

THE DEVIL IN LEGEND AND LITERATURE

ALLEN H. GODBEY, PH.D.

DR. RUDWIN has written half a dozen earlier "devil studies" in the past twenty years, dealing chiefly with the use made of the devil in French and German literature. The present volume is primarily a study of "fendish" elements in the literatures of England, France, and Germany: more narrowly, of their modern literatures. For the devil that Dr. Rudwin would have us consider is a product of the fusion of and conflict of medieval Christianity with pagan divinities and Jewish spooks and dethroned godlings of high and low degree. For devils, historically speaking, are often gods who have lost their jobs: deities sometimes proscribed because they are too popular! The element of political or tribal or ecclesiastical jealousy may be a prominent factor. "Your god is my devil," said Wesley to a theological opponent. The Pahlevi and the Sanscrit are two branches of one language and culture. But the Hindu, like the Roman, declared that *divs* or *devas* were the powers to be worshiped, and that the Asuras of the Northern peoples were "devils" indeed! Tit for tat! Zoroaster retaliates by declaring that an Asura (Ahura-Mazda-Ormuzd) is the Supreme Good, and that all *devas* are evil, and their worshipers all children of the devas. "There! take that!"

Just so, the supreme guardian angel in Assyro-Babylonian lore was a *Shêdu*: the ancestral guardian represented by the human-headed bull-colossi that guarded the gateways of temple and palace. "Entirely too popular: they get too large a share of the business!" think the representatives of rival cults. So the Palestinian prophet denounces the popular cult of *shêdim*: they are "no-gods" (Deut. 32:17). "Demons!" exclaim the English translators of Psalm 106:37. In the same way, medieval Christianity, finding a host of spirits of copse and fell and mountain and stream, strongly entrenched in the folk-cults of central and northern Europe, took the short cut of declaring them all "devils" and their worshipers "children of the devil," "in league with the devil," "sold to the devil," etc. But in later expository literature this historical process is reversed and we are regaled with tales of the many forms that the most Christian Devil is able to assume, instead of being told

that we have reminiscences of ancient cults. The ancient Palestinian tried to harmonize or synthesize by claiming that certain mighty cultus-powers were but a "name of Yahu," as in Isaiah 30:27ff, where a "name of Yahu" is coming from afar, burning, raging, blasting, destroying. The popular name of this Tophet-power we are not told. But Jeremiah, a hundred years later, repudiates this Yahwist acceptance of Tophet liturgy "which I commanded not, neither came it into my mind." (Jer. 19:1-6:32:35.) Jeremiah also knew those who regarded Yahu as a very convenient and accommodating evil power, who could be provoked to anger against their enemies by proper liturgies, (Jer. 7:18, 19). The modern American, with his terse "God d—n you" is equally advanced in his applied theology. A fixed historical line between nominally good and nominally evil powers cannot be drawn, and every anthropologist and every historian of religions knows it. In the realm of origins we cannot anywhere point to an original unmixed race, or liturgy, or cult or creed. The author of Hebrews 1:1 knew that the conception of a God that was current among those of religious fellowship was a composite one: "God, at different times, and with various fragments spoke unto the fathers in former days, through the prophets." Our own scientifically struggling day would confront him with some unfamiliar theologies.

Dr. Rudwin is careful to remind us, then, at the outset that the devil of whom he writes is not known in the Old Testament. An archfiend, a Supreme Evil Power, does not appear there. The word Satan, "prosecutor," as in Psalm 109:6, has no suggestion of the modern Christian devil. Neither has its Greek translation, *diabolos* from verb *diaballo*. Nowhere in Classic Greek do these words mean anything but "accuse, prosecute." In later times an evil sense of false accusation or slander appears, and in this sense it occurs in such N. T. passages as Titus 2:3; 1 Tim. 3:11; 2 Tim. 3:3. But the casual reader, saturated with the popular notion that our "devil" is an orthodox Biblical personage, is not likely to keep Dr. Rudwin's brief prefatory statement in mind.

