jesus. It is possible, but I think not probable, that he wishes to imply that the Apostles who can claim to have known and touched Jesus have no claim to an apostolate superior to his, and their adherents have no right to unsettle the Corinthian Christians. There is not here an antithesis between a Jesus of history and a Lord of faith. The Jerusalem community in all probability recognised Jesus as *Kyrios*, and certainly this recognition is pre-Pauline,¹ while St. Paul's account of the Christian story as exemplified in Acts xiii is very much like what we can imagine that St. Peter would have given,² and his expectation of the second coming is as vivid as that of the Jewish group can have been; nor was the expectation among his converts at Thessalonica less strong.

Were this antithesis absolute, had we a direct contrast of two opposed types of belief, there might be some plausibility in the view that St. Paul was acquainted with 'saviour deities' whose death was the basis of salvation and whose adherents might by sacramental fellowship with them attain the surety of happy immortality, and that his picture of Christ was unconsciously coloured and determined thereby.³ It would indeed be far from clear: there was at this time no

¹ See p. 85 later. I am glad to find this view of 2 Cor. v. 16 confirmed by Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, pp. 374 *sqq.*

² There is no very great probability that the Hellenistic author of this account would make Pauline teaching more Jewish than it was (unless we accept Loisy's theory of the second-century redactor of Acts, and this is not easy).

³ This view is put with admirable skill and eloquence by Loisy, *Mystères*, p. 333. Loisy sees clearly the impossibility of supposing a *mechanical* adoption of pagan beliefs or even a deliberate creation of a rival system: his statement of this is most valuable (pp. 334 *sq.*).

such thing as a 'spirit of paganism'¹ which the Apostle could know. It is perhaps correct to speak of something of the sort in the Julianic reaction three centuries later, when paganism was seeking a theology: before that, we find theological speculation of a unifying type (as for instance Euhemerism, or the allegorical nature-symbolism of the Stoics, or the quasi-monotheism of Plutarch and others, or the Heavenly Man theory of the Naassenes²) but hardly even convergent belief in 'saviour gods.' At Tarsus St. Paul may have encountered Mithras-worship, but it was not necessarily yet what we know as Mithraism; and anyhow Mithras did not die. Whether he knew Attis, Adonis, and Osiris we cannot say; as will be remarked later,³ his teaching of salvation is something quite different. It must be added that 'saviour-gods' and mysteries probably did not bulk so large in the life of the first century A.D. as in modern study. Traditional polytheism, a vague but ready veneration of any and all deities, was far more general and far more deserving of the title 'spirit of paganism' than any piety of the mysteries.

Given that in St. Paul's surroundings there was no such inevitable suggestion of a transformation, given also that the difference between his teaching and that of the community at Jerusalem was one of emphasis rather than of substance, we must probably in the main reject the hypothesis under consideration.

This conclusion is confirmed by an examination of certain linguistic points of contact. The term *mysterion* is used fairly freely, but not of the sacraments—a clear point of distinction between New Testament and later usage, which freely applies mystery-terminology to them⁴; St. Paul

¹ Loisy, *op. cit.*, p. 323; Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*², pp. 134 *sqq.*, seems to me to generalise more than our knowledge warrants.

² Reitzenstein, *Studien*, pp. 104 *sqq.* (correcting and supplementing his discussion in *Poimandres*). He regards this text as a superficially Christianised earlier writing; another point of view is put by R. P. Casey, *J.T.S.* xxvii. 374 *sqq.*, in a paper which deserves careful consideration.

³ Pp. 94 *sq.* below, and my appendix to Mr. Narborough's essay.

⁴ Cf. E. Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas*, pp. 295 *sqq.*; O. Casel, *Jahrb.* iv. 230 *sq.* A striking illustration is Clement of Alexandria's representation of Christianity as the one perfect mystery (*Protr.* 118 *sqq.*); even here Philo supplies an earlier analogy; he speaks of Judaism as the 'Great Mysteries'

applies it chiefly to God's purpose, previously concealed but now revealed, of calling the Gentiles. This use is to be connected with its employment in Daniel, Wisdom, and Sirach to represent the Aramaic *rāz*, 'secret,'¹ and not in the first instance with the Greek religious use. The term *epoptes* in 2 Pet. i. 16 'having become spectators of the greatness of the Christ' perhaps contrasts the Christian vision with pagan visions.² The phrase $\delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega\nu$ in Col. ii. 18 involves the use of a word which was a technical term in mysteries at Claros (of a solemn entry into the shrine), and was possibly also employed in the neighbourhood of Colossae with a similar connotation.³ We find also applied to Christianity metaphors commonly used of pagan rites, as for instance the handing on or *παράδοσις* of truth,⁴ the description of disciples as the offspring of their teacher⁵ and of the religious life as a sacred war,⁶ the references to victory⁷ and to the sweet savour of goodness.⁸

(e.g. *De Cherubim*, 12, § 49, i. p. 147, Mangey). L. Cerfaux, *Le Muséeon*, xxxvii. (1924), pp. 29 *sqq.* argues from *Epist. ad Arist.* § 16, from the Aristobulian form of an 'Orphic' *ἱερὸς λόγος* (Kern, *Orphica*, pp. 260 *sqq.*), from Artapanus, III Macc. and the tragedian Ezechiel that two centuries before Philo Judaism presented itself as a *mysterion* at Alexandria, and in particular that its theocratic idea was so propagated.

¹ Cf. Hatch-Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, s.v.; Preuschen-Bauer, pp. 836 *sq.* A similar use of *μυστήριον* occurs in *Corp. Herm.* i. 16, where, as Scott remarks, there is no suggestion that the recipient ought to keep the secret (as there is in xvi. 2, where the popular love of a secret is played upon, as Bräuninger remarks, *Untersuchungen*, p. 38); it is significant that this tractate belongs to the 'orientalising' group mentioned p. 66 above. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*², 242 *sqq.*, finds more meaning in the word as so used. We find it also in *Historia Alexandri Magni*, iii. 22 *sq.*, pp. 121, 23, 122, 29, ed. W. Kroll (vol. i).

² On 'seeing' in mysteries cf. Clemen, p. 154, and M. Dibelius, *Die Isisweihe bei Apuleius* (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie*, 1917), 6, 28.

³ Cf. Dibelius, *op. cit.* 36; Clemen, pp. 340 *sq.*; and above all Ch. Picard, *Épêse et Claros*, pp. 303 *sqq.* S. Eitrem in *Symbolae Osloenses*, iv. 56, interprets this of entering a tank of holy water. The new inscriptional finds probably dispose of earlier interpretations, for which cf. Lightfoot *ad loc.*

⁴ Cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 288 *sqq.*; Reitzenstein, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1924, 38 *sq.*

⁵ Dibelius, 5, 32; Dieterich, pp. 52, 230; Clemen, p. 239. This also can come from Judaism, cf. von Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, xlii. 3, 110.

⁶ Reitzenstein, *Myst.*², 71 *sqq.* (=³, 192 *sqq.*). Cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul*, p. 128, for Wisdom v. 17 as the source of Eph. vi. 10.

⁷ As 1 John v. 4, which might suggest the acclamation 'Sarapis is victorious' (not known till the second century A.D., cf. Weinreich, *Neue Urkunden*, pp. 33 *sqq.*, Peterson, *EΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ*, pp. 157 *sqq.*; but doubtless in use earlier), not to mention acclamations in the games.

⁸ Cf. the notion of the fragrance of deities discussed by E. Lohmeyer, *Vom göttliche Wohlgeruch* (*Sitz. Heid. Ak.*, 1919, ix.); Reitzenstein, *Iran*

All these are superficial: it is difficult to resist the impression that the religious content of many of them had disappeared in popular use. Figurative language of this kind was applied to philosophy, to poetry, to rhetoric, to love, not to mention magic, which is in close relationship to the ideas of the mysteries.¹ What had been liturgical has also often become literary²: yet it is only at a period later than that of the New Testament that we find Christianity expressly described as *the* 'mystery' in contrast to others, in the same way as Philo calls Judaism *the* 'mystery.'³ It is not clear that St. Paul's linguistic practice points to first-hand knowledge of the mysteries, still less to the reading of theological literature about them.⁴

The importance of these points of contact is that they remind us that the Christian missionary had to use the language of the time, that this language often had religious connotations which were more or less living, and that a stray hearer might well regard the new teaching as something not different in kind from other religions of the time. Thus Lucian speaks of Christ as introducing a new *telete* (that is, a new rite or initiation) into the world.⁵

We must now proceed to examine what we know of the language and practice of Gentile Christianity in its relation to the pagan background. We have to ask what inspiration it drew from this background, what points of contact rendered it intelligible in relation to this background, and

Erlös. p. 34₁; *Myst.*³, 82 *sqq.*, 393 *sqq.* I do not include the metaphor of the sacred marriage (Eph. v. 32; 2 Cor. xi. 2), a form of mysticism which is widespread and may well be spontaneous, and which in any case is used of the Church, not of the individual believer (*cf.* an admirable illustration from Methodius in Casel, *Jahrb.* vi. 144 *sq.*). The reference in Eph. iii. 17 to the breadth, length, height, and depth of Christ and His love may be explained from parallels in magic texts, where these dimensions are predicated of light; *cf.* Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 25₁; S. Eitrem in *Symbolae Osloenses*, iv. 46; E. Peterson, *ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ*, p. 307; but it might arise also from meditation on such a text as Ps. ciii.

¹ For philosophy *cf.* Bréhier, *Idées de Philon*², p. 242, and Theon of Smyrna, *Math.* p. 14, l. 18; for poetry the use of *μύσῳρῆς* in an epigram from Talmis in Egypt published by E. Rohde, *Philologus*, liv. 11 *sqq.*; for rhetoric, Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 193; for love, *Journ. Eg. Arch.* xi. p. 136; for magic *J.H.S.* 1925, p. 84.

² *Cf.* Reitzenstein, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1924, 39, and his admirable remarks, *Myst.*³, 397 *sqq.*, on the growth of sacred metaphorical language.

³ *Cf.* p. 81, n. 4 above.

⁴ So also Loisy, and Christ-Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*⁶, ii. 1135₈.

⁵ *Peregrin*, 11.

whether, with or without mechanical taking over of alien elements, it was the spiritual heir of Hellenistic beliefs, as it was in so large a measure of Judaism.

§ 2. *Jesus* KYRIOS.—A term widely applied to Jesus by Gentile Christians was *Kyrios*, 'Lord.' *Kyrios* means 'master' and connotes ownership and authority. Slavery in this period corresponds to service to-day, slave to servant. Nevertheless, the terminology involves a notion of ownership and authority more concrete than that which is usually associated with the Greek gods,¹ and exactly in accordance with Oriental precedent.² Consequently we find in the Hellenistic age, with the closer contact it caused with Eastern belief, a number of gods coming from Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt called 'lords,' and their worshippers 'slaves': the gods invoked in the magical papyri naturally have this epithet, and so also do some rulers honoured as deities, as, for instance, Demetrius Poliorcetes, some Ptolemies, and some Emperors.³

This attitude was essentially part of Semitic religion. *Kyrios* is used freely in the Septuagint; even if the translators meant it in a relative sense, as 'Master of x or y ,' it is likely that Hellenistic Jews interpreted it in the absolute sense, 'Master,' common around them, and it is doubtful whether any non-Judaic factors contributed to this development.⁴

¹ Δεσπότης, 'master,' occurs as an epithet (Eur. *Hippol.* 88, ἄναξ, θεὸς γὰρ δεσπότης καλεῖν χρεών), probably also in cult-formulae (as Prof. Rose has remarked to me, ὦ δεσπότη' ἄναξ ἀμέτρητ' Ἀήρ in Aristoph. *Clouds*, 264, is a parody of a cult-formula), and as the title of an underworld god at Larissa in Thessaly and at Aiane in Macedon (O. Kern, *P.W. Suppl.* iv. 384: in first century A.D. inscriptions, but doubtless going back to an earlier usage; cf. the title *Despoina* of the queen of the underworld). This section corrects in points what appears in *J.H.S.* 1925, pp. 95 sqq.

² Cf. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*², pp. 94 sqq., and a Phoenician dedication in Cyprus to the Baal of Libanon, his lord' (A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, i. 551b): such language was used of kings (cf. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 22, 4, where Darius calls the satrap Gadates his slave), and was later encouraged probably by the predominance of absolute monarchies. *Adon* is used of god (e.g. Adonis) and of kings, cf. G. F. Hill, *Ch. Quart. Rev.* lvi. (1908), p. 126.

³ Cf. Bousset, *op. cit.* p. 93; the term is, of course, applied to other deities also (as in an inscription from Comana in Cappadocia published by A. Souter in *Anatolian Studies*, 402 sq. Κυρίω Ἐπιμῆ σωτήρι: a Hermes is *Kyrios* also in Nubia, cf. Wilcken-Mitteis, *Grundzüge*, I. ii. 11, no. 4). On the magic use cf. S. Eitrem, *Papyri Osloenses*, i. 44.

⁴ The transition is not difficult, and the relative use can live side by side with the absolute. Isis is in a general way ἡ Κυρία Ἰσις: she is also

The veneration of the Aramaic-speaking disciples of Jesus at Jerusalem for their Master, in the light of their belief in His triumph over death, might naturally be expressed by the Aramaic *Māri* or *Māran* (*Mārana*).¹ The Aramaic *Maranatha* 'Our Lord, come' was probably coined at Jerusalem rather than at Antioch; it is indeed doubtful whether Aramaic was spoken at Antioch.² Of *Māri* the natural Greek rendering was *Kyrios*, a term familiar to Jews of the Dispersion. That the Greek designation should come from the Aramaic is infinitely more probable than that a Gentile description of Jesus as *Kyrios* should be translated back into Aramaic in time for St. Paul to find it existing as a fixed liturgical or quasi-liturgical term. This being so, the use has probably in origin nothing whatsoever to do with the description of heathen deities or the Emperor as *Kyrios*. How early it was stereotyped in Greek appears from the phrase *Kyriakon deipnon*, 'Lord's Supper,' in 1 Cor. xi. 20.³

Kyrios Christos probably comes therefore from the language of the original community at Jerusalem. At the same time, it fitted well in the Hellenistic world. When

mistress of Beneventum' (hieroglyphic text in *Notizie degli scavi*, 1904, p. 119). So far as I know, she is not referred to as ἡ Κυρία without further description; τὸν Κύριον occurs as a description of a god in a Lydian text printed by Steinleitner, *Beicht*, 59, no 32 (after Ramsay, *Cities*, 150, no. 43), but the beginning of the text is lost and τ.κ. may refer back to an earlier named god, as in *Jahresb.* xxiii., *Beibl.* 8, l. 16, τοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ Τιμίμου το 1. 2, Μὲς Τιμίμου. In general, ὁ Κύριος, ἡ Κυρία occur as predicates. We must await the completion of von Baudissin's posthumous *Kyrios* before deciding on the significance of the term in the Septuagint. J. Svoronos, *Journal international d'archéologie numismatique*, i. 463 sqq., goes so far as to regard the Septuagint as very influential in spreading the religious use of the term *Kyrios*. The Jews used θεοπάτορος freely of God (J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 333; Bousset, p. 292_a). It is possible that the Κύριος is sometimes not used in Jewish texts where one might expect it for the reason that it was a κρυπτὸν ὄνομα or cult name (L. Cerfaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 63 sqq.).

¹ Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, pp. 49 sqq., for an important statement of this point as against Bousset's derivation of *Kyrios* from Hellenistic analogies. Prof. Burkitt has shown special reasons for the origin of this usage in Aramaic-speaking circles. (Cf. also E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge*, iii. 218; Rawlinson, *Doctrine, Appended Note I.*) Wellhausen and Reitzenstein (*Iran. Erl.* 119) have urged strongly that the Resurrection belief itself excludes the hypothesis that the disciples had thought of Jesus as a mere man before the Crucifixion.

² So J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 271.

³ This point also is made by Weiss. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*⁴, p. 304, connects the epithet with the use of *Kyriakós* with reference to the Emperor. His early example, like his examples of *Kyrios* used absolutely of the Emperor, comes from Egypt; it is not clear to me that the term was commonly specialised enough for its derivation to be manifest.

St. Paul said 'There are many gods and many *Kyrioi*; we have one God the Father and one *Kyrios*, Jesus Christ,' the Corinthians who received his message would not improbably see in his words a counterblast to familiar claims, to the pagan 'There is one god Sarapis'—the Egyptian deities were the object of enthusiastic worship in their own city.¹ Oppositional phraseology of this kind is not uncommon; an example which deserves attention occurs in the end of the *Gloria in excelsis*: 'Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord; Thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father,' where *thou only*, *Lord*, and *most high* are all pagan formulae for which Christ is to be regarded as the sole fit claimant.² On the other hand, it may be doubted whether there is in the use of *Kyrios* any conscious contrast or anything that would be felt as such between Jesus and the Emperor. The title is far less characteristic of the latter than of Oriental deities. Deissmann's first-century examples all come from Egypt, where the usage was inherited from Ptolemaic times and

¹ On εἰς θεός Σάραπισ, cf. O. Weinreich, *Neue Urkunden*; for the Egyptian gods in Corinth cf. Apul. *Met.* xi.; and for their appearance on coins, showing that the city in its corporate capacity respected the cultus, which had shrines both on the Acrocorinthus and at the port Cenchreae, cf. *J.H.S.* vi. 66, no. 11, pl. D. lxiv.; 74, no. 31, pl. F. cxix. With the distinction of θεός and κύριος cf. that in Philo, discussed by Von Baudissin-Eissfeldt, *Kyrios*, i. 3.

² The Greek forms vary (H. Leclercq, *Dict. Arch. chrét.* iv. 1531; ἄτι σὺ εἶ μόνος ἄγιος, σὺ εἶ μόνος κύριος, <σὺ εἶ μόνος ὑψίστος>, Ἰησοῦς (σὺ) Χριστός (σὺ) . . . It is difficult to resist the conjecture that this second part addressed to Christ was originally independent of the first part addressed to God the Father. For *thou only*, cf. Lucr. i. 31, *tu sola*; μόνος of Hermes is parodied by Martial, v. 24, cf. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, p. 246; on the antiquity of the style cf. *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, iii. 157; cf. also 1 Clem. 59, σὺ εἶ ὁ θεός μόνος καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ παῖς σου καὶ ἡμεῖς λαός σου, *Acta Iohannis*, 109, σὺ γὰρ εἶ μόνος, κύριε, ἡ βίβλα τῆς ἀθανάτου. *Holy, Hagios*, is an epithet of Isis, Sarapis, Syrian deities, and Artemis: cf. E. Williger, *Rel. Vers. Vorarb.* XIX. i. 81 sqq.

Kyrios is in contrast to many claims. *Hypsistos* (given in Codex Alexandrinus and in the Latin texts, not in *Const. Apost.* or in the Egyptian version quoted by Leclercq, 1531) had been used of Jehovah by Hellenistic Judaizers (p. 54, n. 1, *supra*, and Cumont, *Musée du Cinquantenaire*², pp. 67 sq.), but was also applied to Zeus as the god of mountain tops. Cf. in particular 1 Clem. 59, σὲ τὸν μόνον ὑψίστον ἐν ὑψίστοις and Clem. Al. *Protr.* i. 1 sqq. on Christ contrasted with Amphion, Arion, and again Orpheus. P. Perdrizet, *Terres cuites grecs de la collection Fouquet*, i. 84, sees 'opposition' in John xv. 1: 'I am the true vine' (more opposition to Dionysus scented by Grill, cf. Clemen, p. 272). An amusing example of opposition is a terracotta lamp noted by W. Weber, *Ägyptisch-griechische Terrakotten*, i. 158, on which a woman holds out a cross against a (sacred) crocodile.

the Emperor was very markedly the successor of the Ptolemies. On coins, which can be trusted to reflect official language, we find *Kyrios* first at Alexandria of Trajan, then not till the time of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and when we find it on them it is not a regular title but occurs always in acclamations of a fixed type, recurring in various cities—'Good luck to our Lord (Lords),' 'Long live our Lords'—or in dedications 'on behalf of the victory of our Lords.'¹ It has been remarked that the Christian apologists object to the description of the Emperor as *Kyrios*²; that is no doubt because their own usage was stereotyped by then, and they resented what seemed to them misappropriation.

In any case, we must remember that the nuance of *Kyrios* depends on the person or god to whom it is applied; it can be a mere courtesy title, like 'Master' in English.³ In Christianity, just as in many Hellenistic cults, it implies a belief in the divine overruling of the individual, who receives commands from on high.⁴ There is here no question of borrowing. Yet we must recognise in this something of a *praeparatio evangelica*. From the Hellenistic attitude to the Christian was an easy transition.

§ 3. *Jesus SOTER and His EUANGELION*.—Another epithet requiring special consideration is *Soter*, 'Saviour.' Its technical use of Jesus (as distinguished from such a general use as we have in Phil. iii. 20) is met twice in the Lucan writings, and is found also in the Pastoral Epistles and

¹ The Boeotian inscription (*Sylloge*³, 814, 31) calls Nero δ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου κύριος, not simply Κύριος. The numismatic point is due to B. Pick, *Journal international*, i. 451 sqq.; the Alexandrian coin is Dattari, *Numi Alex. Aug.* 81. The Latin equivalent *dominus* does not appear as a title on coins till Aurelian (in the latter part of the third century), nor regularly till the sons of Constantine, though Domitian seems to have required to be called *dominus* and *deus* (Euseb. *Chron.*; *ann. Abr.* 2102). *Kyrios* is in Christian use common in acclamations (such as Phil. ii. 11 implies: cf. Peterson, *EIS ΘEOΣ*, p. 133), but is from the beginning a formal title also.

² F. J. Dölger, *IXOTΣ*, i. 396 (*Römische Quartalschrift, Supplement*, 1910), contrasts this with their lack of polemic against the description of the Emperor as *θεοῦ υἱός*, son of God. Is this because *Kyrios* standing by itself was a much more common description (not epithet) of Christ than *θεοῦ υἱός* was?

³ So E. Williger, *P.W.* xii. 183, 41; for Κύριος as a courtesy title in Egypt cf. F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch griechische Urkunden*, s.v., 849, 851 sqq. Cf. also my *Hagiographica* IV., in *J.T.S.* xxviii. 417.

⁴ Cf. *J.H.S.*, 1925, pp. 95 sqq.

2 Peter ; it occurs once in the Fourth Gospel, in which *soteria* is common.¹ It is familiar in Greek as the epithet of many gods, notably Zeus, Asclepius and the Dioscuri, the Egyptian Isis and Sarapis²; and of many royal personages regarded as divine, as for instance Ptolemy I in his life, Antiochus I of Syria after death, Strato in Bactria, Sauromates II in the Bosphorus ; and again of distinguished Romans who played prominent parts in the affairs of the East (as for instance Titus Flamininus and Pompey), of Julius Caesar also and of the Roman Emperors. As applied to men, it generally asserts their personal divinity and not their identity with recognised *Soter*-gods. It is a Greek term in its origin ; its application to purely Greek deities is as old as the fifth century,³ and its Greek sense comes out clearly in such unspecialised uses as the saying of Demosthenes that the Thessalians thought Philip a saviour.⁴ At the same time it proved susceptible of the oriental connotation of Redeemer.

A *Soter* brings *soteria*, deliverance, and this *soteria* can be of very different kinds. It may be deliverance from foreign foes and from oppression ; so Alexander is called ' deliverer (or protector) of Egypt ' in an Egyptian text of the third century B.C.⁵ (this is the chief meaning of *Soter* as applied to kings and princes, until the term was conventionalised). It may be deliverance from ill-health, as Asclepius is called *Soter* (so possibly also of the nymph Himera), or from the perils of the sea (as with the Dioscuri), or from darkness (as perhaps with the solar *Theos Sozon* worshipped in Asia Minor). It may denote salvation as

¹ Clemen, *op. cit.*, 86 sq. A valuable discussion of this term is given by F. Dornseiff, *Pauly-Wissowa*, III. A. 1211 sqq.

² Dölger, IXΘΥΣ, i. 420 : another instance of the second century B.C. in a Delian inscription printed in O. Weinreich, *Neue Urkunden*, 31, l. 33, ἐσθλοῖς δὲ σωτόρες αἰὲν ἔπεσθε ἀνδράσιν, οἱ κατὰ πάντα νόψα φρονέουσιν. Here σωτήρ is a predicate ; in Dölger's example it is a proper epithet.

³ So of the Nymph on coins of Himera (Head, *Historia Numorum*,² p. 145).

⁴ *De corona*, 43, σωτήρα τὸν Φίλιππον ἠγοῦντο.

⁵ W. Spiegelberg, *Sitzungsberichte d. Heid. Ak.*, 1922, iii. 5. Cf. Antiochus Epiphanes as σωτήρ τῆς Ἀσίας (inscription at Babylon, Dittenberger, *Or. gr. inscr. sel.* 253.2), Julia Domna as σώτειρα τῶν Ἀθηνῶν (inscription published by A. von Pernerstein, *Jahreshefte*, xvi. 249 sqq.). Trajan as σωτήρ πόλεως on a coin of Nicopolis in Epirus (Imhoof-Blumer, *Monnaies grecques*, 141).

given in the mysteries. In contrast with this transcendental sense, *soteria* may mean deliverance from false opinions or superstition (as the Epicurean Diogenes of Oenoanda uses it): *σφῆζεσθαι* may mean as little as 'to be a good man.'¹

How are we to explain the giving of this title to Jesus? Soltau, Wendland and others have drawn attention to certain striking similarities in the use of *Soter* language as applied to the Emperor.² A decree passed by the assembly of the representatives from the Greek cities of the province of Asia in or about 9 B.C. begins thus: 'Since the Providence which has ordered all things and is deeply interested in our life has set it in most perfect order by giving to us Augustus, whom she filled with virtue,³ that he might benefit mankind, sending him as a saviour, *Soter*, both for us and for our descendants, that he might end war and arrange all things, and since he, Caesar, by his appearance [excelled even our anticipations],⁴ surpassing all previous benefactors, *Euergetai*,⁵ and not even leaving to posterity any hope of surpassing what he has done, and since the birthday of the god Augustus was the beginning for the world of the good tidings that came by reason of him.' On a somewhat later decree from Halicarnassus we read: 'Since the eternal and

¹ Cf. my *Sallustius*, xxxvi. n. 112, and *C.R.* 1925, 63₉ (adding Kaibel, *Ep. gr.* 134, *πᾶσι θεοῖς θύρας καὶ σωθῆς πάντοτε ὑπ' αὐτῶν*): of deliverance from perils of war (*Inscr. gr. ad res rom. pert.* i. 717); for philosophic *soteria* also *Corp. Herm.* vii. 2; for *soteria* in mysteries C. Clemen in *Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici*, p. 32. Demeter appears as ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑ on a coin of Metapontum of the latter part of the fourth century B.C. (*B.M.C. Italy*, 257, no. 144: a specimen in *Collection Jameson*, 73, no. 326, is dated 'vers 280').

² The classic paper is Wendland, *Z.N.W.* v. (1904). It is instructive to compare these inscriptions with the similar language applied to James I in the preface to the Authorised Version: 'the appearance of your Majesty, as of the Sun in his strength, instantly dispelled those supposed and surmised mists and gave unto all that were well affected exceeding cause of comfort . . . and that also accompanied with peace and tranquillity at home and abroad.' The comparison warns us against reading too much into it.

³ ἀπετηῆς, which means divine power and not merely moral qualities; cf. *J.H.S.* 1925, p. 86.

⁴ The words translated have been supplied by conjecture to fill a gap in the inscription, which is conveniently published by W. Dittenberger, *Orientalis graeci inscriptiones selectae*, 458; c.f. now W. H. Buckler, *C.R.*, 1927, 119 sqq.

⁵ This suggests Hellenistic kings, but was used of lesser people, cf. Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 214 sq. It is in origin not a religious title, but the regular term of praise for the benefactor of a city (J. Oehler, *P.W.* vi. 973 sqq.); later it is used of deities (cf. Preuschen-Bauer, *Lexikon*², p. 499).

immortal nature of the universe has blessed us most greatly with excellent benefits, bringing into the happy life of our times Caesar Augustus, father of his country, the goddess Roma, being Zeus Patroos and saviour of the whole race of men, whose forethought has not only fulfilled but surpassed the prayers of all: for land and sea are at peace, cities flourish with law, concord and prosperity; all good things are abundant and at their best, and men are filled with good hopes for the future.' ¹ The description of the Emperor as *Soter*, or 'Soter of the inhabited world' (as later Nero), the use of the term *Euangelion* of the news of his goodness (perhaps a fixed term in this connexion, if we may judge from this passage and a papyrus letter relating to Julius Verus Maximus, 'since I became aware of the Euangelion concerning the proclamation of an Emperor' ²), and the account given of the peace and joy brought by the Emperor, have a striking similarity with Luke ii. 10 sq. 'I announce (εὐαγγελίζομαι) to you great joy which shall be to all the people, that a Saviour (*Soter*) is born this day' and with the beginning of the *Gloria in excelsis* 'Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace among men of good will.' Further, we hear of the χάρις, godlike graciousness and strength, of the Emperors as of Christ ³; of their χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία, goodness and

¹ Wendland, *Kultur* ², 410 no. 9. How sincere this feeling about Augustus was is shown by the words of the pious Jew Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*, 23, §§ 143-7: 'He who surpassed human nature in all excellences, who for the greatness of his imperial power and nobility was first called Augustus. . . . This is the Caesar who calmed the storms which had everywhere broken, who healed the common ills of Greeks and barbarians . . . : this is he who did not merely loose but broke the bonds with which the world was bound and oppressed . . . ; this is he who made the sea empty of pirate vessels and full of merchant-men; this is he who rescued all cities into freedom, who brought order from disorder. . . .' (It must, however, be remembered that in Alexandria the Jews tended to be ostentatiously loyal though not participating in ruler-cult, while the Greeks were generally against the government.) Livia also, the wife of Augustus, was regarded as saviour of the world, cf. H. Mattingly, *B.M.C.R. Empire*, I. cxxxvi. The description of the joy of the world (cf. Ditt. *Syll.* ³, 797, of Caligula) is a typical feature of accounts of the birth (cf. the Delphic paean to Dionysus, *Bull. corr. Hell.* xlviii. 108) or epiphany (Pfister, *P.W. Suppl.* iv. 318) of a god.

² Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 313.

³ On χάρις cf. G. P. Wetter, *Charis* (1913), and the magic evidence in S. Eitrem, *Papyri Osloenses*, i. 45 and 88 sqq. F. J. Dölger, *Sol Salutis* ², pp. 206 sqq., followed by H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 237, regards χάρις in the Didache (p. 132 later, χάρις ἐλθέτω) as equivalent to Christ.

love of humanity, as of His in Tit. iii. 4¹: of their *Parousia* or presence, and *Epiphaneia* or self-manifestation²: the Emperor like Christ was 'Ktistes,' 'founder.'³

Soter, *euangelion*, peace, these then are common property. It would be possible to infer that the Christian phraseology was either borrowed from, or created in opposition to, the Imperial. Augustus and Jesus both suited popular expectations of a Saviour, of a King who should be born to the joy of the world, and who should bring peace.⁴ Such expectations were at home in the East, and had found their way into Italy, as the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil shows.⁵ Just as a web of mythology had surrounded the figure of the great saviour king Alexander, so Augustus soon after his death acquired a legend.⁶ There is in the suggested cause a real strength of religious feeling.

Nevertheless, it does not seem clear that the connotations of *Soter* or *euangelion* were predominantly enough Imperial to make their meaning even in combination obvious. At the time at which Christian terminology was being formed Augustus was a memory, not an actual deliverer; it is not clear that similar language was commonly used of his successors before Nero,⁷ and by his time *Christos Soter* was

¹ Clemen, p. 89, and Deissmann, pp. 318 *sqq.*

² This term also is found in the Septuagint; cf. Hatch-Redpath, i. 537; on its use cf. my *Notes on Ruler-cult*, III. (to appear in *J.H.S.*)

³ Pfister, *Reliquiencult*, pp. 296 *sqq.*

⁴ Such an expectation could spring up independently of oriental and mystic ideas; cf. Isocrates, *Philip*, 151 (written in 346 B.C.): 'The gods have given me words, and appointed thee for action, thinking that thou wouldst best preside over them, and that my word would be least wearisome to hearers.'

⁵ On this see E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, 1924, and the considerable literature which has followed its publication (references in ch. ii. of *Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1923-4 and following years). We must not forget that the expectations may be Pollio's rather than Virgil's, a point well developed by J. S. Phillimore, *Pastoral and Allegory* (Oxford, 1925), pp. 28 *sq.* W. Weber, *Der Prophet und sein Gott*, has collected a number of oriental parallels; they suggest that there is in this expectation a certain psychological inevitability.

⁶ W. Weber, *op. cit.* p. 111; Deonna, *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, lxxxiii, lxxxiv.

⁷ But Germanicus in his second edict speaks of Tiberius as 'the saviour and benefactor of the whole human race' (Cichorius, *Römische Studien*, 376). It follows from the same passage that the Alexandrians applied these titles to Germanicus also for his help in a famine. The idea of *pax Augusta* was stressed by all the Emperors of the first century (O. Th. Schulz, *Die Rechtstitel und Regierungsprogramme auf römischen Kaiser-münzen* in *Stud. Gesch. Kult. Alt.* xiii. iv. 64; cf. *Corp. Herm.* xviii. 10,

probably fixed. On the face of it, the *combined* occurrence of *Soter* and *euangelion* is striking. Yet it must be remembered that the latter is not primarily a religious word : it is common from the fourth century B.C. onwards in the senses of 'good tidings' or 'sacrifice in honour of good tidings' ; we find the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι in the Septuagint of Is. lxi. 1, and the noun in a neutral sense, and again as 'reward due to the bearer of good tidings' (a sense known also in secular Greece). We have scores of examples of the general meaning ; it is reasonable to infer that the four known instances in which it is connected with an Emperor's accession do not make it a technical term¹ ; rather, it was the obvious Greek word both for that and for the news of the birth of Jesus.

Soter too was a term of wide use, and its frequent employment in the Septuagint as a predicate of God or of the Messiah seems to supply the most natural antecedent for its Christian use.² It is noteworthy that Philo, who uses the term σωτήρ (several times σωτήρ καὶ εὐεργέτης) of God with some freedom, does so in particular relation to the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, and with no visible oppositional tone ; he speaks of the Exodus also as a type of spiritual σωτηρία, and Josephus repeatedly describes it as σωτηρία, and calls the parting of the waves 'an

p. 358.5 R. τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς ἀσφαλείας καὶ εἰρήνης πρῶτα βασιλεῖς, possibly of Diocletian and his colleagues, as B. Keil argues, *ap. Reitzenstein, Poimandres*, p. 374). On εἰρηνοποιός as an epithet of Emperors, *cf. H. Windisch, Z.N.W.* xxiv. 251 *sqq.*

¹ *Cf. Stephanus-Dindorf, Thesaurus*, iii. 2171 *sqq.* ; Hatch-Redpath, *Concordance*, i. 568 ; Strack-Billerbeck, iii. 4 *sqq.* I must respectfully dissent from Norden's view (quoted by Deissmann, p. 447) that εὐαγγελίων in the Priene inscription refers to prophecies which were regarded as applying to Augustus. Rather it is the good tidings of peace and stable government for which his healthful activities were responsible. Even more must I refuse to connect the term with the cult of Εὐάγγελος as Dieterich suggested (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 195). The secular use of εὐαγγέλια is well illustrated by a Samian inscription, *Suppl. epigr. gr.* i. 362, mentioning a feast, Δημητρίεια ἐπὶ τοῖς εὐαγγελίους, that is (as the first editor, M. Schede, explained) a festival in honour of Demetrius, with special reference to the news of his victory at Salamis in Cyprus. In 1 Cor. xv. 2, εὐαγγελίζομαι is used of the telling of the whole soteriological drama (Christ died, was buried, rose, was seen).

² Dibelius, in *Handbuch zum neuen Testament*¹ III. ii. 184, suggests that many of the passages in question show Hellenistic influence. This may be so, but for us they must reckon as already components of Judaism. Moreover, the Saviour idea was clearly part of Judaism and the concept of salvation develops historically in it, *cf. E. Balla, ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ*, i. 71 *sqq.* ; Strack-Billerbeck, I. 67 *sqq.*

epiphany of God.' If we remember the frequency with which the Christian community is thought of as a new Israel, also St. Paul's comparison of their progress with the progress through the desert in 1 Cor. x, we see how easily the epithet might be given to Jesus.¹ Clemen's view that in this stage of Christology a predicate of God would not easily be transferred to Jesus² is not weighty. It rests on a critical method which is disputable (p. 76, earlier), and which is even less applicable to the Lucan and Johannine writings than to St. Mark. In a measure, developing Christianity deepened its Jewish element.

We conclude therefore that the application of the title *Soter* to Jesus is not in origin connected with non-Jewish religious use of the word. At the same time, converts from the Gentile world must have felt in the term something opposed to other appropriations of it. For them Jesus was *Soter* as the deliverer from disease and demoniac possession, the deliverer from subjection to inferior divine powers, the deliverer from sin, and the giver of happy immortality; for them He was *Soter* as, and more than as, Asclepius, Emperors, and mystery-gods; to them He gave peace, but not merely an earthly peace³; to them He gave also what philosophers looked on as *soteria*.⁴ Further, the title was not a distinct description—Jesus is ὁ κύριος commonly, ὁ σωτήρ first in Gnostic writings; it is a predicate, and the expression of the emotion called forth by achievements or services. When Vespasian's legate Trajan entered Tiberias he was greeted as 'saviour and benefactor.'⁵ Anybody might in

¹ For Philo's use of σωτήρ καὶ, εὐεργέτης see *De sobr.* 11, I, p. 401, Mangey; for σωτήρ in relation to the Exodus cf. *De migr. Abr.* 5, § 25, I, p. 440; for the Exodus as σωτηρία *De ebriet.* 29, § 101, I, p. 374, and Joseph. *A. J.* II, 15, 4–III, i, 1 (eight times); and for ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ θεοῦ, *ibid.* II, § 339. This point I owe to the Rev. W. L. Knox. The return from exile is thought of as a second Exodus in Isaiah xliii, 1, 14. In general, on the Exodus as a salvation 'motif,' cf. E. Sellin, *Mose*; for a kindred idea cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 244.

² Clemen, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

³ H. Fuchs, *Augustin und der antike Friedensgedanke*, p. 41.

⁴ This point is well made by J. Krebs, *Der Logos als Heiland*, 77 sqq.; the difference of Christian and pagan salvation is stressed by E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, iii, 392 sqq.

⁵ Joseph. *B. J.* III, 9, § 459. Here the title springs from spontaneous emotion; how slight a meaning it may convey appears from an inscription at Eumeneia in Phrygia, possibly of Augustan date, describing a local dignity as σωτήρα καὶ εὐεργέτην διὰ προγόνων (Ramsay, *Cities*, I, 377, No. 199).

some circle or other win the title *Soter*; yet he continued to receive worship only if he continued to impress mankind as superhuman. He might be hailed as *Soter*, or an orator might use a turn of speech implying such an acclamation,¹ and the matter might stay there.

