

# THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 427. (VOL. IX.—44.)

CHICAGO, OCTOBER 31, 1895.

One Dollar per Year.  
Single Copies, 5 Cents.

COPYRIGHT BY THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING Co.—Reprints are permitted only on condition of giving full credit to Author and Publisher.

## THE PARISIAN BUDDHA.

BY MONCURE D. CONWAY.

IN THE course of one year two theatres in Paris have drawn vast crowds by representations appealing to the half-awake interest of Europe in Buddha. One of these was "Izeyl," a drama in four acts, by Messrs. Armand Silvestre and Eugène Morand; the other "La Princesse Idæa," a ballet in two tableaux. After seeing both of these, I have remembered an unfulfilled desire of Renan, namely, to compose a philosophical ballet on the legend of Krishna's appearance with his flute among the rustic cow-maidens. The god, as a handsome young herdsman, set them all dancing to his music, and each maiden believed she had him for a partner. Renan found in this the secret of every divine figure, the infinite self-multiplication by which the god or teacher becomes to each that personally beloved one for which each individual spirit longs. But they respond to the several genii of each people also. The English conception of Buddha is now so Christianised that it is doubtful whether either of these French dramas would be favorably received in London, whereas in Paris the great Oriental teacher has been adapted to the emotional and passionate sentiment which has not yet been permitted to take Jesus for a partner,—or not by name. The authors of "Izeyl" have, however, availed themselves of the story of Ambapâli (told in Dr. Carus's *Gospel of Buddha*, p. 201) and the parable of Vâsavadattâ (*ib.* p. 179), to give an Oriental disguise to a tender romance between Jesus and Mary Magdalen. It is an indication of the extreme antiquity of the story of Ambapâli, probably true, that in his discourse in the mansion of this courtesan Buddha spoke no word that could be construed into a reproach of her way of life; nor is there any intimation that, after presenting her mansion and park to the teacher and his friends, she forsook her previous occupation. In a region and time when polyandry, polygamy, and infant marriages were familiar and respectable, the courtesan's occupation could hardly have been one calling for the exhortations given in another age to Vâsavadattâ, and to the two courtesans of the New Testament, whose sins have been laid by legend on Mary Magdalen.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is not a whisper in any text against the character of Mary Magda-

In the drama of "Izeyl," the heroine, powerfully impersonated by Sarah Bernhardt, seeks to fascinate the Master (Scyndya, a Christ-like make-up), is herself converted, and bestows all her wealth on the poor. In defending her recovered virtue from a prince, she slays him in a desperate encounter, and is condemned to living burial. The Master (Scyndya) is really in love with her; he manages to enter the vault where she is slowly perishing; there, torn by grief, he turns with rage on his "mission," which has brought them desolation; he entreats Izeyl to live, they will be happy together, and the world may find another apostle. Izeyl restores his spiritual strength, and he talks with rapture of the radiant future opening before mankind, and the azure realm of repose above; but in the intervals of his utterance she says: "Master, place thy dear hand on my heart; bend thy beloved head on me; ah, give me thy lips! It is in time that I am dying?"

So dies Izeyl in the arms of her beloved, under the kiss of a human love. For she is not dying in that radiant future of the race—not in any azure vault:—she is a woman, dying in *time*, needing love and a heart to lean on. The scene recalls the wonderful picture in Florence of "The Passing of Mary Magdalen," where the infant Jesus appears in her cavern, and extends a crucifix to receive her expiring kiss.

If you can imagine Sakya-Muni so taught by this tragedy that he reaches the belief that Nirvâna is a happy marriage with the beloved man or maid, to have found Izeyl resuscitated and melancholy in her loveless solitude, and wedded her, you have the *motif* of the magnificent ballet, "La Princesse Idæa," at the Folies-Bergère. Idæa, the beautiful and only daughter of the Maharajah, is first seen reclining on her sofa, surrounded by her slaves, who vainly seek to dispel her profound melancholy, bringing beautiful stuffs, jewels, and birds. The Maharajah, as a last effort to cure his daughter's prolonged depression, orders grand *fêtes* in the palace gardens. These, of course, are characterised by Parisian splendor, and Idæa, to please her father, joins in the dance; but

len, but her legend, however started, has survived by its pathetic sentiment, and has been forever fixed on her by the uncritical mention of her name, in the heading to Luke vii., in the old English version.