Dr. Rudwin's collation is a definite contribution to anthropology. There may be a protest from those who define anthropology as "the science of primitive man." Have we really reached far enough into the past to be able to describe that hypothetical personage? Dr. Rudwin recognizes that in pre-Christian times ideas from Palestine,

Babylonia, Persia, and Egypt were blending to survive in the European Devil shaped in the Middle Ages, and exploited by later literati. Yet if those earlier stages of theological speculation were highly composite, complexes of the thinking of a much more primitive past, are the same elements any less primitive today when they survive in the devil-lore of modern writers? These men unconsciously prove to us that the blending and rearranging of borrowed ideas that seem to make the unseen world a little more intelligible is still going on. The modern western literateurs are no nearer finality in that field than the older pre-literary humanity.

Dr. Rudwin in his first three chapters deals with the origin of the Lucifer legend, and the number and names of the devils. An important omitted point must here be emphasized. "Lucifer" is the Latin translation of the Greek "Phōsphoros": and a Lucifer-legend could arise only in Latin literature and exegesis. The Greek "Phōsphoros" nowhere in classic Greek has any of the connotations of the later "Lucifer" conflation. In one Greek passage Bacchus is complimented as the *phōsphoros astēr* "light-bringing star." Venus as morning-star is frequently hailed as *phōsphoros*, or 'Eosphoros—"dawn-bringer"—particularly in the Orphic hymns. Hecate, whose offerings were made upon the 30th of the month, is sometimes heralded by the same title, because she heralded or effected the immediate return of the new moon. Nothing in all this classic Greek astronomical compliment has any element of the "Lucifer" complex. And in the one passage in the O. T. in which English translators introduced the term "Lucifer," with all its accumulated "fallen angel" suggestion, the pious Jewish translators of the Septuagint have no such idea. In Is. 14:12 they read, "How fell you from heaven, O dawn-bringer, herald of the morning"?

Dr. Rudwin (p. 3) is astray here, speaking of a "Hebrew word *Hillel*, the morning star, is the planet Venus". But the Hebrew word is *hêlêl*, Arab *hilal*: the last crescent of the waning moon: seen at dawn. (So Gesenius-Buhl, Zimmern, Hommel, Robertson Smith, Wellhausen, Clay)—The point is wholly missed by those who do not know that the Assyrian Sennacherib was the conqueror and King of Babylon, and finally its destroyer when it revolted. His name, 'Sin-ahê-irba, "Sin will increase his brothers," expresses the megalomaniac king's assurance that he would conquer for himself a chief place among the brothers of the moon-god, the never-setting divine

stars around the pole (Is. 14:13ff), becoming like unto this Elyôn. Yet after all the pompous preparation for his ritual deification he was suddenly assassinated by his own sons by the side of his already prepared *shêdu* or bull-colossus, and was cast out as an utterly abhorred branch of his family (2K. 19:37; Is. 14:15-21). There will be no mortuary offerings to his repudiated ancestral ghost. But Sin is the name of the great Assyro-Babylonian moon god. So Isaiah gibes at Sennacherib's anticipated full-moon splendor with the term *hêlêl*: "You're a *dying moon*—you will never be seen again!"

The Latin Lucifer-legend-builders are in certain points very close to this megalomaniac Sennacherib original (?), yet have blurred the whole. The later West did not know the history and cosmology of Assyro-Babylonia more than 1000 years before, and Babylonian rabbin and Talmud had lost it just as completely. But is it not Sennacherib's measureless pride and vaulting ambition that becomes immortalized as Lucifer's, while pointing to this passage?

As for Ezekiel's apostrophe against Tyre, (Ezek. 28:12-17) which Dr. Rudwin quotes on page 5, I do not know any reason for associating it with the Lucifer legend; and Dr. Rudwin does not mention any "patristic exegesis" which does so. The Lucifer of myth and poetry does not exist in popular speech anywhere. On page 121 Dr. Rudwin says "The early Christians, further, believed that Lucifer, in his efforts to copy the Lord, actually pronounced oracles and worked miracles, among the pagans," etc. Now this would lead one unfamiliar with the early Christian writings to suppose that they employed the name "Lucifer." But they did not. Even the great and voluminous Latin father Tertullian, whom Dr. Rudwin has just cited, never uses it. Only one passage in the Ante-Nicene Fathers contains it: *Origen's Peri Archôn* uses the above-considered Isaiah passage. But Origen himself, writing in Greek, did not use the name "Lucifer." His original is lost, and "Lucifer" in our present Origen-text we owe to his later Latin translator Rufinus. In some other passages Dr. Rudwin shows the same lack of precision.