This view of *Soter* becomes clearer if we consider what was implied in *soteria* by Jesus. It was atonement for sin, the giving of His life as 'a ransom for many' (Mark x. 45); the notion is expressed in a more defined manner in Rom. iii. 25 ('God made Him a propitiatory offering in His own blood for the showing forth of His righteousness by the remission of sins committed earlier; this was of God's remission'),² and in a developed form in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The notion of a sin offering is not foreign to Greek or Oriental belief³; the possibility of one individual giving a ransom for his sin or the sin of another is known to us in the Phrygian circles discussed earlier.⁴ A general atonement by a Redeemer is not Hellenistic. Attis, Adonis, Osiris die, are mourned for, and return to life. Yet it is nowhere said that *soteria* comes by their death. *Soteria* of a sort may come from their return to life, or from the assurance that they will do so in due season.⁵ Firmicus Maternus, writing in the middle of the fourth century of our era, describes a ritual in which 'on a certain night an image is laid on its back in a litter and bewailed with rhythmic lamentation. When they have had their fill of this, light is brought in and the priest anoints the throats

¹ Cf. some instructive illustrations quoted by Wendland, *l.c.* I am inclined to regard the infrequency of the epithet in the earliest Christian literature as accidental rather than deliberate.

² The term *ἱλαστήριος* is not specifically Jewish; cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, p. 303.

³ Cf. P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*³, pp. 127 sqq.; for the scapegoat, *ibid.* pp. 245 sq., and V. Gebhard, *Die Pharmakoi in Ionien und die Sybakchoi in Athen* (Diss. München: M. Hueber, 1926). In Babylonian religion the victim is thought to represent the sacrificer and to take away his sins; cf. F. Jeremias in Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*⁴, i. 579; J. Scheftelowitz, *Relg. Vers. u. Vor.* xiv. iii.

⁴ Cf. Steinleitner, *Das Beicht*, 37 sq., for the word *λύτρον*, and 45, no. 17. (Aurelius Musaeus takes upon himself and makes atonement for his sister Aphphia's offence; the priest who acts the part of Anubis undertakes the expiation of a woman's sins in Juvenal, vi. 535, discussed by Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 144 sq., but he is as it were the official channel.)

⁵ Cf. K. Holl, *Urchristentum und Religionsgeschichte* (Bertelsmann: Gütersloh, 1925), 12 sq.

of all who were weeping, and, this done, whispers in a slow murmur :

Be of good cheer, ye faithful, for that the god is saved.
Saved in truth shall we be from out our toil and pain.'

Firmicus does not name the god : it was probably one of the three just mentioned.¹ The joy spoken of is a joy in sympathy with divine joy, the deliverance is a deliverance in harmony with the god's deliverance, not a deliverance brought by his sufferings : it is the spiritualisation of a rite concerned with the death and revival of the life of the fruits of the earth. From this to the self-oblation of Jesus, as it was preached, is a perceptible distance.

The key to the Christian doctrine is given to us by Jewish conceptions alone. In the Last Supper Jesus spoke of a new covenant in His blood : if these words are not genuine there are few recorded sayings in history which can claim to be genuine.² A new covenant looks back to the old covenant, to the victim sacrificed and its blood outpoured for the sealing of the Law (Exod. xxiv. 8). A new covenant, with its new sacrificial victim, exists for a new Israel. Jesus, the victim of the new covenant, makes atonement for His people. (This is not indeed the whole of redemption ; the conception of the Second Coming, with the rising of the righteous dead, involves conceptions non-Jewish in origin, but probably for some time at home in Judaea.³)

The peculiar nature of this atonement deserves particular attention.⁴ It is in Christian theology a constituent which has caused very great philosophical difficulties ; it has survived as an element clearly original but very hard to digest. Before we pass on, one linguistic observation has to be made. Deissmann explains the Pauline

¹ *De errore profanarum religionum*, ch. xxii. Hepding and Loisy think Osiris ; either Attis or Adonis is possible. On the rite cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 400 sq.

² Cf. p. 120 later. The phrase rests on two independent traditions, the Synoptic and the Pauline (cf. H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, 211 sqq.).

³ Cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul*, p. 139.

⁴ On its relation to the 'Iranian Redeemer' belief cf. p. 100 later. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*², p. 297, admits its Jewish nature as readily as conservative critics do. It is natural to suppose that the Pauline 'anthropology' is an adaptation of earlier ideas (cf. Bousset, 129 sqq.) ; Christianity did not create new presuppositions in every field.

language of ransom, redemption, and so forth from pagan formulae of manumission in which a slave is spoken of as being ransomed by a god; the god nominally paid the price of freedom (in reality supplied by the slave) to the slave's master.¹ To some readers or hearers this connotation may have been inevitable, but it should be remarked that the use itself is most easily explained from the Septuagint. 'Let them tell who have been ransomed by the Lord, those whom He ransomed from the hand of an enemy' in Ps. 106 (107) is expressed by λελυτρωμένοι, ἐλυτρώσατο.² The same metaphor is employed in the Phrygian inscription mentioned above.³ At this point I may stress the importance of the linguistic usage of the Septuagint; for the study of that of the New Testament in general and of St. Paul in particular it can hardly be over-emphasised; to take a single instance, it is probably from the meaning given to ἅγιος (holy) in the Septuagint that we must explain its Christian sense.⁴

§ 4. On the title *Son of God* little need be said. It has imprinted itself on the Synoptic tradition. What its origin is—the claims of Jesus for Himself, the deepening reverence of the disciples for Him in the light of their belief in His resurrection and in His continued activity in the Spirit, and their consequent reinterpretation of Messianic prophecies, or the Syrian belief more recently suggested⁵—cannot well be discussed here. It is sufficient to note that the attempts

¹ Licht ⁴, 274 sqq. The freedman may then be regarded as the god's slave, a use to be distinguished from the *religious* and personal use of δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ, mentioned p. 84 earlier.

² In Acts vii. 35 God is λυτρωτής in respect of the Exodus; cf. Isaiah xliii. 1, 14, and p. 93 n. 1 above.

³ P. 94 n. 4 *supra*.

⁴ So E. Williger, *Relig. Vers. u. Vor.* XIX. i. 84 sqq., and his general observations, pp. 103 sqq.

⁵ Reitzenstein, *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grosse*, 23 (using the text of Celsus, discussed, p. 97 n. 2. Von Gall, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ (Heidelberg, 1926), pp. 416 sq., observes that it is clear that Jesus regarded the Son of Man as Son of God, cf. Klostermann's note on Mark i. 11 in *Handbuch*. The most natural explanation of the term remains Ps. ii. interpreted as in Mark; cf. Rawlinson, *New Testament Doctrine*, 426. Jewish conceptions of sonship as predicable of angels and of the king or people of Israel or the pious among them (Strack-Billerbeck III. 15 sqq.) have been given a new meaning. This meaning is brought out by the parable of the wicked husbandmen, as explained by F. C. Burkitt, *Trans. Third Congr. Hist. Rel.*, II. 321 sqq. παῖς θεοῦ corresponds originally to 'servant of Jahwe' in Deutero-Isaiah (Bousset, 56 sq.) and is rarely used or implied, except in a liturgical formula, διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου and its derivatives (Harnack, *Sitzungsber. preuss. Ak.*, 1926, 212 sqq.).

which have been made to explain it from the larger Hellenistic world fail. The Emperor was called θεοῦ υἱός, but in the particular sense of being son of his deified predecessor, as Augustus was of Julius by adoption, which in antiquity gave status more like that of a son of the body than we can easily imagine. There are, moreover, indications that the term was at the time fairly colourless, and we have seen reason to doubt the whole theory of a Christian terminology opposed to the Imperial.¹

Greek gods had sons, and famous men were often regarded as sons of particular deities (for instance, Plato and Augustus alike as sons of Apollo); but 'son of god' was not in itself a common designation. G. P. Wetter has urged that *son of god* was a current title for a wonder-worker; the evidence adduced is wholly inadequate.² He has reminded us truly that various Gnostic teachers were treated as more or less divine, and given some epithets which Jesus received, *messenger, herald, prophet*, and that other figures, like Apollonius of Tyana, approximate to the type. The inspired man, θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, is an important figure in the religious life of the time. Yet it must be remembered that the Gnostic figures who come closest to Jesus are known to us mainly as represented by Christian writers in contrast with His claims,³ and that in any case this terminology is the conse-

¹ Pp. 86 *sq.* earlier, and see the excellent discussion by F. J. Dölger, IXΘΡΞ, i. 388 *sq.* The Ptolemaic and imperial θεός ἐκ θεοῦ does not find an analogue in Christian terminology till later (as *Acta Thomae*, 47, and the creeds).

² See G. P. Wetter, *Der Sohn Gottes*, ch. i.: the only text he quotes which gives the title expressly to any other than Jesus and Simon Magus is Cels. *ap.* Orig. *Contra Celsum*, VII. 9, which he, like other scholars, misunderstands; the picture C. draws of a typical Syrian prophet is a parody of the portrait of Jesus (Rawlinson, *Doctrine*, p. 70). Yet note Justin, *Apol.* I. 22. 1, εἰ καὶ κοινῶς μόνον ἄνθρωπος διὰ σοφίαν ἄγιος υἱὸς θεοῦ λέγασθαι (perhaps inspired by Mark xv. 39; Matt. xxvii. 54). The prophecy in Lactant. *Inst. div.* VII. 17. 2, *se coli iubebit ut dei filium*, refers to an Antichrist.

³ Cf., for instance, Wetter, 8, 10, and again 11 (St. Irenaeus says that Menander claimed ὡς ἄρα εἶη ὁ σωτὴρ ἐπὶ τῆ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐνωθέν ποθεν ἐξ ἀοράτων αἰῶνων ἀπεσταλμένος σωτηρία). At the same time a Simon Magus asserts his claims in a way which Jesus is in the story of the Temptation made expressly to reject (Wetter, pp. 87 *sqq.*; Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 54 *sq.*; S. Eitrem, *Die Versuchung Christi*, 1924, has shown how the temptations resemble the claims of contemporary magicians). I do not wish to deny the independence of the Simon type, on which cf. P. Alfarcic, *Actes Congr. Hist. Rel.* (1925), ii. pp. 268 *sqq.* (In the Gnostic group attacked by Plotinus, *Enn.* II. 9. 9, the title παῖς θεοῦ was apparently applied to the individual believer in possession of γνῶσις.)

quence of the impression made by personalities ; it does not create belief. The Christian who called Jesus Son of God denoted something precise by the term.

§ 5. *Christological speculation.*—The existence of the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος in Syria and in the Hellenistic world perhaps made it easier for converts to grasp the idea of a more than human teacher having lived in the world, and passed from it to take definitely divine rank. It does not explain the recognition of Jesus as Son of God and as Lord by the community at Jerusalem.¹ Nor does the evolution sometimes supposed, by assimilation to Hellenistic saviours, explain what happened. Such assimilation, even if it occurred in a far larger measure than to me seems plausible, postulates something which had enough resemblance to be capable of assimilation ; it demands as a starting-point Jesus, regarded by Himself and by the disciples as more than human.² From that we can explain the cult of Jesus simply ; the contrary view, that the cult provoked the whole *Kyrios, Soter, Theou Hyios* terminology is far more difficult.

From the beginning there was this element so hard to digest in a theology, a Jesus who is *Māri*, whose Messiahship is found to be not traditional or immediately of this world. The statement of His nature, as appreciated more and more in Christian experience, requires and exhausts all the available terminology. It is a long journey before an acceptable interpretation of the position, a proper recognition of its compatibility with the claims of the Father, is reached. Few statements could be more unhistorical or misleading than a dictum of Saintyves : 'Aux esprits philosophiques, auxquels l'antique initiation donnait une nourriture appropriée, on enseigne aujourd'hui à ciel ouvert une métaphysique que les conciles et les

¹ Cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul*, pp. 30 *sqq.* ; the evidence for the recognition of Jesus as more than human is the stronger because of divergences (I mean, because of the clear existence of suitable titles at Jerusalem which St. Paul does not use).

² An analogy which might be adduced against this view is the development of the status of St. John Baptist among the Mandaeans (for which see Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erl.* pp. 124 *sq.*) I am inclined to hazard the conjecture, unacceptable as it may appear, that this view of John arose in opposition and rivalry to the Christian view of Jesus, and is not prior or independent.

théologiens ont organisée de façon à ne pas heurter trop violemment les croyances euhéméristes des partisans du nouvel Adonis.'¹ Christian dogma is not the product of deliberate creation; it comes rather from a number and variety of attempts to meet problems, to exclude untenable theories which had been propounded, and in general to avoid error rather than to state and define truth.

We have noted earlier that St. Paul's peculiar position made it imperative for him to think out problems which the disciples at Jerusalem would not have considered or at least would have felt no pressing need to formulate and answer. Among these problems were the Coming and the Passion of Jesus.

Of the first he says, in Phil. ii. 5 *sqq.*: 'Who, being in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as a lucky find,² but emptied Himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in the likeness of man, and being found in shape as a man humbled Himself, being submissive even to the point of death, and that death on a cross. Wherefore God exalted Him, and gave Him a name above every name . . .' The passage is important; it sounds like a prose hymn, and is among the antecedents of the liturgical Preface.³ Divine epiphanies in human shape are common enough in the Greek world, though not with such a purpose as this. Horace may represent Augustus as being Mercury in human shape, come down to save mankind, but the salvation implied is essentially practical: vengeance for Caesar's death, and the restoration of peace and prosperity. The descent of the Primal Man in the *Poimandres* (the first tractate of the Hermetic Corpus) is a fall which begins the cosmic

¹ *Essai sur les grottes* (1918), 249.

² So W. W. Jaeger, *Hermes*, l. (1915) 537-53, supported by Dibelius *ad loc.* Οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγάσαστο ἀλλὰ . . . contrasts a possible attitude, treating Godhead as a lucky prize to be enjoyed, with the actual attitude of Jesus, who chose to win it as ἀπερῆς ἀθλον, as St. Gregory Naz. says. The word ἀρπ. however clearly implies that Jesus possessed Godhead in the first instance. (An interesting suggestion on the passage in Rawlinson, *Doctrine*, pp. 134 *sqq.*) As for ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 357. μ.θ. is predicated of the divine Primal Man in *C.H.* i. 12. Cf. Dibelius *ad loc.* μορφῇ in *N.T.*, says H. A. A. Kennedy *ap.* Moulton-Milligan, *Vocabulary of the N.T.* 417 (where is valuable material), 'always signifies a form which truly and fully expresses the being which underlies it.' On the whole passage cf. now Ch. Guignebert's discussion, *Actes congr.*, ii, pp. 290 *sqq.*

³ Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, 178 *sq.*

process.¹ More akin to what we are considering is a Mandaeen myth which Reitzenstein traces to unofficial Iranian belief. It tells of a Primal Man descending from the world of light, now imprisoned in the body, but destined one day to break his chains, to reassemble his scattered members (our souls), and so, led by a messenger of light, to return to heaven; we return in him. In the meanwhile the awaking is expected. There is, of course, similar Manichean teaching. Of this myth Reitzenstein has found numerous traces on the fringe of Jewish thought; in Pauline eschatology, in the *Odes of Solomon*, in Gnostic texts, among the Mandaeans, and elsewhere.² It is difficult to form a satisfactory judgment at the moment; the origin, date, and diffusion of the story are hotly disputed.³ Provisionally it may be remarked that some of the supposed traces of the myth in Christian thought are very questionable,⁴ and the rest, though they may seem to be based ultimately on the myth, do not state it. It is as though its pictorial language and some of its components had survived, but not the myth in its entirety. Had St. Paul known it, approved it, and assimilated it, his account would have been more direct. We cannot, moreover, till further notice quite ignore the possibility that the elements of the myth were all present at his time, but the synthesis was not till later. In any case, there is a contrast between his more superficial contacts

¹ Clemen (*op. cit.* p. 94) quotes *C.H.* i. 15, which refers not to the Primal Man but to all men, immortal because of the Existent Man, but mortal in respect of their bodies; and is therefore irrelevant. The author of *C.H.* x. 25 expressly states that no god comes down on earth, possibly in opposition to Christianity, possibly, as Wetter thinks (*Der Sohn Gottes*, p. 99), in opposition to popular Hellenistic belief.

² See Reitzenstein's article, *Die Göttin Psyche* (*Sitz. Heid. Ak.* 1917, 10), and his brilliant book, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (1921). H. Güntert, *Der arische Welthönig und Heiland* (Halle, 1923), argues for the great antiquity of the basic idea of this.

³ See on the other side G. Wesendonk, *Urmensch und Seele*. Reitzenstein, *Ir. Erl.* p. 242, has some good remarks on the taking over of religious ideas.

⁴ M. Dibelius, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1923, 415, remarks reasonably that the warning to arise from sleep in 1 Cor. xv. 34, 1 Thess. v. 4, is natural enough, and does not in any way presuppose the myth (*cf.* his note on the latter passage in *Handbuch*). Again, δ Χριστός ἐν ἡμῖν, which Reitzenstein (*op. cit.*, p. 132) refers to the myth, does not imply a world soul which is also Redeemer, and of which our souls are part. It means rather the presence of Christ's Spirit in the community of those He loves. On the difference between the Christian story and this Iranian belief *cf.* Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, p. 423.

and the close resemblance to it of the *Odes of Solomon* or the Hymn of the Soul in the *Acts of Thomas* or the views of the Symmachiani, and it must further be postulated that if the myth influenced him, it probably influenced him through a Judaism it had earlier coloured.

St. Paul's conviction that Godhead must be predicated of Jesus has been seen in Phil. ii. 5. An even stronger statement is found in Col. i. 15-19 and ii. 9, which if not Pauline cannot well be much later. Christ is the image of the invisible God,¹ the first-born of all creation,² and God has willed that in Him should dwell the sum total of everything³; in Christ dwells the fullness of Godhead. A Jesus so clearly more than human is naturally thought of as pre-existent. The idea of a pre-existent Son of Man in 1 Enoch may have contributed somewhat to the shaping of this

¹ εἰκών is applied by Greek philosophers to the visible world (in Philo μίμημα θείας εἰκόνας) as a copy of God; by Philo to reason, mind, and wisdom as copies of God; on the Rosetta stone to a Ptolemy as living image of God (Dibelius *ad loc.*). Jesus as εἰκών τοῦ θεοῦ is distinct from man, ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ.

² πρωτότοκος, first-born before the creation of the world. Dibelius notes the express parallelism of Creation and Redemption.

³ τὸ πλήρωμα means probably the same as the adjacent τὰ πάντα. In general πλήρωμα means:

(α) the task of filling;

(β) that which is put in to fill—the stuffing of the sausage. Hence the crew of a ship, the gang of workmen who do a job, the complement. (So probably in Eph. i. 23: the Church is τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα πληρουμένου, the complement of Him who fills all. The writer's use of πλήρωμα perhaps subconsciously suggested the other aspect of πληροῦν, πληροῦσθαι; so I should explain πεπληρωμένοι in Col. ii. 10.)

(γ) total. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 660; Herod. III. 22; Rom. ii. 25 τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνων (= πάντα τὰ ἔθνη); Philo, *De praem. et poen.* 11 (II. 418, Mangey) γενομένη δὲ πλήρωμα ἀρετῶν ἢ ψυχῆ; 18 (p. 425) ὡς ἕκαστον οἶκον πλήρωμα εἶναι πολυανθρώπου συγγελαίας; *Corp. Herm.* VI. 4 ὁ γὰρ κόσμος πλήρωμα τῆς κακίας ὁ δὲ θεὸς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἢ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (the universe is a concentration of evil, the good a concentration of God, God a concentration of the good. Scott's deletion of ἢ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is uncalled for); IX. 7 πνοὴ γὰρ οὐσα πυκνοτάτη προτείνει τὰ ποιά τοῖς σώμασι μετὰ ἐνὸς πληρώματος τοῦ τῆς ζωῆς (the universe is one continuous mass of life; so Scott, comparing XII. ii. 15 ὁ δὲ σύμπας κόσμος οὗτος . . . πλήρωμα ἐστὶ τῆς ζωῆς). In the Gizeh amulet Christ is πλήρωμα τοῦ αἰῶνος (A. Jacoby, *Ein neues Evangelienfragment*, p. 32, τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητός σου in a liturgical text in *Jahrb. f. Lit.* I. 133).

It does not seem to me that πλήρωμα can be regarded as a technical term of religion till its use by Christian Gnostics. (In Gal. iv. 4, ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου is, as Lietzmann remarks *ad loc.*, simply equivalent to ἐπληρώθη ὁ χρόνος.)

concept.¹ In any case, there are indications of the concept in the Synoptic Gospels,² and, as Dibelius observes, the style of the first passage from Colossians indicates that its writer is reproducing an earlier formulation of belief. It is not an *ad hoc* statement or a theological *tour de force*.

Pre-existence involved some sort of descent. This St. Paul had taught the Philippians orally, and of it he now reminded them. But it must be remembered that the emphasis is here entirely on the moral consequences. The humility of Jesus is the model for the humility to be practised by the Philippians—*τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*: 'have in your corporate existence that attitude which you have as members of Christ Jesus.'³ We are able to study St. Paul working on a mythology that he has received in his adaptation of Jewish angelology to interpret the triumph of the Cross (as, for instance, Col. ii. 15). His Christology is in obvious contrast. If developed from mythological sources⁴ it shows a hardihood of simplification which we do not find in his angelology. It remains easier to seek the source of the Pauline language in necessary development of the belief in the Lordship of Jesus.

§ 6. *The Spirit*.—Judaism had before the beginning of our era acquired the idea of a Spirit or Wisdom of God, a functional power operating in the world; from what source we cannot here discuss.⁵ In Christianity this assumed a new and personal significance. To St. Paul the Spirit is the life-breath and continued vitality of a personal Lord in His own followers (Phil. i. 19; Rom. viii. 9) which has superseded and replaced their former personality: Jesus, lately on earth, is now freed from limitations of place and operates in the Church. We have in St. Paul the beginnings, but

¹ Cf. Rawlinson, *Doctrine*, p. 122. In general see Strack-Billerbeck, II. 333 *sqq.*

² Mark ix. 19 = Matt. xvii. 17 = Luke ix. 41 (so Windisch, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, lii. 1918, 218; he regards these passages as belonging to the latest stage of the Synoptic tradition).

³ The interpretation given is that of Dibelius and others.

⁴ Cf. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 238 *sqq.*, and Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erl.* 233 *sqq.* It is instructive to contrast St. Paul's treatment of this subject with *Ascensio Iesaeae*, 10.

⁵ Cf. E. de W. Burton, *Galatians*, 486 *sqq.*; Clemen, 113 *sq.*; Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erlös.* 240 *sqq.*; *Myst.*³, 70 *sqq.*, 278 *sqq.*, 308 *sqq.* On the later popular diffusion of this idea of independent functional powers of deities cf. *J.H.S.* 1925, 90 *sq.*; G. Beyerhaus, *Rhein. Mus.* 1926, 6 *sqq.*

only the beginnings, of that doctrine of the Holy Spirit which in time reaches the orthodox form.¹ The Spirit is not merely a present guide but also a pledge of the heavenly inheritance to come (2 Cor. i. 21, etc.²), and embodies this divine function.

This conception, individual as it is, found many points of contact in contemporary thought. The Stoics taught that a divine reason penetrated the universe and worked within the individual.³ It must have become commonplace: Virgil's statement of it contributed something to this.⁴ This Spirit is spoken of in a way which suggests Christian language, though we find *pneuma hieron* (sacred spirit), not *pneuma hagion* (holy spirit).⁵ In Hermetic writings a similar divine *Nous* or Mind is present with the just and pious and prevents them from sinning.⁶ The general notions that life is in the breath and that man's intellectual part is of the nature of the rarefied upper air or *aether* have also to be taken into account.

How far these Hellenistic ideas contributed to the development, how far merely to the popularisation, of this doctrine of the Spirit we cannot determine. The same is true of the teaching that Jesus is the *Logos* or Reason and Word⁷ of God. Here antecedents are clearer; Heraclitus, if we accept one interpretation of his first fragment, had

¹ Cf. H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*. The relation of the *πνεῦμα* in man to this *πνεῦμα* is far from clear; cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul*, 140 sqq., and for a Hellenistic view *P. Par. l.* 489 (in the *Mithras-liturgie*, ed. Dieterich, p. 2, l. 11): *πνεῦμα πνεύματος τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ πνεύματος πρώτου*.

² Cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 356, for parallels. The Spirit as Advocate (Joh. 14, 16, etc.) fulfils a function ascribed in Rabbinic texts to angels (Strack-Billerbeck, II. 560 sqq.), in Philo once to the *Logos* (*Vita Mosis*, II. [III.] 14, p. 134, vol. ii. p. 155 Mangey).

³ Tatian, *Oratio*, 4, p. 5, 2, distinguishes between Christian and Stoic ideas of God as Spirit.

⁴ Cf. my *Sallustius*, xxxv. n. 108.

⁵ So E. Williger, *R.G. V. V.* XIX. i. 95 sqq. Clemen's reply (114) that *πνεῦμα ἁγιον* is implied by Val. Max. IV. 7, ext. 1, *fida hominum pectora quasi quaedam sancto spiritu referta templa sunt*, is unconvincing. Valerius Maximus is a non-philosophical writer, and may not have chosen his words with care. *πνεῦμα ἁγιον* comes in magic texts, where Jewish influence is possible (Williger, 101₁).

⁶ *C.H.* i. 22; *νοῦς* stands for *πνεῦμα*, here and in 1 Cor. ii. 16 (Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 337 sqq.).

⁷ Usefully discussed by W. R. Inge, *E.R.E.* viii. 133 sqq.; on the possibility of a purely Jewish origin cf. Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, 185 sqq. (excellent); Strack-Billerbeck, II. 302 sqq.

taught five centuries earlier that the Logos was eternal, and that all happened according to its laws. The Mandaean parallel also is good; their Redeemer is the Word or the Son of the Word, and with the special reason that a cry and its reply accompany his coming and are identified with him.¹ Yet the kernel of the doctrine is not the term; it is the use of the term to modify a monotheistic conception. Philo shows particularly well how a Hellenistic Jew could picture a *Logos*, a Reason operating in the world and thus explaining God's activity without impairing His transcendence. How far he personally, or the school of thought which Bousset postulates as lying behind him, influenced the New Testament is hard to say²; it is always necessary to remember the fact that the great majority of the theological writings of the time have disappeared. A certain judgment is therefore hardly to be hoped for. The doctrine as expressed in the proem of the Fourth Gospel has great importance as being early Christian apologetic. It means that Christianity, in spite of its recent beginnings, is the worship of that which was from the beginning.

To some extent, then, the origin of these terms, of which the Christians now claimed the exclusive application, must be at present uncertain.

§ 7. *Mystic Life*.—The title of *Christusmystik* has been given to an attitude prominent in the Pauline writings and expressed in such sayings as that believers are *in Christ Jesus*,³ *crucified with Him*, that *to live is Christ Jesus*.

This phraseology is interesting and implies a form of

¹ Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erlös*. 66 sqq.; *Myst.*², 14 (cf. 314). R. Bultmann, *Eucharisterion H. Gunkel*, ii. 3 sqq., and *Z.N.W.* xxiv. 100 sqq., argues that the background of the prologue and of the Christology of the Gospel is mythology, not philosophy; he quotes remarkable parallels to the fourth Gospel from Mandaic texts. On the possibility of a Messianic Logos-conception cf. G. H. Dix, *J.T.S.* xxvi. 1 sqq.

² Cf. H. Leisegang, *P.W.* xiii. 1061 sqq., and on the other hand Clemen, 259 sq. Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 189 sq., remarks well on the absence from John of the characteristic Philonic catchwords, on the improbability of its author having studied Philo minutely, and on the differences of their thought. A convenient survey is given by Bauer in his edition of the fourth Gospel (in *Handbuch*²), pp. 5 sqq. On the apologetic importance of the idea cf. Strathmann in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*², i. 414; Ehrhard, *Urchristentum*, 144 sq.; and p. 77, n. 1, above.

³ Cf. now Rawlinson, *Doctrine*, 155 sqq. On Χριστοῦ cf. C. T. H. Walker, *J.T.S.* xxiii. 306 sqq.; Bultmann, *A.R.W.* xxiv. 143; Reitzenstein, *Myst.*², 334, and on the later weakening of the phrase's sense, *ibid.* 415.

piety which we do not find in the Synoptists (which does not prove that it was foreign to the writers; they were not describing their own spiritual lives). Bousset has well contrasted it with Hellenistic piety, and in particular with the belief that the initiate in certain mysteries was identified with the god and was worshipped accordingly.¹

The attainment of divinity by mystery or magic is not in general the same thing as identification with a particular Saviour,² certainly not a mystical identification throughout life with the existence and the saving acts of a Saviour. In Christianity we find, not (as a rule) the adoration of a newly baptised catechumen, but a permanent spiritual attitude.

¹ *Kyrios Christos*³, pp. 110 *sqq.* The evidence requires careful handling. In general, it seems that in a number of mysteries the initiate was supposed to die, to be reborn from the elements, and when reborn to become divine (*cf.* S. Eitrem in *Symbolae Osloenses*, iv. 39 *sqq.*). He did not necessarily become the god of the mystery. Lucius, when initiated in the rites of Isis, is worshipped as a Sun god (possibly because of the introduction of alien elements in the mystery; Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, p. 228). He has been purged of his mortality, reconstructed as an immortal being, filled with divine power, and is worshipful. He receives worship only at this point, not afterwards; it is the recognition by the faithful of what has been wrought in him. In Mithraism a similar ceremony may have existed, if, as I suggest, we so interpret the ritual phrase *ostenderunt crysios*, 'They showed the *cryphii*,' initiates in the second grade (on the phrase *cf.* Cumont, *Textes*, i. 316). Of the Cybele-cult we know that the *archigallus*, after undergoing the annual *taurobolium* (on which see p. 118 later) on behalf of the welfare of the Empire, was adored as though a god; we do not know whether ordinary people who went through the ceremony were treated in this way (Loisy, *Mystères*, p. 119). It may be remarked that a stranger who attended a Pontifical High Mass sung by or before a Bishop in his own diocese might think that the Bishop was treated as a god; he receives the same reverence as the Host.

² For magic *cf.* Eitrem, *l.c.* 40, also a charm quoted by Heim, *Incantamenta magica* (*Fleckeisens Jahrbücher Supplementband* xix. p. 552): *linguam eius* (sc. *voluturis*) *si in dextrum subgularem miseris et cum eo ambulaveris, adorabunt te omnes inimici tui*. A parallel is the temporary divinity of a Brahman sacrificer (J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*³, i. 380). Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 343, quotes as an instance the dream of the philosopher Damascius (*Life of Isidore*, summarised by Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 242, p. 345a Bekker). The philosopher, after visiting Hierapolis and descending safely into the chasm, the odours of which were thought to be fatal to all save the *galli* or sacred eunuchs of Cybele, dreamed that he had become Attis, and that the Mother performed on him the rites known as the *Hilaria*, which signified deliverance from Hades. 'O'ΑΤΤΗΣ might indeed be interpreted as an Attis (the high priest bore the name) and dream initiations are known (Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 211; and Sopatros, viii. 110 *sqq.*, Walz; C. Chirius Fortunatus, I. 14, p. 91. 23, Halm), but the passage seems to mean that Damascius dreamt that he was Attis and went through that divine experience which was the prototype of the actual festival (*cf.* for a parallel C.R. 1925, 174), and to imply that the festival included a dramatic resurrection.

The Christian attitude appears in what St. Paul says of baptism: 'Ye are all sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus, since all of you who were baptised into Christ put on Christ' (Gal. iii. 27).¹ This is not really parallel to priestly donning of a divine mask, or to the dressing up of Lucius in twelve robes as the Sun in Apuleius. By a common metaphor St. Paul says that the Christian is assuming the part of Christ. The new creation is in effect this substitution of a new personality for an old. So the full Christian is *πνευματικός*, not *ψυχικός*; divine Spirit has taken the place of his human soul.² Man puts on Christ, or (as we read in *Acta Thomae*, ch. 157) 'the power of the Wood'; he follows Jesus, now glorified, and stands in His place on earth in virtue of that glorification (John xiv. 13). The thought comes out in the liturgy; *fecisti nos dignos filiatione per baptismum sanctum*,³ or again *da nobis per huius aquae et uini mysterium eius diuinitatis esse consortes qui humanitatis nostrae fieri dignatus est particeps*. Something of the sort may have been believed in Isiac ritual; in any case, it explains itself here out of Christian presuppositions.

The Pauline phraseology is the expression of an intense personal faith. To its author Baptism meant dying with Christ sacramentally; and the notion of sacramental death is not foreign to paganism⁴; but to its author Christian life meant dying with Him every day. In Baptism life in Christ started, but it should grow continually.

Bousset has indeed seen the influence of Hellenistic piety in this, as also in the Johannine 'that every one who sees the Son and believes in Him may have eternal life' (John vi. 40), and 'If He is made manifest we shall be like Him because we shall see Him as He is' (1 John iii. 2). With these he

¹ Here the idea is used as the basis for a moral inference, the indifference of the higher life to social distinctions (very akin to a Stoic idea, cf. Liechtenhan, p. 11 of the work mentioned p. 147, n. 2 later). On the idea of the adoption of Christians by God cf. von Harnack, *Terminologie der Wiedergeburt*, p. 103.

² Cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*, 70 sqq. On the new man of Col. iii cf. *ibid.* 267 sqq. (useful material, though I doubt the supposition of an Iranian source).

³ In the Gregorian liturgy quoted by Wetter, i. 87, cf. Wetter, 82 sqq., and Tatian, *Oratio*, 7, p. 7, 9: *Ὡς περ ἡ ἀφθαρσία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον θεοῦ μοίρας ἀνθρώπου μεταλαβὼν ἔχη καὶ τὸ ἀθάνατον.*

⁴ Cf. p. 117 later.

compares the mystery-deification, which is mentioned by Apuleius as following on a vision of the deity (but may well have been thought of as *preceding* that vision¹), and the Hermetic saying 'Thou hast made us, while still in the body, divine by the sight of thyself.'² But again there is a difference. The first Johannine passage does not postulate an *immediate* transformation: the fruit of vision is in eternal life. The second also looks to the *Parousia* or Second Coming. The closest parallel to the Hermetic text in the New Testament is afforded by 2 Cor. iii. 18, 'All of us, seeing the Lord's glory as in a mirror with unveiled forehead, are transformed into His likeness from glory into glory (that is, from the glory of one condition to the glory of another, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 40 *sq.*) as by the Spirit of the Lord.' Reitzenstein has shown how near this is to Hermetic phraseology and thought. In both we have the idea of a transformation which is the substitution of a divine personality for human in the believer.³ The difference lies in the fact that the Christian is playing the part of a historic and near Jesus, not of a vague divine being.

Now the desirability of becoming like God is a Platonic notion, which is later commonplace: the term for being transformed (*μεταμορφοῦσθαι*) is not clearly a term with unquestioned mystery-connotations.⁴ Philo lays emphasis on vision as the activity or the end of the contemplative life.⁵ We have remarked on the close affinity of the Fourth

¹ Eitrem, *op. cit.*, p. 54. It is *qua* divine that he sees the gods of the upper and of the lower world.

² In the Greek original of the prayer closing the *Asclepius*: ὅ[τι ἐν π]λάσμασιν ἡμᾶς ὄντας ἀπεθέω[σ]ας τῇ σεαυτοῦ χάριτι (*Myst.*², 286); *cf.* *C.H.* i. 26 τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέλος τοῖς γνῶσιν ἐσχηκόσι θεωθῆναι; xiii. 10 ἐθεώθημεν τῇ γενέσει (MSS. ἐθεωρήθημεν; Reitzenstein emends rightly); and Bousset, 164 *sqq.* Christianity in general avoids such language as θεωθῆναι; ἐδόξαsen stands in Rom. viii. 30, where a Hellenistic mystic would have used some verb like ἐθέλωsen (Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³ 259 *sq.*)

³ Such belief is in Egypt sometimes associated with devotion to Hermes, as, for instance, in a prayer in a magical papyrus, 'Come to me, lord Hermes, as babes come into the wombs of women'; and again in another, 'Thou art I and I am thou; thy name is mine and my name is thine; for I am thy image' (Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, pp. 20 *sq.*). This is, in a sense, personal devotion, but at the same time Hermes is identified with Mind.

⁴ Material in Reitzenstein, *Myst.*², 158 *sq.*; ³, 262 *sqq.*, 307 *sq.*, 357 *sqq.*; *Studien*, 33; Lietzmann, *ad loc.*; on ὁμοίωσιs also my *Sallustius*, xl, and Plotin. *Enn.* i. 2, 3. The mirror simile occurs also in the different sense of the Lord being our mirror (Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, i. 111).

⁵ Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

Gospel to Philonic thought earlier; here also it seems to show a development of Hellenising Judaism. In 2 Cor. we may perhaps see the influence of popular Hellenistic mysticism; certainly the Pauline terminology seems indebted to a prior use; it may be recalled that there are indications in the Hellenistic age of what we should call mental prayer or meditation.¹ At the same time the attitude in question is one which could probably, and may in fact, have arisen spontaneously.

§ 8. *The Father*.—Christian teaching about God the Father is the heir of Judaism as spiritualised by the Prophets. Jahweh had passed from tribal god to universal God of justice.² In the Hellenistic world this idea could not but find a ready welcome. Even in Homer Zeus is the god of all mankind, Greeks, Trojans, and Ethiopians alike: such he remained later, and the growth of universalism must have strengthened this conception. The hymn of Cleanthes, praising him as Father, will be familiar to many readers:

Most glorious of immortals, many-named,
Almighty Zeus, creation's primal lord,
Whose lawful government is over all,
Hail!—for we mortals unto thee may speak.
We are thine offspring; we alone of all things
That live and move on earth can copy God.
Thee therefore I will praise, thy power will sing.³

Of the difficulties which were inevitable in the reconciliation of these beliefs in a system something has been said (p. 98); for further consideration of them the reader will turn to Dr. Kirk's paper in this volume.

¹ Something of this sort was directed towards the Egyptian deities. Cf., for instance, Apul. *Met.* xi. 25, *diuinos tuos uultus numenque sanctissimum intra pectoris mei secreta conditum perpetuo custodiens imaginabor*, and F. Cumont, *Monuments de la Fondation Piot*, xxv. (note the occurrence of silent mystic prayer before an image at Rome as recorded of Scipio in the temple of Juppiter Capitolinus).

² Cf. Dr. Rawlinson's essay. There are, of course, limitations on the Jewish side. In the *Small Talmud treatise on Proselytes*, edited and translated by G. Polster, ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ii. 3, we read an address to be made to the proselyte after baptism: 'For Israel's sake alone was the world created. It is only the Israelites who are called children of God. It is only the Israelites whom God loves.' Yet the proselyte has in effect become an Israelite; religious unity even here transcends racial (cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 193 sqq.). In any case, most post-Christian Judaism shows a narrower tendency.

³ I quote Dr. Cook's rendering, *Zeus*, ii. 855, by his kind permission.

III

THE PRACTICE OF CHRISTIANITY

§ 1. *General considerations.*—The little band of disciples at Jerusalem constituted a religious society. To such a society some rite of entrance, some rite of communal life were necessary. The religion of this society spread in a world which contained many other societies with corresponding rites and many rites not belonging to societies. Were the Christian rites assimilated to these others? Were they re-interpreted in their sense? Not deliberately, we may say; the psychological probabilities against such a supposition are overwhelming. But was there an imperceptible transformation? Our inquiry is not an easy one. Man's power of addressing the supernatural in language does not admit of an infinite variety of forms, and his capacity of relationship with the supernatural by acts admits of even fewer—touching, washing, breathing on, eating together, sacrificing¹; these therefore we find very widely distributed.

Further, from the earliest days the rites of the new community must have been central in its life. It is now felt by many that to suppose that physical acts have direct consequences in the spiritual world savours of magic and is rather disreputable. This attitude finds something kindred in the attacks of the prophets on sacrifice (Amos v. 21, 25; Hosea vi. 6; Isaiah i. 11 *sqq.*; Micah vi.; Jerem. vii. 22); they felt the absence of ethical basis in contemporary religion. It does not, however, appear in early Christianity; and it was rare in the world around.² Cultus was central

¹ Cf. the last chapter of W. R. Halliday, *The Pagan Background*.

