

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. X.

APRIL, 1906.

No. 2.

## FAITH.

(Continued.)

The term *καρδία*, heart, and the uses for which Scripture employs this term, might seem sufficiently important to merit a separate discussion. For the present, suffice it to say that *καρδία* is, indeed, "more than the center of the living organism of matter." <sup>1)</sup> Scripture predicates of the heart every known activity of the inner life of man. The heart thinks, projects ideas, formulates judgments, weighs and ponders the pro and con of a question; the heart wishes, desires, cherishes a wish, frames resolves, impels to action. Reason, desire, and will, all act through and by means of the heart. We meet with such phrases as *νοεῖν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, to understand with the heart, John 12, 20; *ἐνθυμήσεις καὶ ἔννοιαι καρδίας*, the thoughts and intents of the heart, Hebr. 4, 12; *διάνοια κ.*, the imagination of the heart, Luke 1, 51; *ἐπίνοια κ.*, the thought of the heart, Acts 8, 22; *συνιέναι τῇ καρδίᾳ*, to understand with the heart, Matt. 13, 15; *λογίζεσθαι, διαλογίζεσθαι ἐν τ. κ.*, to reason in the heart, Mark 2, 6. 8; *εἰπεῖν ἐν κ.*, to say in one's heart, Rom. 10, 6. Envy and strife, James 3, 14; adulterous desire, Matt. 5, 28; double-mindedness, James 4, 8; sadness and gladness, John 14, 1; Acts 14, 17, have their seat in the heart. The heart conceives a purpose and decides in favor of an action, hence, exercises the will-power, Acts 5, 4; 7, 23; 11, 23. We would summarize the exhaustive research of Cremer in a few

1) Cremer, *Bibl. Woerterb.*, p. 494.

## SOME PARALLELS TO ROM. 1, 18 ff.

(Concluded.)

Among the leaders of modern thought, Dr. Mansel held that the only attributes of God "which may be reasonably predicated of Him," are Personality and Infinity. And Herbert Spencer does not admit as much. "Our duty is to submit ourselves with all humility to the established limits of our intelligence. Duty requires us neither to affirm nor to deny personality. . . . All attributes are degradations." God is "a Power to whom no emotion whatever can be ascribed."<sup>1</sup>) To the Greek mind the personality of God was a living fact. Of His attributes they recognized not only Infinity,<sup>2</sup>) but likewise Unity<sup>3</sup>) and Life.<sup>4</sup>) He is the Creator of all things,<sup>5</sup>)

1) *First Principles*, Part I, ch. 5, § 31. 32.

2) As did Anaximander: πάντα περιέχει καὶ πάντα κυβερνᾷ. (*Aristot. Phys.* IV, 4.) Secundus applies to him the expression πολυδιοίκητον πνεῦμα — "spiritus cuncta pervadens." (Mullachins, op. cit., p. 512.) Villosion terms this "commune totius antiquitatis dogma." (op. cit., p. 410.) Συνέχει πάντα and πνεῦμα ὀμῶν διὰ παντῶν, "penetrating everywhere," are expressions frequently met with.

3) Xenophanes (*Fragm.* 7) has: εἰς θεός, ἐν τε θεοῖσιν καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος; he asserts that the figures of mythology were "fictions of the ancients." Εἰς δὲ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἄρχων, θεός. (Plutarch, *De Exil.* 5.) Εἰς ὃν ὁ θεός. (Idem, *de Ei ar. Delph.*, 20.) "Ἐν κράτος, εἰς δαίμων γέμετο, μέγας ἄρχος ἀπάντων — "there is one power, one God, the great Ruler of all things." (*Orphica* VI, 17.) He is εἰς θεός ἐν πάντεσσι. (Ib. IV, 3.) Like the personality of God, his Unity is taken for granted in the passages hereafter adduced. His *Immutability* is asserted in the strongest of terms: ᾧ μοῖραι πείθονται, "whom the Fates must obey." (*Orphica* III, 4.) Elsewhere he is absolutely identified with Fate, as by the Stoics. (Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* I, 15.) "It is impossible that God should desire any change in himself." (Plato, *De Rep.* II, 381 C.)

4) "He alone may fitly receive the predicate ἔσται" (not merely ἦν or ἔσται). (Plato, *Phaidros* 278 D.)