In dealing with the popular fancies of innumerable fiends, we are told that "the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus as early as the third century mentions already several "legions of devils" who are under Satan's sway in hell." To lessen our terrors we should have

been reminded of twelve legions of angels that could be spared from the defenses of heaven (Matt. 26:53), even though no answer be given to the problem of medieval schoolmen—"How many angels could dance on the point of a needle?" We are also reminded that Josephus (Wars 7:6;3) speaks of legions of demons, meaning the spirits of wicked men (Rudwin, p. 17, note 3). But the same is true of the cemetery-maniac in Mark 5:3ff; Luke 8:27ff; and this case is one of a host that helps us understand folk-fancies. The poor victim of an obsession imagines that he is possessed not by one malicious spirit only but by the whole cemetery. Such cases are familiar today. Or a wandering "Saint" may constitute himself the guardian and oracle-spokesman of some petty cemetery instead of one tomb only.

But our special interest just here is that Puritanism has used *our* much-modified word "devil" for both *diabolos* and *daimōn* in the Greek. The Old Testament has no exact equivalent for either, unless we declare that *yiddeoni* is etymologically "one who deals with a knowing one." ("Our AV usually translates it 'wizard.'). For *daimōn*, *daimonion*, is simply "a knowing one" as Dr. Rudwin recognizes on p. 26. Its ancient connotation was generally good, as late as Neoplatonic times. But for the Christian-creed builders, this meant a rival group of good powers. Hesiod speaks of "good daimōns above the ground, givers of wealth to mortal men." There is nothing whatever of our "demons" about that, nor of the Greek *diabolos*. Origen "Against Celsus" protests against the Hesiod creed, still proclaimed by Celsus near a thousand years later, and against the assertion that men should continue to reverence and bring first-fruits to the good daimōns who cared for the fruit-trees and grains of men; and being equally scientific, Origen asserts in turn that every fruit and stream and fount and breath of air is due "in consequence of the agency and control of certain beings whom we may call invisible husbandmen and guardians; we deny that those invisible agents are daimōns!"—Tweedledee versus Tweedledum!—"The divine angels of God!" Origen calls them in a previous sentence. Not daring to deny the existence of daimōns he would charge them with the production of famine, blasting, pestilence. In their capacity of public executioners they receive power at certain times to carry out the divine judgements, for the restoration of those who have plunged headlong into wickedness, or for

the trial and discipline of the souls of the wise."¹ We are reminded of the supralapsarian "hard-shell" backwoodsman, who acknowledged the devil's activity among the Lord's sheep, but it was only to chase them back into the fold: then, "Thank the Lord for such a good Devil!" As for Origen's solemn adaptation of the cosmology and *daimōn-ology* of Celsus, we are reminded of the remark attributed to Wellhausen upon the reported acceptance of his OT theories by Scotch Calvinists: "I knew their Old Testament was a lie, but I never made the Almighty a party to it!"—But Origen would not have us worship the divine guardians of fruit and fount and tree. The opposition of such early churchmen to any *daimōn-cultus* was in the interest of monolatry: not in opposition to "diabolism." So Dr. Rudwin's statement (p. 21) that in 1 Cor. 10:20 "the great apostle identified all ancient gods with devils" is a perversion of Paul, who said, "the nations sacrifice to *daimonia*"—"human spirits" of Josephus. Paul did not say that *daimonia* included "all Gods"—Sun, moon, sky, Zeus, Neptune, etc. Every Biblical passage must be scrutinized in the original if we would know the exact thought of the Biblical writers. The indiscriminate use of our adapted words "demon" and "devil" in translations or comments upon the scriptures continually puts into the mouths of ancient writers ideas that they did not express.