presently she sinks in the arms of the bayaderes. At this moment, when the king is desperate at his failure to make her smile, a Buddhist hermit, coarsely clad, appears, kneels at his feet, and implores permission to attend the princess. Receiving a disdainful permission, the hermit, on a lyre made of an antelope's skull, executes a plaintive melody. At this the princess half rises, and listens. Then heavenly voices, as if summoned by the hermit's incantation, are heard singing of Sakya Muni, in Nirvâna's sublime repose, unruffled by any breath, his soul sleeping in the infinite. "Let the virtue of his sacred word chase from thee every impure doubt, that thy spirit may ascend and soar, and find rest in the azure!" The princess, under the hermit's spell, approaches him, and the mysterious voices, with accents somewhat less celestial, sing: "O marvellous prodigy! Under the shining heaven what is there that can thus control this fainting heart, changing its deep night to radiant day? It is the Master of the World—victorious Love!"

After a struggle to free herself from the spell of the hermit, the princess falls in his arms. Indignant at this, the Maharajah orders his officers to seize the hermit and put him to death. But in the moment when the guards touch the hermit, he throws off his religious vestment, and stands revealed as a young and powerful prince, who had long loved Idæa and took this means of reaching her. The gloom of the princess is dispelled; Sakya Muni, taken to her heart, becomes her partner for life; and the spectator is left to his own speculations as to whether the celestial voices are to be ascribed to a lover's ingenuity or to some fresh interest these inhabitants of the "Azure" are taking in the warm and tender affairs of earth.

This, then, is the form under which the Buddha is approaching Paris. He is to become what Jesus, from having been too long deified, too long ecclesiasticised, can never become in France; but he (Buddha) can become this only in combination with Jesus.

It is indeed doubtful whether, to any but a few philosophical minds, any great religious teacher of another race can ever find approach, except in this same way: that is, by leaving at home his local and official investiture, and bringing his real and beautiful human character into alliance with the like humanity of the similarly invested and hidden being in the country to which he comes.

When travelling in Ceylon, I found the Buddhists personally lovable and thoughtful, but their Buddha appeared to me too distant, too perfunctory, too much like the Christ of many Europeans, and I had a feeling that those whose "Messiah" was a human Jesus can see deeper into Buddha than the majority of Buddhists can.

Meantime there is a largely ignored Jesus in Eu-

rope, a great-hearted man veiled by traditions, forbidden to the genuine treatment of literature and art, which can only approach him by clothing him with alien name and costume. Is Buddha coming to reveal Jesus and Mary Magdalen and the rest to us? And are we ever to have a humanised Jesus able to journey abroad, and put the Parsee and the Buddhist in fuller possession of their own great teachers?

The two plays which I have briefly described, however unsatisfactory, appear to me noticeable as a gesture or sign of our time.

They are also occasionally mounting the Passion Play in Paris: it may be that the art which has gained freedom to raise a Christ on the Cross will presently be free enough to manage his Descent, and give him, like the legendary Krishna, to human hearts to become to each its near friend and partner.

### THE SONG OF SONGS.

BY THE REV. T. A. GOODWIN, D. D.

#### II. THE CHARACTER OF THE POEM.

The true place in literature for this Song of Songs is that of a Love Story in verse. To call it a drama is hardly to classify it intelligibly to popular thought, yet it partakes of most of the elements of a drama, and is more of a drama than anything else. It certainly belongs to the drama family. If it were allowable to build a word out of recognised material at hand, I would call it a drama-et. While it lacks the scenic touches which are necessary to adapt it to the stage, yet when read or rendered even in the less pretentious form of a dialogue it is necessary to change time and place and the *dramatis personæ*, in order to catch its significance.

In the following rendering I have followed in the main the text of the revised version as bringing out more nearly the meaning of the original, and because the metrical arrangement is more suggestive of poetry. But in comparing even this with the original the Bible student feels at every step, as he feels a thousand times elsewhere in such a comparison, that the revisers were too much handicapped by a well-meant agreement at the start, to retain the phraseology of the authorised version wherever possible without too much injury to the sense of the original. Here as elsewhere they have confessedly often failed to give the best possible rendering, perpetuating thereby not a few incorrect notions if not also in some cases some doubtful doctrines.