5) As in the passages cited above. According to Cicero, man was created "praeclara quadam conditione a supremo Deo." (*De Legg.* I, 22.) "God has created and endowed him." (Ib. 27.)

—omnipotent,<sup>6)</sup> omnipresent,<sup>7)</sup> omniscient,<sup>8)</sup> and eternal.<sup>9)</sup> To Him is ascribed holiness,<sup>10)</sup> justice,<sup>11)</sup> wisdom,<sup>12)</sup> and Truth.<sup>13)</sup> His Righteousness and Justice were present to the mind of orator, historian, and dramatist, — a terrible justice, inexorable, inevitable, and, according to Plato, unappeased by sacrifice and supplication. It is in this recognition of divine Justice that the pagan Consciousness of Sin, ever recurring in the history of ethnic religions, finds an explanation.

There remains one other phenomenon, exhibited in Greek and Roman literature alike, in which a reasserting of the higher knowledge over against the popular, traditional polytheism may be observed: the constant confusion which seems to have prevailed regarding the notions of one God and of many gods, a confusion which becomes apparent in the frequent intrusion of monotheistic terms into passages which seem to reaffirm the traditional theology, and vice versa. Indeed, a very great

6) Epicharmus, *Fragm.*, v. 298: ἀδυνατεῖ δ' οὐδὲν θεός. (Cf. *Odyss.* ξ, 444, quoted above.) Plutarch, *Plac. Phil.* I, 7: εἰ θεὸν οἴσθα, ἴσθ' ὅτι καὶ ῥέξαι δαίμονι πᾶν δυνατόν.

7) Οὐδὲν ἐκφεύγει τὸ θεῖον . . . αὐτὸς ἴσθ' ἁμῶν ἐπόπτας (inspector). (Epicharmus, *Fragm.*, v. 297 sq.)

8) Οὐλος (= ὄλος) ὄρᾱ, οὐλος δὲ νοεῖ, οὐλος δὲ ἀκούει. (Xenophanes, *Fragm.* 2.) "He sees and hears all things." (Homer.) "The eye of God sees all things at once." (Xenophon, *Mem.* I, 4, 17.)

9) Xenophanes: "They say that God is One and Eternal," αἰδίων καὶ ἕνα. (Cited also by Cicero, *Lucullo*, ch. 35.) Parmenides regarded him as "eternal and without a beginning," οὐ γενόμενον.

10) There were revulsions of feeling against the atrocities ascribed to the divinities by Homer and Hesiod. Plato protests against the notion that God should be the cause of evil (*De Rep.* II, 379 D); in his ideal republic the "lies and fables" of Hesiod and Homer shall not be recited to the young (ib. 377 D). Similar protests were raised by Pindar, *Aischylos*, Herodotus, and others. — Aristotle has the expression "Supreme in virtue," as applied to God, κράτιστος ἀρετῆ. (*De Mundo*, ch. 6.)

11) "The Deity leads the evildoer to judgment." (Menander, 14.) Δίκης μέτα (with Right) πάντα κυβερνᾷς. (Cleantes, *Hymn.* I, 34.)

12) "God alone can be called Wise." (Plato, *Phaidros*, 278 D.)

13) Antoninus has "θεὸς εἰς διὰ πάντων . . . ἀλήθεια μία." Just so Cicero (*De Nat. Deor.* III, 6; I, 15), and the Stoics generally. Plato has (*Apolog.* 21 B): [θεός] αὐτὸς δὴ πῶς ψεύδεται· οὐ γὰρ θέμις αὐτῷ—God cannot lie.