It is of first importance to remember that even Origen's limitation upon the attention to be paid to the *daimōns* or *daimonia* with which his cosmos swarmed did not gain general acceptance. Some two centuries later the pagan Faustus wrote to Augustine, "you have substituted your *agapae* for the sacrifices of the pagans; for their idols your martyrs, whom you serve with the very same honors. You appease the shades of the dead with wine and feasts: you celebrate the solemn festivities of the Gentiles, their calends, and their solstices: and as to their manners those you have retained without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans, except that you hold your assemblies apart from them."² But persecuting pagan and persecuted Christian reciprocally scorned each other's favored heroes, as Aryan and Iranian did *devas* and *asuras*. Again it should be clear to the popular reader that to introduce our

¹Origen *Against Celsus*, VIII, 31.

²Draper, *The Conflict Between Religion and Science*, p. 48.

adopted terms "demon" and "devil" into translations of folk-thought of these early centuries is to miss their actual thinking.

Rambling further, the presentation of any historic personage as either devil or saint, according to the point of view is illustrated in the case of Old Nick and Santa Claus. Dr. Rudwin on p. 33 recognizes that both are phases of St. Nicholas, the kindly bishop of Myra, who gave dowries to poor maids and gifts to children: now, he sends good children presents, and is Santa Claus: bad children who get switches call him "Old Nick!" (Any American public school-teacher may be similarly rated!). That is repeating Origen's estimate of the police-powers of the cosmos! New England Puritanism long held out against the "pagan Christmas." But the New York Dutch conquered American child-thought. Long ago in a description of Dutch colonial ways I met this verse, a Christmas petition,

Sankt Niklaus, goed heilig mann,
K'nop je best an Amsterdam
Van Amsterdam an Spanje
Van Spanje an Oranje,
En brang deze kindjes eenige graps.

"Saint Nicolas, good holy man,
Go your best to Amsterdam,
From Amsterdam to Spain,
From Spain to Orange,
And bring these children some toys (frolics)."

The common folk usually shortened Sankt Niklaus into San Claus. *K'nop* in the second line for *gaan op* may be garbled by the printer as well as by the dialect.

Dr. Rudwin concludes the chapter with a comment upon the many nicknames that present the Devil as likable—even "nice." Should we consider the fact as a reminiscence of godlings of high and low degree that were really viewed as kindly, but which were declared "not orthodox" by medieval ecclesiatics?—"The Story of Mary Maclean" which appeared about 30 years ago confesses that the Devil was Miss Maclean's hero. She was evidently "against the orthodox," as the traditional Irishman is "agin the government."

On page 36 Dr. Rudwin comments upon the ability of the Devil, in folk-tale, to appear in any animal form. The capacity is not distinctive. Medieval witches are always credited with like powers, as

Mackay summarized in his *Extraordinary Popular Delusions*. The notion of such powers appears in all parts of the world, either for good or for ill. It is not distinctive of evil powers. Any reader of the Arabian Nights' tales remembers the battle between a princess and an evil magician in behalf of a transformed prince. The opponents rapidly assume many successive forms in this battle to the death. Palmer in his *Desert of the Exodus* p. 92, tells how his Arab guide, old Salem, was much disturbed one night by hearing the devil himself utter an awful shriek near by. Mr. Holland, hearing the familiar sound, slipped out and shot a fine white owl, and brought the "fiend" to old Salem. Resigned and sententious old Salem said "Ah! just as I expected. That's one of his tricks!" The very name "jinn" with which we are all familiar, is from a root meaning "to hide, conceal." A jinn is one who appears in a changed or invisible form: his real character concealed. All such powers, undisputed, have been "omnibused" as "Devilish" by medieval ecclesiasticism.