² The Cynic Diogenes protested against this attitude to the mysteries (Diog. *Laert.* vi. 39): so later Demonax and the earlier Hermetic mysticism. Otherwise the only striking exception to what is said is the polemic of some against animal sacrifice; there are other sporadic criticisms, like Ovid, *Fasti*, II. 45, *a nimium faciles qui tristia crimina caedis / fluminea tolli posse putatis aqua* (probably a commonplace of popular philosophy and in origin Cynic). Philo has some interesting polemic against Jews who wished to spiritualise away the observances of the law, *De migratione Abraham*, §89 *sqq.*, discussed by Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 320. Hatch, *Influence*, 19 *sq.*, has remarked that ancient philosophic ideas of matter and spirit as varying forms of a single substance conditioned their outlook in these respects otherwise than ours is conditioned by our presuppositions.

in both ; in nothing is Christianity more like its background.¹ We do not find as much about it in the New Testament as we could expect ; but how dangerous negative conclusions would be appears from the fact that St. Paul's clear exposition of his Eucharistic teaching, which he must have given in all his missions, is on record only because it was necessary to remind the Corinthians of it and thereby to warn them against malpractices. His theological explanation of Baptism is given in Romans as something on which he can build an ethical inference. His Epistles are concerned with incidental difficulties, not with regular and unquestioned practice.

The result is that we are very much in the dark about the practice ; much we can only restore conjecturally from later liturgies, and this is a hazardous undertaking. At the same time, we are ill-informed also about the practice of the pagan mysteries. For Mithraism we are in a position scarcely more favourable than would be some later student of present-day Christianity who only knew some of the Jewish religious literature which lies behind it, the ground-plans and structure of some churches stripped or nearly so of their ornaments, some altars, carvings, and stained glass, a few pages from baptismal registers, and some numbers of the Rationalist Press Annual. Moreover, the great expansion of these mysteries seems to have occurred in the second century of our era. Though their terminology and usage was no doubt already for the most part fixed, they also could develop, and they were not unwilling to absorb alien elements. Much of what we know of the mysteries relates to the third and fourth centuries, and at that time some of them were probably assimilated of set purpose to Christianity in the hope of countering its attractions ; this assimilation is very obvious as part of Julian's reactionary movement in the years 362 and 363 ; but it seems to have been practised earlier by Maximinus Daia and possibly also by Galerius. The greatest caution must therefore be exercised in determining what was the precise character of any particular mystery which might be supposed to have influenced

¹ A point well made by O. Casel, *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, iii. 1 sqq.

Christianity in the first century ; we need in effect to know its character at the point of contact, since it is unsafe to assume that there would be complete uniformity in any such cult wherever practised (we know that later this was certainly not so with Mithraism, which varied in details from East to West).¹ Further, we require some means of estimating not merely in what cities a particular mystery was observed, but what the local intensity was, whether it was for instance impossible for any man in those parts to be unaware of its more characteristic features, or at any rate of its existence. To all these questions there cannot be complete and satisfactory answers. Certain things we have learnt : the general distribution of Mithraism, both chronologically and geographically (the latter is exhibited in Cumont's map) ; and some modes of thought common to various mysteries of the Empire. But the obscurity of much that we should like to know is undeniable, and it must not be forgotten that, as Reitzenstein has reminded us, rites and their meanings cannot be analysed like a mineral, and that, as the same scholar has said, ' All our indications of origins have only in a certain degree a claim to general validity.'²

§ 2. *Baptism*.—The rite of baptism was clearly received by Gentile Christianity from Jewish Christianity. St. John Baptist had baptised all his penitents, and the precedent then set received a special sanction from his baptism of Jesus. It must be remarked that, whatever significance we (or the early Christians) attach to that event, there can be little doubt that it is a historical fact, that it is something which meant very much to Jesus Himself, and that it was treated as in some sense the beginning of the Gospel.³ This is enough in itself to account for the genesis of a baptismal ritual for all admitted converts. Johannine baptism had been more than the Jewish baptism of proselytes ; it had been a rite endowed with the objective remission of sin, and probably with the eschatological significance of sealing the

¹ W. R. Halliday, *Folklore*, 1924, p. 381 ; cf. Cumont, *Mystères de Mithra*³, pp. 18 *sqq.*, on the various forms which the god took in Asia Minor.

² *Litteris*, i. 159.

³ Loisy, *Mystères*, p. 277, denies the historicity of the Synoptic story ; to do so is a great strain on one's faculty of belief, as is also to accept Bultmann's view of its origin, *A.R.W.* xxiv. 104. Cf. Ignat. *Eph.* 18. 2 : *ὅς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθάρσῃ.*

elect who should be members of the Kingdom.¹ That Jesus commanded the use of the rite cannot be proved ; the texts in question are secondary in the Synoptic tradition.²

For the origin of the custom it is therefore not necessary to look outside Judaea. Nevertheless, since it has been maintained by many serious students that we must look to Hellenistic mysteries, it is necessary to examine the evidence.

Lustral washings are a natural part of public worship. The basis of most worship consists of practical conceptions ; the act which cleanses you of material uncleanness will under the right conditions free you also from moral or religious pollution. ' I rid myself of my fleas and of my sins,' said in modern times the Greek peasant of Tenos when he leapt over a bonfire on St. John Baptist's Day.³ A more sophisticated religion reads more into these acts. In Egypt the king was besprinkled before ceremonial. In the beginning this is lustral ; then the water comes to be regarded as positively health-bringing and not merely as a kind of sacred disinfectant. The dead again are besprinkled, to restore the moisture of life to their shrivelled frames ; the positive qualities of water rise further when it is thought to be an effluence of Osiris.⁴

The washing of the initiates at Eleusis before initiation was no doubt thought to remove their guilt. Tertullian, if we accept a common emendation, ascribes to a washing at games held there the purpose of attaining rebirth and im-

¹ Cf. Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erlös.* p. 124.

² It should not be forgotten that if we assume that they spring from the rite we do not accuse the writers of any insincerity ; to their generation it would be inevitable to suppose such an institution whether it had in fact happened or not. This admission should not disturb the orthodox. If the community was guided by the Spirit, they were doing the will of the Founder. What modern study does shake is the conception of Christianity as a piece of clockwork wound up once and for all and set to run.

³ J. C. Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, p. 37 ; cf. Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 740 : *κακόρητ' ἰδὲ . . . χείρας ἄνιπτος.*

⁴ Cf. H. Bonnet, *ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ*, i. 103 sqq. His account of these rites is based on A. M. Blackman's thorough studies, but he rejects the supposition of regeneration. (Blackman holds that the Sun's daily bath is the prototype of the King's ' baptism' : now the Egyptians held that the Sun is born anew every morning ; hence rebirth of the King is implied. This is attractive, but remains an hypothesis.) For the bathing of the dead elsewhere cf. Schrader, *Realexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*², i. 35.

punity for acts of perjury. It is Tertullian who supplies the motive, and Tertullian adopts Justin Martyr's theory that the Devil ingeniously counterfeited in advance Christian ritual. Moreover the emendation is probably wrong: Tertullian is probably speaking of the festival called *Pelusia* and of Apolline games at Rome or elsewhere,¹ and it is very unlikely that any such esoteric significance was attached to washings in them. A rebirth probably was believed to take place at Eleusis not in this bathing, but in the initiation proper. The bath was only one of the purifications required; the sacrifice of a pig was another.² In the same passage Tertullian says 'People are initiated by a bath in the rites also of a certain Isis and of Mithras.' On the first point we know from Apuleius that the initiate was bathed, but it appears that this was a preliminary, as at Eleusis, not the main rite; and it is fair to support this with the analogy of the Egyptian lustral washings just mentioned and of the washings which formed part of the periods of ritual purity which Isis exacted of her worshippers in Roman times. Rebirth properly follows a mystic death, and that is mentioned later by Apuleius.³ On the second point we know no more; Tertullian is fairly well informed on Mithraism; it is conjectured that he may have been an adherent of that faith before his conversion, and we need not doubt this statement. There is, however, no reason to suppose that it was anything other than a preliminary, as at Eleusis, and as also in the rites of the Bacchanalia as described by Livy.⁴ A similar washing of initiates seems to have been performed by the priestess of the Corybants at Erythrae⁵; we know no more of it than of that of the followers of the Thracian goddess Cotytto, themselves known as *Baptai* or 'dippers,'⁶ or of that which may have

¹ Cf. my note in *J.T.S.* xxviii, 289 sq.

² Cf. H. G. Pringsheim, *Archäologische Beiträge zur Geschichte des eleusinischen Kultus*, pp. 20 sqq.

³ *Met.* xi. 23; *Tibull.* i. 3. 25 on repeated washings; also Plutarch, *De superstitione*, 3, p. 166 A.

⁴ xxxix. 9. 4; cf. J. Leipoldt, *ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ*, i. 46 sq. Taf. II. for a possible representation of the ceremony in Dionysiac worship.

⁵ J. Poerner, *Dissertationes philologicae Halenses*, XXII. ii. 308.

⁶ J. Hubaux, *Musée Belge*, xxvii. (1923) 5 sqq., gives the evidence; his idea that the Basilica, discussed p. 65 earlier, belonged to Cotytto is hardly possible, cf. *C.R.* 1924, 1078. An underground baptismal tank of

happened in the Sanctuary of Men Askaenos near Antioch in Pisidia,¹ or of the annual bathing in the festival Maioumas at Antioch in Syria, which can hardly have been sacramental in nature.²

In all these cases the washing or baptism is something preliminary, as it is again in a recipe in the great magical papyrus at Paris. 'Leap into the river with your clothes on; after dipping yourself in it (βαπτισάμενος), return, change your clothes, and go away without turning back.' The rite is called an initiation, *telete*; but the word is of wide sense, and we should do well to recall its frequent use in magic of a ceremony which makes an object, as for instance a gem or a plant, suitable for use in working a charm. In this way you put yourself in the right condition for procuring an oracle from a daemon.³ Three other possible baptisms are relegated to a footnote.⁴

In any case, the fundamental problem of a rite lies in its meaning and in the development of its meaning or meanings. Christian baptism meant initially no doubt entrance into the community, partnership in its hopes hereafter,⁵

the fourth century A.D. found near the Via Salaria in Rome (R. Paribeni, *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1923, 380 sqq.) may be connected with Cotyttto (*ibid.* pp. 396 sq.); I find it hard to believe. J. P. Kirsch, *Jahrb. f. Lit.* v. 245. no. 288, regards it as a *nymphaeum* (in effect not religious). J. A. Scott, *Classical Journal*, xvi. (1920), 53, notes that βάπτειν can mean 'sprinkle' as well as 'dip.'

¹ Cf. Ch. Picard, *Éphèse et Claros*, p. 307, for a discussion of W. M. Ramsay's hypothesis to this effect (published *Ann. Br. Sch. Athens*, xviii. 39 sqq.).

² F. Cumont, *Syria*, v. 354 sqq.

³ *P. Par.* 43 (for the passage cf. S. Eitrem, *Les Papyrus magiques de Paris*, pp. 6 sqq.); for the use of *telete* noted cf. S. Eitrem, *Lina Lauckar*, in *Festschrift A. Kjaer* (Oslo, 1924).

⁴ A Lydian inscription (Keil-Von Premerstein, *Zweite Reisebericht*, in *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, LIV. ii.), no. 183, mentions οἱ καταλουστικοὶ Μητρὸς . . . καὶ Μητρὸς Τιδμοῦ καὶ Μητρὸς Περραελτροῦ. These may be 'the worshippers of . . . who bathe themselves' (Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle*, pp. 177 sq., gives indication of a possible lustral baptism in the rites of Cybele). It may also be 'those who wash the images of these deities,' and thus refer to the common rite of *lavatio* (Graillot, pp. 136 sqq.; perhaps in essence a rain-charm; cf. E. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 476, for one of many parallels). On a baptism possibly implied by *Corp. Herm.* IV. cf. p. 66 above. Reitzenstein, *Z.N.W.* 1912, 9, interprets a letter of Apollonius to his father Ptolemaeus as referring to a baptism in connexion with Sarapis; but this view seems to me overthrown by U. Wilcken's arguments (*Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, i. 331 sqq.), and is practically withdrawn by its author (*Myst.*³, 297).

⁵ In this way it becomes parallel to Greek initiations (like those at Eleusis) which are the pledge of happiness in the next world.

and the remission of sins. When Gentile converts were received, it may have taken away their uncleanness (as did the Jewish baptism of proselytes), and rendered possible their table-fellowship with Jewish Christians. It was further baptism in the Name of Jesus.¹ We are moving in the world of conjecture for everything pre-Pauline, but it is clear that baptism meant the beginning of a new life, and it was some time before a final mode of expressing this was reached.²

Writing to the Christian community at Rome, which had then received no direct influence from him, the Apostle says (Rom. vi. 3), 'Do you not know that all of us who were baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death, so that just as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' It has been inferred from the words *Do you not know* that this view of baptism was current at Rome already, independently of Pauline teaching.³ The inference is however insecure, since the phrase need not be more than a trick of style.⁴ This suffering in sympathy with a Redeemer has an analogy in the sympathetic character of some mystery rituals, though in them the sympathy is not of the initiate at the moment of initiation, but of the community of the faithful at a seasonal festival.⁵ It is not necessarily connected, and St. Paul does not expressly connect it, with a mystic rebirth.

¹ Belief in the magical efficacy of a name is not less Jewish than Hellenistic; cf. Mark ix. 38; Luke ix. 49.

² See above all von Harnack, *Terminologie der Wiedergeburt, (Texte und Untersuchungen, xlii. 3, 97 sqq.)*.

³ So Heitmüller, *Z.N.W.* 1912, 335, followed by Weiss, Dibelius, and Bousset.

⁴ Certainly it is to be remembered that ἡ ἀγν. states a premiss, from which the conclusion is drawn; this supports Heitmüller. For the trick of style, if such it be, cf. *Corp. Herm.* x. 20, ἡ οὐχ ὀρᾶς; xiii. 14, ἀγνοεῖς; and *nonne uides* in Lucretius repeatedly. A possible indication of the belief that baptism was regarded as a sort of death in the original community is found by Reitzenstein, *Z.N.W.* 1912, 11, in Mark x. 35. He argues that the paradoxical conception of death as a baptism presupposes the known conception of baptism as a death.

⁵ Pp. 47 sq. above; the only exact sympathy of an individual there is that of those who on the *dies sanguinis* mutilated themselves like Attis. This idea of death becomes important again in the ceremonial of monastic profession, on which cf. Casel, *Jahrb.* v. 7 sqq.

His idea is fairly clear. Baptism brings us into an intimate relation with Christ's death, the basis of the forgiveness of sin. Therefore we die with Him. In the same way life in Him is as a 'new creation' (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15). This is not rebirth but resurrection: 'the baptised convert is not thought of as a child, but as one miraculously changed into a new and full-grown estate.'¹

From this to the notion of rebirth as a little child was an easy step, and one that can in part be explained, as Harnack suggests, from the fact that the idea of rebirth gave expression to belief in the Fatherhood of God. Yet Hellenistic influence is perhaps rightly suspected. A convert knowing the mysteries would hardly see a difference between the two views. That St. Paul does not use the idea of rebirth, though thinking of baptism as a death,² is a striking illustration of his unfamiliarity with the mysteries.

When we come to 1 Pet. ii. 2, 'as newborn babes desire the harmless milk of the word,' we are perhaps on Hellenistic ground, though certain Gospel sayings (Matt. xviii. 3; xi. 25), and again Isaiah xxviii. 9, would also account for the phrase; when St. Paul speaks of the Corinthians as children in Christ it is in so far as they are immature and imperfect Christians.³ In Tit. iii. 5, 'He saved us through a bath of rebirth and renewing by the Holy Spirit,'⁴ and in John iii. 5, 'Unless a man is born of water and the Spirit he cannot

¹ F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, p. 109. Compare *καινή διαθήκη* (p. 122 below); that is a new Covenant superseding the old Covenant. I cannot in *καινή κρίσις*, which is something present and actual, see an allusion to the Iranian myth of a re-creation at the last day. Rabbinic writers apply the term 'new creation' to men healed of their sins or delivered from their distress without implying moral regeneration (Strack-Billerbeck, II. 421 sqq.).

² Loisy has well remarked that the metaphor is particularly easily applied to baptism by immersion as it was practised.

³ Cf. von Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XLII. iii. 98 sq., and the comparison of our inability to praise God with the inarticulate utterances of newly born babes in *Corp. Herm.* xviii. 12, pp. 359 sq. On the un-Pauline view cf. R. Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligionen und das Problem des I. Petrusbriefes* (R.G.V.V. XI. iii.), 37 sqq.; Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 329 sq.; my *Sallustius*, lv. I regard unfamiliarity with the idea as a more probable explanation of its absence from St. Paul than deliberate avoidance of a pagan thought. Rabbinical writers of the second and third centuries A.D. speak of proselytes as being like newborn babes (Strack-Billerbeck, II. 423).

⁴ On *παλιγγενεσία* cf. Rawlinson, *Doctrine*, 1448; Philo, *De vita Moysis*, II. 11 sq. §§ 59-65 (II. pp. 143 sq. Mangey), uses both *παλιγγενεσία* and *σωτηρία* of the world's new life after the Flood.

enter into the Kingdom of God,' the view later dominant has taken shape.

We must ask where the suggestion of this transformation could arise. A ritual pretence of death, followed by a ritual pretence of resurrection, is of very wide distribution as a puberty rite of initiation among primitive tribes. It is not surprising to find it in the mysteries which represent the spiritualisation of elementary types of belief. The Orphics probably believed in rebirth by a supposed boiling in milk¹; a cauldron of apotheosis is mentioned in the cult of Leucothea, whether the Greek goddess or some Syrian deity Hellenised under the name²; a feigned death is mentioned in Mithraism, and the seven grades of initiation correspond to the soul's passage through the seven spheres to the body, that is, to birth³; a feigned death formed the central act in initiation in the mysteries of Isis⁴; rebirth in the *taurobolium* of Cybele will be discussed later; rebirth at Eleusis was probably indicated by a symbolic act⁵; kindred practices are found in Graeco-Egyptian magic under the Empire. In this period rebirth is elaborated by the doctrine of the reconstitution of the new self of the initiate out of the elements.⁶ Rebirth as a little child is attested by Sallustius, who says of the rites of Cybele, 'after this (the *dies sanguinis*) we are fed on milk as though being reborn; that is followed by rejoicings and garlands and as it were a new ascent to the gods'⁷; here the rites seem to be

¹ A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, i. 676.

² *Ibid.* p. 420; Cumont, *Musée du cinquantenaire*², 166, No. 141. But B. Haussouillier and H. Ingholt, *Syria*, v. 340 sq., prefer the older interpretation of τοῦ ἀποθεωθέντος ἐν τῷ λέβητι δι' οὗ αἱ [ἐ]ορταὶ ἄγονται, the phrase in an epitaph in the Hauran on which the idea is based, as 'the dead man who after cremation was buried in the sacred vessel,' perhaps rightly. Reitzenstein now explains it (*Z.N.W.* 1927, 613) of a baptismal *bassin* in a stream.

³ *J.H.S.* 1925, 99, where Porphyry, *De antro nympharum*, vi. is misunderstood; as Professor Cumont kindly pointed out to me, καθόδον refers to the descent of the soul into the body, ἀνοδον to its return to its heavenly abode.

⁴ Apul. *Met.* xi. 21, *ipsam traditionem ad instar uoluntariae celebrari mortis*.

⁵ A. Körte, *A.R.W.* xviii. (1915), 116 sqq., by contact with a representation of the *pudendum* of Demeter in a *cista*.

⁶ S. Eitrem in *Symbolae Osloenses*, iv. 39 sqq.

⁷ *Concerning the gods and the universe*, ch. iv. pp. 8, 24 sqq., in my edition. For an illustration of the rebirth idea applied to a stone used in magic cf. *J.H.S.* 1925, 99e.

communal celebrations in which all the faithful participated every year rather than the ceremonial of individual initiation.

Rebirth then was common in ritual, and it was known in myth, as the story of Medea's cauldron shows. That it should find a place in Christianity was almost inevitable; we shall do well to avoid the supposition that one particular rite, the *taurobolium*, was of paramount importance in determining its development. The recipient of this descended into a trench and was there drenched in the blood of a bull slaughtered over him. Originally, no doubt, a ritual performed by individuals for their own welfare, or perhaps rather by the chief priest for the community of faithful,¹ it appears later also as performed by the *archigallus* or chief servant of Cybele at Rome annually with special intention for the Emperor's welfare; this celebration is probably to be connected with the official patronage which the cult received from and after Claudius. An analogous ceremonial was performed with a ram, and called *criobolium*.

We first hear of this rite in the second century of our era; our inscriptional records tell then of its use on behalf of the Empire, later also of its private use, and we learn from them that it could be repeated after twenty years. It would be unsafe to conclude that it was till then not introduced into the Graeco-Roman world; private devotees may not have felt it necessary to record the act.² Its meaning is almost as obscure as the question of its date. Its name implies some sort of lassoing of a bull, afterwards slaughtered³; the captor then presumably bathed in its blood, and it seems a fair conjecture that his object was to secure for himself the vital force of the bull, which is commonly regarded as a vehicle of divine power, while offering to the goddess the *uires* or testicles as a sacrifice

¹ Cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*², 45 sq.

² So Loisy argues, *Mystères*, p. 116. Cf. the commemorative inscriptions in which Mithraists record their elevation to various grades of initiation; these also come from the middle or later part of the fourth century A.D. (Cumont, *Textes et monuments*, ii. 94 sq.), that is, from a time when a pagan devotee was 'in opposition' and self-conscious.

³ So Cumont, *Religions orientales*, pp. 101 sqq.; for the wide distribution of such hunts, something sacral, cf. B. Laum, *Das Eisengeld der Spartaner* (Braunsberg: 1925). Reitzenstein, *Myst.*², 45, sees in the rite the influence of the old idea that blood poured over a grave gives new life to the dead.

of substitution. The only statements as to its object which we find are late in the fourth century of our era.

One recipient of that time states that he is 'reborn for ever by the *taurobolium*.'¹ What we are to make of this is uncertain. Is it the expression in a conflict of religions of the old basic idea of the rite, as always held but not directly expressed earlier? Does it 'represent rather the enthusiastic hopes of the devotee than any dogma'?² Is it again forcibly contrasted with Christian baptism?³ In any case it is not an ordinary initiation, and in the dated cases does not occur during the March celebrations (that is, the commemoration of the myth and the *Initium* or initiation which followed immediately); it is a *heilige Handlung*, an act of devotion influencing heaven, and applicable, like sacrifice, of the character of which it partakes, to the needs of others. It is possible, but not definitely attested, that a *criobolium* was performed on behalf of the initiates by the Archigallus.⁴ In view of these considerations, and of the uncertainty whether Christianity in its first fifty years encountered the rite, we can hardly allow it much importance in this connection.

Another aspect of the Pauline conception of baptism, that expressed in Gal. iii. 27, 'You are all sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus, since all of you who were baptised into Christ put on Christ,' has been considered earlier (p. 106). That baptism is also thought of as conferring the Spirit is a natural consequence of those beliefs concerning the Spirit which we have considered earlier (p. 102).

The application to baptism of terms strictly appropriate to pagan initiation, *photismos* illumination, *sphragis* sealing,

¹ *Taurobolio criobolioque in aeternum renatus* (376 A.D., H. Hepding, *Attis*, 89, no. 37). The earlier belief limited the efficacy of the rite to twenty years, a typical period (cf. Moore's paper cited in the next note, and the fourteenth-century German story of the man whose dead wife was restored to life for twenty years by his sacrificing twenty years of his own life; Fr. Pfister in *Völkerkunde*, 1927, p. 22). For the idea of repetition cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 179. Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle*, 543 sq., sees the influence of Christianity in this change.

² So C. H. Moore, *Classical Philology*, xix. 363 sqq., and W. R. Halliday, *Background*, p. 308.

³ So H. Graillot, *op. cit.*, p. 171. His treatment of the rite (pp. 153 sqq.) is full and useful.

⁴ Graillot, p. 178; the analogy of 'baptism for the dead' is false; cf. p. 136 later.

mysterion, telete, and the like, is later and belongs to a time when Christianity moved more widely in the Hellenistic world, and when the proportion of Jews among its guiding spirits was lower and the proportion of Hellenistic converts knowing other mysteries was higher.¹ This means that the new terminology was used when the essential concept of the rite had substantially taken shape. In that concept we have seen a possibility of Hellenistic influence; but only as effecting a slight transformation in what was determined by an internal evolution.

§ 3. *Eucharist*.—On the eve of the Crucifixion Jesus took bread, blessed, and said ‘This is my Body,’ and took a cup and said ‘This is my Blood of the Testament,’ or ‘This is the Testament in my Blood.’ That is the common basis of the Synoptic and Pauline stories, which give us two independent versions of the same tradition.² Loisy’s assumption that Jesus said only, what the Synoptists give also, ‘I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine till I drink it new with you in the Kingdom’ and that *This is my Body, This is my Blood* are added to the original Synoptic tradition from St. Paul can hardly be correct.³ In the first place, such an interpolation of Mark would be very peculiar; he and the other Synoptic strain represent a remarkably careful attempt to reproduce a record of the past, rather than an adaptation thereof to present needs and experience. In the second place—and this may fairly be thought decisive—any one interpolating from St. Paul would have at the same time added the words ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ which we find only as a later incorporation in Luke.

¹ Hatch, *Influences*, pp. 295 sq. τοὺς ἀπαξ φωτισθέντας in Hebr. vi. 4, φωτισθέντες, x. 32, seem to be used in a more general sense. But it is not clear that the use comes from mysteries, as Clemen, pp. 333 sq., thinks; it may come rather from mysticism, and was probably commonplace. Moreover, the metaphorical use of ‘illumination’ occurs in the Septuagint (Harnack, *op. cit.*, 1272).

² This has been established by H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 218. (I do not wish to deny that the Lucan account may be a third; cf. H. N. Bate, *J.T.S.*, xxviii. 362 sqq.). Feeling as I do in important points bound to adopt conclusions other than those expressed in this striking book, I am the more anxious to express my deep sense of indebtedness to its author.

³ Loisy is supported by G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, i. 147. Cf. against the idea of an aetiological invention of *This is my Body*, Lietzmann, 252, and in general the wise remarks of F. C. Burkitt, *Trans. Third Congr. Hist. Rel.*, II. p. 327.

That Jesus then said 'Do this' is an assumption which our evidence does not support. Loisy, Klostermann, and Wetter all hold that the Synoptic account would in itself clearly imply the repetition of the rite.¹ The emphasis on the eve was on what was then done. Jesus, by His symbolic presentation of the Sacrifice, constrained the disciples to willing acceptance of His death. They now entered the new Covenant. What should be done thereafter was not at the moment the point of interest. Certainly it was conveyed to the early community that they were intended to continue what He had done, and the Pauline form of the tradition represents what must afterwards appear essentially true. St. Paul's words ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου are susceptible of two meanings, 'I received as a tradition coming from the Lord' and 'I learnt by personal revelation from the Lord.' Against the latter view it has been urged that a direct revelation would be expressed by παρά not ἀπό,² and that the former is the natural preposition to use after the compound. A stronger argument is that he elsewhere uses παραλαμβάνειν only of instruction from a Christian teacher; when he speaks, as he does, of revelations from Christ, he employs other language.³ Yet the phrase means that the tradition has the full authority of the Lord of

¹ It may be added that Lietzmann in his note on 1 Cor. xi. 25 rightly regards 'Do this' as referring to the whole cult-act. N. P. Williams, *Essays Catholic and Critical*, pp. 401 sqq., sees a reference to future repetition in 'I will drink no more,' and Klostermann on Mark xiv. 22-25 thinks that Mark may have so interpreted the words. To me it appears impossible to give to those words any sense other than the anticipation of the heavenly banquet in the Kingdom. If von Gall, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ, is correct, the idea of the Church on earth as the Kingdom of God is not earlier than St. Augustine, though he finds even in St. Paul beginnings thereof (p. 478).

² J. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, 283; Clemen, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

³ παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν in 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 6; cf. Gal. i. 12, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ (his εὐαγγέλιον) οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, where the special relevance of π. is to the first member.

Of his own special inspirations he says, for instance, Gal. i. 16 καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (for ἀποκ. cf. 2 Cor. xii. 1); 1 Cor. vii. 10 τοῖς δὲ γεγαμηκόσιν παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ Κύριος (distinguished from 12 τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς παραγγέλλω ἐγὼ, οὐχ ὁ Κύριος; for the style cf. 1 Pet. iv. 11 εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ); 1 Cor. xiv. 37 εἴ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶναι ἢ πνευματικός, ἐπιγινώσκέτω & γράφω ὑμῖν ὅτι Κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή. Loisy's suggestion (*Mystères*, p. 282) that ἐγὼ supports the idea of personal revelation is hardly right; it is in ineffective contrast with γοι which comes before: τί ἐπω ὑμῖν; ἐπαινέσω ὑμᾶς; ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ. ἐγὼ γὰρ . . .

present spiritual life, the supreme sanction which St. Paul recognises.

In any case, the essential meaning of the rite for St. Paul, that it is a liturgical setting forth of Christ's death, is surely not his invention if the *Covenant* word was spoken, or was independently of him believed to have been spoken.¹ According to Exodus xxiv. 6, half of the blood of the oxen sacrificed was sprinkled on the altar, half on the people as the blood of the covenant which the Lord had made with them concerning the law, and Moses and the elders ate and drank in God's presence; according to Genesis xvii. 9 *sqq.*, circumcision is a covenant between God and man, and the blood shed therein is also spoken of in Rabbinic sources as 'blood of the Covenant.' Jesus said in effect 'I am the sacrificial victim whose blood is shed for you, the faithful, to seal a new covenant with God, and whose body is broken for you.'² The blood on this occasion was to be drunk, not sprinkled on the participants; it may be noted that in solemn oath-taking or treaty-making blood and (or) wine may either be drunk by or sprinkled on those concerned. The parallels for this make the matter clearer.³ The broken bread as symbol of a victim cut in pieces is not unnatural; to us bread is simply inanimate matter, but to less sophisticated people it seems to contain life.⁴ While bread might be eaten in pledging the marriage union, an oath-victim, in Greek usage at least, might not usually be eaten; this *antitypum* in a covenant between man and God (as con-

¹ Clemen remarks, p. 177, that the Paschal meal is never spoken of as a covenant; Casel, *Jahrbuch*, vi. 140, that it was not a mystery in the Hellenistic sense, though it is a memorial (*ibid.* 155_{7a}). On recent attempts to explain the Last Supper out of the Paschal meal cf. G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, pp. 383 *sqq.*

² So Lietzmann, pp. 220 *sq.*, though he regards the connecting of the communal meals of the Christians with the Atonement on the Cross as a Pauline innovation (255_a). For the vitality of the covenant idea in Judaism cf. the Talmudic statement (אִתְּעָלוֹס, II. 7, 32) that a proselyte enters it by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. Parallel is the idea of Christianity as a *new law*, for which cf. Hatch, *Influence*, p. 162. It may be remarked that the idea of Covenant sacrifice does not appear among the Old Testament symbolism of Eucharistic liturgies; yet it must be remembered that that symbolism is a later product, due to a generation which would not recall the original significance of the act.

³ See for some S. Eitrem, *Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* (Oslo, 1915), pp. 422 *sq.*

⁴ Cf. E. Reuterkjöld, *Die Entstehung der Speisesakramente* (Heidelberg, 1912) pp. 115 *sqq.*

trusted with one between man and man, in which God's duty is to punish the offender, who is sometimes represented by the victim) might. What was done was a symbolic representation of the Crucifixion conceived as a Covenant offering.

The repetition of what Jesus did was therefore in the first instance a re-enacting of this Covenant offering, bringing its participants into an intimate relationship therewith, assuring their share in the new promise. The Eucharist as we see it in and behind the early liturgies is an action, not an expression of piety; the performance in *mimesis* indefinitely often of what happened once and for all, the association of the individual in the community with the Cross conceived as a worsting of daemonic powers and as the prelude of victory, or itself victory.¹ To call this Covenant offering a $\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ or sacrifice was natural; the new high-priestly sacrifice was contrasted with those of the old dispensation.² The idea that participation in the Covenant victim gives the soul its meat and drink is at first less stressed (it is implied in 1 Cor. x. 3 *sq.*, but its development is Johannine): we find it again in the *Didache*; but it is not originally central. The later piety of communion is a genuine development, but a development which causes a shift of emphasis. Till well on in the fourth century there hardly seems to be a moment of consecration: people did not look for one, the centre of interest being in the action as a whole, reproducing visibly the Christian scheme of salvation; the Easter Secret from the *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, (*da nobis haec quaesumus, Domine, frequentare mysteria, quia quotiens hostiae tibi placitae commemoratio celebratur opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur*) illustrates this

¹ It is G. P. Wetter's merit to have emphasised this in *Allchristliche Liturgien*, i, however much we may disagree with him in some of his conclusions. With the view expressed in *Alt. Lit.* ii. that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a conception formed of the combination of this mystery idea with the oblations made by the Christians of bread, wine, oil, etc., I do not agree; cf. against it O. Casel, *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, iii. 175 *sqq.*

² *Hebr.* viii. *sq.*; *Didache* xiv. 2 (quoted p. 132). It is possible that Jesus held the high-priestly view of His Messiahship; cf. Mr. Narborough's essay, p. 37. On the later obscuring of the 'mystery' aspect of the Mass when contact with antiquity was lost cf. Casel, *Jahrbuch*, iv. 221, no. 88; vi. 184 *sqq.*; on the passage from *Mysterienliturgie* to *Sakramentsmystik*, cf. A. L. Mayer, *ibid.* vi. 92 *sqq.*

most clearly. Throughout, popular devotion is something quite concrete. The Eucharist is the objective memorial in act of Jesus. The sacrificial aspect springs from this; the sacrifice is not a new sacrifice, but the one offering of the New Covenant, as Casel says.¹

The Eucharist regarded as the actualisation of a soteriological drama is in a line with contemporary mysteries, which purported to represent the sufferings and triumph of a god, in which his worshippers sympathised and shared. There are differences (it is not a seasonal rite but a regular rite independent of time of year: the triumph of Christ is a triumph over forces of evil rather than mere death and has a moral value which is all its own; it is moreover what is believed about a recent historical event, not about something in the mists of the past²), but there is a fundamental unity of conception. The Eucharist is a mystery, as mysteries were then understood, and Christianity, the heir of Judaism, has also an essential spiritual continuity with Hellenistic religion. Nevertheless, on our evidence we must conclude that its parallelism comes from an independent basis; we have in fact here one of the clearest cases of convergent religious development.

There is, however, no clear evidence that sacred meals had this significance in the mysteries; it appertained rather to ritual of a dramatic type, to mumming with actors or images. Ancient religious meals are of three main types.

First, there is eating together in fellowship by a cult society which does no more thereby than give outward expression to its fellowship, or commemorate gratefully a

¹ The above statement owes much to O. Casel, *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, l.c.; iv. 226 sqq.; vi. 113 sqq.; it is to be supplemented from my appendix to Mr. Narborough's essay. The transition from *διαθήκη* to *θυσία* (sacrifice) is not difficult; it was no doubt facilitated by the connexion of the Last Supper with the Paschal sacrifice (Exod. xii. 27). Cf. a development of the parallel in S. John Chrys. *Hom. LXXXII in Matth.* 782 D; also *Jahrb.* vi. 133. The description of the Canon of the Mass as *actio* illustrates the religious idea well; cf. Casel, *Jahrbuch*, i. 34 sqq., and Dölger, *Sol Salutis*², 295 sqq.

² Attis, Adonis, Osiris were supposed to have lived; our view of them as projected from religious consciousness (or however else we put it) is not that of their worshippers. A striking example of the pagan parallel, which, however, will have none of history, is Sallustius, ch. iv., 'All this did not happen at any one time but always is so,' copied from Julian, p. 171 c, quoted in my edition, p. li58.

dead founder in whose honour they meet, or whose pecuniary benefactions they enjoy ; in this connection the phrase ' in memory of ' is used as in 1 Cor. xi,¹ though without the same significance ; as Casel remarks, the Christians thought of Christ not as dead but as living. Common meals implied union in a degree which we do not readily imagine, and such meals in honour of the dead are still held in modern Greece and elsewhere.²

Secondly, there is eating together when a god or goddess is thought to preside. The orator Aristides, writing in the second century of our era, says in his speech ' Concerning Sarapis ' (viii. vol. i. p. 93 sq., Dindorf), ' Men have perfect communion in sacrifices with this god alone in a peculiar degree, inviting him to their hearths and causing him to preside over their feasts ' : two invitations to dinner ' at the couch of the Lord Sarapis ' (one of these adds ' in the Sarapeum ') have been found at Oxyrhynchus.³ A citizen of Bologna built a dining-room for Juppiter Dolichenus : this implies perhaps the god was supposed to be present at the common meal of a cult society,⁴ as Zeus of Panamara may also have been at the communal banquet held in the course of his mysteries.⁵ Sharing of food in common is implied by ordinary sacrificial communion with a deity, of which more will be said later.

Thirdly, there is the enthusiastic rending of bulls and eating of their flesh raw by votaries of Dionysus ; here it seems that the bull was believed to be a form in which

¹ Lietzmann on 1 Cor. x. 20 ; Clemen, p. 179 ; and for similar phrases used of dramatic ritual, O. Casel, *Jahrb.* vi. 138 sqq.

² On eating together cf. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, ch. vii. sqq. ; Doutré, *Magic et Religion dans l'Afrique du Nord*, p. 253 (when getting material for a love philtre procure it from a house in which you have not dined) ; an amusing English illustration in H. J. Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch*, 87₈₈ ; a cup is shared by bride and bridegroom in modern Greek marriage rites, *Jahrb. f. Lit.* v. 209. Such a meal of fellowship seems to have been held by some Gnostics, cf. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, pp. 305 sqq. On meals commemorating the dead cf. S. Xanthoudides, *Ann. Br. Sch. Athens*, xii. 22 ; Schrader, *Reallexikon, indog. Alt.*² i. 18 sqq. They run into type II. ; the dead man may be thought to preside, cf. A. Thomsen, *A.R.W.* xii. 484.

³ *Pap. Oxy.* 110, 523. More parallels in Lietzmann on 1 Cor. x. 20.

⁴ Dessau, *Inscr. lat. sel.* 4313.

⁵ H. Oppermann, *R.G.V.V.* xix. 3, 66 sqq. The inscriptions teach us nothing in particular about this meal, which may have been pure jollification (cf. A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, i. 21).

Dionysus appeared. Here, and in the rending and eating of a bull or pig in Crete (supposedly the Cretan Zeus), there is a belief of eating the god, how consciously held we do not know: the first rite is Thracian, the second pre-Greek. Clear traces of this conception of sacramental communion in Greek ritual are not obtrusively frequent.¹ Moreover, the consecration in the Christian rites differentiates them clearly; the elements are by prayer transferred to the sphere of numinous action and made the vehicles of the mystery by a deliberate process, in conscious emphatic remembrance of the saving acts of Jesus; again, the communion aspect of the Eucharist is secondary. It is not from the beginning in a line with what is called theophagy.