number of passages<sup>14</sup>) contains, in close conjunction, both the singular and the plural forms of *θεός* and *deus*, with frequent interchange and substitution of the terms. Of course, we have in mind only such cases where the singular does not refer to some definite divinity of the pantheon, and is not used in the indefinite sense of "a deity." The following from Cicero will illustrate: "Nothing is greater than God (*praestantius deo*); he is subject to nothing; hence he rules the whole universe;" whereupon he adds: "*etenim si concedimus intelligentes esse deos,*" etc. The preceding context also has the plural form. (*De Nat. Deor.* II, 30.) The writers seem continually to lapse from higher to baser religious views, and then again seem to rise above the debris of their traditional faith into realms of a higher cognition. As a matter of fact, the Olympian divinities were relegated to the domain of poetry and the pictorial arts long before they were made the butt of Lucian's jests, and the doctrine of One God was indeed, as Villoisonius has it, "*commune totius antiquitatis dogma,*" the recognition of One, the Creator and Preserver, the Judge and the Avenger, who loomed even above majestic Zeus enthroned on Olympus, of One who stood afar off and alone, One "who was, who is, who will be" — but to whom worship was never rendered.<sup>15</sup>) They "glorified him not as God, . . . but became vain in their imaginations and their foolish heart was darkened," until idolatry was swallowed up in the Pantheism of the schools, and in the Atheism of Lucian and Lucrece.

What was the source of this knowledge? The evolutionist is ready to apply his little formula; he sees in all this merely the culmination of a national religious development. Two con-

14) Especially in Plato (*e. g.* *De Legg.* V, 739 E, as throughout the *Republic* and the *Laws*), in Cicero (as in the *Nature of the Gods, Offices, Epistles*), and in Seneca.

15) The notion — still reiterated in the popular handbooks of mythology — that a higher form of *worship* obtained in the Greek Mysteries, was given its quietus, some seventy-five years ago, by Lobeck in his *Aglaophamus*. Read Arnobius, *Adv. Nationes* V, 20 sqq., for a true estimation of these mysteries.

siderations will show this construction to be unsatisfactory: 1) How can the same law account for the subsequent decay and dissolution of this "nobler faith"? And 2), "Evolution," in Spencer's famous definition, is a change from homogeneity to heterogeneity, from "simpler to more complex" forms. A progress from polytheism to monotheism, from many gods to one God, however, would represent a change from more complex to simpler forms, *the reverse* of that course which we are asked to regard as preestablished by the law of evolution! Besides, we have already given instances of a belief in one God as held by nations and tribes very low in the scale of development—by those, in fact, whom the evolutionist regards as "aboriginal" men.

Christian scholars have found in instances such as quoted above either reminiscences of an original revelation, or have explained them as the result of an acquaintanceship, on the part of the pagan writers, with the Hebrew Scriptures. Both of these views are unsupported by historical evidence,<sup>16)</sup> and are hypotheses, pure and simple. There is here no need of hypotheses. The words of St. Paul are so clear as to render all guess-work unnecessary: "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world *are clearly seen, being understood* by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." This, then, is the *manner* in which the natural mind arrives at its knowledge of the Creator: He is seen and understood, His eternal power and Godhead stand revealed—in the works of Nature.

---

16) Scripture is silent as to the manner in which Melchizedek, for instance, obtained his knowledge of El Eljon; whether it was the faith of Noah that he retained, or whether he had received a special revelation, we are unable to tell. The Eastern nations *may* have, at a much later time, profited by the residence of the Jews in Babylon, or by commercial intercourse. But even this is unsupported by contemporary evidence. Besides, the *universal* occurrence of monotheistic views could not thus be explained.—It need hardly be added, that the reports of an intercourse of Plato and Aristotle with the Hebrew prophets are of an entirely legendary, not to say mythical, character.

Some striking *verbal* coincidences may be disclosed by a comparison of the words of St. Paul, Rom. 1, 20, with ex professo arguments of pagan authors for the existence of God. "So much *may be understood*," says Aristotle,<sup>17)</sup> "concerning God, who is of surpassing *power*, and of *eternal* life; . . . for, being *invisible* to every mortal creature, He is *seen* in the *works* themselves." Stobaeos cites expressions quite as remarkable in his *Eclogae*: "God can neither be seen nor can He be perceived (*ἀσθητός*), but He is *visible to the mind* (*νόφω*); His *works and operations are perceived* by all men." Similarly, in Xenophon: "He who has learned to recognize the *power* (*δύναμις*) *in creation* is under obligations to worship (!) the divinity."<sup>18)</sup> And in the *Orphic Hymns*:<sup>19)</sup> "My child, I will show you the footprints and the *mighty hand* of the *powerful God*, wherever I observe them." And where did he observe the workings of this power? In the water, in the air, in the storm, in the earthquake, and in the starry firmament<sup>20)</sup> — in all that which St. Paul terms "the creation of the world." Similarly, Hierocles observed, in the visible universe and in its *incorruptibility*, "an image of the world-creator God."<sup>21)</sup> It may be repeated in this connection that the Egyptian "Untar," the name applied to the "Unknown God," signifies "*Power*;"<sup>22)</sup> the *method* by which the Egyptian mind arrived at this concept is thereby clearly indicated.