While therefore scholars readily recognise many changes for the better in the rendering of this Song by the revisers, they also detect not a few instances where the meaning might have been greatly improved by a departure from the old phraseology. Take, for example, Chapter 7, verse 2, in the Song. It is not a



matter of delicacy merely which induces me to substitute the word *waist* for the word *navel*, and the word *body* for the word *belly*. There is nothing in the navel alone to suggest a round goblet full of wine, while, by the aid of a little poetic fancy, the waist may suggest it. Neither is there anything in the belly alone, as that word is now used by all English speaking peoples, to suggest a heap of wheat encircled with lilies, while a well-formed body, as that word is now used to include the central and principal parts of the human frame, may easily suggest the figure used. These several words in the original mean what the translators have given as their English equivalents, but they mean also *waist* and *body* respectively. I am sure that the reader will appreciate the change.

Again, the Hebrew text can never be translated into our language literally so as to be intelligible. For that matter no dead language can, and very few living languages, hence in all translations explanatory words are frequently used of necessity. In the following rendering I have availed myself of this necessary prerogative, supplying adverbs and prepositions and other words that seem necessary to bring out the meaning of the original by making the text correspond with the idiom of the English language. For example at Chapter 2, verse 6, the heroine is made to say both in the old and in the new versions: "His left hand *is* under my head and his right hand *doth* embrace me." There is no verb in the original from which our *is* can be obtained and the tense of the verb to be supplied can as well be in the future as in the present; besides, it avoids a false statement not justifiable even by poetic licence, for as a matter of fact no left hand was under her head nor was any right hand embracing her. But even this change of tense still leaves the meaning obscure, or rather leaves the sentence meaningless. The shepherdess is protesting against the caresses of the lecherous Solomon and saying of her shepherd lover: "*Only* his left hand shall sustain my head and *only* his right hand shall embrace me;" meaning that none but her virtuous Shulamite shepherd shall be allowed the liberties of a lover; hence, in addition to changing the tense I have supplied the necessary adverb.

In all cases I have omitted such distinctive marks as italics and quotations. The curious reader may easily compare the text here given with the text of the revised version if he wishes to see how far and wherein I have departed from it; while the scholarly reader may compare it with the original Hebrew if he wishes to see what liberties I have taken in order to bring out the meaning of the poem. I have also wholly ignored the artificial chaptering and versing of the text. In no other way can the connexion be preserved which is necessary to a right understanding of the book.

It will be observed that I have not followed the suggestions of those who would dignify the poem by making it a drama and introducing acts and scenes accordingly. To so construe it involves too many difficulties. One of these is so great that no two of those who have attempted to divide it into acts have ever agreed where one act ends and another begins, neither can they agree as to the *dramatis personæ*. I have simply sought to restore it to its original form as nearly as that can be ascertained after the lapse of so many centuries, as it was read or recited by the common people, three thousand years ago, whether they were captives by the rivers of Babylon or of Assyria, or were slaves on the banks of their own Jordan, with only such equipments as might be improvised for the occasion, by slaves and captives. Classifying it with the unpretentious dialogue places it within the reach of the common people, who could read or recite it without the expensive paraphernalia of the theatre.

The scene opens in the gorgeous country seat of the wealthy and dissipated King Solomon, where were houses and vineyards and orchards and gardens, with much silver and gold and cattle and men servants and women servants and all the peculiar wealth of kings, including many women and much wine. It was early in the reign of that famous monarch. His harem at that time had only sixty women who posed as wives, and only eighty who were classed as concubines, whatever the difference between them may have been. Later these were increased to seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines. It was in the process of multiplying these wives that the incidents of the story belong.

The heroine of the story is a beautiful sun-burnt maiden, who had been brought from her country-home in Northern Palestine to this accumulation of splendors. To assume, as some do, that she had been captured by a band of brigands and taken by force to the king's harem, is to do violence to every known law of human nature. Unwilling captives would soon transform a harem into a hell from which the would-be lord would flee for dear life. Not one of the possible pleasures of such an accumulation of the means of sensual enjoyments could be found there. Solomon was too wise even in his most abandoned moods to do such violence to every law of lust. The harem was not a prison for unwilling captives, to be obtained or retained by force, but a place with such attractions as to make it a desirable home as compared with the ordinary home-life of the women of Palestine at that time. We must not form our estimate of the lot of a second or a second-hundredth wife of that period by our views of polygamy to-day. Frequent and devastating wars made the disparity in numbers between males and females very great, and the honor of moth-

erhood removed from a multiplicity of wives—most of what now makes polygamy abhorrent.