In the mystery cults there were sacred meals, but our curiosity as to their meaning receives little satisfaction. The password which the initiate at Eleusis had to say was, according to Clement, 'I have fasted, I have drunk the *kykeon* (a kind of porridge made with milk), I have taken (the sacred object) from the box, I performed the act, I put the thing in the basket and out of the basket into the box.' What the drinking of the *kykeon* signified we do not know; possibly it was a reception of the fruits of the earth in honour of the goddess who gave them. There is nothing which necessarily implies a receiving of deity under tangible forms.² In the mysteries of Attis and Cybele the initiate said 'I have eaten out of a timbrel, I have drunk out of a

¹ Cf. A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, i. 651 *sqq.*; L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, iii. 196. On such eating cf. E. Reuterskiöld, *op. cit.* He shows that such eating is something pre-deistic; the bull is 'concentrated force' (p. 128). Still, it was taken into the orgiastic cult of Dionysus. Eating is an obvious way of assimilating the magical properties of that which is eaten, an idea illustrated at length by A. Dieterich, *Mithras liturgie*, pp. 95 *sqq.* The drinking of blood is sometimes an oath-ceremony (p. 122), sometimes an ordeal, sometimes a means of receiving divine inspiration for prophetic utterance (Pausan. ii. 24. 1, at Argos; cf. J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*³, i. 381 *sqq.*) or magic strength (*J. Eg. Arch.* xi. 157); cf. J. Scheftelowitz, *R.G.V.V.* xiv. 3, 58 *sqq.*; wine is sometimes ritually a substitute for it, cf. K. Kircher, *R.G.V.V.* ix. 2, 84 *sqq.*, and Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 80 (drinking in magic of wine as blood of Osiris). For communion with a goddess in drink on Hittite monuments cf. A. H. Sayce, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* xxxii. (1910), 177 *sqq.*; for Hittite communion in food, *ibid.* xxviii. 95. On Scythian monuments M. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, pp. 104 *sqq.*, in other religions A. M. Hocart, *Kingship* (1927), pp. 58 *sqq.*

² *Protr.* ii. 16, 18, Stählin. Cf. L. R. Farnell, *E.R.E.* xi. 13.

cymbal, I have become an initiate of Attis.' What he ate and drank, and what eating and drinking meant we do not know; the emphasis is on the cult vessels employed for the purpose, these being sacred to Cybele and Attis in particular. It has been urged that bread was probably eaten, and this has been brought into connexion with the abstinence from bread which formed part of the sorrowful period preceding the celebration of the god's resurrection and with the identification of Attis with the cornstalk; it has therefore been inferred that Attis was eaten as the mystic bread. The conclusion is uncertain. The abstinence was from fish and pork, as well as from bread, pomegranates and dates, and even in the ancient authorities who were most interested is not brought into connexion with a communion: Julian, who deals with the subject at length, speaks of fasting as aiming at the ascent of the soul; Sallustius regards it as appropriate to the gloom of the period (he remarks further that bread and all coarse food are opposed to the soul). The identification of Attis with the cornstalk is ascribed by Hippolytus to the Phrygians; the remark is one of the data of a piece of theologising, and we cannot assume that a cult formula is implied by λέγουσι Φρύγες. Whatever the truth as to origins may be, there is no evidence for sacramental communion in Attis as a belief at the time in question; had it been so, Julian would presumably have stressed it.¹ For the cult of the Cabiri we have an inscription from Tomi on the Black Sea, which as restored conjecturally reads, 'The priests of the mystic gods in Samothrace shall on the seventh day of *Apatoureon* break and distribute the cake and shall pour the drink for the initiates and shall hold a procession.'² The restoration is attractive, but conjectural, and once more we do not know what was implied; possibly again it is a typical reception of the fruits of the earth. The eating of fish in certain Thracian mysteries is obscure to us; we know it from

¹ Dieterich, p. 216, for the formula; L. R. Farnell, *Hibbert Journal*, ii. 316 *sqq.* We can hardly explain Julian's silence as due to the extreme sanctity of the rite of eating and drinking, which one may infer from Firmicus to have been well known. The contrast which Firmicus makes, *De errore*, 18, between this rite and the Eucharist hardly justifies theory-spinning.

² Dieterich, p. 105.

tablets in relief representing the communion, but have no liturgical texts, not even a literary allusion to explain them.¹ For Mithraism we have Justin Martyr's statement, which follows his description of the Christian Eucharist, 'The evil spirits copied this and handed it down to be observed in the mysteries of Mithras; for you can know or learn that bread and a cup of water are among the rites administered to the initiated, with certain prayers,' and the remark of Tertullian, who adopts this theory, 'Mithras marks his soldiers on the forehead, he celebrates also an oblation of bread.'² What this signifies is uncertain: Loisy's connexion of it with the usual representation of Mithras slaying a bull, from which proceeds corn, and his supposition of a communion in Mithras are conjectures which at the moment have no solid support.³

There is then, as far as we can see, nothing in this which can well have contributed to the genesis of the Christian rite, still less to its central position and soteriological significance. Nor are sporadic survivals of eating the god likely to have contributed to this; the point of emphasis in the Eucharist is not at first communion. This inquiry then into pagan parallels leaves us with the substance of the rite as a residuum not so to be explained. This view is confirmed by the fact that St. Paul is clearly not involved in controversy with Jewish Christians on the subject of the Eucharist, ready as they are to accuse him of innovation.⁴

The common meals of the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem were no doubt accompanied by table prayers of the familiar Jewish type. In such eating together, with its preliminary offering to God of food and drink, lies the kernel of their common meal of love. Incorporated in this and only later

¹ Cumont, *P.W.* ix. 847; Dölger, *IXΘΡΞ*, i. 143 *sqq.*, ii. 421 *sqq.*, iii. Taf. XXXII. 2.

² Justin, *Apol.* i. 66; Tertull. *De praescriptione haereticorum*, 40; for representations in reliefs cf. Cumont, *Mystères de Mithra*³, pp. 163 *sqq.*

³ *Mystères*, pp. 189 *sqq.*; *contra* see Clemen, pp. 186 *sqq.*

⁴ Loisy has met this point by arguing that dispute arose purely on practical questions (as, for instance, the position of Gentile converts) and that St. Paul's teaching on the Eucharist might pass unnoticed (*Mystères*, pp. 338 *sq.*) Yet it may be remarked that this teaching concerned deeply the historical memory of Jesus, a subject stressed by them more than by St. Paul.

separated was the Eucharist. In the Pauline rite the breaking of bread perhaps came first ; then the meal proper, then the blessing of the cup.¹ In the Jewish Christian rite described in the *Didache*² breaking of bread and blessing of cup are described without reference to the Last Supper. It has been urged that in kindred Egyptian liturgies the Institution section is not original, and it is inferred that this type of liturgy goes back to a Jewish-Christian celebration which had no connexion with that Supper as a soteriological act, while the familiar type which has such a connexion is regarded as having been originated by St. Paul.³ This conclusion is, with all respect to the admirable work in which it has recently been maintained, quite uncertain. In the first place, it is improbable that St. Paul should have been the first to connect the communal meals of the Christians with the Last Supper. It would be peculiar that in this one point he should seek to emphasise a particular earthly act of the Jesus of history, and to relate to it the religious *pneumatic* life of the community. Still, as has been remarked, everything pre-Pauline is a matter of conjecture, and it is possible that St. Paul was the first to see the link, though difficult to imagine how his view could

¹ Lietzmann, p. 228. On the later separation of common meal and Eucharist cf. O. Casel, *Jahrbuch*, iii. 175. P. Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie*, pp. 283 sqq., has argued brilliantly against the view that non-Eucharistic *agapai* existed. Common meals without a Eucharistic close are in fact uncertain for the earliest age of Christianity : but there is every reason to suppose that the Eucharist was originally, like the solemn act of Jesus, 'after supper.' Against the supposition of a primitive wineless rite cf. Clemen, pp. 175 sqq. ; I suspect that *κλάσαι ἄρτον* in Acts is a technical phrase parallel to 'saying Mass.'

² Its evidence is here accepted as representing conditions in a backwater, in spite of Armitage Robinson's persuasive arguments for the view that it represents a later attempt to reconstruct a picture of primitive conditions ; on the whole, that hypothesis presupposes imaginative ability and antiquarian interests which are difficult to believe. (Cf. also W. L. Knox, *St. Paul*, p. 86, n. 17.) Hennecke, *Neutest. Apokr.*², p. 560, dates it in the first half of the second century ; this is perhaps right ; A. Ehrhard, *Urchristentum und Katholizismus* (Luzern, 1926), p. 107, dates it as 80-90 or 90-100. The use in it of the Johannine writings (Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 246) must affect the question. I would add that the use of *παῖς θεοῦ* (p. 132 ; cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, pp. 90 sq.) and *γνώσις* (p. 131) points to an origin or at least a redaction in Christian circles which, though Jewish, thought largely in Greek (cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul*, p. 379 : for a Jewish circle of this kind cf. the prayers discussed by Bousset, *Nachr. Gött. gel. Gesell.*, 1915, pp. 435 sqq.)

³ Lietzmann summarises his views, *op. cit.*, pp. 249 sqq.

have prevailed unless he had found in the Christian community which he joined an undisputed tradition concerning the Last Supper to which to refer. In the second place, it should be remarked that there is no need of the repetition of the narrative of the Institution. Loisy and Wetter have in fact argued that it was absent from the Pauline Eucharist.¹ The story is the Church's authority for the rite, but a sanction need not be repeated.² Furthermore, the *Didache*, which we shall consider at length, while giving instructions to presbyters as to the conduct of service in the absence of a prophet, is not a complete book of the words : it may assume a mention of the Institution as something which could not fail to be in the reader's mind. In the Anaphora of Serapion, even if the mention of the Institution is secondary, the bread is a type of the Holy Body (§ 12), the offering of it a type of Death (§ 13), the cup is a type of the Blood (§ 14), and the action is ' the living sacrifice, the unbloody offering ' (§ 12).³ All this points to the Last Supper, and is meaningless otherwise ; a Pauline quotation (ζῶσαν θυσίαν) would be very odd in a rite ignoring the Pauline conception of the Eucharist.

The *Didache* rite does not expressly refer to the Last Supper. Nevertheless, read with that in mind, it does not exclude a reference to it.⁴ Jewish table prayers are varied

¹ Loisy, *Mystères*, p. 283; Wetter, *Liturgien*, i. 148₁₄. Loisy further remarks that there is no reason to suppose that the general course of the Pauline rite differed from the Jewish, though he holds that St. Paul is responsible for the *interpretation* in question.

² Note the introduction of the Institution narrative in the Anaphora of Serapion. ' This bread is the representation (ὁμοίωμα) of the Holy Body, because our Lord Jesus Christ . . . ' (Lietzmann, p. 36). Loisy has suggested that the Ignatian Eucharist, clearly as it involved the Pauline idea, had also no recitation of the words of institution. The localisation of the consecration moment at their recitation meets us clearly in [Ambrosius] *De sacramentis*, though as Lietzmann has said (*op. cit.*, pp. 195 sq.), in the 'Liturgy of Hippolytus' the Institution narrative is the central point ; perhaps it hangs together with the idea that the recitation of a story can be equivalent to a direct constraining prayer : that principle is familiar in magic. (On Christian belief in the power of prayers and hymns *per se*, cf. Wetter, *Liturgien*, i. 167 sqq.)

³ Note the parallel with Ps. Ambros. and the 'Liturgy of Hippolytus' in the use of ὁμοίωμα (remarked by Lietzmann, p. 120) and thereon Casel, *Jahrbuch*, ii. 100. *Living sacrifice* is perhaps in contrast with the dead animals offered by the heathen (Casel, *Jahrbuch*, iv. 44₁₅).

⁴ Wetter, i. 147, allows its connexion with the Last Supper ; but it will be remembered that he does not agree with me as to what Jesus there said.

just enough for the purpose (ch. 9, *sq.*). ‘Concerning the {thanksgiving} ¹ do it in this fashion. First of the cup : {eucharist}

We give Thee thanks, Our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy son, which Thou hast revealed to us in Thy Son Jesus : glory be to Thee for ever.

And of the broken bread :

We give Thee thanks, Our Father, for the life and knowledge (*gnosis*) which Thou hast made manifest to us through Jesus Thy Son : glory be to Thee for ever. As this bread was scattered on the mountains and gathered into one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the world into Thy Kingdom ; for Thine is the glory and power through Jesus Christ for ever.’ ²

After follows a direction : ‘Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist except those who have been baptised in the Name of the Lord. For of this the Lord has said : “Do not give what is holy to the dogs.”’ (Here we have in a Jewish Christian rite the beginning of the finding of symbolical sacramental meanings in the Evangelical tradition.) ‘When you have had your fill, offer your (Eucharistic) thanksgiving thus :

We thank Thee, holy Father, for Thy holy Name, wherein Thou didst tabernacle in our hearts,³ and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus Thy Son ; glory be to Thee for ever. Thou, almighty Ruler, didst create all things for Thy Name’s sake, food and drink hast Thou given to men for their enjoyment, that they may offer thanks. But to us Thou hast given spiritual food and

¹ I give the alternative renderings in view of the possibility that the term has not become quite technical and definite (H. Leclercq, *Dict. arch. chrét.* iv. 783). I see no reason to suppose, with Casel, *Jahrb.* vi. 217, that ch. 9, 10 refer only to the Eucharist celebrated for the newly baptised ; *εὐχαριστία* must be the normal weekly rite.

² Compare with these the Jewish formula of thanksgiving :

‘Blessed be Thou, Jeja Our God, King of eternity,
Who hast made the fruit of the vine.’

The *vine of David* is based on Psalm lxxix. (lxxx.) 9 *sqq.* : but Jesus is now connected with the cup. Compare also the Jewish blessing of bread,

‘Blessed be Thou, Jeja, Our God, King of eternity,
Who lettest bread arise from the earth.’

and another Jewish prayer,

‘Raise a basket to collect all our banished members from the four ends of the world into our land. Blessed be Thou, Jeja, Who dost collect the scattered ones of Thy people Isarel.’ (Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 203, 235.)

³ *ὅδ κατασκηνώσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν* (perhaps ‘which Thou didst make to tabernacle’) ; the thought is one we have noted earlier, p. 106.

drink and eternal life through Jesus Thy Son (or Servant).¹ Above all we give Thanks to Thee for Thy power: glory be to Thee for ever. Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to rescue it from all evil and to perfect it in Thy love, and bring it together from the four winds, a church sanctified into Thy Kingdom, which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory for ever.

Let grace come and let this world pass away.
Hosanna to the God of David.

If any one is holy, let him come; if any is not let him repent
*Maran atha.*²
Amen.'

'Let prophets offer thanks at such length as they wish.' There follow more directions about prophets, and then ch. 14:

When you meet on the Lord's Day break bread and offer thanks, having first made confession of your sins, that your sacrifice may be pure: let any man who has a dispute with his fellow not come together with you, until they are reconciled. For this is the sacrifice mentioned by the Lord. 'In every place and time offer to Me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great King,' saith the Lord, 'and My Name is held in wonder among the heathen.'

The interpretation of this seemingly straightforward description is one of the most difficult problems which face the student of Christian origins. I can here do no more than indicate some possibilities. If we assume that εὐχαριστία in ch. 9 is the Eucharist, and that the rite described is none other than that mentioned in ch. 14,³ there remain difficulties. μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι, 'after having your fill,' is an odd phrase for participation in the Sacrament⁴; again εἴ τις ἄγιος . . . reads like an invitation to communion, warning off those who have not confessed their sins or made their peace with other brethren, and liturgical analogies perhaps suggest that the great prayer εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἄγιε, . . . should come *before* the people receive

¹ διὰ <Ἰησοῦ> τοῦ παιδὸς σου, where Ἰησοῦ is added from the Coptic version. παῖς means properly Servant, Ebed-Jahweh (p. 965). It is significant that this liturgical formula occurs both in the Didache and in the Liturgy of Hippolytus, which Lietzmann refers to a different, Pauline tradition.

² Lietzmann, p. 237, has recognised a dialogue of celebrant and congregation in these last words.

³ So Lietzmann, pp. 232 sqq.

⁴ Casel, however, well compares *satiari* in Postcommunions in the Missal (*Jahrb.* vi. 216); we find also *repleti* (in the Postcommunion for the second week of Advent).

the Sacrament; such prayers after the people's communion as are known are brief and confined to thanksgiving; they are not intercessory. It is therefore not surprising that some scholars have regarded the blessing of the cup and broken bread in ch. 9 as belonging to the communal meal, *followed* by the Eucharist proper. μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι refers then to the bodily sustenance thus received, not to the 'spiritual meat and drink' of the long prayer.¹ If this is so, εὐχαριστία may be applicable to the rite, meal and Eucharist as a whole: it is certainly difficult to distinguish between its use in chs. 9 and 14. In fact, the separation of meal and Eucharist was probably a gradual process in the East. Some strictly Eucharistic matter and what relates to the communion proper we do not find in the text. On the strength of other analogies one might expect prayer of a consecration type between 'Glory be to Thee for ever' and 'Remember, Lord, Thy Church . . .' This view is not free from difficulties; 'Do not give what is holy to the dogs' suits the Sacrament better than the content of the common meal; yet the latter was solemnly blessed, and in fact the Eucharistic prayer is as it were an elaboration of the simpler prayer used over the bread. On the whole it is perhaps the best explanation yet offered, but it seems at the moment impossible to attain to certainty, and the text seems to me to have suffered from dislocation.

The *Didache* stands by itself in Christian history, but the comparison of bread and church is in itself strikingly like St. Paul's saying, 'For we the many are one bread, one body; we all share in one bread' (1 Cor. x. 17). It is tempting to suggest that the comparison was likely to occur in prayers he himself used. The context also requires

¹ So W. L. Knox, *St. Paul*, pp. 378 *sqq.*, and others (*cf.* Batiffol, *op. cit.* pp. 295 *sq.*. The view put forward by Cagin and others and summarised by Leclercq, *op. cit.* pp. 780 *sqq.*, according to which chs. 9 and 10 refer simply to a frequent common meal, distinct from the Sunday Eucharist of ch. 14, seems to me impossible). I do not think it likely that the suppression of properly Eucharistic matter here postulated is due to *disciplina arcana* on the author's part; that *disciplina* belongs in the main to the fourth century A.D. (Batiffol, *Études*, pp. 1 *sqq.*; G. Anrich, *Rel. Gesch. Gegenw.*², i. 532 *sq.*; Casel, *Jahrb.* iv. 237). It may have influenced a redactor. For redactorial activity in connexion with the *Didache* *cf.* the presence in a Coptic version and absence from the Greek of a blessing of oil (*Jahrbuch*, v. 237; Hennecke, p. 560). There is the other possibility of loss in transcription.

consideration. 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not communion in the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not communion in the Body of Christ?' Then comes the remark quoted, and after it, 'Look at Israel in the flesh; do not those who eat of the sacrifices participate in the altar? Why do I say this? Is what is offered to an idol of any force? or is an idol of any force? No, but the point is that the sacrifices offered by Gentiles are sacrifices offered to *daemonia*. I do not wish you to have communion in *daemonia*. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of *daemonia*: you cannot share in the table of the Lord and in the table of *daemonia*.' The argument is against participation in meats offered to idols. The Christian must not share both in Christian cult meals and in the others. The argument that Israel *after the flesh* shares in the altar is Philonic: *altar* is in Jewish texts sometimes a circumlocution for God. What is meant by *κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων* is hard to say. Perhaps the easiest explanation is that St. Paul is transferring his interpretation of the Christian rite to them, to make as effective a contrast as possible.¹ Even so he does not contrast *κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων* with *κοινωνοὺς τοῦ Κυρίου*.

Lietzmann has maintained a very different view. After setting forth examples of eating at the tables of gods, and of sharing food with them, and the rare instances of eating the god, he remarks, 'A clear idea of the occurrence of the *κοινωνία τῶν δαιμονίων* deprecated by Paul is given by Porphyry quoted in Eusebius *Praep. evang.* IV. 23.'² We

¹ There is an analogy in the *Acts of Carpus Papyrus and Agathonice*, ch. 7 (p. 13 in Von Gebhardt, *Ausg. Märtyreracten*): ὡπερ γὰρ οἱ ἀληθεῖς προσκυνηταὶ . . . ἀφομοιοῦνται τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀθάνατοι, μεταλαμβάνοντες τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς διὰ τοῦ λόγου, οὕτως καὶ οἱ τούτοις λατρεύοντες ἀφομοιοῦνται τῇ ματαιότητι τῶν δαιμόνων, another in *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, viii. 34. 9 (a warning against assemblies of unbelievers): ὡς γὰρ οἱ ὅσιοι ἱερεῖς ἀγιάζουσιν, οὕτως οἱ ἐναγεῖς μιáλνουσιν. The 'cup of *daemonia*' may refer to the pagan custom of drinking after a banquet cups in honour of Zeus the Saviour and of the Good Daemon described with the genitive *ποτήριον τοῦ Ἀγαθοῦ Δαίμονος*, cf. Deissmann, *Licht*⁴, p. 299₄. On St. Paul's view of the gods as *δαίμονια* cf. R. Liechtenhan, pp. 14 *sqq.* of the work quoted p. 147, n. 2 later; Strack-Billerbeck III. 47 *sqq.* (Rabbinical parallels).

² In his excursus on 1 Cor. x. 22. The passage of Porphyry is annotated by G. Wolff, *Porphyrii de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae* (Berlin, 1856), pp. 147 *sqq.*, and Bousset, *A.R.W.* xviii. 154 *sqq.* On Porphyry's attitude when he wrote this in youth cf. J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre* (Gand, 1913), pp. 17 *sqq.*

must study the quotation in its context. Porphyry there says that Sarapis, whom he identifies with Pluto, is lord of the *daemones* and gives us acts with a hidden meaning to drive them away. The essence of the method is in the offering of the blood of animals ; by this we get rid of the *daemones* and secure the god's presence. Our bodies are filled with *daemones* which settle on us when we eat ; hence our fasts drive them away. There is nothing relevant in this, any more than in Porphyry's later statement (*De abst.* II. 42) that animal sacrifice attracts *daemones* and should be avoided by the wise man, who does not desire their company. Lietzmann has elsewhere urged that the *epiklesis* of the Spirit to come upon the elements and through them enter the communicants is to be connected with an ancient idea of sacrifice and the accompanying meal. 'The strength of the deity dwells in the sacrificed flesh and passes into him who eats it.'¹ On this it must be remarked that on the one hand there is evidence suggesting that such ideas lie behind Greek sacrificial meals. Certain preliminary ritual and contact with the altar, which was originally held to be charged with divine power, hallow the victim. On the other hand, what we infer from these indications is our inference, not ancient expressed belief or theory. It is something much less near the surface than the notion that the worshippers and the god eat together in fellowship ; part is reserved for the god, the rest man takes.² The Christian teaching is explicit, not implicit.

¹ *Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 77.

² Cf. the excellent discussion by L. R. Farnell, *E.R.E.* xi. 14 sqq. Thus, for instance, Iamblichus and his followers explain sacrifice as a kind of communion. But it is not communion in the life of the gods ; it is communion with it by means of the life of the sacrificed animals, which, so to speak, 'make contact' (cf. my *Sallustius*, lxxxiv sq.). Again, we may draw inferences from the fact that in the cult of the Syrian Atargatis the priests ate fish offered to her, though others might never partake of any fish (Dölger, IXΘΡΣ, ii. 184 sqq. for references) ; but do these inferences correspond to actual belief ? On communion with a god in an animal cf. M. P. Nilsson, *History of Greek Religion*, pp. 95 sq. As evidence for divine essence in food offered to a deity, *Mythol. Vatic.* i. 177 has been quoted : *templum Iunonis fuit in quo mensam Hercules et Diana lectum habebat, ubi portabantur pueri ut de ipsa mensa ederent et inde acciperent fortitudinem et in lecto Dianae dormirent ut omnibus amabiles fierent et illorum generatio succresceret.* That eating from the table of Hercules should make you strong is readily explained from the principle of sympathy and does not postulate for its explanation anything deeper. Moreover, the statement looks like a scholiastic imagining based on Virgil *Ecl.* iv. 63, not a statement founded on fact.

We may then with reason refuse to see Hellenistic influence in the Pauline use of *κοινωνία*.

§ 4. *Conclusions on sacramentalism.*—We have reviewed some of the evidence for the character of Baptism and of the Eucharist. In both we have seen the eminently concrete nature of early Christian ideas in general, and of St. Paul's in particular. To him both rest on one concept: the individual actually participates in the sacred drama. In Baptism he dies with the Lord and rises with and in Him; in the Eucharist he assists at the same drama renewed before him. Against this view it is ineffective to argue that St. Paul *could not* have thought in such a way and could not thus have ascribed spiritual consequences to material acts (his words in themselves suggest most strongly that he *did*), and useless to quote his thanksgiving to God for the fact that he baptised none of the Corinthians except Crispus, Gaius, and the household of Stephen (1 Cor. i. 14); the explanation is there given 'that no one may say that he was baptised in my name.' He had good reason to be grateful for the fact that in their wranglings men could not say 'I was baptised by Paul, which puts me on a higher level of grace than you who were baptised by his underlings.' Further, as he says (*v.* 17), his special work was preaching.¹ Unless Baptism was regarded as in itself efficacious it is difficult to understand the Corinthian practice of baptism on behalf of dead persons, mentioned without praise or blame in 1 Cor. xv. 29 in an argument supporting belief in the Resurrection. The practice is probably not parallel to pagan ritual intended (like Christian requiems) to secure the welfare of loved ones in the next world²; it would rather seem that one Corinthian went through the rite on behalf of another who had not done so, much as a College

¹ This seems more probable than the inference of J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 499, that the baptiser required special spiritual gifts, different from those of the preacher.

² For Orphic ritual on behalf of the dead cf. *Orphica*, fr. 232, Kern (*λόσιον προγόνων ἀθεμίστων μαϊόμενοι* may indeed mean, as Lagrange thinks, *Revue Biblique*, 1920, p. 435, no. 2, 'to obtain deliverance from the inherited guilt of the crimes of impious ancestors'; but the next reference is unmistakable). Plato, *Rep.* 364 B; Th. Zielinski, *La Sibylle*, pp. 40 *sqq.* The prayer of a dead man for help in an epitaph from Rome, *Notizie degli scavi*, 1923, p. 358, l. 3 b, has been interpreted as parallel, but doubtfully. On the antecedents of Requiem Mass cf. Dölger, *IXΘΡΣ*, II. pp. 555 *sqq.*

Praelector takes a degree on behalf of a student who is unable to kneel in person before the Vice-Chancellor of the University.¹ So again with the Eucharist, we find a clearly objective view in 1 Cor. xi. The Corinthians could not 'eat and drink damnation to themselves' if the bread and wine were a mere symbol; they could not be blamed for 'not discerning the Lord's Body' if that Body was not there to discern. We are sometimes in danger of exaggerating the distance from Paul to Cyprian.

At the same time, the peculiar character of Christian sacramentalism needs to be realised. The Christian who receives the sacraments is put into a new and ineradicable spiritual condition, is fed with the meat and drink of eternal life; he secures the benefits of Christ's Passion. Yet he can throw away these benefits by not bringing to them or showing after them the right disposition; that he needs if he is to receive in the words of St. Thomas *rem et uirtutem sacramenti*, the reality and effective working power of the Sacrament. This teaching is clearly given by St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 1 *sqq.* 'I would not have you be ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud and all passed through the sea and were all baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea and all ate spiritual food and all drank the same spiritual drink, for they drank from a spiritual rock which accompanied them, and the rock was Christ. Nevertheless, God was not well pleased with the majority of them, for they were laid low in the desert. These things were types of our experience, that we might not be desirers of evil, as they were.' To the new Israel under its new Covenant, as to the old Israel under its old Covenant, God's spiritual gifts are no pledge of blessedness. Moreover, participation in the new sacramental life does not automatically make the participants *pneumatikoi*, men living the life of the Spirit; that title belongs only to those who show the fruits of the Spirit, as many of the Corinthians

¹ Cf. Lietzmann *ad loc.* on the Marcionite continuation of this practice. There is an ancient Mandaean parallel (Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 233), a modern in Mormonism (*E.R.E.* xi. 83). Preiske, *Z.N.W.* xxiii. 298 *sqq.*, has suggested that when baptism came to be regarded as essential, this vicarious baptism was introduced that the number of the elect might speedily be completed. People were anxious to secure the inclusion of their relations.

do not (1 Cor. iii. 1, etc.). On the other hand, the *soteria* given by pagan mysteries seems to have been a gilt-edged investment not liable to depreciation, though here also indications of a more spiritual attitude are not wholly wanting.¹

§ 5. *Church order*.—Of the Christian ministry in early days we know little; gradually, it seems, individuals claiming special spiritual gifts gave place to a regular order, after existing for a time beside it.² We read in Acts vi. 6 that the Apostles prayed and then laid hands on those chosen to be deacons, and we hear of this laying on of hands in 1 Tim. iv. 4, 2 Tim. i. 6 (also in the giving of the Holy Ghost to disciples of St. John Baptist in Acts xix. 6). Belief in a transmission of divine power by physical contact was common at the time, particularly in miracles of healing; at the same time we do not seem to hear of it as a means of conferring priesthoods, which were usually entered upon without ceremony; a few involved the reception of some sort of initiation.³ Those who were to fill them were commonly selected by lot, the parallel between which and the choice of Matthias (if we regard the story as historical) is not important, since the Jews also made use of the lot. The practice of open confession of sins mentioned by James v. 16 (1 John i. 9 may mean 'confess to God') is a natural concomitant of such Church discipline as we see exemplified in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. Its development, inevitable from the moment at which it was discovered that people sinned after baptism, was completed later. Whether it was in any measure encouraged

¹ Cf., for instance, the address of the priest to Lucius in Apul. *Met.* xi. 15: *teque iam nunc obsequio religionis nostrae dedica et ministerii iugum subi voluntarium; nam cum coeperis deae seruire, tunc magis senties fructum tuae libertatis.*

² Cf. Wetter, *Liturgien*, i. 162 sqq.

³ For the miracles of healing cf. O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder* (R.G.V.V. viii.). Priests of Asclepius at Chalcedon, Dionysus at Pergamon, the African Saturn, also the hierophants at Eleusis, were admitted by initiation (*C.Q.* 1926, pp. 107 sqq.), also a priestess called Γαλατώ of Apollo at Pednelissus in Caria (*Supplementum epigraphicum graecum*, ii. 710). On the continuity of the early Christian ministry with the Jewish cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul*, pp. 86 sq.; on Jewish imposition of hands, *ibid.* p. 371; Strack-Billerbeck, II. 647 sqq. Ehrhard has remarked on the Jewish *πρεσβύτεροι* in Acts xxiii. 14, xxiv. 1, xxv. 15. The title was in Egypt applied to the older men forming something like a council within a larger body (Dittenberger, *Or. gr. index sel.*, I. pp. 653 sq.); but the Jewish use is here clearly the parent of the Christian.

by the Phrygian custom of confession-inscriptions earlier mentioned, by the Samothracian confession by the initiate of the most evil thing he had done in his life, by occasional confession in the cult of Isis, or the like, can hardly be determined.¹

We have briefly reviewed early Christian cultus, and have found that, while it had much in common with what was around, the driving forces in its development came mostly from within. This development was not *in vacuo*, but in the Hellenistic background; it involved give and take. The evidence as we have reviewed it does not seem to justify the supposition of substantial borrowing by Christianity: if it did, the development of the new faith would still be the development of something not only individual, but consciously individual. 'In religious history,' says Reitzenstein, 'it is even clearer than elsewhere that nothing can exercise influence which does not find its way prepared, and nothing is living which is not essentially new.'²

IV

CHRISTIANITY IN THE COMMUNITIES

WE have hitherto considered in the main the official teaching and practice of Gentile Christianity as presented by St. Paul. We must now ask how it was received. Three main sources of danger may be noted: Judaizing tendencies, which would have stultified the whole development of the new religion and made it a mere variant of Jewish proselytism; survivals of old paganism in spirit and in ethics; and Christian heresy. The first, of which we hear at Philippi, in Galatia, at Colossae and in the letters to Timothy and Titus, and the third (mentioned, for instance, in 2 Tim. ii. 18) fall outside the scope of this Essay. The second appears clearly at Corinth in St. Paul's First Epistle, and to this we must again turn.

New disciples of Greek education might feel that they

¹ Cf. p. 73 above, also a public confession of guilt mentioned in an inscription of the fourth century B.C. at Epidaurus (*Suppl. epigr. gr.* ii. 58). On an unction of the sick which appears in James v. 14 cf. F. Cabrol, *Dict. d'arch. chrét.* vi. 2777 sqq., Leclercq, *ibid.* v. 1029 sqq.; Strack-Billerbeck, III. 759.

² *Z.N.W.* 1912, 23.

'had passed out of death into life,' but they could not become perfect Christians in a day: the story of their conversion is, as Weiss says, that of 'the gradual penetration of the ideas they brought with them from paganism by the spirit of Christianity.' The first grave warning given to the Corinthians was directed against the spirit which expressed itself in such utterances as 'I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, I of Christ.' Partisanship of this sort was very dangerous: there was at the time a tendency to exalt religious teachers or prophets, as men with occult gifts, as having deity in them, θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι; such were Apollonius of Tyana and later Alexander of Abonoteichus (Lucian says of Peregrinus—ch. xi.—that the Christians 'thought him a god and used him as law-giver.') Further, a certain competitiveness in matters religious makes itself felt later in the Empire, if not clearly in the first century.

St. Paul found also at Corinth the gravest moral laxity. We have remarked earlier that popular standards, as distinct from those of ascetics and of *coterie* poets of dissipation, were probably somewhat lower than they are to-day (p. 74). Corinth at least, a cosmopolitan place, would be no rosebed of virtues. The ascetic reaction from such tendencies had in its turn dangers, and the Apostle, in spite of his own ascetic leanings, counselled moderation. But the great danger was licence.

To some adherents of Christianity it might seem that they were now saved, God's elect, and could do what they would. Against such an attitude St. Paul protested, as we have seen (p. 137). Some were proud of their spiritual gifts, of their capacity for *gnosis*. To them St. Paul says in effect, 'Yes, your gifts are good, and Christian *gnosis* is real *gnosis*, and those who possess it, the *pneumatikoi*, are superior to the *psychikoi*, those who have only the ordinary human soul.'² At the same time, what matters is not the ability to go into ecstasy but three things, Faith,

¹ It is noteworthy how eagerly St. Paul avoids any such attitude towards himself (Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*², 119); note *Gal.* iv. 14 *ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*. The *Didache* bids one honour a teacher as the Lord, but for the reason that the Lord is in the man who proclaims His Lordship. On θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 236 sqq.

² On the earlier history of these terms cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 284 sqq.

Hope and Love; of these Love is supremely important, while your present *gnosis* must be imperfect and provisional.¹ The spiritual powers which you should seek are those which tend to the edification of others, not *glottolia*, ability to speak as a medium (1 Cor. xiii.).'

This teaching is fundamental to Christianity, not the less so because a somewhat similar conception of Faith is found in Egypt in the Hermetic Corpus and in magical texts, and because the combination Faith, Hope and Love seems to have non-Christian antecedents.² St. Paul has taken words and formulas which are current, and given to them the sense he needs. Ecstasy, natural as it was, was being over-valued; this involved danger to morality and order, and no little loss of perspective. We may recall a saying of Jesus in Luke x. 20: 'Rejoice not because you have dominion over the unclean spirits; rejoice rather that your names are written in the book of life.'

At Corinth, then, we see a community lapsing into old sins and old habits of thought and rebuked accordingly. It was no doubt an extreme case, and can hardly be regarded as typical of early Church life. At the same time it is very significant of the dangers which had to be overcome and of the importance of St. Paul's activity in meeting betimes tendencies subversive of Christianity as he understood it. He was more conservative than is sometimes allowed.³ 'Not Paul's introduction of mysticism into Christianity but his bringing of the moral Gospel of Jesus into the Greek world is the act of his which counts in world-history,' says von Dobschütz.⁴

¹ There is perhaps a certain irony in xv. 34 *ἀγνοῶντες γὰρ θεοῦ τινας ἔχουσι*, 'For all your confidence in your *gnosis*, some of you lack necessary *gnosis*.' But *ἀγνοῶντες* is also a fixed term; cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, pp. 292 sq., 343.

² On Faith cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 286 sqq.; Dölger, IXΘΥΣ, ii. 482 sq. On Faith, Hope, Love, cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 383 sqq., Christ-Stählin, *Gesch. griech. Litt.* ii. 11410, Clemen, pp. 328 sqq., Überweg-Praechter, *Philosophie des Altertums*, 12, p. 630. Proclus in the fifth century A.D. speaks of love, truth, and faith as raising man to God, and recommends them to *θεοουργοί* (wonder-workers) as a means of securing contact with God (*Ad Alcibiadem*, p. 52); this triad comes from the *Oracula Chaldaica*, cf. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 386 sq. The tendency to triads was of course strong.

³ Cf. the good observations of K. Holl, *Urchristentum und Religionsgeschichte*, p. 41, and of E. F. Scott, *First Age of Christianity*, pp. 157 sq.

⁴ *Der Apostel Paulus*, i. 43.

V

RELATIONS TO PHILOSOPHY

§ I. *Hellenistic popular philosophy*.—We must now ask what relation Gentile Christianity bore to contemporary philosophic teaching, which then took the place of religion in moulding the lives of many.¹ Philosophy was the more fitted to do this for the reason that in the Hellenistic age its main emphasis came to be laid on man, his needs, and his duties. How it thus served the needs of the times has been well stated by Edwyn Bevan in *Stoics and Sceptics*, and again in his essay in *The Hellenistic Age*. Those were days of sudden and catastrophic reversals of fortune: man required some way of escape. Hence comes the importance attached to self-sufficiency, *autarkeia*. He who has learnt his lesson aright is beyond the reach of circumstances.

Some found satisfaction in a warm belief in the omnipotence of the stars. Together with the fatalism involved in Babylonian astrological theories, which in the Hellenistic age won many adherents, there grew what Cumont has called 'astral mysticism.' This meant an enthusiasm in the contemplation of the stars and a finding in this contemplation of something which could raise man above worldly cares and occupations. 'I know that I am mortal and the creature of a day,' says Ptolemy, 'but when I track by my mind the winding courses of the stars, I no longer tread the earth, but am with Zeus himself, and take my fill of ambrosia, the food of the gods,' and this attitude was not confined to great astronomers; Seneca, in sketching the happiness to be enjoyed after death by the righteous, stresses the privilege of contemplating at close quarters the motions of the stars.² Astrological ideas could

¹ For philosophy's definite claim to do this cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 134, 288.