In the year A. D. 1440, at a grand religious council held at the consecration of a newly built temple of the Sun at Cuzco, Peru, the Inca Yupanqui arose before the assembled multitude, and spoke somewhat as follows:<sup>23)</sup> "Many say that the Sun is

17) Ταῦτα χρῆνὴ περὶ θεοῦ διανοεῖσθαι, δυνάμει μὲν ὄντος ἰσχυροτάτου, ζωῇ δ' ἀθανάτου . . . διότι πάσῃ θνητῇ φύσει ἀθεώρητος ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων θεωρεῖται. *De Mundo*, cap. 6. Not only the thought, but the very *vocabulary* of these lines will be seen to correspond very closely with Rom. 1, 20.

18) Xenophon, *Memorabilia* IV, 3, 14. 19) II, 18.

20) *Ib.*, v. 24—41; cf. Plato, *De Legg.* X, 886 A.

21) *Comment. in Aureum Carmen*; Mullachins I, p. 419 (ἀφθάρτου, as in Rom. 1, 23: ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ).

22) Renouf, l. c.

23) Brinton, *Myths of the New World*, p. 72 sqq.

the maker of all things. But he who makes should abide by what he has made. Now, many things happen when the Sun is absent; therefore he cannot be the Universal Creator. And that he is alive at all is doubtful, for his trips do not tire him. . . . He is like a tethered beast which makes a daily round under the eye of a master. . . . I tell you that he, our father and master, the Sun, *must have a lord and master more powerful than himself*, who constrains him to his daily circuit without pause or rest." A temple was constructed to this greatest of all existences, in a vale by the sea, near Callao. "The fact," says Brinton, "and the approximate time of the incident are beyond question." The signal failure of this attempt at an introduction of a higher faith has been stated in a previous chapter.—The main facts of the *Mexican* story, alluded to in the same connection, are the following: The Mexican king Nezahualcoyotl (ca. 1400) devoted much time to the study of astronomy, botany, and zoology. "*He studied attentively the causes of the phenomena of Nature*," says the contemporary native record cited by the Spanish historians, "and this study led him to recognize the worthlessness of his faith. '*Verily*,' he exclaimed, '*the gods that I am adoring, what are they but idols of stone without speech and feeling?* They could not have made the beauty of the heaven, the sun, the moon, and the stars, which light the earth, with its countless streams, its fountains and waters. . . . *There must be some God, invisible and unknown, who is the universal Creator.* He alone can console me and take away my sorrow."<sup>24</sup>) In this case also a temple was dedicated "to the Unknown God," though idolatry was not abolished. And of this and other expressions containing monotheistic views, as found among the Aztecs before the advent of the European, Brinton again remarks that they are "of undoubted indigenous origin," and "will bear the closest scrutiny." They may be placed on record, therefore, as authentic examples of that *method* by which in Rom. 1 all men are said to arrive at a knowledge of the Creator.—

24) Cited in Schultze, *Fetichism* VII, 2, and by Brinton, l. c., 74.

The remaining verses of our chapter, vv. 21—32, are concerned mainly with the moral decadence which resulted from a denial of the truth revealed to man in nature, a moral disintegration such as the apostle had good opportunity to observe in his travels among the peoples on the shores and islands of the Mediterranean. However, this was accompanied *pari passu* with a gradual "clouding over," to use Rawlinson's expression, of religious knowledge, of the Truth which man possessed. Their heart "was darkened," v. 21; they "became fools," v. 22; the truth "was changed into a lie;" they "did not retain God in their knowledge." The doctrine of One God was, indeed, "commune dogma" of all antiquity—even during and after the age of greatest moral degeneration—and has been demonstrated in the case of savage tribes at a time when they had reached the very lowest stages of fetichistic worship. On the other hand, the *decay* of religious knowledge which accompanied this moral dissolution is likewise corroborated by the history of ethnic religions. Without exception, the religions of the world show traces of an earlier, higher, and purer faith. The farther back we trace them, the less conspicuous do their mythologic and superstitious elements become, the higher and nobler do they grow, the clearer and stronger does the innate truth, the knowledge of a Creator revealed in his works shine forth.