On page 41, Dr. Rudwin observes that the dove, a sacred bird to pagans, became in time an evil power to Christians; and that all Semites revered it as the reincarnation of their beloved dead; while the Romans venerated the dove as the bird of Venus. There is confusion here between the domestic pigeon, and the wild blue rock-pigeon. Had Dr. Rudwin been familiar with the Akkadian or Assyrian language, he would have known that the Greek word for the domestic pigeon, *peristera*, is *perah Istar*—"Bird of Istar!" It is from the ancient orient that the Graeco-Roman world learned the association of the prolific domestic pigeon with the goddess of love. And this bird, the associate of humanity, is to be understood in John 1:32. But the wild blue rock-pigeon avoids mankind. It nests in gorges, canyons, clefts, ruins and caves (cf. Cant. 2:14, Jer. 48:28), and because such places are so often chosen by men for their cave-tombs, the rock-pigeon's nests may be in such tombs. This association made the blue rock-pigeon to be viewed as a reincarnation of the dead. Hezekiah, facing premature death, imagines that he will twitter as a swallow or crane: or moan as a rock-dove (Is. 38:14); and his thinking was not "Semitic" nor local. It is found all the way from ancient Etruscan Italy to modern India and Turkestan. O'Donovan observes, "One might well imagine the great flocks of blue pigeons perched along the battlements of the

dead city to be the bewitched inhabitants.”³ And the wild blue pigeons swarm to the mosque-tomb of Bajazet on the Bosphorus and are fed there (Lynch, p. 88), as many travellers also report of Mecca. Dennis long ago observed that the pigeons which the Etruscans so commonly sculptured on their tombs were the wild blue rock-pigeons, nesting and wheeling in gorge and precipice above.⁴ The Greeks did not need to learn this association from the far east. They had their own word, *phatta* for the wild blue pigeon: and Persephone, or Proserpina, as Queen of the world of the dead, was *pherse-phatta*, or *pherephatta*, “wild-dove-bringer.”

So early Christianity found reason to object to both tame and wild. “No milk-white dove—nor if there be anything more lascivious,” says Catullus (lxvi, 125). And to give prominence to the wild blue pigeon might make hopes for the dead to center in Persephone instead of Christ.

This latter issue is directly involved in the objection to “Beelzebub,” barely noticed by Dr. Rudwin on page 41, without explanation. The name means “Lord of flies”—but of what flies? It would take many pages to tell all the popular beliefs that the souls of the dead escape from the body in the forms of various flies. To this day Beduin of Moab believe that the souls of the dead in their deserts escape as flies, hum mournfully, then fly straight to Jerusalem and plunge down a well in the center of the Haram-asherif to the underworld-home of the dead. So Yahu himself to them would be a “lord of flies.” But the actual Baalzebub of Ekron, 2 Kings, 1? We face the belief in a butterfly-soul: and anthropologists know that this lore would fill a sizable volume. Suffice it that this Minoan-Philistine conception is vividly before us in Evans’ discoveries at Knossos. Scales for weighing the souls of the dead have golden butterflies in them as souls. And youth and maiden joyously meeting in the Land of Spirits have the chrysalis of a butterfly drawn over them as their “outworn shell by Time’s unresting sea.”⁵ But the butterfly, the white cabbage-butterfly, is still regarded as a soul by Aegaeon peasantry. And he who will consult Lidell and Scott’s lexicon will find that *Psyche* is the name of this white cabbage-butterfly! Christian preachers will still use the mir-

³*The Merv Oasis*, II, 80.

⁴*Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria* I, 185.

⁵See *Palace of Minos*, I:705f: II:278f, 482, 784f.

acle of the butterfly's transformation as an analogy for the resurrection of the human spirit. But they will urge that no one connect the facts with the name Beelzebub! *Anathema Sit!* I have heard a Kentucky hills-woman say of a slowly dying neighbor, "He was born with a golden butterfly in him, and when that flies away he will be dead."