² *Anth. Pal.* ix. 577; cf. F. Cumont, *Bulletin de l'académie royale de Belgique*, 1909, pp. 256 sqq.; F. Boll, *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin*, 1921, pp. 2 sqq.; and H. Gressmann's convenient tract, *Die hellenistische Gestirnsreligion (Beit. z. Allen Orient*, v. 1925). For contemplation after this life cf. my *Sallustius*, xciv²²³, and Seneca, *Dial.* VI. 25; W. W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles* (1923), pp. 143 sqq., has shown that Aristotle is to some extent the father of this attitude. The idea of the flight of the mind through the universe is Platonic; cf. R. M. Jones, *Class. Phil.* xxi. 97 sqq.

produce also an ecstatic self-surrender to the immutable decrees of Fate, accepted as divine law which it is man's privilege to obey. Here astrology and Stoicism were on common ground : two instances of the attitude in question may be quoted from Vettius Valens, a writer of the early part of the second century A.D., particularly valuable for our purpose as being a thoroughly commonplace man (*Anthologia*, VI. 1, p. 242, 8 Kroll), ' I was not excited by the varied courses of horses and the swift rush of the whip, or by the rhythms of dancers and the idle delight of flutes and the Muse and languorous strains, or by all that through devices or ribaldry moves hearers, no, nor did I have any part in harmful or beneficial occupations compact of good and evil or in foul and burdensome occupations, but, having chanced upon divine and reverent contemplation of things celestial, I wished to cleanse my character of all vice and all pollution, and to leave my soul immortal'; and again (V. 9, p. 220, 19), ' Those who busy themselves with foreknowledge of the future and with the truth acquire a soul that is free from slavery, and despise Fortune, do not persist in hope [thought of here as an evil thing], do not fear death, and live without perturbation, having schooled their souls to be brave, and they are not puffed up by prosperity or depressed by adversity, but are contented with what they have. As they are not hankering after the impossible they bear with constancy what is ordained, and being freed from all pleasure or flattery, they are soldiers of Fate.' (This is the metaphor of the *militia sacra*, which we have seen applied to Christianity.) ' For it is impossible for any man by prayers or sacrifices to overcome what was fixed from the beginning and alter it to his taste ; what has been assigned to us will happen without our praying for it, what is not fated will not happen for our prayers.' This doctrine was too austere for the many, who sought in mysteries freedom from astral fate, which might to them seem the codification of life's hardness.¹

Others took refuge in one philosophical school or another.

¹ For the Stoic attitude cf. Hatch, pp. 221 *sqq.*, Liechtenhan, pp. 90 *sqq.*; for the un-Greek idea that Fate, *Heimarmene*, is actually evil cf. p. 150 below.

It is noteworthy that a man of the world like Cicero turned to philosophy not only as a field for literary activity, but also as a subject of real importance and helpfulness in difficult times; that even before the circumstances of the time caused him to substitute literary activities for political, he had busied himself with Greek political philosophy and transformed the Hellenistic idea of immortality won by service of mankind into the more Roman idea of immortality won by service of the state¹; and again that a Horace was so pre-occupied in his later years with questions of conduct and of man's place in the universe as we see in the first book of his *Epistles*. Virgil is associated with the Augustan revival of Roman religion, and of him we are told that he purposed after finishing the *Aeneid* to devote the rest of his life to philosophy. Since philosophy consoled man and gave him a kind of *soteria*,² it could evoke something of a religious sentiment. What Cercidas says of Diogenes, what Lucretius says of Epicurus, is in the nature of an apotheosis,³ and the attitude of Lucretius to Epicureanism is that of a man who has undergone the psychological experience which we call conversion. Of that experience, produced in St. Augustine when a pagan by the reading of Cicero's *Hortensius*, a work intended to stimulate men to study philosophy, there are other examples, and of a consequent abandonment of the world; this occurs markedly in Neopythagoreanism and kindred philosophy,⁴ and in Hermetic circles. The conclusion of the *Poimandres* or first tractate of the Corpus may be quoted, 'And now, why delay? Will you not, having received all this teaching, be a guide to all who deserve it, in order that the race of men may through you be saved by God? . . . And I began to preach to men the beauty of piety and *gnosis*, saying "O people, earth-born men,"⁵

¹ In the Dream of Scipio, in Book VI. of his *De re publica* (written in 54-51 B.C.), finely characterised by Reitzenstein, *Neue Wege zum Antike*, ii.

² P. 89, n. 1 above.

³ Cf. O. Weinreich, *Neue Jahrb.* 1926, p. 643.

⁴ Cf. A. Gwynn, *Roman Education*, pp. 175 sq.

⁵ ὦ λαοί, ἄνδρες γηγενεῖς, an old type of religious address. Cf. Aristoph. *Birds* 685 ἔγε δὲ φύσιν ἄνδρες ἀμαυρόβιοι, φύλλων γενεᾷ προσόμοιοι/ὀλιγοδρανέες, πλάσματα πηλοῦ, σκιοειδέα φύλ' ἀμενηνὰ/ἀπτῆνες ἐφημέριοι ταλαοὶ βροτοὶ ἀνέρες εἰκελόνηυροι, in a parody of an Orphic theogony (with ὀλιγοδρανέες cf. Orph. *Argon.* 430; cf. also a kindred address to men in Empedocl. fr. 124 Diels, ὦ πόποι ὦ δειλὸν θνητῶν γένος ὦ δυσάνομβον). With ὦ λαοί cf. also Micah i. 2.

that have given yourselves up to sleep and drunkenness in ignorance of God, be sober, cease to be drunken and spellbound by foolish sleep.' And they listened, and came with one heart.' The speaker is *le type d'un converti*, as Méautis says.¹ Hermetism is indeed a ground in which religion and philosophy meet, but the attitude in question had come to be at home in the latter.

Now that philosophy in this way answered spiritual as well as intellectual needs, it addressed itself to the masses and not merely to the select few. Thus Stoicism taught man to fit himself to the world order of which he was part, 'to live in accordance with nature,' and developed the theory of duties; Epicureanism sought to free him from superstitious fear of the gods and of death; Cynicism emphasised the advantages of cutting oneself adrift from all worldly interests. School rivalries could be severe, but in the sphere of popular philosophy they were least marked; thus Seneca quotes various good sayings from Epicurus.

The spread of philosophic ideas was due partly to oral teaching, given by a number of lecturers who had often something of the missionary in them, partly to books. The latter might be plain expositions, as the *Elements of Ethics* by the Stoic Hierocles: not a few belonged to or were influenced by a type known as the diatribe. The word itself means 'conversation,' and denotes in this case a species of written causerie in colloquial and pointed style.² Its invention is ascribed to Bion the Borysthenite, who flourished in the first half of the third century B.C. We possess considerable fragments of the works of his imitator Teles. In these men are exhorted to play cheerfully whatever parts Fortune has given to them on the stage of life (a recurrent metaphor), to be contented with the plainest fare and the sharpest poverty, and to bear all things with a good grace; they are taught also that the supposed evils men fear cannot deprive them of happiness, and that their spiritual need is of healing. The diatribe is Cynic in origin and continues to be coloured by Cynicism,

¹ *Aspects ignorés de la religion grecque* (1925), p. 143.

² The Pauline method of argument by question and answer may be explained thence, but it can also be brought into relation with Rabbinic practice (von Dobschütz, *Der Apostel Paulus*, i. 22 sq.).

but its use is not limited to Cynics: the Stoic Musonius wrote characteristic specimens in the first century of the Empire,¹ and some features of its style occur even in writings of the Hermetic school, to which we shall return.

It is natural to seek for traces of the influence of the style of writing here employed and of the ideas stated in it on New Testament writings. Sometimes that influence is fairly clear; the Epistle of St. James perhaps contains a strain of the diatribe, as Geffcken and Dibelius have argued: the description of the evil which the tongue (iii. 3 *sqq.*) can work seems to be a Hellenistic commonplace.² Nevertheless, it is not easy to form conclusions with any confidence. As Bonhöffer has shown in his valuable *Epiktet und das neue Testament*, many of the points of contact between the diatribe and St. Paul are to be explained from the fact that both St. Paul and the authors of diatribes used the conversational language of the day.

Much material for comparisons, as the planting and sowing of seed,³ gymnastics, wrestling, the games, triumphs, they have in common: here St. Paul may be influenced by the diatribe, or may, like the diatribe, draw his illustrations from the world around him and from its conversation. Both were trying to do similar tasks, and certain obvious methods were available.

§ 2. *Stoicism*.—In general, we may also be sceptical as to any large measure of Stoic influence on the Pauline writings. On the face of it there appears to be much common ground: yet there is such an absence in St. Paul of what is more characteristically Stoic that we may well ask if he had received more of their doctrines than had become commonplace, even though at Tarsus he may have had opportunities for hearing Stoic lectures on philosophy.⁴

¹ Cf. my *Sallustius*, pp. xxvii *sqq.* A. Bonhöffer, *R.G.V.V.* x. 102 *sqq.*, points out that the lectures of Epictetus are for the most part not diatribes in the strict sense of the term.

² Cf. Clemen, p. 363.

³ Here a religious metaphor is perhaps to be found; cf. Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erlös.* pp. 142 *sqq.* But the thought that spiritual development is like the growth of a seed is common in philosophy from Antiphon downwards (Pohlenz, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1913, p. 637).

⁴ Yet he probably was sent to Jerusalem soon after becoming a 'son of the Law' at the age of fourteen (von Dobschütz, *Der Apostel Paulus*, i. 2).

He speaks of φύσις, Nature, and its teaching (1 Cor. xi. 14), but ἡ φύσις διδάσκει need not mean more than 'the physical facts indicate what is right' and is an *argumentum ad homines*: it has a parallel in Epict. I. 16, 10, but need not come from a Stoic source. *Syneidesis*, which St. Paul uses of conscience, is not a Stoic technical term, although it has often been thought to be Stoic: the idea may come from Stoic sources, but it is not clear that the writer had first-hand acquaintance with Stoic texts. Rom. ii. 15 'who show the work of the law written in their hearts, as their conscience testifies' may look Stoic, but can more readily be explained from Hebraic ideas like Jerem. xxxi. 33: 'But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put My law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.' Though in existing Rabbinical texts this is not extended to cover the heathen,¹ in the more liberal schools of Judaism existing in St. Paul's day it may have been. At the same time, the idea in Romans that all races know God is a Hellenistic commonplace (p. 61 earlier). So also with other Stoic terms which he seems to use; it is not obvious that he uses them in their peculiar sense or with knowledge thereof. Bonhöffer has argued with great force for this view: subsequent criticism should perhaps cause some modification of his conclusions, but in general he has made a clear case against any theory of extensive influence on St. Paul of Stoic writings. At times St. Paul shows acquaintance with Stoic ideas, but he opposes them or uses them against the system to which they belong.²

At most he has used Stoic material to construct his own system, and it is likely that in so far as he has used it it is through intermediary Hellenistic Jewish writings or discussion. It is not probable that he was widely read in

¹ Strack-Billerbeck, III. 88 *sqq.*; for the Stoic parallel *cf.* M. Pohlenz, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1913, pp. 642 *sqq.* (he gives valuable material on the idea of conscience). In *Neue Jahrb.* 1926, pp. 257 *sqq.*, Pohlenz regards the emphasis which Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, laid on law in nature as due to his being Semitic.

² *Cf.* R. Liechtenhan's good book, *Die göttliche Vorherbestimmung bei Paulus und in der Posidonianischen Philosophie (Forsch. Rel. Lit. A.N.T., N.F., 18; 1922)*, pp. 5 *sqq.* For other recent work *cf.* Clemen, pp. 130 *sq.*

Greek literature. In any case, some Stoic ideas were so widely current that an educated man could not fail to be affected by them. It has recently been argued that their influence is to be traced in 1 Cor. xiii, and that chapter certainly has points of contact with popular philosophic writing of its time.¹ Yet it must be remembered that the passage in general is one of the most strikingly original things St. Paul ever wrote. Hellenistic ideas are fairly clear in the speech put in his mouth at Athens (Acts xvii) : there is no reason to suppose either that he said exactly what is attributed to him, or that he failed to make his message as presentable to Greek philosophers as he could. In it a number of commonplaces of Greek speculation must be recognised. The argument concerning men's natural belief in God is strongly tinged with Stoicism. Thus Seneca also says that God does not require temples, that He is always friendly and needs no placation, a host of writers that He needs nothing from us, Stoics and Hermetics that He gives life and health to all, Stoics that man seeks God, Dio of Prusa and Seneca that He is not far away. Stoic, again, is the idea that our existence is in God, and μετανοεῖν in v. 30 is used in the pagan sense 'change one's mind' rather than the Christian 'repent.' Most of the details are Stoic² ; once more much can be paralleled from Philo and other Jewish Greek writers.

Stoicism supplied Christianity with useful arguments for polemic, as later Epicureanism afforded valuable collections of material for the criticism of the absurdities of pagan mythology. It is difficult to see any evidence for the view that it transformed the new religion. At the same time Stoicism may well have given a *praeparatio evangelica* : R. Bultmann has recently remarked that while the matter common to Stoicism and the New Testament gave points of contact for evangelising, Christianity had what Stoicism had not, the strength and enthusiasm of a living religion and a personal faith in God, a new value for the individual and the power to arouse the human soul to its true life.³

¹ Cf. Clemen, pp. 326 sq.

² Clemen, pp. 300 sqq. A number of the commonplaces had been absorbed by Jewish Greek writers.

³ Z.N.W., 1912, p. 191.

Again, as Edwyn Bevan says, Stoicism believed that 'the Universe is governed by a Purpose towards a valuable end, but Christianity gives a positive image of this end by defining it as love.'¹ Moreover, in its later forms Stoicism had become the defender of established religion, and could thus in a measure anticipate the Christian harmonisation of the intellectual and religious instincts. In this respect, as in others, converts found in the new religion all that they had sought elsewhere, and much more also.

§ 3. *Neopythagoreanism*.—The suggestion that Neopythagorean influence is responsible for St. Paul's unfavourable attitude towards marriage² is improbable. That attitude is most readily explained as springing from the common expectation of a speedy Second Coming: the Apostle's temperament perhaps counts for something, as does also a tendency to asceticism which was then manifesting itself. Christian and pagan asceticism do in a measure come from the same soil. Certainly self-mortifications are not the peculiar property of any school or sect: in the fourth century, as has been observed, Julian was as proud of the lice in his beard as could be any monk in the Thebaid. In Eph. iv. 26 we read 'Let not the sun go down upon your wrath.' Plutarch records that Pythagoreans, if ever moved by anger to abusive words, joined hands, embraced and were reconciled before the sun set.³

This is, however, not a case of influence, rather of the transference of a moralising precept which may have become commonplace.

§ 4. *Hermeticism*.—A summary account of Hermetic literature has been given earlier in this essay (pp. 65 *sqq.*). It has some interesting things in common with the New Testament. Apart from the warning to rise from sleep and drunkenness, which they share with Mandaeen texts and which Reitzenstein would explain as due to common use of the Iranian Redeemer-myth,⁴ we note the mention of

¹ *Stoics and Sceptics*, p. 49. Again, Stoicism appealed to the dignity of the individual soul, while Christianity looked to God's grace (Pohlenz, *G.G.A.* 1913, p. 648). Cf. further Liechtenhan, *op. cit.* pp. 114 *sqq.*, for a statement of differences.

² Rightly rejected by Clemen, p. 321.

³ *De amore fratrum*, 17, p. 448 B.

⁴ But see p. 100, n. 4, above.

λογικὴ θυσία, service by reason and in the spirit, the statements that true wisdom lies in piety and that all turns to good for the elect, the description of the giving of knowledge as illumination, the eagerness to liberate the soul from the body, the emphasis on vision as transforming us,¹ and the concept of a number of the elect emancipated from the present world-order. These points of contact are perhaps most easily explained as due to a common but free use of terms and conceptions which shaped themselves in lost Hellenistic mystical writing.²

Another coincidence deserving attention arises from the notion of Fate as evil. According to the first tractate, the *Poimandres*, man can win escape from the sway of the planetary gods, which is this Fate, by knowing the truth; this knowledge means no less than the passage from death into life.³ This is not unlike Gal. iv. 3—'We were slaves to the Elements,' (regarded as personal daemonic powers, possibly without a physical connotation).⁴ 'Now, having known God or rather having been known by Him, you still go back to the Elements,' (here regarded as having been mediators in making the Law). Yet the two thoughts are quite different: the one is freedom from servitude to Fate, the other freedom from servitude to the Law. The Hermetic freedom is a freedom when the soul quits the body and passes upwards through the celestial spheres; mystically this is anticipated on earth. The Pauline freedom is an escape here and now from a worship of inferior heavenly powers and from the keeping of their ordinances, to the free worship of God. Very significant of the way in which

¹ λογικαὶ θυσίαι, *C.H.* i. 31; λογικὴ λατρεία, *ibid.* xiii. 18; *cf.* Casel's full study in *Jahrb. f. Lit.* iv. 37 *sqq.* of the antecedents of the phrase and its apt application by the apologists to the Eucharist; for all turning to good *cf.* Rom. viii. 28 with *C.H.* ix. 4; on vision *cf.* pp. 106 *sq.* above; for further references *cf.* Clemen, pp. 39 *sqq.*

² *Cf.* p. 67 above.

³ *C.H.* i. 15, 19 *sqq.*

⁴ *Cf.* 1 John iii. 14. *Cf.* K. Dieterich, ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ, i. 9 *sqq.*, for a full discussion. In the στοιχεῖα Jewish and planetary ideas meet; *cf.* also F. H. Colson, *The Week*, pp. 95 *sqq.*; an excursus of Dibelius on Col. ii. 23; Lietzmann on Gal. iv. 3 (Strack-Billerbeck, III. 370, cling to the old explanation that στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου means the religious ordinances of the world before Christianity came, regarded as an elementary stage in religious instruction. But *cf.* Col. ii. 16-20. For the elements as helping to make the Law *cf.* the Mandaean belief discussed by Reitzenstein, *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grosse*, pp. 36 *sqq.*

the terminology is handled is 'knowing, or rather known'; for the technical sense of *gnosis* another is substituted; God's knowledge of us, not our knowledge of Him, transforms our lives. Yet even here there is a Hermetic parallel, 'God is not ignorant of man: He knows him thoroughly and would be known of him. For it is only knowledge of God that brings salvation to man.'¹

The most striking similarity of Christianity and Hermetism is that, just as the former spoke of the operation of the Holy Ghost within every Christian, the latter taught that a divine *Nous* or Mind worked in and transformed the individual.²

The significant difference is, I think, that in Hermetism, as in some Christian Gnosis, man when so transformed has reached a new plane of life in which he is raised above the need for moral endeavour; in Christianity the possession of the Spirit comes to man, but he must still struggle against sin.³ The Christian has Heaven *in spe*, the Hellenistic mystic in certainty. It is the same difference which we have earlier observed between Hellenistic and Christian sacramentalism.

¹ *Corp. Herm.* x. 15; cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 287 sq. It should be noted that this use of *gnosis* had probably made its way into Judaism (Bousset, *Nachr. Gött. gel. Gesell.* 1915, pp. 466 sq.; Lietzmann, *Messe*, p. 234). Yet St. Paul knows *gnosis* as a technical term; Reitzenstein (*Myst.*³, p. 67) truly remarks that his contrast of *λόγος σοφίας* and *λόγος γνώσεως* would have been incomprehensible to a purely Greek thinker. Philo seldom uses *γνώσις* (Bousset 468) though the idea involved is familiar to him (Reitzenstein. *ibid.* p. 318); this avoidance is perhaps due to the fact that Philo is addressing the general public of cultivated Greeks and avoids an un-greek technical term. Norden has remarked (*Agnostos Theos* 89) that Clement avoids *γνώσις* in his *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus*. On the word cf. also p. 67, Clemens, p. 310, Harnack, *Terminologie der Wiedergeburt*, p. 128, and my *Sallustius*, xc₁₁₁; on the use of *τέλειος* for those who have *gnosis* (parallel to 1 Cor. ii. 6) cf. Reitzenstein, *Myst.*², 190 sqq.; ³, 338 sqq. (also 317); on its non-technical use Harnack, p. 137.

² Cf. p. 103 above.

³ In fact this moral imperative is one of the fruits of the Spirit. Man when 'justified' (p. 78) must fulfil visibly in the earthly sphere what is already an invisible reality in the sphere of divine action (Windisch, *Z.N.W.*, xxiii. p. 271). The Hermetist is not called to such actions; *κάθαιραι σεαντόν* (*C.H.* xiii. 7) refers like *ἀνακαθαίρομενος ταῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεσιν* in § 8 to the decisive divine act of justification. Afterwards if he performs what to another is a sin it is not so for him (xii. 7), and he has no Judgment to fear.

VI

CONCLUSIONS

§ 1. *The development in general.*—To study all the points of contact which have been observed between early Christian writings and pagan thought would be impossible within the present compass, and the reader who wishes to pursue the matter further has Wetstein's commentary and Clemen's invaluable survey at his disposal. We cannot linger over interesting details such as the close similarity between the qualifications required of a bishop and of a presbyter in the Pastoral Epistles on the one hand and of a general in Onosander on the other, or (to mention a matter of more moment) Pauline and Hellenistic lists of sins.¹

Glancing backwards, we have seen in the Gentile world to which Christianity came signs of preparation for a new religion of this type ; we noted a deepening of religious consciousness, a sense of sin, a readiness to accept teaching as of authority, signs of a new moral atmosphere, a philosophic standard of ethics capable of being vitalised by religion. Christianity came on the crest of a wave ; it was able to use and direct existing tendencies. If it seemed unoriginal in ethics, still it was able to give a new motive for morality, the soul's desire to show its grateful love to the God who had redeemed it, and a new stimulus, in the belief that Christ and His Spirit work in the humblest individual Christian and that he enjoys intimate personal communion with God.² To us it may seem to have much in common with other creeds of the time : yet to those who met it, it opened a new world. It is surely significant that, when Julian wished to galvanise paganism into new life, he imitated that which he opposed.

Christianity, in those early years which we know so dimly, had developed. In its passage to becoming a world-religion

¹ Cf. Clemen, p. 347, for the first point ; Deissmann, *Licht*⁴, p. 268, for the second (without forgetting Rabbinic parallels). I have not touched on the supposition of Orphic influence, against which in general cf. A. Boulanger, *Orphée*, pp. 85 sqq. ; it is to be recognised in some later eschatology (*ibid.* pp. 127 sqq.).

² Holl, *Urchristentum*, p. 24 ; Weiss, *Urchristentum*, p. 119. The difference from Hermetism, noticed p. 151, is important in this connection.

the new body of believers had clothed their tenets in Greek language, some of it philosophic and religious, and they had realised more of the implications of those tenets. They had continued their original rites, and realised more of the significance of those rites. The stream of belief, which had now received Greek tributaries to swell its original waters, was to widen further. It was to receive Rome's contribution also. To study that would take us too far; we should see how the Roman Empire helped to shape the picture of the Catholic Church,¹ how the *ciuitas dei* on earth learnt from the *ciuitas Romana*, how the Roman conception of authority strengthened the Christian, how the legal mind of the West coloured its view of man's relations with God, and how its practical tendency forced to the front problems different from those which concerned the more speculative East. None of these things were new to Christianity; all of them received new impulse from without.

To any student primarily concerned with the other religions of the Empire, Christianity stands out as curiously uncompromising, in spite of the attempts of the apologists to represent it as a reasonable Greek philosophy. Against deliberate compromise there stood firmly the intense personal devotion of the many who had found the certainty which they craved, the peace which the Roman Liturgy stresses to this day.² *Pax Domini sit semper uobiscum . . . dona nobis pacem . . . Domine Jesu Christe qui dixisti Apostolis tuis, Pacem meam relinquo uobis.* Later, when Christianity became the official religion, it was easier to be a Christian than not to be a Christian; entrance to the Church was not always the result of an enthusiastic rejection of one's religious past.

§ 2. *Why Christianity won.*—To answer in precise and rational terms the question 'Why did Christianity win in

¹ Cf. Halliday, *Background*, pp. 256 sq.; but for the antiquity of the idea of the unity of the Church see also Wetter, *Liturgien*, i. 175 (already in 1 Cor. x. 32 we have the germ of the idea of the Christians as a 'third people' distinct from Jews and Gentiles, as von Dobschütz observes, *op. cit.* i. 45). For pagan parallelism of God and the Emperor cf. *J.H.S.* 1925, 9799.

² On the idea in St. Paul cf. von Dobschütz, *op. cit.* i. 39; on history down to St. Augustine cf. H. Fuchs, *Augustin und der antike Friedensgedanke* (1926).

the conflict of religions? ' is naturally not possible. The course of such an evolution is not usually simple, and here we have to reckon with many cross-currents. It may however be of service to state some of the qualities which gave the victorious creed advantages over others.

Christianity satisfied both the religious and the philosophic instincts of the time. It offered a cultus in which the individual found his own personal needs and the desire for brotherhood in worship satisfied. This cultus shared with others the merit of giving the realisation of the means of salvation; it was superior in that the Saviour was not merely a figure of unique attraction, but also a recent historical figure invested with deity—not a mythological personage encumbered with legends which to many thinking men were positively offensive and to others were at least in need of defence¹; it was superior in that the salvation involved was a salvation from forces of moral evil, and in that the cultus itself was simple and free from primitive ritual survivals in need of allegorical explanation. While the increasing use of the Old Testament gave the requisite stamp of antiquity to the claims of Jesus, He was not limited by any over-emphasis of His home in Judaea. Mithras was and remained Persian: Jesus was universal.² Again, the new faith satisfied the desire of contemporary mystical faith for *gnosis*, special knowledge, union with deity, illumination and the like, and succeeded in combining with this a personal conception of God often lacking in Hellenistic analogues.³ At the same time, Christianity gave a dogmatic philosophy of the universe, and the philosophic tendency of the time-welcomed dogma. Men wanted not to seek truth but to be made at home in the universe.⁴ The Christian thinkers, like Clement of Alexandria, found room in their systems for

¹ Cf. a remark of the orthodox Macrobius quoted in my *Sallustius*, 153, and the third and fourth chapters of *Sallustius*. The above remarks on the contrast of Jesus and other Saviours are much indebted to Loisy, *Mystères*, p. 343. Difficulties arose from the Old Testament, cf. Hatch, *Influence*, p. 80.

² Cf. p. 77, n. 1, above. On the acceptability of prophetic allusions at the time cf. above all Hatch, *Influence*, pp. 72 sqq.

³ Wetter, *Phos*, p. 167; *ibid.* p. 162, he remarks that in the world around the content of *gnosis* was less regarded than the possession of *gnosis*.

⁴ The phrase comes from Edwyn Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics*, p. 98 (as the aim of Posidonius).

very much of Platonism, which in the second century of our era was a rising force, and both Christians and pagans found a striking similarity between philosophic and Christian teaching.¹ The resulting religious philosophy had fewer inconsistencies, fewer indigestible traditions to explain, than, for instance, the religious philosophy of Iamblichus. Here was something which might satisfy mystics like those Hermetists who disliked popular worship; here was their 'spiritual service.' Moreover, there was room in the new faith for a common-sense practical ethics,² and it had a sacred Book which, so far as we can estimate, compared and compares favourably with the other religious literature of the time.

In these points Christianity could do what other rivals claimed, and could do it better. It had another important merit. It combined belief in God's perfect justice with the conviction that He loved the sinner even in his sin and desired his salvation.³ The attraction of this to ordinary people must have been very great. At it Julian directs his bitter sarcasm, making Jesus say 'Whosoever is an adulterer, whosoever is a murderer, whosoever is accursed and wicked, let him be of good cheer and come; for I will wash him in this water and at once make him clean, and, if he falls into the same sins again, I will allow him to smite his breast and strike his head and become clean.'⁴ It freed from fear: fear of Fate, fear of *daemones*, fear of death.⁵ Other causes would contribute to the ascendancy of the

¹ Cf. Hatch, pp. 126 *sqq.* An interesting testimony to the esteem in which Plato was held is Tatian's sneer (*Oratio*, 3): γελῶ . . . καὶ τὴν τοῦ Πλάτωνος, κἄν τινες μὴ θέλωσι, τὴν περὶ τούτου (sc. τοῦ δόγματος) μίμησιν.

² Cf. M. Dibelius, *Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrici dargebracht* (1914), pp. 176 *sqq.*

³ On the philosophic difficulties which it entailed cf. Hatch, pp. 226 *sqq.*

⁴ *Convivium*, p. 336; so earlier Celsus *ap. Orig. C. Cels.* iii. 59. Holl's distinction between Christianity and its rivals on this point (*Urchristentum*, p. 16) has been met by Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, p. 98₂. But it remains true that Christianity welcomed the sinner while paganism accepted him.

⁵ Cf. Tatian, 29, p. 30. 12 συνῆκα . . . ὅτι λύει τὴν ἐν κόσμῳ δουλείαν καὶ ἀρχόντων μὲν πολλῶν καὶ μυρίων ἡμᾶς ἀποσπᾶ τυράννων; 9, p. 10. 7 ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ εἰμαρμένῃς ἐσμεν ἀνώτεροι. Compare the prayer in a Berlin magical papyrus (as emended by Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 78): ὑπεράσπισόν μου πρὸς πᾶσαν ὑπεροχὴν ἐξουσίας, δαίμονος, θρόνου, ἀρχῆς, εἰμαρμένης, and *C.H.* xii. 7; also Reitzenstein, *Myst.*³, 300 *sqq.* In modern times it is stated that a main reason for the conversion of many Oraons in Bengal to Christianity is the belief that witches have no power over Christians (*E.R.E.* ix. 507).

new religion, as for instance its exclusiveness. One mystery-cult did not exclude adhesion to another ; at most it would claim to be the authentic and oldest form of worshipping godhead. The Christian refusal to allow other worship would convey a conviction of sure knowledge which was and is psychologically effective. Further, the monarchic episcopate gave Christianity a unity and a purpose which other religions of the time lacked, and once Christianity had made considerable headway, it would gain many adherents as showing itself to be more powerful than other cults ; the Christian God could defeat the other gods.¹ Christian philanthropy and care for the dead must also have won adherents, as we may infer from Julian's counter-measures. Christian brotherhood and Christian assertion of the value of each individual soul had great attraction in an age when a nascent feudalism was tending to tie the poor more and more to their callings, and when Roman Law and those who administered it had one punishment for the *honestiores* and another for the *humiliores*.

We may here close our inquiry. It is tentative ; for new material may at any time be brought to light by the spade which will unsettle its conclusions ; it is tentative also because the volume of modern critical study is so great that an individual student cannot hope to know all that has been previously thought and learned. From this earnest endeavour of many minds much has emerged and more will emerge.

Lux crescit, decrescunt tenebrae.

¹ Cf. *J.H.S.* 1925, 94 sq. ; and on the evidential value then of miracles of healing my *Sallustius*, lxxix₁₇₇ ; for the Christian's argument from their success cf. *ibid.* lxxxviii.

II

A NOTE ON THE RESURRECTION

THE belief that Jesus did in fact rise from death is the basis of the faith of the Christian community. The Church is from its beginnings not a band of men honouring the memory of a founder who has passed from contact with them (like the followers of Epicurus), but a corporate body which feels itself animated by the Spirit of One whose rising is the guarantee that He lives and will come again, and which regards the period between that rising and that coming again as a transitory phase of history between the old order and the new.

It has often been urged that this belief in the Resurrection of Jesus is due to ideas of divine resurrection current in the contemporary world.¹ We know several such: the stories of Attis, Adonis, and Osiris. Their myths are the expression of ancient nature-symbolism. The spirit of vegetation dies every year and rises every year; his dying is kept with mourning and his rising with festivity. Thus the dying of Osiris was celebrated on 17th Athyr, the finding and reanimation of his body in the night of the 19th. Further, his rising was a type of the resurrection of his worshippers, and on his rising he is the 'first of those in the West' (the other world),² just as Christ is 'the firstfruits of those who have fallen on sleep' (1 Cor. xv. 20). For this typical resurrection there now appears to be no clear evidence in the cult of Adonis in Syria, nor again in Babylonia.³ When Adonis rose we did not know till recently, but a brilliant interpretation of a papyrus has made the third day probable.⁴ The rising of Attis was celebrated on the fourth day, March 22 being

¹ For a summary of modern views, cf. C. Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des neuen Testaments*², p. 96 sqq. This note is concerned with some aspects of early belief in the Resurrection, and not with the form in which the official narratives were later cast.

² Text from Abydos (1887-1849 B.C.), summarised by Fr. Nötscher, *Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglauben* (Würzburg, 1926), p. 59. For the idea of Christ as the first-born of the dead, cf. G. Bertram, *Festgabe Deissmann*, p. 199.

³ Nötscher, 93, 24.

⁴ G. Glotz, *Revue des études grecques*, xxxiii. (1920), p. 213.

the Day of Blood, on which he was mourned, March 25 the Feast of Joy or *Hilaria*, on which the faithful rejoiced. (It is possible that the actual coming to life was fixed in the night of the 24th, but the evidence for this is not certain.¹)

There is, then, a formal resemblance between Christian belief and some of its contemporaries. It must not, however, be allowed to obscure the great difference in content. In the pagan parallels death means defeat, the temporary worsening of life. Man mourns in sympathy with a god who suffers something imposed upon him. In the Christian commemoration the only element of mourning is the thought that *men* have betrayed and murdered Jesus. His death is itself triumph. The forces of evil have played their trump card and lost.

Mors et vita duello confluxere mirando :
dux vitae mortuus regnat vivus,

as the Easter Sequence says, with an antithesis in which early Christian writing delights.² In the pagan stories the rising again is a joyous reversal of defeat; in the Christian story it is the complement of victorious death. It may be said that Attis and Osiris saved by rising again, Jesus by dying. It is significant that pathetic realism is almost entirely absent from pictorial representations of the Passion till the Carolingian Renaissance,³ and that the Christ on the Cross is till even later a crowned figure. *Dominus regnat de ligno* is the keynote of the thought we are analysing.

Again, the pagan stories are cult legends to explain annual festivals in which are re-enacted events which happened long ago. Christianity has in Easter what looks like such a festival. It has, however, been proved that the Easter observance did not arise at once out of belief in the Resurrection, but developed later by gradual stages out of the Jewish Pascha.⁴ The notion implied in the Easter

¹ H. Hepding, *Attis*, pp. 165 *sqq.* D. Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle*, p. 130, puts the coming to life at dawn on the 25th, on slight grounds.

² Cf. J. Kroll, *Beiträge zum Descensus ad inferos* (Ind. lect. Braunsberg, 1922; Königsberg), pp. 26 *sqq.* for parallels.

³ L. Kozelka, *Römische Quartalschrift*, xxxi. (1924), 125 *sqq.* K. draws attention also to the fact that no poet (except Nonnus) till the end of the Merovingian age describes the Nailing.

⁴ E. Schwartz, *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vii. 1 *sqq.*, followed by G. Loeschke, *Jüdisches und heidnisches im christlichen Kult*, pp. 8 *sq.*

greeting 'Christ is risen' is a secondary development¹; the idea comes from this festival and from its occurrence in spring; the festival does not come from the idea.

Further, the sacred drama of the Eucharist involves Passion, Death, Resurrection; it is a dramatic re-enacting in mystery of the *opus redemptionis*. Yet whereas in the corresponding mystery ritual there was a passage from sorrow to joy, from darkness to light, there is in the Christian rite no element whatever of joyous reversal of a tragic death by a glorious resurrection.² The Sacrifice of the Cross is the climax from which any change would be an anticlimax. In it the whole soteriological work of Jesus is concentrated. This is made very clear by the Eucharistic prayer of the Hippolytan Church order: 'Who, when He was given over to His voluntary Passion, that He might break the bonds of death and rend the Devil's chains, and tread on Hell, and give light to the just, and fix bounds, and show His Resurrection,' a formula which is repeated in various liturgies.³ The conquest of death, the harrowing of Hell, the Resurrection, are for its writer implicit in the Crucifixion. It may be remarked in passing that the popularity of the concept of the descent into Hell, thought of as a harrowing, not in the more theological way as a means of delivering the saints of Judaism, may well be due to the fact that in it the conquest of death, implicit elsewhere, is explicit and able to seize the popular imagination.

These points of divergence do not exhaust the differences between Christian and pagan resurrection. In Christianity everything is made to turn on a dated experience of a historical Person; it can be seen from 1 Cor. xv. 3 that the statement of the story early assumed the form of a statement in a Creed. There is nothing in the parallel cases which points to any attempt to give such a basis of historical evidence to belief. Nor is there till the fourth century of our era any indication of an attempt to

¹ For material cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Weltuntergangsvorstellungen* (off-printed from *Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift*, 1924), 53.

² A. Dieterich, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 429, states that this element exists in the Mass. I cannot see it.

³ G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, i. 26 sqq.; J. Kroll, *op. cit.*, pp. 7 sqq.

give a moral basis and moral values to any of the pagan parallels.¹

Belief in the Resurrection was fixed by the time of St. Paul's conversion; he states it in 1 Cor. xv. 3 as 'that which I received.' He had learnt it within about ten years of the Crucifixion. The evidence at our disposal does not suggest any prototype so close as to lend probability to the supposition either that the Christians deliberately borrowed a story, or that they were unconsciously influenced by some model. This being so, it is hardly necessary to consider at length the psychological improbability which the first supposition certainly presents. But it may be remarked that while in the literary narratives of the Resurrection apologetic motives have been not unreasonably suspected, the *fact* of the Resurrection was not merely an argument whereby the community at Jerusalem might convince others; it was the presupposition of their own communal life. Their experience, deeply as it had moved them, was not necessarily accompanied by precise memory of detail; it might be urged that *on the third day* is a date which suggested itself automatically; *on the third day* and *after three days* recur so often in the Old Testament that they may be regarded as a normal interval between two events in immediate succession,² and Rabbinical writers, influenced by Hosea vi. 2 ('After two days He will revive us, in the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight'), held that the Resurrection of the dead would take place on the third day after the end of the world³; again, we find both in Persia and in Judaea the idea that the soul abides in the body for three days after death.⁴ Yet it must be remembered that in the earliest Gospel record this *third day* rests on an elaborate chronological framework of circumstances which we must regard either as historical or as a complete fabrication. The clearness of our record on this point is in striking contrast with its variations elsewhere. The simple explanation of the tradition which the first Christians bequeathed is that it represents their impression of what had happened.

¹ Cf. then the treatment of the mysteries of Attis by Iamblichus as reproduced by Julian in his fifth speech and by Sallustius, *Concerning the gods and the universe*, iv. (cf. my edition, pp. 1 sqq.).

² Cf. parallels in Wetstein's note on Matt. xii. 40. *Three days* is naturally common elsewhere.

³ Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, i. 747.

⁴ Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*², p. 27.

III

HELLENISTIC MYSTERIES AND CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS

Memoriae dilectae
GERARDI VAN DER LEEUW

This subject has been so much discussed that the reader will expect from me neither striking novelties nor a complete knowledge of what has been written about it. Nevertheless it may be worth while to try to review the situation and to submit some conclusions.¹ We have perhaps reached the point where we can think of these things *sine ira et studio*, with no desire to explain away the rise of Christianity and with no feeling that the suggestion of Hellenistic elements in it would involve something 'common or unclean'. Dom Odo Casel, whose death was so great a loss to scholarship, used the title *Die Vorschule Christi* for a chapter in which he discussed the ancient mysteries.²

¹ A first form of these remarks was delivered as one of a series of Haskell Lectures at Oberlin in 1942 and as a lecture to the University of Chicago in 1944; a second was presented to the Seventh Congress of the History of Religion at Amsterdam in 1950 (cf. *Proceedings*, 53 ff. for the text as read) and to the University of Bonn in the same year. Under the circumstances it would be hard to thank all those to whom I am indebted; but I wish to express my gratitude to my hosts and to Professors Campbell Bonner, H. J. Cadbury, Martin P. Nilsson, Morton Smith and F. R. Walton and Mr. Zeph Stewart.

For the evidence, references will be found in M. P. Nilsson, *Gesch. d. griech. Rel.*, I, 619 ff., II 85 ff., 230 ff., 291 ff., 329 ff., 596 ff.; A. J. Festugière-P. Fabre, *Le monde gréco-romain au temps de Notre-Seigneur*, II 167 ff.; Festugière, *Rev. ét. gr.* LXIV (1951), 474 ff.; Nock, *Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background* (see p. 1 ff.), *Conversion, Ricerche Religiose*, VI (1930), 392 ff., *Enc. Social Sciences*, XI 172 ff., *Camb. Anc. Hist.* x, XII. The notes which follow are intended only by way of supplement or to document individual statements.

² *Die Liturgie als Mysterienfeier*, I ff.