Vague *recollections* of an earlier, purer religion are not rare in the records of ethnic races. In his *Phaidros*, Plato introduces Socrates as conversing on the service and worship most pleasing to God; Phaidros is questioned upon his views in the matter, and is asked whether he has any knowledge of the subject. Phaidros answers, "Not any; have you?" "I have indeed," says Socrates; "I have indeed heard a common report of the ancients, but the truth they themselves knew. If we could discover it [the truth] ourselves, should we then any longer have need of human opinions?"<sup>25)</sup> Cicero says<sup>26)</sup> that "the ancients (antiquitas) approached nearest to the gods," and in

25) τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων δοξασμάτων, *Phaidr.* 274 B.

26) *De Legg.* II, 27.



the *Orphic Hymns*, cited above, we meet allusions to "an ancient report" (λόγος) concerning the Ruler of the world. Andrew Lang<sup>27)</sup> records the report of the first missionaries in Greenland to the effect that "they could gather from a free dialogue they had with some perfectly wild Greenlanders (at that time avoiding any direct application to their hearts), that *their ancestors* must have believed in a Supreme Being, and did render him some service, which their posterity neglected little by little. An Eskimo said to a missionary, 'Certainly there must be a Being *who made all these things*. He must be very good, too. . . . Ah, did I but know him, how I would love and honor him!'"

The founders of the Comparative Study (or Science) of Religion, and the greatest authorities in its various departments, are practically unanimous in their opinion, that all pagan systems of mythology and religion contain remnants of a more exalted form of belief, of a higher, clearer knowledge of the Divinity, which gradually became dimmed and corrupted.

From Max Mueller's Lecture on the Vedas<sup>28)</sup> we quote the following: As a result "to which a comparative study of religions is sure to lead," "we shall learn that religions in their most ancient form, or in the minds of their authors, are generally free from many of the blemishes that attach to them in later times;" and from his Essay on Greek Mythology:<sup>29)</sup> "When we ascend to the most distant heights of Greek history, the idea of God, as the Supreme Being, stands before us as a simple fact."—F. G. Welcker, who was to the study of Greek mythology what Mueller was to the study of ethnic systems in general, has laid down the following as the ultimate result of his researches: "This [Greek] polytheism has settled before the eyes of men like a high and continuous mountain range, beyond which it is the privilege only of general historical study to recognize, as from a higher point of view, the natural primitive monotheism."<sup>30)</sup> Concerning the monotheistic ideas of

27) *The Making of Religion* (1898), p. 199.

28) *Essays*, vol. I, p. 48.

29) *Essays*, II, p. 146.

30) *Griechische Goetterlehre*, vol. I, p. 225 f.

later thought, the same author says that they are to be regarded *not* as a result of an ascending line of evolution (“aufsteigende Linie der Entwicklung”), but as “a *return* of the profound wisdom of old age to the feeling of *primitive* simplicity.”—From Carl Boettcher’s great work on the Treeworship of the Greeks, we may cite: “So far as we are able to trace the sacred tradition of the Greeks into prehistoric times, the united pre-Hellenic nation recognized only one God, nameless, without temples and images.” This he regards as a tradition of “irrefutable inner truthfulness. . . . The beginning of Polytheism therefore represents the *second* phase of Greek religion, which was preceded by a Monotheism.”<sup>31)</sup>

Le Page Renouf expresses his entire agreement with the “matured judgment” of Emmanuel Rougé: “The first characteristic [of the Egyptian religion] is the Unity of God most energetically expressed: God, One, Sole and Only—no others with Him . . . the Only Being. . . . The belief in the Unity of the Supreme God and in His attributes as Creator and Law-giver of man, whom He has endowed with an immortal soul, . . . *these are the primitive notions*, enchased in the midst of mythological superfetations accumulated in the centuries.” “The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient,” adds Le Page Renouf.<sup>32)</sup> Franz Lenormant reached the same conclusion.