The harem was replenished through the agency of procurers, whose business it was to travel through the country and induce handsome women to become inmates. Human nature is not so changed in these three thousand years that we need suppose that the methods of these procurers were essentially different from the methods of men and women of their class to-day. Possibly in no case was their purpose fully disclosed at the first. The hard lot of women, especially in the rural districts, made it easy then, as it is too easy now, for a plausible man or woman to persuade young women to exchange their country surroundings and hard work for the easier lot of an inmate of a king's palace. Once there, under whatever inducement, they were put into the hands of governesses, whose duty it was to gain their consent to yield to the lust of the king, either as a wife or concubine. Light domestic duties and luxurious living were combined until the consent was obtained; the king himself taking no prominent part in these preparatory proceedings, probably knowing nothing of the novitiate until her consent had been obtained to become his wife.

Our heroine was a rustic girl whose hard life was not most agreeable. In her earlier girlhood she had been detailed to the duty of guarding the family flock. This had brought her into the company of neighboring shepherds, among whom was a handsome young man, between whom and her there had grown a strong mutual attachment. She had two half-brothers who were displeased with this love-affair. Nothing else proving effectual, in order to break it off, they transferred their sister from the flocks to the vineyard, subjecting her to exposure to the hot sun and to the harder work of dressing the vines. While in rebellion against this oppression, she was visited by one or more of the procurers for Solomon's harem. It was not difficult, under the circumstances, to persuade her that in the palace of the king she would find better treatment and more satisfactory remuneration than she was receiving as a vinedresser. How long she had been in her new home when the story begins, need not matter; it had been long enough for those who had her in charge to venture to unfold to her the ultimate purpose for which she had been brought into the king's family.

The next most important person, the hero of the story, is the Shulammitic shepherd, the devoted lover of the brave young woman, who so persistently refused to abandon him, and to exchange his love for what was proposed to her as a wife of the lecherous king.

The next most important characters is a trio of middle-aged women, from among the wives of the king, the governesses to whose charge she had been

committed, who are called in the poem "Daughters of Jerusalem," or "Daughters of Zion." This young shepherdess was from the tribe of Issachar. Her home was far away. The country of her birth was fertile, and abounded in vineyards and flocks, but her people were humble, though thrifty; hence the splendor of the city-life, and especially of the king's palace, could but have a charm for them, which made them regard the woman who wore a part of these splendors as entitled to such distinction as is implied in those titles.

We may readily suppose that in ordinary cases the task of these women was not a difficult one. There was so little in the humdrum of domestic life in the country to satisfy the laudable aspirations of a spirited woman and so many attractions in the surroundings of the court that it must have been an easy task usually, under the loose notions of that period concerning the sacredness of marriage, to gain the consent of the newcomer to the conditions of her remaining; hence the stubborn and persistent resistance of this Shulammitic shepherdess was a surprise to them.

This is all beautifully set forth in the poem as well as is the honorable womanly course of the trio towards her when they comprehend her situation.

The progress of inauguration into this new life was a simple one. The new victim, who had been allured to the palace under the impression that she was to have some honorable and remunerative employment about the extensive establishment, was clothed in better raiment, and fed on better food, and regaled on more and better wine than she had been accustomed to, until her governesses had gained her consent to forever abandon her country home and the associations and lover of her childhood, for the pomp and splendors of a queen. The luxuriant appointments of the palace; its baths, its tables, and its wardrobes usually did the work; hence it is untenable to assume, as some do, that Solomon himself at any time addresses the maiden in words of adulation or entreaty, or addresses her at all.

Solomon himself plays but a passive and merely a coincidental part in the poem. He is made to be personally unconscious of what is going on in his own behalf in the palace. He appears in the distance in a royal pageant, but not in any sense for the purpose of settling the question under discussion by the women and the maiden, though the women readily seize upon the event to supplement their own arguments. He was carried in his splendid car of state, accompanied by one of his queens, and was greeted with loud plaudits. What effect this had upon the shepherdess appears in the poem.