I

MYSTERIES AND INITIATIONS IN CLASSICAL GREECE

Like the peoples of Anatolia, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt, the Greeks had many annual or periodic ceremonies which were conducted in an atmosphere of secrecy and solemnity.¹ Some of these were restricted to special individuals or groups, while to others citizens in general or (as to the Thesmophoria) their wives were admitted. Such ceremonies were in the main agrarian and many, but not all, of them were associated with Demeter and Dionysus. These were *heilige Handlungen*, solemn actions linked to the annually recurrent cycle of nature, the fertilization of the seedcorn, the renewal of plant and animal and human life; some of them were regarded as the reliving of stories which reflected this cycle. Such renewal of life had always taken place, but it must be ensured. *Heilige Handlungen* were *Handlungen*: the emphasis was on the action and was objective and not subjective, collective and not individual.

There can be little doubt that the mysteries of Eleusis were once something of this type, a rite concerned with the daily bread and well-being of the then independent community of Eleusis. This was still independent at the time of our earliest record, the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, but the mysteries had already assumed a different aspect, and promised prosperity in this life and a better portion in the hereafter to those who had 'seen these things'. The rite retained its relation to the farmer's year, and in the fifth century the Athenians invited the Greeks in general to send first fruits to Eleusis at the time of the mysteries.² Yet these mysteries became primarily initiatory, a thing which changed the status of all who witnessed and which was

¹ The rites of Bona Dea at Rome belonged to this type and Cicero calls them *mysteria* (Wissowa, *Pauly-Wissowa*, III, 688.66). It should be noted that in the Near East and in Italy there are very few indications pointing to anything like the solemn rituals of initiation at puberty often found among primitives; such *rites de passage* as existed were not dramatic.

² Dittenberger, *Syll.* (ed. 3), 83. On the Telesterion at Eleusis cf. L. Deubner, *Abh. Berlin*, 1945/6, II; on various phases of development, Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in ancient Greece* (*Acta Inst. Athen. R. Sueciae*, Ser. in 8°, I, 1951), 36 ff., and F. R. Walton, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XLV (1952).

important to all qualified persons as individuals and not only to the Eleusinians as a group.

In early times the rite, like others of the type, was presumably attended year after year by all local inhabitants who wished to do so. Later what mattered was to have seen the holy things, and to have done so once was sufficient. Initiation was elaborated and came to involve several stages: the fluidity of the Greek language and the vagueness of many statements and allusions in the evidence leave us in doubt on essential points, but the scheme seems to have been as follows. There was first *myesis*, 'initiation préalable' as P. Roussel called it;¹ this was a purification administered at any time of year.² Initiation in the Small Mysteries at Agra(e) was also required before initiation in the Great Mysteries at Eleusis, in Boedromion; last came *epopteia*, at least a year later, at the same place and time. The first stage mentioned may be an old prerequisite but the second is something originally independent and only later incorporated in the scheme. The fourth must be a later accretion; the Homeric Hymn speaks of 'seeing' in a manner which implies that there was only one essential rite and that no higher blessedness was to be had. Presumably *epopteia* was created when Eleusis drew men from far and near, whether it was to attract them to come again or from a natural human penchant for elaboration.³

With the growth of Athens and the influx of non-Athenians to Eleusis, initiates who were not performing some special function in the Telesterion must have been in general

¹ *Bull. Corr. Hell.* LIV (1930), 51 ff. This *myesis* could be administered either at Eleusis or at Athens (B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, XIV, 1945, 77).

² In Aristoph. *Pax* 374 a man in imminent danger of death desires *myesis*; if he means this 'initiation préalable', it must have been credited with some general efficacy. Yet he probably has in mind the chain of acts culminating in initiation at Eleusis; for dramatic effect, Aristophanes could ignore the fact that Trygaeus, whenever he received 'initiation préalable', would have to wait till Boedromion and go to Eleusis if he was to become an initiate (cf. L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, 78 n. 12).

³ First mentioned in *Syll.* 42, a text to be used in Meritt's revised form, *l.c.*, 61 ff. (cf. *Supp. epigr. gr.* x, 6). There remain gaps; but the text as it stands specifies fees to be paid for admission to the Smaller Mysteries and to the Greater Mysteries, but none for *epopteia*. Is it possible that the *epoptai* mentioned (p. 78) are old initiates attending the mysteries again at a time before the pressure of those who wished to become *mystai* made this impossible for those who had no special qualification? For development at Eleusis, cf. Nilsson I 621.

excluded after *epopteia* from presence at the celebration. The building could not seat more than 3,000 persons; that is conclusive.¹ Old initiates no doubt commonly took part in the procession to Eleusis² and may have waited inside or outside the precinct while the sacred action was proceeding in the Telesterion; they could not normally witness it again.

A new type of ceremony and a new view of the potential implications of public ritual thus came into being and had many repercussions. Eleusis acquired immense prestige; the rise of Athens and of Athenian literature to cultural

¹ For the size of the Telesterion cf. *Guide Bleu, Grèce* (ed. 1935), 192 (The suggestion that others stood in the central space seems to me improbable). In addition to the priestly participants and the initiates there were the *mystagogoi* (Plut. *Alcib.* 34, 6). In spite of Philostr. v. *Soph.* II, 1, 12, Himer. *Orat.* xxiii 8 and the metaphor in Menander's fragment about the *daimon* of the individual (fullest text in J. Demiańczuk, *Suppl. com.*, 60), it is unlikely that there was one *mystagogos* for each *mystes*; yet it is probable that their number was appreciable. Our first detailed information about *mystagogoi* comes from a text (unfortunately mutilated) of about the first century B.C. published by J. H. Oliver, *Hesp.* x (1941), 65 ff. Here they are an official body as at Andania (*Syll.* 736, 149; cf. the *paragogeis* at the Theban Kabirion, *I.G.* VII 2428, and the apparently single *mystagogos* at Panamara, for whom as primarily guiding the priest cf. Roussel, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* LI, 1927, 127, n. 5) and apparently responsible for the carrying out of regulations; in particular they were concerned with the *deltaria* or lists of those approved for initiation. This may be part of the late Hellenistic revival and elaboration of ritual known from the texts published by Meritt, *Hesp.* xi (1942), 293 ff. and Roussel, *Mél. Bidez*, 819 ff. It is of course possible that the responsibilities of the *mystagogos* ended at the door of the Telesterion. Oliver's text may represent a measure taken after the discovery of two unauthorized Acarnanians in the sanctuary in 200 B.C. (Liv. xxxi 14, 7; cf. S. Accame, *Riv. Fil.* LXIX, 1941, 189 f. on what may have been an attempt by Philip V to conciliate Athenian opinion). P. R. Arbesmann, *Das Fasten bei den Griechen u. Römern (Relg. Vers. Vorarb.* XXI 1), 81 f. suggests that initiation was given on more than one night of the mysteries; but cf. Luc. *Alex.* 38 for three distinct days of ritual in Alexander's ceremonial, (read *τελοσυμένην* for *τελουμένων*, with G. Zuntz, *Cl. Q.* XLIV, 1950, 69 f.) which initiated some of the external forms of Eleusis. I do not suggest that we can infer a comparable sequence of actions, but certainly the last day was marked by the special ceremony of *plemochoai*, which (apart from the formula) could be described without impropriety (Athen. 496 A-B).

In some sanctuaries old initiates were no doubt present repeatedly; so at Ephesus (*Syll.* 820; the *mystai* join with the priestesses in performing the mysteries).

² We should not take literally the 'about 30,000 men' of the vision in Hdt. viii 65, but the passage implies that a large proportion of the Athenian populace took part: cf. Andoc. I III 'when we (the people) came from Eleusis'. Later the *epheboi* as a body went in full armor to escort the procession; there was an intention 'that they might become more pious men' (*Syll.* 885).

primacy certainly contributed to this.¹ New rituals arose and ancient rituals were modified or re-interpreted in consequence. Thus the rites on Samothrace, which Galen twice mentions in the same breath as those of Eleusis,² were undoubtedly very old. These belonged to the 'Great Gods', mysterious deities who were often but not always identified with the Cabiri. In view of Bengst Hemberg's *Die Kabiren*,³ a most thorough and penetrating discussion of one of the darkest corners of Greek religion, we should perhaps think of a Cabiric type of deity rather than of the Cabiri themselves as being worshipped here. A sacred precinct and an independent 'ritual area', both of the seventh century, have been discovered on the island and a covered building, which could serve for special ceremonies, was erected by about 500 B.C.⁴ The rites may well have had by then some wider reputation in the North Aegean region, but the fact that Samothrace was a member of the Athenian Empire no doubt helped to interest the Athenians and perhaps others. In Roman times at least, the influence of Eleusis is clear, for we find the two grades of *mystes* and *epoptes*. Samothrace devised a special attraction; both grades could be attained at any time of year, and even successively on the same day.⁵

A corresponding antiquity may be ascribed to the rites on Lemnos which are expressly described as belonging to the Cabiri. They won the devotion of the Athenian settlers on the island and of men born elsewhere: inscriptions recently published preserve honorific decrees passed in the second half of the fourth century by 'the *isoteleis* and the People

¹ Note specially the reference in the Delphic paean to Dionysus (Diehl, *Anth. Lyr.* ed. I, II 253), l. 32.

² *De usu partium*, VII 14, XVII 1 (i 418, ii 448 Helmreich). At Pergamon the *epheboi* in general received a Cabiric initiation (Dittenberger, *Or. gr. inscr. sel.* 764).

³ Uppsala, 1950.

⁴ K. Lehmann, *Hesp.* XIX (1950), I ff., XX (1951), I ff., XXI (1952), 19 ff. and *Am. J. Arch.* LV (1951), 195 f.

⁵ Lehmann (-Hartleben), *Am. J. Arch.* XLIV (1940), 345 ff.; the *symmystai* (356) probably had their fees paid by *mystai* (cf. Ch. Picard, *Ephèse et Claros*, 304). On the copying of Eleusis cf. Farnell in Hastings, *Enc. Rel. Eth.* VII 630 f.; Nock, *Am. J. Arch.* XLV (1941), 577 ff. (The rite of *thronosis* there inferred might have corresponded to 'initiation préalable' at Eleusis).

of the initiated' and perhaps a little later by 'the assembly of the initiated'. In other words, there was a congregational spirit and non-Lemnian initiates living on the spot could be given the status of associate membership; one of these latter accepted a religious function involving personal expense.¹ Samothrace was to make a greater impress on the world but the Lemnian evidence shows a notable creativeness and Lemnos, it will be remembered, had old and close associations with Athens.

The Eleusinian mysteries were performed only at Eleusis and (except by legal fiction, to gratify some potentate²) only at the canonical times. The Greeks had however other initiations which were not subject to such restrictions. As always in the development of Greek religion after the Heroic Age, Dionysus counted for much. He had not only numerous civic rites, many of them mysteries of the *heilige Handlung* type, but also private groups of voluntary worshippers. In spite of early institutionalization, his worship retained or could recapture an element of choice, movement, and individual enthusiasm. Most of our evidence for Dionysiatic initiation is later, but the choral songs of the *Bacchae* of Euripides tell their story. So does the tale in Herodotus IV 79 about the disastrous eagerness of Scyles the Scythian to become an initiate of Dionysus Bakcheios; so, again, the inscription at Cumae which provides that no one who had not become a *bakchos* could be buried in a particular place.³ In the classical age these, like the indications of private initiations in the cult of the kindred god Sabazius, are isolated data. After Alexander there is abundant evidence for initiation and in Ptolemaic Egypt this type of worship assumed dimensions sufficient to cause governmental regulation. In general I am inclined to think that, apart from the devotion of the sick to Asclepius, Dionysus provided the single strongest focus for private spontaneous

¹ S. Accame, *Ann. sc. arch. Atene, N.S.* III/v (1941-1943), 89 ff. and 76 (cf. 87, of the end of the fifth cent. and 82); J.-L. Robert, *R. ét. gr.* LVII (1944), 221.

² Plut. *Demetr.* 26; *Syll.* 869 n. 18; Wilamowitz *Glaube*, II 476.

³ Cumont, *Rel. orient.* (ed. 4), 197, 306 n. 17. Aristoph. *Ran.* 357 is perhaps significant in spite of the metaphorical character of 356.

pagan piety using ceremonial forms.¹ Dionysiac initiations did not only, like those of Eleusis and Samothrace, confer a new status on the initiate: they also admitted him to groups of likeminded persons, possessed of the same status and often of a similar hope for the hereafter² —not exactly to a Church, but to congregations which used the same symbols and spoke the same language. We know from Apuleius that an initiate could count upon other initiates to recognize an allusion to things which they held sacred.³

Before we pass on, a word is due to Plato's association of Dionysus with the 'madness that initiates'; this refers to the purifications which the god was thought able to give. For all his insistence on rigid dialectic, Plato had a profound appreciation of the non-rational. He speaks also, and repeatedly, of similar rites of the Corybantes; the way in which he does so implies that they were familiar.⁴ Eleusinian initiation was received once for all, like the call which the veiled god in the *Bacchae* of Euripides claims to have received from Dionysus.⁵ There were also these other *teletai* (cf. p. 118, later) which could, like inoculations, be repeated at need, when a man wished to be freed from possession or defilement; the Superstitious Man in Theophrastus went once a month to the Orpheotelestai. Even the humbler rites had the quality implied in Aristotle's statement that those being initiated did not have to learn something but rather to experience something and to be put in a given state of mind.⁶ They were ways of changing man's spiritual

¹ Cf. Festugière, *R. Bibl.* 1935 and Nilsson, *Bull. soc. roy. lettres de Lund*, 1951/2. On the Ptolemaic edict see now F. Sokolowski, *J. Jur. Pap.* III (1949), 137 ff. and Zuntz, *Cl. Q.* XLIV (1950), 70 ff.

² Cf. Nock, *Am. J. Arch.* L (1946), 148. G. P. Carratelli, *Dioniso*, VIII (1940/1), 119 ff. published a small cylindrical base of white marble from Rhodes, not later than the first cent. B.C., with the text of Arist. *Ran.* 454-9. This means that the belief there expressed was taken seriously; and, since there is no name of a dedicator, the inscription is probably due to some guild of initiates of Dionysus or Demeter rather than to an individual. Cf. Robert, *R. Ét. gr.* LIX/LX (1946/7), 335 f.

³ *Apol.* 55.

⁴ *Phaedr.* 265B; cf. I. M. Linforth, *U. Cal. Publ. Cl. Phil.* XIII (1946), 121 ff. and Fr. Pfister, *Würzb. Jahrb.* II (1947), 187 f.; also E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 64 ff.

⁵ 466 ff.

⁶ Fr. 15 Rose; *Dial. Frag.* p. 79 Walzer. There was of course something to learn: cf. Pindar, *Fr.* 137 S., Apul. *Apol.* 55 (*studio veri*) and Origen's metaphorical use (p. 208 n. 1).

relation to reality; they were not like ordinary cult-acts in which the individual played his matter-of-fact part as a voluntary agent, by sacrificing or making vows or joining in a procession.

II

MYSTERIES IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD: THE METAPHORICAL USE OF MYSTERY TERMINOLOGY

The Hellenistic Age, as introduced by the conquests of Alexander, brought the transplantation rather than the transformation of Greek culture. Such transformation as occurred was largely an extension of developments manifesting themselves in the latter part of the fifth century. The old Greek rites continued: the prestige of Demeter at Eleusis perhaps gained and the popularity of Dionysus certainly did; he might be called the god of Macedonian and Greek expansion into the Near East. Such things flourished on alien and on familiar soil alike; but there were also new growths.

In pre-Ptolemaic Egypt, as in Babylonia, there were no initiates in the Greek sense as it has been described; the terms which appear to correspond are explained as referring to persons who were admitted to participation in secret ceremonies and priestly lore.¹ In the course of time, and probably (though not certainly) before the beginning of the Christian era new initiatory rites were developed for Isis, Mithras,² Cybele,³ Attis etc. Like those of Eleusis and Dionysus, they conveyed the assurance of a higher status, the sense of a closer relationship to the divine, the

¹ Cf. M. Alliot, *Bull. Inst. fr. arch. orient.* xxxvii (1937/8), 142; at least four worshippers of 'Isi Dieu-Vivant' are 'renouvelés de vie'. In general, cf. Wiedemann in Hastings, *Enc.* vi 275.

² I wish to withdraw the suggestion (*Conversion*, 278) that Athanas. v. *Anton.* 14 refers to an initiation; cf. rather R. Reitzenstein, *Sitzungsber. Heidelberg.* 1914, viii, 12 and J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique* 193 ff. For important evidence on *mystai* at Rome, cf. Cumont, *C. R. Ac. Inscr.* 1945, 397 f. To judge from Apul. *Met.* xi 30 (cf. Plut. *Is.* 3, p. 352), initiates in the special sense of Isis sometimes assumed in an honorary capacity the functions of the lower clergy in Egypt; hence their shorn heads.—On Mithraism cf. now St. Wikander, *Et. sur les mystères de Mithras (Veitenskaps-Societetens i Lund, Årsbok, 1950)*, 1.

³ In spite of *Conversion*, 69 *Initium Caiani* has nothing to do with mysteries; cf. *J. Rom. St.* xxxviii (1948), 156 f.

hope (if not the dogmatic assurance) of some sort of blessedness in the hereafter. Like those of Dionysus and unlike those of Eleusis, they could be administered at any place or time. We must not underestimate their emotional depth or overestimate their antiquity and dissemination. Only in the cult of Mithras which, as Nilsson has said (*Gesch.* II 648; new ed. 675), was 'eine einmalige Schöpfung eines unbekanntem religiösen Genies', was the range of initiates co-extensive with the range of worshippers.

We have considered various types of mystery and initiation, all indeed involving some quality of what seemed to be religious experience, some sense of greater intimacy with the unseen world, but divisible into a variety of types. Such distinctions are valid and necessary. Yet we must not suppose that the ancients differentiated in our analytic way or were fully conscious of the diversity of these phenomena. Julian the Apostate speaks of the annual dramatic rites of Cybele and Attis as *mysteria* and treats them as parallel to the Eleusinian mysteries.¹ The Eleusinian pattern was so deeply rooted in literature and tradition that those who 'saw' the annual Finding of Osiris may often have treated it as being something of this sort; this attitude is anticipated in Herodotus, and certainly a deep sense of personal participation and spiritual assurance was thus secured.

Mysteria (mainly like the neutral word *orgia*, used of rites as a *pluralis tantum*) and *telete*, like other Greek words, had a persistent unity which transcended varieties of meaning; the Greeks did not use dictionaries like ours, still less dictionaries giving a range of equivalents in another language. *Mysterion* (in the singular) had the additional sense of 'something secret' without any ceremonial associations; this is known chiefly from Biblical Greek and from what derives from it, but is found outside that range also.² *Telete* from of old denoted any solemn rite, including the Panathenaea

¹ v 169A, 173A; the *mystai* of 179C may well be a special group.

² Cf. Wilamowitz, *Glaube*, II 45 n. 4; Nock, *Harv. St. Cl. Phil.* LX (1951), 201 ff. K. Prümm, *Z. kath. Theol.* LXI (1937), 395 has rightly stressed the predominance of the plural when denoting a pagan rite, in contrast to the singular *mysterion*, as 'secret' in Paul. For an instance of the singular describing a rite cf. Buckler-Calder-Guthrie, *Mon. As. min. ant.* IV 281.

which had nothing esoteric about it;¹ it was also used to denote the consecration of a gem or of whatever else (including a procedure) was to be invested with supernatural properties.²

The fluid nature of the terminology is clear. Isis taught men *myeseis* in general³ and Orpheus *teletai*;⁴ initiation and secret appear side by side in astrological texts,⁵ as in Melito (p. 137, later). The terminology, as also the fact, of mystery and initiation acquired a generic quality and an almost universal appeal. So Alexander of Abonuteichos devised a *telete*, with Eleusinian attributes, as an added attraction for his new oracle. Under the Empire certain delegates sent by cities to consult the oracle of Apollo at Claros underwent a rite, possibly purificatory, described by the verb *myethenai*, and entered some special part of the sanctuary (*embateuein*); the inscriptions set up at their expense speak also of performing or receiving the mysteries. It must have been a question of some optional preliminary to consultation. One of the delegates paid the costs for his young companions to go through the ceremony; but it can hardly have meant much more than the preliminaries to the consultation of Trophonius at Lebadea, save that the latter were compulsory (the consultants there appear as private individuals and not as delegates).⁶

So at Panamara in Caria, where there had been seasonal ceremonies earlier, mysteries available at any time were apparently added and there was vigorous propaganda on behalf of the sanctuary.⁷ We must not be deceived by the

¹ Pind. *P.* ix 97; C. Zijderveld, *Telete* (Diss. Utrecht, 1934).

² On such consecration cf. C. Bonner, *Studies in magical amulets*, 14 ff.; Festugière, *Cl. Phil.* XLV (1951), 82 f.

³ W. Peek, *Isishymnus*, 122 f.; R. Harder, *Abh. Berlin*, 1943, xiv, 21, 41.

⁴ Aristoph. *Ran.* 1032.

⁵ *Gnomon*, xv (1939), 361 f. Was Apollo called *mystes* (Artemidor. II 70 p. 168 Hercher) because he was thought to know hidden things?

⁶ Picard, *Ephèse et Claros*, 303 ff.; Nilsson II 456. A Scholiast on Aristophan. *Nub.* 508 uses the term *myesis* of those consulting Trophonius; this involved elaborate preparations and repeated examination of the entrails of victims to determine whether this or that man might approach Trophonius. Yet Venetus and Ravennas lack the passage and it may be Byzantine.

⁷ Roussel, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* LI (1927), 123 ff. (cf. Hanslik-Andrée, *Pauly-Wissowa*, XVIII, iii, 450 ff.); note *ib.* 130 on the deliberate policy of Panamara.

various claims of immemorial antiquity. There was creative innovation; new rites were invented and old rites were modified or at least reinterpreted, e.g., to give them a relation to the now widespread interest in the heavenly bodies.¹ Nevertheless, we are sometimes dealing with innovation in terminology rather than with innovation in practice. Nilsson, who has done justice to the existence of innovation, has also remarked rightly of the cult of Dionysus in later times, 'On soupçonne parfois que les mystères étaient plutôt une façon de parler qu'une réalité, ce qui n'empêche pas que le sentiment mystique en ce qui concerne le dieu fût une réalité très forte'.²

This terminology was capable of wider applications. The conférencier Aristides, who tells in detail and with obvious sincerity of the deities to whom he turned in ill health and of their aid, recounts one vision vouchsafed by Sarapis; ladders between the parts below and those above earth, the power of the god in either realm, and other things causing wondrous astonishment and perhaps not to be told to all men. 'Such', he says, 'was the content of the *telete*'.³ Apart from one possible exception in a papyrus,⁴ there is no other indication of any mysteries of Sarapis himself; even Lucius in Apuleius was not offered one. It would be rash to deny

¹ Cf. Nilsson, *Hommages Bidez-Cumont* (Coll. Latomus, II), 217 ff. and *Gesch.* II 665 (add perhaps that Pausan. VIII 31, 7 records the presence in the temple of the Great Goddesses at Megalopolis of a statue of Helios called Soter and Heracles, which implies the 'physical' interpretation of Heracles discussed by Jessen, *Pauly-Wissowa*, VIII 73, and by Gruppe, *ib. Supp.* III 1104). For the claim of immemorial antiquity cf. Apul. *Met.* XI 5, 5 *aeterna mihi nuncupavit religio*, of the Ploiaphesia, which must have been a Hellenistic creation. For innovations cf. Nilsson, *Hess. Bl. f. Volkskunde*, XLI (1950), 7 ff. and Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxvii (1934), 96 f.

² *Studi e Materiali di Storia di Religione*, x (1934), 15; cf. his paper in *Serta Kazaroviana*, I (*Bull. Inst. Arch. Bulg.* XVI, 1950), 17 ff. and *Gesch.* II 351 ff. Cf. again the description on coins of a contest at Side as *mystikos* and of the city as *mystis* (*B.M.C. Lycia* 162 f.; F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Kleinas. Münzen*, 343, 346); also L. Robert, *Rev. phil.* 1943, 184 n. 9 on 'mysteries' of Antinous.

³ XLIX 48, p. 424 Keil (i 500 f. Dindorf).

⁴ H. C. Youtie, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xli (1948), 9 ff. publishes a Karanis papyrus letter (re-edited as P. Mich. 511) of the first half of the third century A.D. The writer tells his father that the charge for a *σιωπητικός* at the banquet of Sarapis which is to take place in two months is 24 drachmae and that for a place is 22; instead of making these payments he proposes to undertake the position of an *agoranomos* which would free him from them and ensure him double portions (cf. E. Seidl, *Studia et documenta*

the possibility of the sporadic existence of such mysteries, but in the passage cited the *telete* was the dream itself; Sarapis showed to Aristides the hidden things of the underworld; he saw them as Lucius did in his Isiac initiation. Elsewhere Aristides speaks of a revelation from Asclepius as 'like some *telete*' and says of another experience 'almost as though in a *telete*, good hope being present to me together with fear'.¹ Again, the medical writer Arataeus tells of people who in religious madness slashed themselves and who, if they recovered their sanity, were cheerful and care-free, as having become initiates of the deity.²

The metaphor was common in less specifically religious contexts; Mnesimachus in a comedy spoke of sleep as being the Small Mysteries of death.³ Above all, the experi-

historiae et iuris, xv, 1949, 351). After telling his father of his consequent need of wood, he says, 'For a man cannot refuse Lord Sarapis'. Youtie argues powerfully that *siopetikhos* here, like *σειρητής* in a text published by Vogliano-Cumont, *Am. J. Arch.* xxxvii, 1933, 215 ff, is a religious term and means something like a silent novice who still has to become a full initiate. Certainty is unattainable and a cult could anywhere develop new forms; further, as has been seen, there was a taste for language suggesting mysteries even when there was little actuality to correspond. The statement that one cannot refuse Sarapis might be interpreted as implying a dream-command like those of Apul. *Met.* xi (to be sure a soldier says he received one to give a banquet for Sarapis: Preisigke-Bilabel, *Sammelbuch*, 8828; cf. the Zoilus story in *Conversion*, 49 f.), but may be more general (cf. n. on P. Mich. 511, 15 f.). In any event, the language of the text suggests to me nothing esoteric in the banquet. Youtie 12 n. 15 refers to a thank-offering to Sarapis and Isis by *mystai kai dekatistai* (G. Mendel, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* xxiv, 1900, 366 f.), but these *mystai* could be initiates of Isis. Artemid. II 39 p. 145 Hercher speaks of Sarapis, Isis, Anubis, Harpocrates, their images and their mysteries; these mysteries are spoken of as specially indicating grief, since even if their allegorical sense is different, the myth points to this, which strongly suggests that Artemidorus is thinking of the annual Search by Isis for Osiris.

C.I.L. II 2395, supplemented by *Ann. épigr.* 1897 no. 86, 1898 no. 2 and J. Leite de Vasconcellos, *Religiões da Lusitania* III 345, gives a dedication 'to highest Sarapis and the mysteries' (The reading in the gap is uncertain; Vasconcellos gives *σὺν μύθρᾶν*, which I find hard to accept. R. Cortez, *Panoias*, mentioned in *Am. J. Arch.* LIV, 1950, 399 n. 27 is not accessible to me). The text, together with others (cf. Vasconcellos, 468 f.), comes from a sanctuary which was the concern of an individual who seems to have been a little like Artemidorus of Thera (Wilamowitz, *Glaube*, II 387 ff.). One mentions the dedication of an *aeternus lacus*. I doubt whether any normal cult can be inferred.

¹ L 7, p. 427K (i 503D); XLVIII 28, p. 410K (i 472D); cf. XLVIII 33 p. 402K (i 474D), where A. says that any initiate will understand his mingled feelings when Asclepius drew near (initiation being here a generalized or metaphorical type); L 50 p. 438K (i 517D), where he expresses anxiety as to whether he should reveal a grace of Asclepius; XLVII 71 p. 393K (i 463D) where he says that he does not think it right to tell lightly just what the god said to him.

² III 6, II, p. 44 Hude.

³ III 579 Meineke; II 442 fr. II Kock.

ence of philosophic discipleship evoked such comparison. Philosophy was thought to transform men: it opened windows in heaven; its disciples were set apart from *idiotai*, outsiders who lived uninformed lives; the Pythagorean vow of secrecy was a fact familiar to all educated men. When Aristophanes represented entry into the thinking-shop of Socrates under the form of an initiation, he was using intelligible sarcasm. Plato used the imagery of initiation; playfully in the *Euthydemus*, with most solemn seriousness in the *Symposium*. After all, the Seventh Letter shows that he was convinced that any deeper understanding of the universe could not be communicated as mere information or technique.¹

The imagery was widely used, appearing even in so seemingly dry a systematizer as Chrysippus.² Seneca speaks of the initiatory rites of philosophy (*Ep.* 90, 28), 'which open not some local shrine, but the vast temple of all the gods, the universe itself, whose true images and true likeness philosophy has brought before the mind's eye'. So Galen (p. 181 n. 2) speaks of a new piece of evidence for the purposefulness of the body's structure as a *telete* by no means inferior to those of Eleusis and Samothrace, and of the study of such teleology in general as a *telete* in which all who honor the gods should be initiated; it is superior to those of Eleusis and Samothrace, for they give faint indications, to demonstrate what they would teach, while the indications of nature are clear in all living beings.

III

MYSTERION AND THE METAPHOR OF MYSTERIES IN JUDAISM

The metaphor of initiation fitted other things also,³ but its application to philosophy was to have consequences in Hellenistic Judaism and more later in Christianity. From of old the Jews in Palestine had known the dramatic rites

¹ P. 341C; cf. *Gnomon*, XIII (1937), 163 ff.

² *St. vet. fragm.* II 42, 1008.

³ So by way of parody in the Lucianic *Tragodopodagra*; note 30 ff., 113 ff., the contrast with the *galloi*. Cf. *Harv. St. Class. Phil.* LX (1951), 201 ff. and add Plut. *Flaminin.* 2 (of statesmanship), *Cic.* 22, 2 (young participants in the drama of the end of the Catilinarians as like initiates

of Tammuz, but they had been taught to regard all such things as meaningless idolatry, and their brethren in Mesopotamia can hardly have taken much interest in the dramatic festivals of the land. Now, the conquests of Alexander and the growth of a great Jewish colony in Alexandria brought some contact with Greek worship, and, what was more important, the use of the Greek language; hence came our Septuagint. In this *mystis* appears once (*Sap. Sal.* 8, 4) in the sense of 'one metaphorically initiated in knowledge'; otherwise *mysteria* and *teletai* are used of pagan rites as objects of condemnation. *Mysterion* is here used also as 'secret', whether of a king or commoner or of God, or with the important nuance of 'thing with hidden meaning' (e.g. in Daniel 2, 18 in connection with the king's dream).¹

Again, life in Alexandria caused some Jews to become acquainted with Greek thought at a high level and to discover that there were Gentiles who maintained rigid moral standards and something like monotheism. From this sprang a philosophy of revealed religion and a doctrine of grace known to us in the writings of Philo. He refers to pagan cult-mysteries with abhorrence but finds the philosophic metaphor of initiation congenial. So he speaks with deep feeling of Great and of Small mysteries, of initiation by Moses, of Jeremiah as hierophant. Except with reference to the priestly consecration of Aaron and his sons, which was a thing done once for all in the past and not a contemporary ceremony, he never, I think, applies the metaphor to ritual.²

in the rites of an aristocratic régime); Joseph. *C. Ap.* II 188 (Jewish state compared, to its advantage, with a *telete*); Plut. *Tranq.* 20 p. 477D (life as a *myesis* and *telete*). When Demetrius of Phaleron spoke of there being much of the hierophant (*τελέτης*) in Plato (*D. Hal. Demosth.* 5, *Pomp.* 2, 6; cf. *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, XI 170), he was thinking in metaphorical terms; the officiant at an initiation can hardly have uttered more than brief liturgical phrases. Cf. (Demetr.) *Eloc.* 101; also Hermog. *Id.* I 6 p. 246 *Rabe μυστικῶς τι καὶ τελεστικῶς κτλ.*

¹ Cf. 'His marvellous mysteries in Eternal Being' in one of the new Dead Sea Scrolls (W. H. Brownlee, *Bull. Am. Sch. Or. Res.* CXXI, 1951, 12; also I. Rabinowitz, *J. Bibl. Lit.* LXXI, 1952, 22, 27 f., citing also mysteries of evil). On *τελικόμενος* in Deut. 23, 18 cf. F. H. Colson, *Philo*, VII 285 n. (also Hosea 4.14 in LXX).

² Cf. *Sacr. Abel* 62, *Cherub.* 49 (cf. 48), *V. Mos.* II 149 (where the suggestion was perhaps given by *τελείωσις* in Exod. 29, 22, 26. Levit. 8, 22 and *τελειῶσαι* in Exod. 29, 29); also *Gnomon* XIII 156 ff. and H. A. Wolfson, *Philo*, I 43 ff.

Instead he uses it of intimations of divine truth, of precious nuances in the interpreting of revelation. It was a way of expressing mystical or prophetic intuitions which came to a man as though from without, so that he seemed to himself to be acted upon rather than acting. Philo found the metaphor readymade, in a context free from any serious taint of idolatry.

One more word on Philo before we pass to Christian sacramentalism. His interest in the past was primarily concentrated on the Pentateuch, and not least on the Exodus and the revelation of Sinai. This was the significant story of the nation and for Philo this, like all Scripture, contained the significant story of the individual. The manna and the water from the rock alike stood for the Logos, and manna stood for the food of the soul; Pascha as passover indicated the nation's deliverance from Egypt and passing through the Red Sea, and also the soul's passing over from passions to virtue.¹

The same events were central in the thought of Palestine; there, as throughout Jewry, every Passover time brought the remembrance and telling forth (one might almost say the reliving) of the national liberation. There, as throughout Jewry, there could at all times be the hope that Israel would someday be ransomed from her present subjection as of old she had been from Egypt. It was in fact thought that the earlier ransoming prefigured what was to come. Once more there would be miracles; Israel's enemies would be chastised; the Messiah would cause manna to fall from heaven; he would bring forth water to quench his people's thirst. As the Law was of old given in the earlier time of crisis, so (at least in later Jewish thought) there would be a Torah of the Messiah, i.e. an authoritative explanation.²

¹ *Leg. All.* II 86, III 169; *Quis r. div. her.* 79, 192; *Q. det. pot.* 115; F. J. Dölger, *Ant. u. Chr.* II (1930) 66 ff.; p. 208 n. 1 later. For the concept of the gifts of God to the Jews at this time cf. L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, III 47 ff., 65 etc.; *ib.* I 9, III 46 on manna as the food of the blessed in the world to come. The parallel of bread and word appears already in Deut. 8, 3. Cf. Morton Smith, *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels* (*J. Bibl. Lit. Monog. Ser.* VI, 1951) 157 f.—On ideas about the Passover cf. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, 30 n. 2, 89; Ch. Mohrmann, *Ephem. liturg.* LXVI (1952) 37 ff.

² For the antiquity of the domestic observance of the Passover, independent of the sacrifice and therefore correct outside Jerusalem, cf. L.

Such hopes and expectations were intensified in Palestine by the political events of the first century B.C. and the succeeding decades. These things must be borne in mind if we are to try to understand what John the Baptizer and Jesus did and how their actions were interpreted—and in particular how baptism and the Eucharist took their shape and place in a Jewish milieu.

IV

BAPTISM AND THE EUCHARIST AS 'DONA DATA'

Ritual ablutions were common in Palestine and to the East of it,¹ and were well established in Jewish and Gentile practice. Nevertheless, John introduced a *novum*, a dramatic piece of prophetic symbolism which moreover required action of others—namely that they should submit to a washing in Jordan (or other running water): this should attest a drastic moral reorientation and bring remission of past sins. It was an emergency measure recommended in view of the impending crisis as it was now proclaimed.² The ministry of Jesus was believed to begin with his baptism by John and the descent of the Spirit upon him at that time. After his death the disciples, who deemed themselves to be Jesus' earthly representatives now and his predestined coadjutors hereafter, continued the practice, which now involved the assumption of a new loyalty to Jesus as the Christ. These

Ginzberg *ap.* G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, III 174. For the general associations involved cf. H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Komm. z. N.T. aus Talmud u. Midrasch*, I 85 ff., II 481, IV 1 ff.; and for the possibility that something like a pillar of fire and of the cloud was expected in the Messianic Age cf. F. H. Colson on Philo, *Praem. poen.* 165 (VIII 418).

¹ Cf. J. Thomas, *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*. Much of his material is later than the emergence of Christianity and the reader will note the criticisms of H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie u. Geschichte d. Judentums*, 57; but at least wherever daily or repeated baptisms occur, this older background is to be recognized. Thomas has now published a brief and good discussion in *Realex. f. Ant. u. Chr.* I 1167 ff.

² On prophetic symbolism, cf. H. Wheeler Robinson, *J. Theol. Stud.* XLIII (1942), 129 ff. Baptism corresponded, again, to the blood smeared on the lintel at the time of the original Passover and to the mark in Ezekiel 9, 4.—Cf. now Carl H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist*, 95 ff. and in general H. G. Marsh, *Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism*. M. makes a good case for the view that proselyte baptism supplied a model for John. It certainly existed in his time, but he was not necessarily familiar with it and I prefer the other explanation. Note Marsh 153 ff. on the puzzling relation of baptism to Spirit in Acts.

early disciples had also communal meals in which they looked forward to that time when with Jesus they should drink the fruit of the vine new in the Kingdom. Otherwise the historian can say only that his knowledge of Christian practice begins with Paul and that, whatever the controversies in which Paul was involved, there is no record of any which bore on the interpretation of baptism or Eucharist.¹

Certainly Paul's account of the Last Supper was what he had been taught by early disciples, even if they had not drawn the same inferences from what they too held Jesus to have said over bread and cup. (The 'words of institution', as they are commonly called, have a clear formal similarity to Exod. 16, 15 'This is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat' and 24, 8 'Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words'. The strangeness of what remains, and in particular the paradoxical character for a Jew of any suggestion of the drinking of blood, guarantee the substantial authenticity of the record. It is much harder to imagine someone else inventing the words than Jesus uttering them. They too constituted 'prophetic symbolism'.) Again, whoever baptized Paul may not have thought that baptism involved a dying with Christ when the waters went over his head; he may not have ascribed anything like so deep a significance to the death of the Cross; he may have regarded baptism as a protection from wrath to come rather than as something effecting an immediate change in spiritual state. But for him, as much as for Paul, baptism involved becoming Christ's man.²

¹ This is so in spite of the fact that undoubtedly for a long time an appreciable number of Christians did not follow the Pauline view of the Eucharist, just as there continued to be wineless celebrations, a thing which from charity Paul might have tolerated (cf. Nock, *St. Paul*, 57). For the Last Supper we should also perhaps remember the symbolic acts commonly associated with an oath or a covenant; on these cf. E. Bickerman, *Arch. hist. Droit Oriental*, v (1950), 133 ff. Later the Last Supper was inevitably viewed as the institution of a rite for the future and not as a unique action.

² That is involved in baptism 'in the name of Christ'; cf. Fascher, *P.W.* iv A 2508 (in an excellent article on baptism). Cf. on the name 'Christians' E. Peterson, *Misc. Mercati (Studi e testi, cxxi, 1946)*, 355 ff.; E. Bickerman, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XLII (1949), 109 ff.; H. Fuchs, *Vig. Christ.* iv (1950), 69 n. 5.