Of the Phoenicians the greatest student of their history and religion, F. K. Movers, says: “Nature worship gradually obscured the purer God-idea of a more ancient stage of belief, but has never entirely obliterated it.”<sup>33)</sup> Later he again refers to this “adulteration of a purer and more ancient God-idea.”

Regarding the Zoroastrian, M. Haug, the famous Zend-scholar, asserts,<sup>34)</sup> that “Monotheism was the leading idea of his theology;” Ahura-mazda, *i. e.*, “the Living Creator.” Zoroaster did not teach a theological Dualism. He arrived “at the

31) p. 7 sqq.

32) *The Religion of Anc. Egypt*, p. 94 sqq.

33) *Die Phoenizier*, vol. I, p. 168.

34) *Essays on the Sacred Language, etc., of the Parsees* (London 1884), p. 300 sqq.

idea of the unity and indivisibility of the Supreme Being," but "in course of time this doctrine was changed and *corrupted* . . . the dualism of God and the devil arose." "Monotheism was *superseded* by Dualism."<sup>35)</sup>

Both Dr. F. Hommel<sup>36)</sup> and Friedrich Delitzsch<sup>37)</sup> agree on the question of an early Arabian and Sumerian monotheism. Dr. Hommel demonstrates from the personal surnames contained in the inscriptions the existence of "a very exalted monotheism" "in the most ancient times" of the Arabian nation, about 2500 B. C., and among the Semitic tribes of northern Babylonia. This "monotheistic religion" degenerated under the influence of Babylonian polytheism.<sup>38)</sup> The same opinion was held years ago by Julius Oppert, the Assyriologist, who was led a belief in "a universal primitive monotheism as the basis of all religions."<sup>39)</sup>

Expressions similar to the above might be adduced from Rawlinson,<sup>40)</sup> Legge (*Religions of China*), Doellinger,<sup>41)</sup> Victor v. Strauss-Tarney,<sup>42)</sup> Jacob Grimm,<sup>43)</sup> and others. In short, the

35) Rawlinson speaks of "the purer and more ancient form of the Persian Religion." (*Anc. Mon.* II, p. 224.)

36) *Allisraelitische Ueberlieferung* (1897), ch. III.

37) Essay "Monotheism," 1903.

38) *op. cit.*, p. 117.

39) The bearing of these facts upon the evolutionistic conception of human history should be noted in passing; more especially, their bearing upon the popular notions concerning the descent of man. That all religions grow purer the farther we trace them back, admits of no doubt. But this militates against the idea of a "tailless, catarrhine, ape" (Huxley) as the ancestor of man. The evolutionists see the danger and strain all their powers—including, also, their capacity for truthfulness—in endeavoring to demonstrate *by processes of reasoning* (not by adducing historical evidence), that man's early faith was Animism and Fetichism, out of which, successively, Polytheism and Monotheism were evolved.

40) *Religions of the Ancient World, and Ancient Monarchies.*

41) *Judentum und Heidentum.*

42) *Altaegypt. Goetterlehre*, II, 38 sqq.; 72 sq.

43) *Deutsche Mythologie.* As, from the chapter on Odin: "Odin appears to have been the almighty, omnipresent Being, the spiritual Divinity. . . . This original notion was *obscured and finally lost*, . . . the old Divinity was degraded into an evil, Satanic, cruel being."

majority of independent and unprejudiced students of heathen beliefs, from the days of A. W. v. Schlegel<sup>44)</sup> to our own, have reached the conclusion, that all religions in their later stages exhibit a much lower conception of the Divinity than in their earlier form. It is only the hopelessly prejudiced who can say, as does John Fiske,<sup>45)</sup> that "to regard classic paganism as one of the degraded remnants of a primeval monotheism, is to sin against the canons of a sound inductive philosophy." Sinning against the consonant testimony of universal history is a venial offense, it would seem, when the integrity of this "sound inductive philosophy" — that is, of the Hegelo-Spencerian theory — is at stake. It needs but a glance at the well-known facts of religious history to show the working of this law of Decay as influencing the development of every system of belief which has a recorded history or a literature. Phœnician religion made the descent from an almost unalloyed monotheism to the cults of Moloch and Astarte; the lofty system of Egypt, to a worship of crocodiles, bulls, cats, and beetles; the early Parsee faith, to a crude sort of idolatry, now little better than fetichism; the ancient religion of China, to a grotesque worship of apocryphal monsters and a gibbering dread of ghosts and demons; the religion of Vedic India, first to a polytheistic form of belief, in which the ancient God-idea long continued to shine forth, but to-day to a worship of hideous wooden idols and the Buddhist prayer-wheel;<sup>46)</sup> the faith of early Greece, passing first through a stage of polytheism,<sup>47)</sup> in which the debauched and