The half-brothers of the shepherdess play a sorry part in the affair, both at the beginning and at the end-



ing, and the neighbors appear to congratulate the lovers on the successful issue of the struggle when they return to the scenes of their earlier courtship.

### FABLES FROM THE NEW ÆSOP.

BY HUDOR GENONE.

#### Sports of the Gods.

A HUSBANDMAN, having pressed the juices out of a quintal of cherries, for the purpose of making cherry brandy, a liquor of great medicinal virtue and much esteemed in those parts, threw the refuse, the skins and pulp from which the juices had been extracted, and the pits, upon a heap of compost, which in the autumn, having been spread over the land to enrich it, the cherry seeds, almost countless in number, were scattered over the whole extent of a vast field.

The following spring the owner of the field came and ploughed, and turned the rich earth, and harrowed it, and prepared it for a crop of grain.

Now it happened that this season, owing perhaps to a too plentiful rainfall, was not propitious to the growth of the corn, much of which rotted in the ground and caused the balance which chanced to grow to spring up lank and fibrous, and going more to stalk than ear.

The farmer, much chagrined, was about to mow down the sparse grain to feed green to the cattle, but when he came, he and his laborers with their sickles, to the field, he perceived here and there, scattered in all directions, stout strong sprouts of green leafing out at their tops and giving signs of the most lusty life.

The husbandman, who was of a strictly pious turn, held this to be a sign of the favor with which he was regarded by Zeus, and therefore directed his laborers to leave the field. The young cherry sprouts from that time on had it all to themselves.

The following year the husbandman came again to his field to see how the gifts of Zeus prospered, when, because of the growth the year had given, he recognised in the mysterious sprouts only the common cherry. Then he became very angry, not, (as he ought,) at his own want of judgment and knowledge, but at Zeus, who, he swore, had only mocked him.

So angry was he that he would have cut down the saplings, but found that they had grown too well for that to be done easily. He therefore went away in his rage, vowing to pay no more oblations at the shrine of any god.

The years went on, and the sprouts, which had become saplings grew to trees. It might have been that twenty or so had passed when the husbandman, now an old man, came again to the field, which had become almost a forest. From tree to tree he went,

tasting the fruit, but so nauseous and bitter was the taste of each that, making a wry face, he exclaimed: "O, unlucky man that I am! what have I done to be so persecuted by Fate? The gods, not content with their first malice, must needs wait twenty years for another."

While he thus mused aloud and bewailed his misfortunes, in the midst of the foliage he heard the sound of mocking laughter, and, whilst his anger kindled, a voice, (which was the voice of the great Pan, although he knew it not,) saying: "Whom the gods will help they first chasten and then puzzle. Keep on tasting the fruit."

Now the husbandman, although he had given up offerings to the gods, was yet superstitious, and obeyed the voice,—because it was a mystery,—and went on tasting the fruit, and yet for a long time finding all bitter, till at last, coming to a tree remote from its mates, he perceived instantly how fine was its fruit, how black and big and glistening. This also tasting, he found so exceeding luscious that he at once cried out for joy and as though he had found a rich jewel.

When he was about to return to his house with some of the fruit, the voice was again heard.

"So," it said (seemingly coming forth from the very bole of the tree itself), "so you think you have solved the riddle."

"Surely," replied the husbandman valorously, for nothing maketh one bolder than a successful achievement, "surely, what more could be asked in way of answer? I sought, and I have found."

"Stop," said the voice sternly, "stop and listen, for I have something to tell thee perchance for thy profit. Answer me this: Which is the more important, earthly things or heavenly?"

"Heavenly things, surely," answered the man.

"And yet," continued the voice, "you are content to have solved the riddle though the solution gives you only a fine cherry. Is a cherry then in your eyes better than wisdom? And tell me, O vacillating and inconstant one that you are, why, many years ago, you deemed the cherry sprouts gifts of the gods? And why again the next year did you rail at the heavenly powers because you found the sprouts only young cherry trees? And why did you then forego all further worship and swear that Zeus had mocked you? And why, only now, did you curse your unlucky fortune and revile heaven and the gods, and say that, not content with their first malice, they waited twenty years for another? Tell me, why are you so frightened at one mystery, so enamored of another; so superstitious at one time without reason, so bold in self-conceit at another without cause? Tell me, O mortal, if you can, why are you mortal?"