When considering the early development and interpretation of baptism and the Eucharist we have to put aside certain concepts which are so familiar that we take them for granted and assume that they have always been current; we have also to recapture one concept which is for us remote. On the one hand we have all grown up with the category of sacraments as things of a specific kind; we are all aware of the centuries of controversy about their meaning and number. There was no such category in the first century of our era and even in the fifth century what we call sacraments were not set sharply apart from other aspects of the Christian revelation. Then, as in the first century, baptism and the Eucharist were part of the whole economy or dispensation of salvation; then, as in the first century, baptism had a public solemnity which it has largely lost; and in neither period was there any antithesis between the word of God and a sacrament or institution or ritual,¹ or again between individual and institutional gifts of grace.

On the other hand, we have to make a deliberate effort of historical imagination to realize something positive—the importance of typology, that is to say the regular application of the idea that the Old Testament in general, and not only Messianic prophecies, bore a Christian meaning, that this meaning was primary and not secondary, and that in Christ's

¹ I Cor. I, 14-7 does not imply any depreciation of the importance of baptism, but the definition of Paul's special function as having the Gospel for the Gentiles (on which cf. Rom. 15, 16 and A. Fridrichsen, *The Apostle and his message*, Uppsala, 1947), and his awareness of a potential danger that disciples might develop something like what psychiatrists call a fixation; (for devotees or initiates grouped around an individual cf. P. Roussel, *Cultes égyptiens à Délos*, 100 and Nock, *Conversion*, 294). The previous verse suggests Paul's specific association of baptism with the death of Christ. To say *nolo episcopari* does not imply any failure to appreciate the dignity of the functions of a bishop (Acts 10, 48 may reflect a practice like Paul's). Later, the idea of Apostolocal Succession seems to have involved a guarantee of validity of doctrine rather than of validity of sacraments (cf. C. H. Turner in *Essays on the early history of the Church and the Ministry*, ed. H. B. Swete, 1918; E. Molland, *J. Eccl. Hist.* 1, 1950, 12 ff.). The statement of Ignat. *Smyrn.* 8 about the Bishop and the Eucharist involves what would be in modern theological terms a question of jurisdiction rather than of sacramental validity. In fact, the sacramentalism of Ignatius is only part of his general belief in God and in Christ; 'you are full of God' (*Magn.* 14) expresses a total attitude. To isolate what we have come to think of as the sacraments is to misunderstand them and to misunderstand the whole early Christian movement.

actions everything came into focus; the Plan of Salvation had been adumbrated and was now made manifest.

Burckhardt spoke of myth in relation to the Greeks as being the 'ideale Grundlage ihres ganzen Daseins'; it retained that character even in late times.¹ For the Christians the Old Testament, as reinterpreted and supplemented, gave an 'ideale Grundlage'. Not only did Christianity arise out of Judaism, but also the idea that the Christians constituted the new Israel² and the belief that the promises of the Old Testament were intended for them, were and remained central. Any prophecy, any event, any phrase in the Jewish record was potentially fraught with contemporary meaning. Except to radicals like Marcion, who rejected Scripture (that is, the Old Testament), typology meant not an exercise of exegetical ingenuity but the statement of essential supernatural verities and the disclosure of hidden contents. The Promises had to be fulfilled; nay, they had been fulfilled and were being fulfilled *in ultimis temporibus*. To Paul, who had had to make so drastic a readjustment of his beliefs, there was a deeply personal need to find the Old in the New.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper were for Paul stark realities; to ask how he classified them would be in a sense wrong, for he had neither the time nor the temper to be analytical and his thought and language show a kaleidoscopic range of variety; moreover, when he speaks of these things, it is to draw a moral inference or to point a warning. Nevertheless, his interpretation of the two phenomena as a pair is set forth in ch. 10 of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Paul has been emphasizing the strict obligations which were binding on his converts and himself alike and continues:

I want you to know, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and all ate the same supernatural food and all drank the same supernatural drink. For they drank from the

¹ Quoted by Nilsson, *Cults, Myths*, etc. 12, in a work which puts the whole matter in a just perspective.

² Cf. A. Fridrichsen, *Rev. hist. phil. rel.* xvii (1937), 339 f.; S. Munck, *Stud. Nov. Test. Bull* 1950; for the broader aspects of typology cf. H.-C. Puech, *Proc. vii Congr. Hist. Rel.* 39, 45 f., 48.

supernatural Rock which followed them, and the Rock was Christ. Nevertheless, with most of them God was not pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness.

Exactly so; baptism and the Lord's Supper (with its New Covenant) were to be thought to correspond to the gifts vouchsafed to the People of God in its Exodus—gifts to the community, from outside this world, which radically changed the situation but did not convey and guarantee security from future human frailty and its pitiful consequences. To the Jews the deliverance from Egypt was the supreme type of Messianic redemption; some of them believed that the Messiah would give his people manna, and the water from the rock was a favorite symbol of God's mercies to Israel. Both manna and rock were explained as God's Wisdom, which is a name applied to Christ in I Cor. 1, 24. Further, Jewish tradition always emphasized the human weaknesses which marred what should have been the idyllic phase of the national history.

In the same chapter of I Corinthians Paul speaks of participation in the Blood and in the Body of Christ and compares Israel's participation in the altar by eating what had been offered thereon. His purpose is again moral and homiletical—to discourage the giving of scandal by indiscriminate enjoyment of meat which had been offered to pagan deities and was thereafter available for eating. Yet his language implies another typological interpretation which was to have a long and developing history—the view of Christian institutions as replacing the ceremonial ordinances of the Old Testament. Malachi 1, 11 'and in every place incense is offered unto my name, and a pure offering'¹ was one more prophetic text to be regarded as fulfilled: Christians in general were to be 'a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices that should be acceptable' (I Pet. 2, 5). The cessation of sacrifice in Jerusalem after 70 no doubt encouraged this way of thinking. So also baptism came to be regarded as that which replaced circumcision. There is a suggestion of this in Coloss. 2, 11-3, but circumcision was too controversial an issue in Paul's time for free development of the idea.

¹ Cf. Harnack's note on *Didache* 14, 3.

The Epistle to the Hebrews dwells at length on Jesus as typified by Melchisedek and on Jesus as making the perfect offering for sin, in contrast with the blood of goats and of bulls as it had been used of old. Here the reference was to the single offering of Calvary and not to the Eucharist; 13, 10 ff. shows this clearly; yet feeling and thought inevitably moved further.

The enjoyment of the divine gifts of the old Exodus, as seen in retrospect, and of the new deliverance, as a matter of contemporary experience, required man's obedient cooperation. Moses had to lead the Israelites through the Red Sea and they had to follow; he had to strike the rock and they had to drink; the manna had to be gathered and consumed; where the pillar of fire and of the cloud led, the people had to follow. So now, the Christians had to carry out what they came to believe to be the Lord's command 'Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' (Matt. 28, 19); again, they had to utter words of blessing and break the Bread. What is more, they provided the bread and wine which were to be so taken and this providing of the bread and wine soon began to be regarded as an offering to God.

A variety of factors within the Christian situation contributed to a further development. The death of Jesus and likewise the Last Supper were linked most closely to the Passover with all its associations. Moreover, the words which Jesus was believed to have uttered over Bread and Cup brought them into an intimate connection with his sacrificial death; the Pauline interpretation of Christian practice was bound to triumph in the long run. Again, for Jew and Gentile alike the natural form of homage to God or the gods was sacrifice—whether it was the offering of animal victims or of the fruits of the earth, whether it was material or metaphorical (i.e. prayer and praise). For both the natural ministrant of sacrifice was a priest, and for both sacrifice was a ceremony which commonly led to participation in what had been offered. Finally, there was a progressive separation of Bread and Cup from anything in the nature of a communal meal such as like-minded Jews or Gentiles

took together; this inevitably went with the ascription of a wholly special character to the Eucharist. In some such ways the view that the Eucharist was a re-presentation of the sacrifice of Calvary may be thought to have been approached; it was probably a complicated and largely unconscious process and I see no reason to suppose that it was in any sense indebted to the mysteries. Further, the idea of reception continued to outweigh the idea of action.

For convenience of exposition we have for a moment looked into the future; let us now return to Paul. For him the main foreshadowing of the New Dispensation in the Old Testament, outside the prophecies interpreted as referring to Christ, lay in the Promise to Abraham and in Abraham's faith and not in the Mosaic Law; the function of the latter was temporary and the ascription by him of typological significance to sacrifice and circumcision is incidental. When Paul speaks of sacrifice here and now, he is thinking of the bodies of the Christians as kept pure or of their faith or of their charitable gifts. He ascribes to the Eucharist a character of action. 'Do this', but it is action in the special sense of participating and of proclaiming the death of the Lord (I Cor. II, 26), i.e., a method of setting forth within the group the message of salvation;¹ much as in the Passover the message of the earlier salvation was proclaimed).

As in all God's dealings with his chosen people, gift called for response; but the main emphasis for Paul lay on the gift, as again on being known rather than on following. To be sure, such supernatural gifts could easily be thought to carry supernatural hazards; Paul literally believed that sickness and death could be explained as resulting from unworthy participation in the Lord's Supper by those who did not discern the Body (I Cor. II, 29). The manna which melted tasted sour to Gentiles and the manna which Dathan and Abiram kept over-night bred worms and betrayed their guilt;² this food had greater danger, for wrong participation

¹ On sacrifice in Paul cf. Behm in Kittel, *Theol. Wörterb.* III 182 etc. (*ib.* 187 Jewish analogies, 188 Greek); on later development, C. W. Dugmore, *J. Eccl. Hist.* II (1951), 24 ff.; on 'proclaim', cf. Philipp. I, 17 and Schniewind in Kittel, I 56 ff., esp. 69 ff. (In Clem. *Recogn.* I 39 it is baptism which replaces the sacrifices of the Old Law).

² Cf. Ginzberg, *Legends*, III 45, 48 (which improves on Exod. 16, 20).

led to judgment. The fact that an idea is foreign to us does not mean that it was an alien and intrusive element in early Christianity.

These considerations seem to me to give some answer to the old and serious question of how what are now called Christian sacraments acquired their standing in a body which had its origin within a Judaism normally regarded as non-sacramental; they further help us to understand the parallelism which exists between ideas about baptism and ideas about the Eucharist. Both were *nova*—not classifiable institutions made for an enduring state of society. And when I say *nova*, I should wish to emphasize that the word 'new' (*kainos* more often than *neos*) is as characteristic of early Christian language as is the word 'joy'. As in prophecy, the epithet denotes what was thought characteristic of the results of a drastic divine intervention in history.¹ 'A new creation' as used of Christians (II Cor. 5, 17; Gal. 6, 15) was meant literally; we may recall the formulation quoted from Schweitzer by Bethune-Baker, "Jesus 'instituted' no sacraments but 'created' them".² And yet the new was rooted in the old, the Church in Israel, redemption in Exodus.

The view of baptism and the Eucharist as primarily *dona grata* is indicated in I Cor. 10 and is set forth clearly in the Fourth Gospel. Birth from water and Spirit (3, 5) is a gift and so is the bread from Heaven (6, 32 ff.); the analogy of manna is made explicit. These are gifts, like the living water for which the woman of Samaria could have asked (4, 10, 14). The Fourth Gospel speaks indeed of eating the flesh of the Son of man and drinking his blood (6, 53); this is deliberately strong language uttered in defiance of opposition in a manner which almost anticipates Tertullian. Yet, as the paradox was already in Paul made more intelligible by the emphasis on the Lord of faith rather than the Jesus of Galilee and by his doctrine (certainly not Hellenistic) that the Church is itself the Body of Christ, so also the Johannine view that Jesus was the Word offered an interpretation. To Philo already manna was God's Word and God's Word was the food of the soul. (The idea appears

¹ Cf. K. Prümm, *Christentum als Neuheitserlebnis*.

² *J. Theol. St.* xvii (1916), 212.

also in Hebr. 6, 4 where the reference is, I think, to teaching and revelation and perhaps baptism, rather than to the Eucharist.¹)

This idea of *dona data* retained its force among Christians; Justin Martyr (*Apol.* I 65) tells how at the Eucharist the presiding brother gave thanks to God for the fact that he had thought the community worthy of these things. The food of which they partook and the water of baptism were gifts and also pledges of better things to come. Such was also the Spirit, which was so intimately linked to them. (For Paul and his successors Spirit and 'spiritual' had none of the idealizing and abstract character which they are liable to suggest to us. Spirit was an active power showing itself in concrete tangible manifestations as well as in the rational or ecstatic inspiration and in the special holiness or normal piety of individuals. The same power was seen in the water of baptism, and in the Bread and Cup of the common meal.) This sense of gratitude for the total content of the gifts of grace accounts for the somewhat generalizing character of the Eucharistic prayers in the *Didache*. These express thanks to God for what he has given, 'thy holy Name which thou hast made to dwell in our hearts', 'the knowledge and faith and immortality which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy Servant', 'spiritual (i.e. supernatural) food and drink'.

Any idea that what we call the Christian sacraments were in their origin indebted to pagan mysteries or even to the metaphorical concepts based upon them shatters on the rock of linguistic evidence. Paul never uses *telete* or its correlatives, and has *myein* only once, and then metaphorically to describe what life had taught him (*Phil.* 4, 12), just as in *Epictetus* IV 1, 140. He has *mysterion* often, but always as in the *Septuagint* to mean 'secret'—and commonly 'secret which might and must now be proclaimed from the house tops', some aspect of the 'mystery of the kingdom of God' as revealed to the disciples (*Mark* 4, 11), the *novum* which impinged on the world and caught it unaware. It is *mysterion*, again, in the singular (in *I Cor.* 4, 1

¹ Cf. H. Windisch *ad. loc.* and W. Bauer on *Joh.* 6, 31.

the plural is an ordinary plural). It has been thought that *embateuo* in Col. 2, 18 is to be connected with the use of the word at Claros (p. 118, above); but this is, I think, a misunderstanding, for Paul probably means 'expatiating on what he has seen' and not 'what he has seen when entering as an initiate'.

The Fourth Gospel has none of these words, not even the neutral *mysterion*. Ideas can be transposed into a different vocabulary but we seldom banish from our speech words which we have had in common use. The absence from early Christian writing of other terminology commonly applied to pagan worship, even of the less esoteric kind, tells its own story.¹ In fact, for all his travels and missionary labors, Paul shows extremely little knowledge of paganism as a concrete phenomenon; he speaks of it in terms of what as boy and youth he had heard in sermons in the synagogue. As for the writer of the Fourth Gospel, he lived in a closed Christian circle; the Greeks who 'would see Jesus' (12, 21) are lay figures in the drama, introduced to prefigure the predestined spread of the good tidings. Let me add that in pagan initiatory rites, washing was no more than a preliminary, and meals were meals, with no known special significance save in Mithraism—and Mithraism was not, it seems, a notable force in the world around nascent Christianity.² We cannot, again, imagine copious impromptu prayer in a pagan rite.

In accordance with Jewish custom, Jesus uttered a blessing or gave thanks (the terms are synonymous) before breaking the Bread; hence the name Eucharist and what it connotes. The blessings or thanksgivings of Christians at their common meal or Eucharist long continued to admit

¹ Cf. Nock, *J. Bibl. Lit.* LII (1933), 131 ff. On Christian innovation in terms for baptism cf. Fascher, *Pauly-Wissowa*, IV A 2504, 12.

² On Mithraic meals cf. Cumont, *R. Arch.* 1946, I, 183 ff.; Cumont-Rostovtzeff in *Excavations at Dura-Europos*, Rep. VII/VIII 107 ff., 75, 124 ff.; M. I. Vermaseren, *De Mithrasdienst in Rome* (Diss. Utrecht, 1951) 169 s.v. maaltijd. Against the ascription of mysterious character to the text on the Janiculum referring to a worshipper of Syrian deities cf. J.-L. Robert, *R. ét. gr.* LIV (1941), 263 f., LV (1942), 361, LXIII (1950), 216. On the *kykeon* at Eleusis cf. Eitrem, *S. Oslo.* XX (1940). 140 ff.; it was a solemn preliminary to initiation, and not a part thereof, and there was no table-fellowship or continued repetition.

of free individual improvisation, but essentially followed the Jewish pattern. 'Blessing God's Name' might be called the classic expression of Jewish piety: private and public prayer alike, while containing much intercession, laid great stress on the heart-felt praise of God for all his mercies. The Christians naturally emphasized above all their thankfulness for what God had done for them in recent times, and they added a new and important element—their approach to God in prayer and praise through Jesus as Servant (*παῖς*) or as Christ. Paganism also expressed gratitude for blessings received but affords no analogy to this use of thanksgiving as a central act of devotion.¹ The earliest known Eucharistic prayers begin, 'We give thanks to thee, Our Father' and 'We give thanks to thee, O God'; later development was to increase the Jewish element, by including the Sanctus, introduced by *Vere dignum et justum est, aequum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere; Domine sancte...* or equivalent phrases.

V

DEVELOPMENT IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES

So much for origins and forms. The message which Paul and others brought to the Gentile world contained much that was unfamiliar and could not easily be understood or assimilated. Further, since the end of the world seemed imminent, time could not be spared, as it was later, for any catechumenate or proper preparation for baptism. The passage quoted from I Corinthians 10 probably means that some of Paul's converts at Corinth regarded themselves as having received an unconditional guarantee of a privileged status in the universe, such as some pagan rites were thought to afford. This idea was presumably attached to baptism;²

¹ A pagan philosopher could pour out heartfelt praise to God (Epict. 1 16, 19 ff.) and the hymn of Cleanthes is essentially of this kind, since the existence of deities other than Zeus is there unimportant; but this is a matter of individual expression. The forms of praise which close *Corp. Herm.* I and Ps. Apul. *Ascl.* are clearly influenced by Judaism.

² The realism with which this was regarded is shown by the practice of 'baptism for the dead' on which cf. *Early Gentile Christianity*, 84 f. H. J. Cadbury's discussion of what he calls 'overconversion' (in *The Joy of Study*, ed. Sherman E. Johnson [N.Y. 1951], 43 ff.) is instructive.

the next chapter of the same Epistle suggests that, as one might have expected from the pagan evidence, they were not predisposed to regard the communal meals as a *mysterium tremendum*—quite the reverse. Again, with the waning of the idea that the Lord would very soon come again, the Church became a continuing society in a continuing world. It would have been only too natural for Christians to think of themselves as having, in Lucian's phrase, a new *telete*.¹

After all, there can have been few if any Greek-speaking inhabitants of cities in the Near East who had not some awareness of the fact that there were ceremonies called *mysteria* and *teletai*. It is the more surprising to see how slow and slight was the adaptation before the fourth century of anything like mystery terminology and even of its metaphorical application as seen in Greek philosophers and in Philo, let alone of any effective approximation or reinterpretation of any feeling that a serious analogy to Christian practice existed in the world around.

It has indeed been thought that the description of baptism as *sphragis*, 'seal' or *photismos* (or *photisma*) 'illumination' and of the baptized as 'perfect' or 'being perfected', *teleioi*, *teleioumenoi*, is based on the language of initiation, but this is not so. *Sphragis* and its cognates were used of the tattooing or branding of sacred eunuchs and of devotees or initiates in various cults,² but *sphragis* was not a term for a pagan initiation as such. It was perhaps already applied, as the corresponding Hebrew word was later, to circumcision and Paul uses it in a context concerned with circumcision, but it denotes the general situation of the baptized believer in relation to God rather than baptism itself and, while later very often used of baptism, was not restricted to it.³ In any event it must be remembered that seals and sealing were from the earliest known times infinitely more widespread and important in the daily life of the ancient world than they are with us; the metaphor was inevitable.

¹ *Peregrin.* II; cf. Cels. *ap. Orig. C. Cels.* III 59 (discussed p. 208 later) and VI 24.

² Cf. F. J. Dölger, *Sphragis and Ant. u. Chr.* I (1929), 66 ff., 88, II (1930), 100, 278, III (1932) 257 ff.; W. Heitmüller, *Neutest. Stud. Heinrici*, 40 ff.; Cumont, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* XXVI (1933), 156.

³ Rom. 4, II (with Lietzmann's note); C. Bonner, *Melito*, 29, 95; E. Peterson, *Vig. Chr.* III (1949), 148 n. 25.

So was also the metaphor of light: apart from Old Testament usage, there was the sun, there was the light of the moon and the stars, there were those helpful surrogates by which man saved from darkness time for work and kept his feet from stumbling or taking the wrong direction; there was now the quite special sense of having passed out of darkness into light. The natural symbolism of light showed itself in pagan piety,¹ but I can find no evidence that *pho-tismos* was a term denoting initiation. Latin usage is significant; while *illumino* was common in earlier usage, *illuminatio* appears to be almost wholly confined to Christian language and *illuminator* wholly so. So again both adjective and verb meaning 'perfect' in Greek not only are not technical terms of initiation (Greek did not run to technical terms), but are not even words conspicuous in that context. *Teleios* is primarily moral, as in Matt. 5, 48, which echoes Deut. 18, 13 and Levit. 19, 2; it can also have the sense 'full-grown, mature'.² To pass for a moment from terminology to ideas, the concept that Christ became man in order that man in his entirety might become as God is common in Greek Christian thought from Irenaeus onwards. At first sight this looks like an imported idea and, while the supposed parallels from initiation do not carry much weight, there are interesting analogies in Hermetism. Nevertheless, the formulation of the idea proves on examination to be the product of a development which, while it could be and was enriched by the Platonic idea of being made like to God, lay entirely within the range of Christian presuppositions. Further, it is my impression that the idea is linked primarily to the Incarnation and to the redemptive and

¹ Cf. Nilsson, *Acta Inst. Romani R. Sueciae*, xv (1950), 96 ff.; *Gesch.* II 515. Apul. *Met.* XI 27-9 thrice uses *inlustro* in the context of initiation, but it can mean 'glorify'; note specially 29 *felici illo amictu illustrari posse*, where the reference is to the privilege of wearing on ceremonial occasions the garb of an initiate.

² On perfection, cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit*, 290. The combination of *tele(i)os* and *telete* in Plat. *Symp.* 210A, *Phaedr.* 249C, *Plut. Rom.* 28, 10 is a figure of speech. On *telos* cf. A. Wifstrand in Nilsson II 671 n. 1. For the exuberant variety of Christian language and imagery, cf. A. v. Harnack, *Terminologie d. Wiedergeburt (Texte u. Unters.* XLII, iii, 1918), 97 ff.; also H. Rahner *Z. kath. Theol.* LIX, 1935, 348 ff. on the idea of baptism as rebirth from the Spirit and the Virgin (i.e. the Church) and P. Lundberg, *La typologie baptismale (Acta Sem. Neot. Upsal.* x, 1942).

exemplary action of Christ; the sacraments, though involving a more intimate participation in divine experience than is suggested by our evidence for pagan initiation, are, so to speak, necessary modalities.¹

Returning to our study of words, we find that Ignatius speaks of 'fellowinitiates of Paul'² but in a metaphorical sense; his use of *mysterion* is Biblical and Pauline, and shows a certain appreciation of the term's solemn sound. Neither he nor the other Apostolic Fathers have *teleo* (in the sense 'initiate') or *telete*; they too use *mysterion* as 'secret', 'symbol'.

The Apologists naturally display somewhat more knowledge of pagan practice, though it is at times rather bookish knowledge. Justin speaks of the bread and cup of water in the *mysteria* of Mithras as an imitation in advance by *daimones* of the Eucharist; but he speaks also of lustral washings before entering a pagan temple as standing in a similar relation to baptism, which means that the point of comparison was not initiation as such. Further as Prümm remarks, Justin, like Clement of Alexandria, was concerned to find an analogy between Christianity and philosophy;³ he sought none between Christianity and pagan worship. In general, Justin uses *mysterion* to denote the Christian revelation as a whole, the appearance and passion of Christ, and anything in the Old Testament which could be interpreted as prefiguring the new salvation;⁴ this seems entirely unrelated to his use of *mysteria* with reference to paganism.

Particular interest attaches to a slightly later text edited by Campbell Bonner, the homily of Melito on the Passion. Melito uses anew the Pauline combination of Red Sea, manna, and water from the rock, and repeatedly applies *mysterion* to the Passover as prefiguring the death of Christ;

¹ On divinization cf. *J. Religion*, xxxi (1951), 214 f.; the idea is applied to baptism in the *Theophania* handed down under the name of Hippolytus (8, i ii 262, 10 f. ed. Bonwetsch-Achelis), but this is, I think, generally and rightly ascribed to a later time.

² *Eph.* 12, 2.

³ *Apol.* i 66, 4, 62, 1; cf. i 54, 6, 62, 2 (on taking off shoes) and *Dial.* 70, 1 (with Cumont, *Textes et monuments*, II 20 n. 2), 78, 6, 69, 1; Prümm, *Neuheiterlebnis*, 438 f.

⁴ Cf. H. v. Soden, *Z. neut. Wiss.* xii (1911), 201; H. G. Marsh, *J. Theol. St.* xxxvii (1936), 64 f. For *mysterion* in *Ep. ad Diogn.* cf. Meecham on 4, 6; it is not applied to the sacraments.

it is the original Passover of the Exodus, not the contemporary commemoration. The power of verbal association in Greek was strong enough to lead him to speak of Egypt as 'uninitiated in the mystery', but the primary sense of *mysterion* remained 'datum or Old Testament prototype of redemption'; 'the Law became Word'.¹ Elsewhere he uses the word of a natural prototype of baptism, the renewal by washing in the sea of the sun and other heavenly bodies.²

From this time on till well into the third century *mysterion* and cognate words are seldom used of the sacraments, and *mysterion* is generally either in the singular or, if used in the plural, it is an ordinary plural;³ *myein* for baptism is apparently quite exceptional. *Mysterion* is still primarily 'secret'—in the Pauline sense of what *had* been secret and was now revealed, or in the other sense of esoteric teaching still reserved for a 'happy few'. In the second meaning *mysterion* could be used seriously by convinced adherents and sarcastically by opponents. From either side the transition to the idea of initiation was easy, but the point of departure remains 'secret' rather than 'initiatory rite', Biblical rather than pagan.⁴ When the analogy of pagan

¹ *Homily on the Passion* (K.-S. Lake, *Studies and Documents* XII, 1940), 84/5 p. 147, 16 p. 95, 33 p. 107, 7 p. 89 (cf. p. 47); cf. R. P. Casey, *J. Bibl. Lit.* LX (1941), 83, 87.

² E. J. Goodspeed, *Apologeten*, 311; cf. H. Rahner, *Griech. Mythen in christlicher Deutung*, 73 ff., on the ways in which ancient and mediaeval Christians found the Cross and baptism typified in the most varied aspects of nature and life. Goodspeed 312 gives a fragment ascribed to Melito which speaks of the leading of Isaac to be sacrificed as a novel mystery, but doubts its authenticity.

³ Cf. K. Prümm, *Z. kath. Theol.* LXI (1937), 391 ff.

⁴ The evidence of the Apocryphal Acts is of particular interest, for they are documents in which we should not expect any high degree of caution and traditionalism. *Acta Pauli* 3, 23 p. 32 Schmidt-Schubart speaks of 'initiating in the seal in the Lord' (for the genitive cf. E. Peterson, *Vig. Chr.* III 148, and Porphyry's quotation of Apollonius of Tyana in *Stob. I* 70, 10 Wachsmuth [*Epist.* 78] referring to the theme of Philostrate). *Ap. Ty.* III 14, 32, 51, VII 14). *Mysterion* is used of consecrated oil (*chrisim*) in *Acta Thomae* 121 (II ii 230 Lipsius-Bonnet), *mystagogia* in one text of *A. Jo.* 106 (II i, 203, 17), in an Eucharistic context; '*mysteria* of Christ', in the same setting, is a variant reading in *A. Thom.* 121 (II ii 231), as is '*mystes* of Christ' in *Mart. Matth.* 11 (II i 228). *Passio S. Pauli Ap.* 15 (I 40, 6) has *divinorum mysteriorum vivificatione sacrati* of baptism. *Contra*, in *A. Jo.* 47 (II i 174) Great and Small mysteries serve as a metaphor for grades of miracle; *ib.* 96 (p. 198) *mysteria* (in the plural) refers to all that is shown forth in the Dance, the repetition of which was not commanded; the singular *mysterion* in 100 (p. 201) denotes the meaning of the Cross 'Thy *mysteria*' in *A. Thom.* 25 (II ii 141) means 'saving truths', as it may

rites to Christianity is adduced, it is usually incidental and involves such generalities as the need for a preliminary purification, or the appropriateness of Small mysteries coming before Great, and the reference is commonly to doctrine; and so, in other words, this is the literary metaphor as used by Plato and Philo alike. Clement of Alexandria once speaks at length of Christianity in terms of a Dionysiac analogy, but there are several special features to note in this passage (*Protr.* II, 118 ff., i 83 f, St.). First, he had in mind the *Bacchae* of Euripides and not actual contemporary worship; secondly, as he goes on, his language brings in Eleusinian terms which had become literary commonplace, and also Christian allusions; thirdly, he is speaking of Christian life as a whole and not of the sacraments in particular; fourthly, as has been remarked, the parallel which he desires to emphasize for Christianity is that of philosophy.¹ When he speaks of pagan mysteries at length in *Protr.* 2, 12 ff. (i 11 St. ff.), it is with abhorrence at the impropriety of their myths and rites and the absurdity of their symbols and without any sense of their being analogous to the sacraments.

Origen's usage is similar. On occasion he could employ an analogy. Thus, Celsus had urged that, whereas those who summoned people to other *teletai* addressed their invitation to those who had clean hands and clear heads, the Christians invited sinners. Origen in reply (III 59) said that the Christians summoned sinners to repentance and did not invite them to 'the *teletai* which we have' till they had shown

well in 88 (p. 204), 136 (p. 243). Otherwise *μνέω*, *telete*, *τελέω* (in the ritual sense), *epoptes* appear to be absent from this literature. So the mysteries of the Coptic-Gnostic literature are primarily matters of special revelation, and Mani's *Book of the Mysteries* appears to have been principally concerned with theological controversy and not with ceremonial (P. Alfarc, *Ecritures manichéennes*, II 17 ff.).

¹ It may be recalled that Hor. *Epp.* I 16, 73 ff. used the *Bacchae* in a moral allegory; note also the use of the story of Pentheus in *Strom.* I 13, 57 (ii 36 St.): For Clement's use of *mysterion* etc. cf. Marsh, *i.c.* (p. 205, n. 2); Prümm, *Neuheitserlebnis*, 439 and *Z. kath. Theol.* LXI (1937) 398 ff. For *teletai* in a simile cf. *Strom.* V 4, 19 (ii 338); for *epopteia*, I 28, 176 (ii 108), with express but unidentifiable reference to Plato. The idea, so prominent in Clement, that there were some truths which were not to be communicated even to all believers was at least foreshadowed in I Cor. 3, 2 and had analogies in Judaism (M. Smith, *Tannaïtic Parallels*, 156), as well as in Platonism and the Hermetica. Certainly *mysterion*, etc., have in Clement no special attachment to the sacraments.

amendment of life. He carries on the metaphor

(60) *μείσθω . . . μυστήρια . . . μυσταγωγῶν*

(62) *διδάσκαλος θείων μυστηρίων*

Yet, as A. Miura-Stange remarked, the mystery-religions were something foreign to both Celsus and Origen;¹ Celsus mentioned them for the purpose of polemical argument, just as Origen (*ib.* I 7) referred not only to philosophy but also to mysteries in general as having their secrets without arousing popular disapproval. Origen does however elsewhere employ the metaphor of initiation just as he sometimes, when speaking of the Eucharist, uses the term 'mysteries', and as a term that would be understood. Yet in his writings the predominating sense of *mysterion* appears to be 'fact of revelation made explicit in Christ or foreshadowed in the Old Testament'—and again 'higher truth to be apprehended only by those who had mounted to a particular stage in the spiritual ascent'.²

¹ *Celsus u. Origenes* (*Z. neut. Wiss., Beih.* IV, 1926), 156.

² For the metaphor of initiation in Origen cf. F. J. Dölger, *Ichthys* II 516 f. (apropos of *disciplina arcani*) and *In Cant. cant.* II (G.C.S. xxxiii 171), *qui per sacramentum vitis et botrum cypri initiati ad perfectionem feruntur et calicem novi Testamenti ab Iesu susceptum bibere contendunt. In Cant. cant.* I (*ib.* 92), *sub tempore mysteriorum*, of the kiss of peace at the Eucharist is so used as to suggest that *myst.* was now familiar; cf. *In Num.* xvi 9 (G.C.S. xxx 152), *bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi non solum sacramentorum ritu sed et cum sermones eius recipimus* and *In lib. Iud.* vi 2 (*ib.* 500) *ubi vero iam militiae coelestis sacramenta gustavimus et pane vitae relecti sumus*. For the plural cf. *In Levit.* ix 10 (G.C.S. xxix 438), *qui mysteriis imbutus est; In Exod.* xiii 3 (*ib.* 274) *qui divinis mysteriis interesse consuestis; Sel. in Ps. Hom. II in Ps.* xxxvii (P.G. xii 1386D) *accedere ad tanta et tam eximia sacramenta*—all referring to the Eucharist. This might be thought to reflect pagan usage (cf. p. 186 n. 2), but I think it is a generalizing plural; cf. *In Levit.* v 10 (G.C.S. xxix 352) *ad suscipienda verbi Dei mysteria* (which means, I suppose, baptism and also Christian doctrine) and *Comm. in Rom.* v 8 (P.G. xiv 1040) *typus tantummodo mysteriorum*; (with reference to baptism). In any event we have the translation of Rufinus and not the *ipsisissima verba*.

It may be remarked that three of Dölger's quotations come from discussions of Old Testament prototypes. So in *In Levit.* xiii 3 (G.C.S. xxix 471 f.) we have *mysterii magnitudinem*, to denote what was meant by the ordinance about the shewbread, before *ecclesiastica mysteria* (the Eucharist as thus prefigured) and, later, *mysteria revelanda* (secrets to be shown to Abraham). Cf. *In Levit.* ix 9 (*ib.* 436 f.) *quid haec* (sc. *sacrificia*) *etiam secundum rationem mysticam contineant et sed mirum contuere ordinem sacramentorum* (also of O.T. offerings) before the Christian reference in 10 (p. 438). *In lib. Iesu Nave* IV (G.C.S. xxx 307 ff.) has *per baptismi sacramentum Iordanis fluentia digressus es...* and *nec ipsum absque mysterii ratione arbitrator scriptum* (of the way in which Jordan parted) and *agni*

To be sure, *sacramentum*, which for Christians came to be the principal Latin equivalent of *mysterion*, was freely applied by Tertullian to baptism and the Eucharist and occasionally to pagan rites or beliefs.¹ But *sacramentum* had overtones which *mysterion* lacked. It meant an oath in general, and in so doing carried possibilities of suggestiveness which did not attach to *ὄρκος*, and it meant the soldier's oath of loyalty in particular; this marked entry on military life, was the symbol of loyalty to its rules and its ruler, and fitted the idea of *militia Christi*.² Again, Apuleius used *sacramentum* to mean 'the mutual loyalty which might be expected of dumb animals (and which poor Lucius, when transformed into the shape of an ass, did not find), and 'the dignity of a court'.³ *Sacramentum* had a wide range of meaning and in seeking to understand its use by Christian

mysterium (of the Passover); entry on the catechumenate corresponds to the passing of the Red Sea, baptism to the passing of Jordan; cf. also v (ib. 313 f.) (*ea quae in Iordane gesta referuntur formam teneant sacramenti quod per baptismum celebratur*).

Like earlier Jewish and Christian writers, Origen was familiar with *mysteria* in the pagan sense (cf. also *In Num.* xx 3, G.C.S. xxx 193, *in huius ergo idoli mysteriis consecratus est Istrahel*) but the material quoted and what the reader may find by looking at Baehrens' index in G.C.S. xxx under *mysterium*, *sacramentum*, etc. show that the primary connotations of *mysterion* were for him those which it had acquired in Christian usage (so *In Exod.* v 2, G.C.S. xxix 186 *baptismi mysteria*, with reference to I Cor. 10) and these were perhaps somewhat more 'sacramental' than earlier.

Origen's use of the metaphor of initiation has a literary flavor; cf. *C. Cels.* vii 10 (ii 162 Koetschau) where *μυστικώτερα* and *ἐποπτικώτερα* are used for the more recondite parts of what the Prophets had to reveal (*μυστικὸς* in *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclite...* ed. J. Scherer (Pub. Soc. Fouad, *Textes et Doc.* ix, 1949), 152, 10, 154, 2 is 'esoteric' and 'with inner meaning'; ib. 174, 1 *mysteria* is used of the wheels in Ezekiel). For the usage of Hippolytus cf. Prümm, *Z. kath. Theol.* LXIII (1939), 207 ff.; ib. 350 ff. he treats that of Athanasius, as J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique*, 189 ff. does that of Gregory of Nyssa.

¹ So *Cor.* 15, *Adv. Marc.* i 13; cf. in general J. H. Waszink on *Tert. Anim.* i, 4. (Note *initio* of baptism in *Monog.* 8; *sacramento infanticidii* in *Apol.* 7, discussed by Dölger, *Ant. Chr.* iv 188 ff. seems to me a piece of Tertullian's own sarcasm).

² Cf. the contrast in *Tert. Cor.* 11 (with Chr. Mohrmann, *Vig. Christ.* vi, 1952, 112 f., 116 f.) and also Orig. *In Libr. Jesu*, V 2 (G.C.S. xxx 315) *militiae huius et cinguli sacramentum*. On the soldier's oath cf. A. v. Premerstein, *Werden u. Wesen d. Prinzipats* (*Abh. Bayer. Akad.* N.F. xv 1937), 279 s.v. *sacramentum* and J. H. Gilliam, *Yale Classical Studies*, xi (1950), 233; for its use as a simile note Epictet. i 14, 15 ff. (cf. *Sen. Ep.* 95, 35).

³ *Met.* III 26 and 3; for the second sense, cf. the use of *religio* in *Suet. Tiber.* 33 (with Rietra's note and reference to *Cod. Iust.* III 1, 14 pr. on the oath taken by a judge).

writers we must not try to press any one sense.¹ Certainly Tertullian called sacraments *sacramenta* because they fitted the general associations which the word had in his mind; he did not call other things *sacramenta* because they seemed akin to the sacraments. In fact, the word *sacramentum* retained 'une grande plasticité'.²

VI

DEVELOPMENT IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

The free application of mystery terminology to the Christian sacraments, like the full elaboration of *disciplina arcani*,³

¹ For the range of suggestion of *sacramentum* cf. Chr. Mohrmann, *Vig. Chr.* III (1949), 170 f. and IV (1950), 197; we shall await eagerly the special study which she announces. O. Casel, *Jahrb. f. Liturgiewiss.* VIII (1928), 227 ff. (cf. *Das christliche Kultmysterium* (ed. 2), 105 f.) has stressed (1) the language of Livy concerning the solemn oath of the Samnite *legio linteata* (x 38, 2; cf. ix 40, 9); (2) the mutual pledge of unhallowed union which was ascribed to members of the Bacchanalia (Liv. xxxix 15, 13); (3) the *sacramentum* of Apul. *Met.* xi 15; (4) the taking of oaths of conformity (cf. Nilsson II 667) before participation in certain rites. It will be observed that in (1) we have a comparison, *ritu quodam sacramenti vetusto velut initiatis militibus*, and a metaphor, *sacrati*. As for (2), to the Roman authorities this was a criminal conspiracy (cf. Liv. xxxix 18, 3) and in (2) and (3) alike the point of departure of the metaphor is military service and not initiation. Further in (3) *sanctae huic militiae* is stressed, and *rogabaris* is after all the manuscript reading; if it is correct, the pledge of loyalty which mattered for Lucius is primarily that which Isis demanded in the vision and not what was to follow in his initiation. As for (4), an oath was in no known instance a mode of initiation; it was at most a concomitant.