---

44) "The longer I study the history of ancient times, the more am I convinced that all civilized nations have proceeded from a purer knowledge of the Supreme Being." (*Introd. to Prichard's Egypt. Mythol.*, p. XVI.)

45) *Myths and Myth-makers* (1895), p. 108.

46) Bastian remarks, that the very names of the great Trimurti (Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva) which figure so largely in the popular hand-books of Mythology, are unknown to the great mass of the Hindoos. (*San Salvador*, p. 326.)

47) The ordinary compend of Mythology gives no conception of the depravities of this system; Arnobius' seven books *Adversus nationes* should be read to gain a true insight into its enormities.

perjured race of the Olympians received homage, ended in vulgar superstitions, among the masses, or in pantheism, among the cultured; while Rome perverted its higher conceptions (*e. g.*, the Etruscan Jupiter) into a worship of fetiches, pure and simple, burned incense to human tigers like Caligula, and resolved itself into that maze of superstitions—paralleled only in the accounts of modern travelers in Central Africa and Oceanica—which Juvenal describes. The workings of this law can be traced even in the case of savage tribes. Of the African negroes, P. Baudin says that “their traditions and religious doctrines . . . show clearly that they are a people in decadence. . . . They have an obscure and confused idea of the only God, . . . who *no longer* receives worship.”<sup>48)</sup> “The negroes possess the remnants of a noble and sublime religion, though they have *forgotten* its precepts and *debased* its ceremonies.”<sup>49)</sup> They still retain a recollection “of God, the Supreme, the Creator.” Concerning the Zulus, Bastian records that they informed him that “*their ancestors* possessed the knowledge of . . . that *source of being* which is above, which gives life to men.”<sup>50)</sup> The example of the Eskimos has been cited above.—

Thus has the denial of “the Truth” at all times and everywhere worked out its result as stated Rom. 1, 21—32. The hearts of men “were darkened,” they “became fools,” and “did not retain God in their knowledge.” If the earlier systems of belief were of a more exalted character, this was because man’s heart had not yet become darkened; but in the course of time his organs of religious perception became enfeebled and atrophied, through long continued misuse and neglect; the cloud of ignorance settled over his eyes, and in the end his religion became a trembling, superstitious regard

48) *Fetichism*, p. 7. 10.

49) Winwood Reade, *Savage Africa*.

50) *Vorgeschichtliche Schoepfungsglieder*, p. 33. 34. Toland, Davies, and Hulbert testify that “the ancient Druids believed originally in one supreme, invisible, omnipresent, and omnipotent Deity . . . and spoke of him under the epithet of *Hu*, signifying “*he that is*,” the self-existent Being.

of omens and portents, of Shamans, medicine men, soothsayers, and magicians, of fetiches, totems, talismans, and amulets. Yet it remains true that "*they have no excuse.*" Men cannot plead, even after ages of moral and religious corruption, an entire ignorance of Him to whom alone worship is due. In times of complete religious bankruptcy the idea of One God has reasserted itself in all its pristine vigor, and with astonishing clarity and intensity, just as examples of real pagan piety are regarded in ages of moral dissolution. The reason has been given by St. Paul: Both a knowledge of divine Law and a knowledge of His "eternal power and Godhead" are inscribed in the hearts of men (not merely retained by tradition); "*for God hath showed it unto them, so that they are without excuse,*" v. 20; "There is none that *seeketh* after God," ch. 3, 11 — the idolater persists in his idolatry. In the words of a great modern scholar: "Man cannot escape the belief that behind all form is one essence . . . ; yet he worships not the Infinite he thinks, but a base idol of his own making."<sup>51</sup>

Red Wing, Minn.

THEO. GRAEBNER.

---