But the man remained dumb. And the voice con-

tinued: "Know, O mortal, that thou art most highly favored to have gotten from the gods a rare fruit, but yet more highly that for thee now I will solve the riddle. As this tree, which was but one of many, produces a fruit which for size and flavor surpasses all others of its kind, so is it with man; for the race is bitter and little, and if perchance by dint of much care the wild man is bettered if he be left by himself for a season he returns forthwith to his savage nature. But the gods have willed that as now and then among trees a more excellent appears, so among mankind come great men as samples of the future race. Of this sort was Kungfutzu of Cathay, the Buddha of India, the Christos of whom thou hast heard much of late, and even thine own Socrates. Go home now and remember what things have been here revealed. Rail no longer at Fate, for the accidents of fortune are the deep designs of destiny, and high caprices of birth the sports of the gods."

#### AZAZEL AND SATAN.

The primitive stages of the Hebrew civilisation are not sufficiently known to describe the changes and phases which the Israelitic idea of the Godhead had to undergo before it reached the purity of the Yahveh conception. Yet the Israelites also must have had a demon not unlike the Egyptian Typhon. The custom of sacrificing a goat to Azazel, the demon of the desert, suggests that the Israelites had just emerged out of a dualism in which both principles were regarded as equal.

We read in Leviticus, xvi.:

"And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one for the Lord, and the other for Azazel. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, and offer him for a sin-offering. But the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make atonement with him and to let him go to Azazel in the desert."

The name *Azazel* is derived from *aziz*, which means strength; the god of war at Edessa is called *Asisos* ("Αἰσιος), the strong one. *Bal-aziz* was the strong god, and *Rosh-aziz*, the head of the strong one, is the name of a promontory on the Phœnician coast. *Azazel*, accordingly, means the Strength of God.

The mention of Azazel must be regarded as a last remnant of a prior dualism. Azazel, the god of the desert, ceased to be the strong god; he has become a mere shadow of his former power, for the scapegoat is no longer a sacrifice. Yahveh's goat alone is offered for a sin-offering. The scapegoat is only sent as a messenger to carry out into the desert the curse that rests on sin and to give information to Azazel that the sins of the people have been atoned for.

These sacrificial ceremonies, which, on account of their being parts of religious performances, could only

reluctantly be discarded, are vestiges of an older dualism still left in Hebrew literature.

\* \* \*

It is evident from various passages that the Israelites believed in evil spirits dwelling in darkness and waste places. (See Lev., xvii., 7; Deut. xxx., 17; *ib.* xxxii., 17; Isaiah, xiii., 21; *ib.* xxxiv., 14; Jer., l., 39; Psalms, cvi., 37.) Their names are *Se'irim* (chimeras or goat-spirits), *Lilith* (the nightly one), *Shedim* (demons). But it is difficult to say whether they are to be regarded as the residuum of a lower religious stage preceding the period of the monotheistic Yahveh cult, or as witnesses to the existence of superstitions which certainly haunted the imagination of the uncultured not less in those days than they do now in this age of advanced civilisation.

Satan, the fiend (in the sense of Devil), is rarely mentioned in the Old Testament. The word Satan, which means "enemy" or "fiend," is freely used, but, as a proper name, signifying the Devil, appears only five times. And it is noteworthy that the same act is, in two parallel passages, attributed, in the older one to Yahveh, and in the younger one, to Satan.

We read in 2 Samuel, xxiv., 1:

"The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah."

The same fact is mentioned in 1 Chron., xxi., 1:

"Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel."

In all the older books of Hebrew literature, especially in the Pentateuch, Satan is not mentioned at all. All acts of punishment, revenge, and temptation are performed by Yahveh himself, or by his angel at his direct command. So the temptation of Abraham, the slaughter of the first-born in Egypt, the brimstone and fire rain upon Sodom and Gomorrah, the evil spirit which came upon Saul, the pestilence to punish David—all these things are expressly said to have come from God. Even the perverse spirit which made the Egyptians err (Isaiah, xix., 14), the lying spirit which was in the mouths of the prophets of Ahab (1 Kings, xxii., 21; see also 2 Chron., xviii., 20-22), ignorance (Isaiah, xxix., 10), jealousy and adultery (Numbers v., 14), are directly attributed to acts of God.