In the case of Sammaël, Dr. Rudwin contents himself with a bare reference to a very late Jewish tangling of Sammaël with Lilith, and his being chief of the fallen angels, and never replaced by Satan (pp. 20, 28, 78, 86, 87, 97, 98, 101). The Assyriologist must come to the rescue, incidentally asking why he writes Samael instead of Sammaël. Sammaël is well known in cuneiform lore, thousands of years before the worthless jumble that late Judaism has made of the facts. Sammaël is *Šammu-īlu*, "divine plant": wormwood. Exhilarating in small quantities, its deadly absynthian powers made it an ordeal-plant where evidence was insufficient. Old Babylonian reliefs show an accused person led before a god or chief priest who holds out the deadly cup—Here the *Šammu-īlu* is resorted to by the accuser or prosecutor: "the satan." The cuneiform liturgies referred to hang this "*šammu ilu* of joy" upon the neck of a sick petitioner: and survivals of this ancient use appear still in some parts of Arabia, where a bunch of wormwood is hung on the neck of a corpse, or placed under the head. The rabbinical lore collected by Baring-Gould that make Sammaël an angel of Death, an angel of the Lord, killing with a drop of wormwood when the man's time is come, is fundamentally correct.⁶ For the use of wormwood in ordeals in Old Testament times, see Godbey, "Incense and Poison Ordeals In the Ancient Orient," *AJSL*. July 1931.

⁶See *Legends of the Patriarch and Prophets*. Under "Fall of the Angels," we have "Sammaël, whose proper name is satan," etc.—In "Fall of Man," at the end, Sammaël tempts Eve with the fruit of the Angel of Death.—In "The Offering of Isaac," the Book of Job is adapted: "There came a day when the sons of God stood before the Eternal One, and amongst them was the Accusing Angel, Satan or Sammaël."—In "Esau and Jacob," Esau's name "indicates that he was closely connected with Satan or Sammaël." And it was "not Michael who wrestled with Jacob, but Sammaël or Satan"—thus making him the "man" or "god" of Gen. 32:24, 30—Under Moses—"The giving of the Law," Sammaël or Satan tempts with the golden calf. And Sammaël is sent by the Most High to "bring the soul of my servant Moses to Paradise" (Section on the Death of Moses). And later, Sammaël is simply called "the Angel of Death."—And in the tempting of Abraham to offer Isaac, it is Satan who tests, as in the case of Job: and as Angel of Death, Satan laughs when Sarah dies). It is as an Angel of Death that Sammaël comes in time to be viewed as an Evil One.

On Lilith, something is to be added by the Assyriologist. Dr. Rudwin on page 95 has "the Hebrew word *lilith* is a feminine derivative of the Hebrew *lay'la* (Assyrian *leila*), which is the regular noun for night." But in Assyrian, *mušu* is "night," as opposed to "day," *urru*; and *lilātu* is "twilight," as opposed to "dawn." There is no *leila*. But there is the masculine Spirit *lilu*, feminine *Lilitu*, or *ardat lile*, "Maid of the twilight. *Lilitu*, in the form *lilith*, does not occur in the Old Testament save in Isaiah 34:14, where any animal that comes forth at twilight is possibly meant. In contrast, the Hebrew never uses the word *layela* for "twilight," "evening," or "dawndusk."

The Sumerian-Akkadian lexical tablets group the *lilu* with "dust-storms," "sand-columns," and define it as "maid of the light-stealer." She dims or darkens the day in various ways. Data in hand show that the Babylonian rabbins' *lilith* was originally the Jack O'lantern: familiar enough in Euphratean marshlands. The whole conception existed before the Semitic Akkadians were in Babylonia, before 4000 B. C. But there is no trace of it in any Phoenician-Palestinian lore yet recovered. The root *Lyl* for "night" is in all the Semitic languages. But the spirit *lilit* is in Akkadian only, as the translation of an earlier Sumerian conception. Dr. Rudwin's *Leila* above is the Jewish word for "night." But the tangle of data he cites shows that an ever-expanding explanatory myth-making is still going on, providing more analytical problems for the anthropologists of the future.

Dr. Rudwin's chapter on the "Death of the Devil," stirs some mirthful memories. There is Charles Reade's Denys, with his old *consigne*, "Courage, Camarade! le diable est mort!" But in sharp contrast with some material quoted by Dr. Rudwin is the witticism of Sam Jones. Having heard much of the Devil's activity in a certain American city, he went to contribute some evangelistic energy to the routing of the Devil. But after a few days in the town he announced that the Devil had not been in that place in 20 years! He was not needed there!