The phrase *sollemnis et sacrata militia* is used of the service of disciplined soldiers who remembered their *sacramentum*, as contrasted with the *caeca et fortuita (militia)* of undisciplined soldiers; the latter also had sworn and it was not the oath which made the difference (Liv. VIII 34, 10). It is possible that the tattooing of soldiers as practised in the later Empire was thought to involve something like a consecration to the military service of the Emperor, but this was a preliminary to the *sacramentum* (Veget. II 5) and practical reasons may have predominated, as in the tattooing of the *fabricenses* and of the *hydrophylaces* (Perdrizet, *Arch. Rel. Wiss.* XIV, 1911, 99).

A man might not normally fight unless duly enlisted; cf. Plut. *Q. R.* 39 p. 273E; with H. J. Rose's note. Whatever may be thought as to early ideas which may lie behind this, it was in effect a matter of Roman legal definition of the situation (*sacrati commilitiones* in S. H. A. *Gord.* 14, 1 is naturally a piece of rhetoric). The essence of military (as of other) oaths was the conditional curse which the individual invoked upon himself if he should fail to do his duty. [For an oath as required of men entering a religious body which lacked mysteries, cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Dead Sea-Scrolls*, tr. E. M. Rowley, 47, 51.]

² Mohrmann, *V. Chr.* III (1949), 170.

³ Cf. Dölger, *Ichthys*, II 516 ff.; v. Harnack, *T.U.* XLII, iii 124; O. Perler, *Reallex. Ant. Chr.* I 667 ff. In spite of this, Ps. Aug. *Quaest. vet. nov. Test.*

belongs essentially to the period of the triumph of the Church and can be explained as an answer to an internal rather than an external challenge. It was a matter of diplomatic and paedagogic technique and involved a fairly conscious effort, which is made very clear in various sermons to catechumens awaiting baptism on Easter Eve, to evoke the right sentiments in the neophytes and to maintain these sentiments thereafter. We see a somewhat comparable attitude in the use of curtains around the altar, and later still in the iconostasis.¹ Now that the Church had come out of the period of persecution it was necessary to make entry into it sufficiently serious and it was appropriate to give all possible dignity to Christian worship. We now find the metaphorical language of initiation coming into increasing use; but it was based on the metaphor as a traditional mode of expression and not on the concrete reality of initiations. Dramatic ceremonies in public were familiar in Augustine's boyhood but initiations, in spite of the vigor with which Firmicus attacked them (together with other manifestations of paganism) and in spite of the enthusiasm with which the pagan aristocracy of Rome clung to them, must have been disappearing fast. The use of the term *mystagogia* is particularly marked in the fifth century when organized paganism was almost everywhere dead.

Two further reflections are in order. First, even at this time the *traditio symboli* in baptism was no less solemn than regeneration at the font; Augustine, again, describes a sacrament as *tamquam visibile verbum*.² The essential secret was the revelation, not a visible expression as such, and there was no possibility of an antithesis between the two. Second, it is easy to contrast the Papal Mass of the sixth

(C.S.E.L. L) 114, 6, p. 305 could still contrast the simplicity and openness of Christian rites with the secrecy of pagan mysteries. This is like an objection which Philo, *Spec. leg.* I 319 f. made against Gentile *teletai* (cf. Lucan IX 576 f.). Consistency is not to be expected. Incidentally, K. Prümm, *Z. h. Theol.* LXIII (1939), 114 has well suggested that the use of *mysterion* in the New Testament made it more natural for the Fathers to adopt mystery terminology.

¹ On the iconostasis cf. K. Holl, *Ges. Aufs. z. Kirchengesch.* II 225 ff. We may compare E. Bishop's remark (R. H. Connolly, *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, 93) on the idea of a holy awe in worship as stressed by Cyril of Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth century.

² *In. Jo. Evang. tract.* 80, 3.

century, as reconstructed by Edmund Bishop,¹ or the elaborate ceremonial of Sancta Sophia with the scene in the Upper Room or with one of the untidy meetings of the Corinthian converts of Paul. Yet the process of elaboration owed nothing essential to pagan ritual. It depended rather on the splendors of the old Temple of Jerusalem and on those of the New Jerusalem as portrayed in the lectionary; it depended also on the fashions of secular life. After Constantine an Imperial Church must needs move towards a magnificence and solemnity like those of the Imperial Court. Only recently Theodor Klauser has shown how some of the attributes of episcopal state were simply taken over from those of civil dignitaries; the bishops were now such.²

To argue as I have done is not to suggest that pagan mysteries had no influence on the development and acceptance of Catholic Christianity; the surprise is that on the evidence they had so little. We can of course see something like a recrudescence of the old psychology in certain Holy Week ceremonies in East and West alike, as for instance in the Eastern greeting at Easter 'Christ is risen' and the response 'He has truly risen'. The same attitude appears in the *hodie* of various liturgical celebrations of festivals and in certain Epiphany ceremonials.³ I do not for one moment suggest deliberate direct adaptation or any such *interpretatio Christiana* as appears in the acceptance of *Natalis Solis Invicti* as the birthday of the Sun of Righteousness. Rather we see how the annual commemoration of the drama of salvation made its natural impact on men living closer to the soil and to nature than most of us do. In any event the old Jewish typology did not only survive; it was cherished and developed.

Novum pascha novae legis
Phase vetus terminat.

¹ *The Genius of the Roman rite* (reprinted in *Liturgica Historica*).

² *Der Ursprung d. bischöflichen Insignien u. Ehrenrechte*; cf. his *Abendländische Liturgiegeschichte*, 12 f.

³ Cf. *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxvii (1934), 91 n. 124; P. Argenti-H. J. Rose, *Folk-Lore of Chios*, 364; Usener, *Kl. Schr.* iv 429 ff.; Holl. *op. cit.* ii 123 ff.; E. G. Turner, *Aberdeen Papyri*, p. 5—Augustin. *Serm.* 220 (cf. Mohrmann, *Ephem. liturg.* LXVI, 1952, 50 f.) is instructive.

Unless I am mistaken, scholarly opinion is moving towards something like the position which I have outlined. If you look back a quarter of a century to the second edition of Carl Clemen's indispensable *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments* you will find a patient analysis of many studies which resulted in very different conclusions. Eating the body and drinking the blood of the Lord was put on a level with the fact that in some remote past the worshippers of Dionysus rent animals asunder and devoured them and were perhaps supposed to partake of the god's flesh—and that though by the beginning of our era such rending was no more than a respectable survival.¹ 'I am the vine; ye are the branches' was again thought to reflect the same cult and belief in baptismal regeneration was related to the *taurobolium*. The Mandaeans, also, have had their day.

Without exaggeration and oversimplification little progress is made in most fields of humanistic investigation. Hypotheses such as have been mentioned have served to stimulate a great amount of critical enquiry; they have liberated the study of Christian beginnings from an unwholesome isolation; they have freed us from an overemphasis on these aspects of early Christianity which commended themselves to reasonable votaries of progress at the beginning of this century. In reacting against them we must beware of exaggeration in the opposite direction and of any tendency to assume simple relations of cause and effect in an area in which they are very rare. We must, again, do justice to the high seriousness and continued vitality of ancient paganism and to the essential unity of much of man's behavior towards the unseen. In the beautiful words of Gerardus van der Leeuw, 'Es gibt aber nur ganz wenige Gedanken, die es der Menschheit vergönnt ist, über das Göttliche zu denken, und diese hat... die Vorwelt längst gedacht, sei es in anderen, fremdartigen Formen'.²

¹ F. J. Dölger, *Ant. u. Chr.* IV (1934), 277 ff. notes the repugnance to the idea of feeding, even metaphorically, on a deity shown in Philostr. *Ap. Ty.* v 20.

² Cf. Augustine *Retract.* 1 12 (13), 3: *nam res ipsa, quae nunc Christiana religio nuncupatur, erat et apud antiquos nec defuit ab initio generis humani quousque Christus veniret in carne, unde vera religio, quae iam erat, coepti appellari Christiana.*

INDEX

- Aaron, 122
 Abel, xv
 Abiram, 130
 Abraham, 130, 140
 Accame, S., 112, 114
 Adonis, 29, 42f., 72, 105
 Agape, the, 76f.
Aion, 16
 Alexander, xi, xii, 114, 116, 122
 Alexander of Abonuteichos, 118
 Alfarcic, P., 45, 139
 Andocides, 112
 Anrich, G., 81
 Antichrist, 45
 Anubis, 120
 Apollo, 4f., 11, 118
 Apollonius of Tyana, 45, 138
 Apollo, xvii
 Apologists, the, 137
Apophthegmata Patrum, 15
 Apostolical Succession, 126
 Apotheosis, 65
 Apuleius, 13, 17, 19, 34, 56, 61, 65,
 86, 115, 119, 120, 141, 142
 Arataeus, 120
 Arbesmann, P. R., 112
 Archigallus, the, 66f.
 Argenti, P., 144
 Aristides, 6, 73, 119f.
 Aristophanes, 32, 49, 92, 111, 114,
 115, 118, 121
 Aristotle, 6, 115
 Armstrong, A. H., xix
 Arnobius, 9, 16
 Artemidorus, xii, 118, 120
 Artemis, 3f., 34
 Asceticism, 88, 97
 Asclepius, 4f., 114, 120
 Astral mysticism, 90
 Astrology, 3, 7f., 14, 90f., 118f.
 Athanasius, 141
 Athenian culture, 111-13
 Atonement, 43f., 70
 Attis, 4, 29, 42f., 53, 63, 72, 74f.,
 105, 108, 116, 117; *see also* Cybele
 Augustine, St., 92, 143, 144, 145
 Augustus, xii
Autarkeia, 90
 Authority, 20, 100f.
 Baalim, 4, 9
 Baehren, 141
 Balla, E., 40
Baptai, 61
 Baptism, vii, ix, 14, 54, 59-68, 84-
 86, 124-134, 135, 137f., 140f., 143,
 145; for the dead, 84, 134
 Basilides, xvii
 Baudissin, W. W. von, and Eiss-
 feldt, O., 33f.
 Bauer, W., xx, 52
 Behm, 130
 Bell, H. I., xviii
 Berossus, 7
 Bertram, G., 105
 Bethune-Baker, J. F., 131
 Bevan, E. R., vii, xix, 5, 10, 12, 90,
 97, 102
 Beyerhaus, J., 10, 50
 Bickermann, E., 125
 Bidez, J., 82
 Billerbeck, P., *see* Strack and Biller-
 beck
 Bishop, E., 143, 144
 Bishop, 100
 Blackman, A. M., 60
 Blood, Day of, 106; *see also* *Dies*
 Sanguinis
 Body/Blood of Christ, 128, 130, 131,
 145; *see also* bread and wine,
 etc.
 Boissier, G., 16
 Boll, F., 90
 Bonhöffer, A., 94f.
 Bonner, C., 109, 118, 135, 137
 Bonnet, H., 60
 Boulanger, A., 100
 Bousset, W., 14, 23, 29, 32f., 43ff.,
 50, 53ff., 63, 73, 82, 88, 99, 108

- Bräuninger F., 15, 30
 Bread/bread and wine, 125, 129,
 131, 132, 133, 137
 Bréhier, E., 31
 Buckler, W. H., 22
 Buckler-Calder-Guthrie, 117
 Bultmann, R., xiii, xiv, xx, 24, 52,
 59, 96
 Burckhardt, J. J., 127
 Burkitt, F. C., xx, 33, 44, 64, 68
 Burrows, M., xviii
 Burton, E. de W., 50
- Cabiri, 6, 75, 113
 Cadbury, H. J., 109, 134
 Caesar-worship, 7, 17
 Cain, xv
 Calvary, sacrifice of, 129f.
 Carcopino, J., 13
Carpus, Papyrus and Agathonice,
Acts of, 82
 Carratelli, G. P., 115
 Casel, O., 23, 29, 31, 58, 63, 70, 72f.,
 77f., 80f., 98, 109, 142
 Casey, R. P., xx, 29, 138
 Celsus, 45, 103, 135, 139f.
 Cerfaux, L., 30, 33
Chaldaic Oracles, xiv
 Charlesworth, M. P., xix
 Chirius Fortunatus, 53
 Christ, W., and Stählin, U., 31, 89
 Christianity, early evolution of, xii,
 xiii-xvii, 109, 124-134; borrow-
 ings from other religions, vii,
 121, 135
 Christology, 41, 46ff.; Pauline, 47ff.
 Chrysippus, 121
 Chrysostom, St. John., 72
 Cicero, 82, 110
 Cichorius, 16, 39
 Circumcision, 128, 130, 135
Civitas Dei, 101
 Claros, 118, 133
 Cleanthes, 5, 134
 Clemen, C., 30, 34, 36f., 39, 41, 48,
 50ff., 68-70, 73, 76f., 89, 94f., 96f.,
 98f., 100, 105, 145
 Clement of Alexandria, 29, 34, 74,
 99, 103, 130, 137, 139
 Clement of Rome, 34
Clementine Homilies, 23
 Colossae, xvi
 Colson, F. H., xviii, 3, 98, 124
- Communion/communal meals, 125,
 129, 132, 135; *see also* Eucharist,
 Meals, religious, *etc.*
 Confession-inscriptions, pagan, 21;
see also Inscriptions
 Connolly, R. H., 143
 Consecration, 117, 122, 142
 Constantine, 144
Constitutiones Apostolorum, 82
 Conversion, 17, 92
 Cook, A. B., 2, 9, 32, 56, 65, 73f.
 Cortez, R., 120
 Corybantes, 115
 Covenant-relationship, 43, 64, 69f.,
 71f., 85, 128
 Creation, New, 28, 64
Criobolium, 66f.
 Cross, F. L., xxi
 Cross, F. M., ix, xviii
 Cult-society, 13, 72f.
 Cumae, 114
 Cumont, F., xix, 1f., 4, 10, 13f.,
 19f., 34, 53, 56, 59, 62, 65f., 76,
 90, 114, 133, 135, 137
 Cybele, 6, 9, 53, 62, 65f., 74f., 116,
 117; *see also* Attis
 Cynics, the, 11f., 22, 57, 93f.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, 143
- Daimones,* 137
 Damascius, 53
 Daniélou, J., 141
 Dathan, 130
 Dattari, G., 35
 Deacons, 86
 Dead Sea Scrolls, ix, 142; *see also*
 Qumran
 Death, 120, 130, 134
 Deissmann, A., 1, 22, 33, 37ff., 44,
 82, 100
 Deities, identification of, 8ff.
 Delphi, 5, 18
 Demeter, 6, 10, 65, 110, 115, 116;
 Homeric Hymn to, 110, 111
 Demianczuk, J., 112
 Deonna, W., 39
 Deubner, L., 110, 111
 Diatribe, 93f.
 Dibelius, M., 30, 40, 47ff., 63, 94,
 98, 103
Didache, 77-81, 88, 132
 Diehl, 113
Dies Sanguinis, 63, 65, 106

- Dieterich, A., 16, 30, 40, 51, 74f., 107
 Dieterich, K., 98
 Dindorf, 19
 Dio of Prusa, 5, 96
 Diodorus Siculus, 6
 Diogenes Laertius, 57
 Dionysus 4, 11, 73f., 110, 114f., 116, 119, 145
 Dispersion, Jewish, x, 2
 Dittenberger, 110
 Dix, G. H., 52
 Dobschütz, E. von, 25, 27, 89, 93f., 101
 Dodds, E. R., xx, 115
 Dogma, 47, 102
 Dölger F. J., 35f., 38, 45, 72, 76, 83f., 123, 135, 140, 141, 142, 145
Dona data, 124-34
 Dorese, J., xxi
 Dornseiff, F., 36
 Douffé, E., 73
 Dudley, D. R., xix
 Dugmore, C. W., 130
 Dupont-Sommer, A., 142
 Dura-Europos, x, xi, 133
- Easter, 106
 Eclogue, Fourth, 39
 Ecstasy, 88f.
 Ehrenberg, V., 8
 Ehrhard, A., 25, 52, 77, 86
 Eitrem, S., 30ff., 38, 45, 53, 55, 62, 65, 70, 133
 Elchasaites 23
 Eleusis, 6, 60f., 62, 65, 74, 86, 110-17, 121, 133, 139
Embateuo, 133
 Empedocles, 92
 Enoch, xv
 Epictetus, 21, 95, 132, 134, 141
 Epicureanism/Epicureans, 12, 93, 96
 Epicurus, 11, 92
Epiklesis, 83
Epiphaneia, 39, 41
 Episcopate, monarchic, 104, 126
Epoptes, 6, 30, 111-13, 139
 Eschatology, ix, 59
 Essenes/Essenism, ix, x, xiv, 23, 27
Euangelion, xiii, 35ff.
 Eucharist, vii, 27f., 58, 68-86, 98, 107, 124-34, 137, 140f.
- Euhemerism, 11, 29
 Eunuchs, sacred, 135
 Euripides, 32, 114, 115, 139
 Eusebius, 4, 35, 82
 Eve, xv
 Exclusiveness, 17, 104, 111f.
- Fabre, P., xix, 109
 Faith, 89, 130, 131
 Faith, Hope and Love, 88f.
 Farnell, L. R., 6, 18, 74f., 83, 113
 Fascher, 125, 133
 Fate, 91, 98, 103
 Father, God the, 56, 129
 Fatherhood of God, 56, 64
 Fathers, Apostolic, 137, 143
 Fehrle, E., 18
 Festugière, A. J., xix, xxi, 109, 115, 118
 Finkelstein, L., xviii
 Firmicus Maternus, 42f., 75, 143
 Frank, T., xix
 Fraser, P. M., xix
 Frazer, J. G., 53, 74
 Freedman, D. N., xxi
 Fridrichsen, A., xxi, 126, 127
 Fuchs, H., 41, 101, 125
 Fuks, A., xviii
- Galen, 113, 121
 Gall, A. von, 44, 69
 Gärtner, B., xx, xxi
 Gebhardt, V., 42, 82
 Geffcken, J., 8, 94
 Gilliam, J. H., 141
 Ginzberg, L., xix, 123f.
Glottolalia, 89
 Glotz, G., 105
Gnosis, 15, 88f., 92, 99, 102
 Gnosticism/Gnostics, xii, xiii-xvii, 14, 41, 45, 48f., 139
 God, xi, xv, xvi, 132
 Godfearers, 2
 Gods, the pagan, viii, ix, xii, 113
 Goodenough, E. R., xviii
 Goodspeed, E. J., 138
 Gospel, the Fourth, xiii, xvii, 131, 133
 Grace, doctrine of, 122, 126, 131f.
 Graillot, H., 62, 67, 106
 Grant, F. C., xix, xxi
 Grant, M., xix
 Grant, R. M., xx, xxi

- Gray, G. B., 70
 Greek language and thought, x, xi,
 xvi, 109, 111, 116, 117, 122, 135,
 136ff.
 Grégoire, H., 4
 Gregory of Nyssa, 141
 Gressmann, H., 3, 8, 10, 90
 Griffith, G. T., xviii
 Grill, J., 34
 Grobel, K., xxi
 Gruppe, 119
 Guignebert, Ch., 47
 Guillaumont, A., xxi
 Güntert, H., 48
 Gwynn, A., 92

 Halliday, W. R., 1, 23, 57, 59, 67,
 101
 Hanslik-Andrée, 118
 Harder, R., 118
 Harnack, A. von, 30, 44, 63f., 99,
 128, 142
 Harpocrates, 120
 Hartleben, 113
 Hatch, E., 4, 11, 23, 29, 57, 68, 70,
 91, 102f.
 Hatch, E. and Redpath, H. A., 30,
 39f.
 Haussouillier, B. and Ingholt, H.,
 65
 Head, B. V., 36
 Heavenly Lord, xvi
 Heavenly Man, 29
Heilige Handlung, 110, 114
 Heim, R., 53
 Heitmüller, W., 63, 135
 Helios, 119
 Hell, harrowing of, 107
 Hellenism, xi-xii, xiv, xv, 109, 116
 Helmreich, 113
 Hemberg, B., 113
 Hennecke, E., 77, 81
 Hepding, H., 43, 67, 106
 Heraclitus, xiii, 51f.
 Hercher, 120
 Hereafter, the, 115, 117
 Hermes, xiv
 Hermes Trismegistus, xvi
 Hermetic writers and literature, xi,
 xiv, xvi, xvii, 14f., 26, 30, 47-51,
 55, 62f., 64, 92, 98f., 103, 134, 139
 Hermetism, 16, 57, 92f., 94, 96, 97-
 99, 100, 103, 136
 Herodotus, 49, 112, 114
 Herter, H., 8
 Hesiod, 60
Hilaria, 53, 106
 Hill, G. F., 4, 32
Hippolytan Church Order, 107
 Hippolytus, 23, 75, 137, 141
Hippolytus, Liturgy of, 78, 80
 Hocart, A. M., 74
 Holl, K., 42, 89, 100, 103, 143, 144
 Homeric Hymn to Demeter, 110, 111
 Hopfner, Th., 7, 14
 Horace, 92, 139
 Hoskyns, Sir E. C., 24
 Hubaux, J., 61
 Hunkin, J. W., 22, 26

 Iamblichus, 83, 108
 Iconostasis, 143
 Ignatius, 59, 126, 137
Illumino/ illuminatio/ illuminator,
 136
 Imhoof-Blumer, F., 36, 119
 Incarnation, idea of, ix, 136f.
 "In Christ," 52
 Individual/individualism, 11f.,
 110f., 114, 123
 Inge, W. R., 51
 Ingholt, H., 65
 Initiation, 53, 60-67, 74f., 86f., 109-
 21, 133, 135f., 137, 138, 140, 142f.
 Inscriptions, x-xii, 113f., 118
 Iranian beliefs, xii, xiv, 9f., 48, 64,
 97
 Irenaeus, 45, 136
 Isaac, 138
 Isis, 6, 10f., 13, 19, 26, 32, 34, 53f.,
 61, 65, 87, 116, 118, 120, 142
 Isocrates, 39

 Jacoby, A., 49
 Jaeger, W. W., 47, 90
 Jeremiah, 122
 Jeremias, F., 42
 Jessen, 119
 Jesus Christ, vii, ix, xvi, xvii, 124,
 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133f.,
 136f., 140
 John the Baptizer, 124
 Johnson, S. E., 134
 Jonas, H., xx
 Jones, A. H. M., xix
 Jones, R. M., 90

- Josephus, ix, 3, 19, 41
 Judaism: early ix-xi, xiv; Hellenistic, xiii, xiv, xvi, xvii, 2, 15, 121-124
 Judgment, 131
 Julian, xii, 20, 58, 72, 75, 97, 100, 103f., 108, 117
 Justification, 26
 Justin, vii, 45, 76, 132, 137
 Juvenal, 19, 42
- Kabbala, the, xiv
 Kaerst, J., 11
 Kaibel, G., 37
 Keil, B., 40, 119
 Keil, J., 4
 Keil, J., and von Premerstein, A., 62
 Kennedy, H. A. A., 47
 Kern, O., 6, 32
 Kingdom of God, 60, 65, 69, 80, 132
 Kings, deification of, 10; *see also* Caesar-worship
 Kircher, K., 74
 Kirk, K. E., vii
 Kirsch, J. P., 62
 Kittel, G., xx, 130
 Klauser, T., xxi, 144
 Klostermann, E., 44, 69
 Knox, W. L., xii, 25, 30, 43, 46, 51, 77, 81, 86, 123
 Kornemann, E., 10
 Körte, A., 65
 Kozelka, L., 106
 Kraeling, C. H., xviii, 124
 Krebs, E., 41
 Kroll, J., 106f.
 Kroll, W., 14, 30
Kykeon, 74, 133
 Kyrios, 28, 32-35, 41, 46
- Lactantius, 45
 Lagrange, M.-J., 84
 Lake, K.-S., 138
 Last Supper, the, 43, 77f., 125, 129; *see also* Eucharist, Lord's Supper
 Latte, K., 12, 22
 Laum, B., 66
 Lausiac history, 15
 Law, the Jewish, ix, x-xi, xvi, 26, 43, 95, 98, 123, 130
 Law, Christianity as a new, 70
 Lawson, J. C., 60
 Leclercq, H., 34, 73, 81, 87
- Lehmann, K., 113
 Leipoldt, J., 61
 Leisegang, H., 52
 Lemnos, 113
 Leto, 3
 Lewy, H., xviii
 Lieberman, S., xviii
 Liechtenhan, R., 9, 54, 82, 91, 95, 97
 Lietzmann, H., 13, 38, 43, 47, 49, 55, 68f., 70, 73, 77f., 79f., 82, 85, 98f., 135
 Light, metaphor of, 136, 138
 Lightfoot, J. B., 30
 Linforth, I. M., 115
 Livy, 61, 112, 142
 Lobeck, C. A., 23
 Loeschke, G., 106
 Logos doctrine, xiii, 51f., 123, 131, 138
 Lohmeyer, E., 30
 Loisy, A., 5, 24, 26ff., 31, 43, 53, 59, 64, 66, 68f., 76, 78, 102
 Lord's Supper, the, 33, 127, 130; *see also* Last Supper
 Lucan, 143
 Lucian, 31, 88, 112, 135
 Lucretius, 34, 92
- Ma, 3
 MacDonald, G., 10
 Magic, xi, 3, 16, 28, 31f., 53, 57, 62f., 65, 74, 78
 Mandaean, 46, 48, 52, 85, 97f., 145
 Manetho, 7
 Mani/Manichaeism, xvii, 48, 139
 Manna, 123, 128f., 130, 131, 137
Maran, Mari, 33
 Marcion/Marcionism, 85, 127
 Marcus, R., xviii
 Marrou, H. I., xix
 Marsh, H. G., 124, 137, 139
 Martial, 34
Matthew, Martyrdom of, 138
 Mattingly, H., 4, 38
 Mayer, A. L., 71
 Meals, religious, ix, 72-76, 125, 128f., 133
 Méautis, G., 93
 Meecham, 137
 Melchisedek, 129
 Melito, 118, 137f.
 Menander the Gnostic, 45, 112
 Mendel, G., 120

- Meritt, B. D., 111, 112
 Messiah/Messianism, ix, 46, 71, 123, 124f., 128
 Meter, 3
 Mewaldt, J., 11
 Meyer, E., 12, 33, 41
Militia Christi/sacra/sancta, 30, 91, 141f.
 Ministry, Christian, 86
 Minns, E., 62
 Missionary religion, Christianity as a, 25f., 129
 Missionary religions, xvi, 11
 Mithraism/Mithras, xi, xii, 6f., 20, 29, 53, 58f., 61, 65f., 76, 102, 116f., 133, 137
 Miura-Stange, A., 140
 Mnesimachus, 120
 Mohrmann, Chr., 141, 142, 144
 Mohrmann, F. van der M.-C., xix, 123
 Molland, E., 126
 Monotheism, 9, 29, 52, 122
 Moore, C. H., 67
 Moore, G., 22
 Moore, G. F., xviii, 124
 Morality and religion, 17ff., 122, 124, 128, 136
 Mormonism, 85
 Moses, 122, 127, 129
 Mother Goddess, 3
 Munck, S., 127
 Murray, G., viii
Mysis, 111, 118, 132, 138
Mystagogos, 111, 112, 143
 Mysteries/mystery religions, xiii, 3, 5ff., 13ff., 23, 29, 37, 41, 53, 55-65, 68, 70, 72-76, 86, 91, 104, 109-22, 130, 140
Mysterion, 29, 68, 117, 122, 132, 133, 135, 137f., 140f., 143
 Mystery religion, Christianity as a, 23-56, 72
 Mystery-terminology, 30ff., 67f., 117-24, 132f., 135-43
 Mysticism, 13ff., 56, 89, 98f., 102ff.; astral, 90; "Christ mysticism," 52ff.
 Myth, vii, xiv, 127, 139
Mythol. Vatic., 83
 Naassenes, 29
 "Name of Jesus," 63
 Neoplatonism/Neoplatonists, xvii, 15f.
 Neopythagoreanism/Neopythagoreans, 13, 15f., 22, 92, 97
 Nilsson, M. P., xii, xix, xx, 83, 109, 110, 111, 117ff., 127, 142
 Nock, A. D., viii, xviii, xix, xx, xxi, 4, 9f., 13, 16, 18f., 21f., 31f., 34f., 37, 39, 50f., 55, 61, 64f., 83, 86, 90, 94, 99, 101f., 104, 109, 113, 115, 117, 119, 120, 125f., 133
 Nonnus, 106
 Norden, E., 30, 34, 39, 99
 Nötscher, Fr., 105
 Nous, 99
Odes of Solomon, 48f.
 Oehler, J., 37
 Old Testament, 126f., 130, 136, 137f., 140
 Oliver, J. H., 112
 Oppermann, H., 73
 Order, Church, 86
Orgia, 117
 Origen, 115, 135, 139ff.
 Orpheotelestai, the, 115
 Orpheus, xiv
 Orphica/Orphicism, 11, 13, 23, 30, 62, 84, 92, 100
 Osiris, 29, 42f., 60, 72, 105f., 120
 Otto, W., 8
 Overbeck, J. A., 5
 Ovid, 57
 Paganism, relation to Christianity, vii, viii, 132ff., 136-44
 Panamara, 118
 Panathenaea, the, 117
 Paribeni, R., 62
Parousia, 28, 39, 47, 55, 97
 Passion, Christ's, 137
 Passover, 123f., 129, 130, 137f., 141
 Paul, St./Paulinism, viii, ix, xi, xii, xiv, xvi, xvii, 15, 23ff., 125-28, 130-34, 137f., 144
Paul, Acts of, 138
Paul, Passion of St., 138
 Pausanias, 4, 74, 119
 Peek, W., 118
 Pentateuch, 123
 Pentheus, 139
 Perdelwitz, R., 64
 Perdrizet, P., 34, 142

- Pergamon, 113
 Perler, O., 142
 Personalities, divine, 9
 Peterson, E., 30f., 35, 125, 135, 138
 Pétrement, S., xvi, xx
 Pettazoni, R., 5f.
 Pfister, F., 9f., 38f., 67, 115
 Phillimore, J. S., 39
 Philo, ix, x, xiii, 15, 29f., 38, 41, 49, 51, 55-57, 99, 122f., 124, 131, 135, 139, 143
 Philodemus, 22
 Philosophy, xii, xiii, xv, 12, 14, 17, 90-99, 102ff., 121, 137, 139f.
 Philostratus, 112, 138, 145
Photismos, 15, 67f., 135f.
 Picard, Ch., 30, 62, 113, 118
 Pick, B., 35
 Pindar, 115, 118
 Plato/Platonism, xv, xvi, xvii, 9, 14, 84, 103, 115, 121, 136, 139
Pleroma, xiii
 Pliny, 22
 Plotinus, xvii, 55
 Plutarch, xi, 9, 12, 22, 29, 61, 97, 112, 121, 142
Pneumatikos, 15
 Poerner, J., 61
 Pohlenz, M., 9, 94f., 97
 Polster, G., 56
 Polybius, 13
 Porphyry, xvii, 19, 82, 138
 Posidonius, 102
 Power(s), divine, xv, xvi, 9, 17, 23
 Prayer/praise, 129, 133f.
 Predestination, ix, 26
 Pre-existence of Christ, 49f.
 Preisigke-Bilabel, 120
 Preisike, F., 35
 Preisike, H., 85
 Premmerstein, A. von, 36, 141
 Presbyters, 78, 86, 100
 Preuschen, E., and Bauer, W., 26, 30, 37
 Priest, 71, 129
 Primal Man, 47; *see also* Heavenly Man
 Pringsheim, H. G., 61
 Proclus, 89
 Prometheus, xv
 Prophets, Christian, 78
 Providence, 9, 37
 Prümm, K., 117, 131, 137ff., 141, 143
 Pseudo-Apuleius, 134
 Pseudo-Augustine, 142
 Ptolemy, 90
 Puberty rites, 110
 Puech, A., 3
 Puech, H.-C., 127
 Purification, 111, 115, 139
 Pythagoras/Pythagoreans, 121
 Quispel, G., xx
 Qumran, ix, x, xviii
 Rahner, H., 138
 Ramsay, W. M., 2, 33, 41, 62
 Ransom, 42f.
 Ravennas, 118
 Rawlinson, A. E. J., vii, viii, 1, 33, 44f., 47, 50, 52, 64
 Reality, man's relation to, 115f.
 Rebirth/regeneration, 14f., 40, 53, 60-67
 Redemption, 43f.
 Reinach, A. J., 2
 Reitzenstein, R., xiv, 1, 4, 6-9, 14f., 22f., 25-31, 33, 40-44, 46-48, 50-55, 57, 59f., 62f., 64-67, 74, 85, 87f., 89f., 92, 94, 97-99, 103, 107
 Religious experience, the, 116f.
 Repentance, ix, 139
 Resurrection, 65; of Christ, vii, xvi, 105ff.; of Christians, mystical, by baptism, 64
 Reuterskiöld, E., 70, 74
 Revelation, 24, 122f., 132, 137, 140, 143
 Rietra, 141
 Ritter, H., 16
 Robert, J.-L., 114, 115, 133
 Robert, L., 119
 Robinson, H. W., 124
 Robinson, J. A., 77
 Roeder, G., 14
 Rohde, E., 31
 Roma, 4
 Rome, Church of, 63
 Roscher, W., 8, 14
 Rose, H. J., 8, 18, 73, 115, 142, 144
 Rostovtzeff, M., xviii, xix, 74, 133
 Roussel, P., 111, 112, 118, 126
 Rowley, E. M., 142
 Rufinus, 140

- Sabazius, 114
 Sacraments/sacramentalism, 54, 84-86, 126, 131ff., 137, 138-43; *see also* Baptism, Eucharist
Sacramentum, 141f.
 Sacrifice, 116, 123f., 128, 129, 130
 Saintyves, P., 46f.
 Salisbury, F., 4
 Sallustius, 72, 75, 102, 108
 Salmon, G., 23
 Salvation, 126f., 130, 137, 144
 Samothrace 113, 114, 115, 121
 Sancta Sophia, 144
 Sanctus, the, 134
 Sanday, W., 24, 51f., 77
 Sarapis, 8, 30, 34, 62, 73, 83, 119f.; *see also* Isis
 Sayce, A. H., 74
 Scapegoat, 42
 Scepticism, 12
 Schede, M., 40
 Scheffelowitz, J., 42, 74
 Scherer, J., 141
 Schniewind, 130
 Schoeps, H. J., viii, 124
 Scholem, G., xiv, xx
 Schrader, H., 60, 73
 Schulz, O. Th., 39
 Schwartz, E., 106
 Schweitzer, A., viii, 131
 Scott, E. F., 24, 89
 Scott, J. A., 62
 Scott, W., 14, 30, 49
 Scriptures, 103
 Scyles the Scythian, 114
 Seals/sealing, ritual, 135; *see also* tattooing
Sebomenoi, 2
 Seidl, E., 119
 Seleucids, the, xi-xii
 Sellin, E., 41
 Seltman, C. T., 4, 9
 Seneca, 90, 96, 121, 141
 Septuagint, xiii, 122, 132
 Serapion, 78
 Seth, xv
 Simon Magus, xvi
 Smith, Fr., 27
 Smith, M., 109, 123, 139
 Smith, W. R., 73
 Socrates, xv, 121
 Soden, H. von, 137
 Sokolowski, F., 115
 Son of God, viii, 44ff., 129, 136; *see also* Christology, *etc.*
 Son of Man, 44, 49, 131, 136
 Sopatros, 53
Soter, 35ff., 46, 119
Soteria, x, 36f., 86, 92
 Soul, xiv, xv
 Spiegel, S., xix
 Spiegelberg, W., 7, 36
Sphragis, 67, 135
 Spirit, Holy, 50f., 67, 83, 85f., 99, 100, 124, 129, 131f.
 Stählin, O., 74
 Steinleitner, F., 22, 33, 42
 Stendahl, K., xviii
 Stengel, P., 42
 Stephanus-Dindorf, 40
 Stewart, Z., 109
 Stoicism/Stoics, 11f., 14, 16, 21f., 29, 51, 54, 91, 93f., 94-97
 Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, P., 26, 40, 44, 50f., 64, 82, 86f., 95, 98, 108, 124
 Strathmann, H., 52
 Substitution, 67
 Suetonius, 141
 Svoronos, J., 33
 Swete, H. B., 51, 126
Syneidesis, 95

 Tammuz, 122
 Tarn, W. W., xviii, xix, 11
 Tarsus, 94
 Tatian, 3, 11, 51, 54, 103
 Tattooing, 135, 142
Taurobolium, 65, 66f., 145
 Taylor, L. R., 10
 Tcherikover, V., xviii
 Telesterion, the, 110, 111f.
Telete, 31, 62, 68, 115, 117-122, 132, 135ff., 139, 143
 Tertullian, xv, 60f., 76, 131, 141f.
 Thanksgiving, 133f
 Theon of Smyrna, 31
 Theophagy, 74, 145
 Theophrastus, 115
Theos Hypsistos, 2
 Theurgy, 15
 Therapeutai, the, x
 Thomas of Aquinum, 85
 Thomas, J., 124
Thomas, Acts of, 45, 49, 54, 138
Thomas, Gospel of, xvii

- Thomsen, A., 73
 Thoth, xvi
 Tibullus, 19, 61
 Timotheus, 8f.
 Torah, 123
 Trophonius of Lebadea, 118
 Turner, C. H., 126
 Turner, E. G., 144
 Typology, Christian, 126ff., 130, 144
 Überweg, F. and Praechter, U., 89
 Ultimate Deity, xvi
 Universalism in Christ's attitude: in Hellenistic religion, 7-11; in primitive Christianity, 25ff.
 Unnik, W. C. van, xxi
 Upper Room, the, 144
 Usener, H., 2, 144
 Valerius Maximus, 51
 Van der Leeuw, G., 109, 145
 Vasconcellos, J. L. de, 120
 Vegetius, 142
 Venetus, 118
 Vermaseren, M. I., 133
 Vettius Valens, 91
 Virgil, 83, 92
 Vogliano-Cumont, 120
 Wächter, Th., 18f.
 Walker, C. T. H., 52
 Walton, F. R., 109, 110
 Walzer, 115
 Waszink, J. H., 141
 Water, 128, 131, 132, 137
 Weber, W., 8f., 34, 39
 Weinreich, O., 13, 19f., 22, 30, 34, 36, 86, 92
 Weiss, J., xii, 24, 33, 63, 69, 84, 88, 100
 Wellhausen, J., 33
 Wendland, P., 1, 11f., 37f., 42
 Wesendonk, O. G. von, 4, 48
 Wetstein, J. J., 100, 108
 Wetter, G. P., 25, 38, 45, 48, 54f., 68f., 71, 78, 86, 101f., 107
 Whitaker, G. H., xviii
 Wilamowitz, 114, 117, 120
 Wilcken, U., 10, 19, 62
 Wilcken, U., and Mitteis, L., 32
 Williams, N. P., 69
 Williger, E., 34f., 44, 51
 Wilson, R. M. L., xx
 Windisch, H., 26, 40, 50, 99
 Wisdom of God, 50
 Wolff, G., 82
 Wolfson, H. A., xviii
 Woodward, A. M., 13
 Word of God, 131; *see also* Logos doctrine
 World Soul, xv, xvi
 Xanthoudides, S., 73
 Yahweh, 56
 Youtie, H. C., 119f.
 Zahn, R., 10
 Zeno, 12, 95
 Zeus, 134
 Zielinski, Th., 5, 9, 84
 Zijderveld, C., 118
 Zingerle, J., 18, 22
 Zuntz, G., 112, 115