In reading the chapter upon the Devil's mimicry of God I recalled a modern complaint of the sort. The Catholic Missionaries, Huc and Gabet a hundred years ago declared there was hardly a single feature of Romish liturgy that the Devil had not copied or parodied in the Buddhism of Tartary, Tibet and China. How astonished

they would have been to hear that the rosary of 108 beads was copied by Romanism from Buddhism in relatively modern times! But in saying that "the Synagogue of Satan (Rev. 2:10) is a counter part of the church of God," Dr. Rudwin's has disregarded his principium that our modern devil or Satan is not found in the Biblical literature. He should have added verses 13, 24 and 3:9—the last verse is clarifying. The writer is using Satan in its original sense of "prosecutor, accuser, inquisitor," and is speaking of the Jewish inquisitorial organization to which Paul himself had once belonged, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter" against the infant offshoot of Judaism.⁷ Does not I Pet. 5:8 belong in that same category? And in specifying the devil as "the prince of this world" in John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2; 6:12 (pp. 133, 243, 246,) Dr. Rudwin is not scientifically exact in his terminology, for neither the Diabolos nor Satan is mentioned in them. The cosmology of the ancient world, with its successive aeons or *Kosmoi*, is disregarded. The Messiah was to close one age and rule during a new one.⁸ The passages cited speak of "this Kosmos," "this aeon," "the aeon of this Kosmos"—the existing social order. One familiar with the "Arabian Nights" knows that "O King of the Age" occurs more than 50 times as a respectful or complimentary address. In New Testament times such speakers would have meant the Roman Emperor, or Empire: or a much lesser dignitary if thought advisable to fawningly address him.

On page 253 are names that are fossils of ancient star-cults. Šamsaweel who taught the signs of the sun, is a corruption of Akkadian Šamaš-ilu, "Sun is god." Arakiel, with his earth-signs is an Aramaizing of Arts-ilu, "Earth is god." Kawkabel, the demon astrologer, is Kakkabilu, "a star is god." Seriel, with his moon-signs, is Sēr-ilu: "oracle is god," or "divine oracle"—the moon-god being the chief portent giver. Barakel, Barak-ilu, "Lightning-god," is another heavenly portent giver. These are "fallen angels" only in the sense that formerly leading cults now occupy a minor position; the poor clients or agents of cults now dominant.

In this connection, "The Harrowing of Hell" alluded to on pp. 81, 132 and in note on p. 132 is but a slight adaptation of an ancient Akkadian sun-cult. The Gospel of Nicodemus recognized by Dr.

⁷See Godbey, *The Lost Tribes, a Myth*, for fuller study.

⁸See Godbey, "The Pagan Millennium": *Methodist Review*, July to October 1926.

Rudwin on p. 81 utilizes a miracle-play that had been current in Babylonia for more than 1000 years. In that play the sun-god, the west-sun, descends into the land of the Dead. At Sunrise (cf. Ps. 24:-7-10) he breaks out again, bringing forth his faithful ones. The Cult of the Iranian Sun-god, Mithra "The Friend," owed its power in Rome to its presenting the god in the same way as "*Sol Invictus*." The unconquered Sun. The Temple of Mithra finally gave way to the Vatican. To determine how much Mithraism got into Vatican theology would resurrect much *odium theologicum*. But the daily miracle of the sun's resurrection will bolster weary human hopes to the end of time. Sixty years ago a favorite Sunday School chorus ran—

Beyond the sunset's radiant glow
There is a brighter world, I know,
Where golden glories ever shine,
Beyond the reach of day's decline.

It will be recognized that these illustrations of ancient elemental fancies that have been fused with or absorbed by medieval diabolism do not constitute a hostile criticism of Dr. Rudwin's book. The contrasts between the actual ancient elements and the kaleidoscopic shiftings of the more recent portrayals of a hypothetical Evil One collated by Dr. Rudwin only prove that poetic myth-expanders are as busy as in the stone ages. If it be said that these fancies are no longer to be taken seriously, it raises the question, Were ancient myths originally any more than the flicker of the Northern Lights of the human mind?