The prophet Zechariah speaks of Satan as an angel whose office is to accuse and to demand the punishment of the wicked. In the Book of Job, where the most poetical and grandest picture of the Evil One is found, Satan appears as a malicious servant of God, who enjoys performing the functions of a tempter, torturer, and avenger. He accuses unjustly, like a State's attorney who prosecutes from a mere habit of prosecution, and delights in convicting even the innocent, while God's justice and goodness are not called in question.



It is noteworthy that Satan, in the canonical books of the Old Testament, is an adversary of man, but not of God; he is a subject of God and his faithful servant.

The Jewish idea of Satan received some additional features from the attributes of the gods of surrounding nations. Nothing is more common in history than the change of the deities of hostile nations into demons of evil. In this way Beelzebub, the Phœnician god, became another name for Satan; and Hinnom (i. e. *Gehenna*), the place where Moloch had been worshipped, in the valley of Tophet, became the Hebrew word for hell.

Moloch (always used with the definite article in the form *Hammoloch*) means "the king." The idol of Moloch was made of brass, and its stomach was a furnace. According to the denunciations of the prophets (Isaiah lvii., 5; Ezekiel xvi., 20; Jeremiah xix., 5), children were placed in the monster's arms to be consumed by the heat of the idol. The cries of the victims were drowned by drums, from which ("toph," meaning drum) the place was called "Tophet." Even the king, Manasseh, long after David, made his son pass through the fire of Moloch (2 Kings, xxi., 6).

There is no reason to doubt the Biblical reports concerning Moloch, for Diodorus (20, 14) describes the cult of the national god at Carthage, whom he identifies with the Greek "Kronos," in the same way, so that in consideration of the fact that Carthage is a Phœnician colony, we have good reasons to believe this Kronos to be the same deity as the Ammonite Moloch, who was satiated by the same horrible sacrifices.

Josiah, waging a war against alien superstitions, defiled Tophet, which is the valley of the children of Hinnom (2 Kings, xxxiii., 10), that no man might make his son or daughter pass through the fire of Moloch.

Thus the very name of this foreign deity naturally and justly became among the Israelites the symbol of abomination and fiendish superstition.

Zarathustra still regards the contending powers of good and evil, in a certain sense, as equal; they are to him like two hostile empires of opposed tendencies. Accordingly, in comparison to Zarathustra's idea of Ahriman, the Jewish conception of Satan is more mythological, but less dualistic; less philosophical, but more monistic.

After the Babylonian captivity, Jewish thought naturally became tainted with and was strongly influenced by the civilisation of both their conquerors and liberators; and it has been maintained that the Biblical Satan is a Persian importation. But this is not correct, for we must bear in mind that the conception of a demon of evil among the Jews would, in all proba-

bility, have developed in a similar way to what it did, even without Persian influence. There are sufficient indications of a latent belief in evil beings among the Israelites, and of tendencies to personify the dark aspects of life; and considering the pristine worship of Azazel, we cannot say that the idea of a supreme originator of wickedness was absent in their religious notions.

There is a great family-likeness between Satan and Ahriman, more so than with the Babylonian Tiamat and the Egyptian Typhon. Both are called the serpent, and both appear as tempters, and there is not less resemblance between Yahveh and Ahura. Nevertheless, closely considered, Satan and Ahriman are different. To characterise briefly the difference, we might say that the Hebrew Satan of the Old Testament (as he appears in Zechariah and Job) is a personification of the guilty conscience. He is the accuser, threatening God's punishment for sin, and thus bringing upon mankind, according to God's decree, physical evil as a result of moral evil. In the Zendavesta, Ahriman (*Asi Dahaka*, the fiendish snake) appears as the principle of all evil, physical as well as moral.

#### PROF. C. H. CORNILL ON THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL.

Two years ago Prof. V. Valentin, the president of the *Freie Deutsche Hochstift*, which is an institute at Frankfort on the Main, quite similar to the Lowell Institute at Boston, requested Prof. Carl Heinrich Cornill to give a series of lectures on the prophetism of Israel, on the basis of the maturest and latest researches of Old Testament criticism. Professor Cornill accepted the call and delivered his lectures from his notes, expecting to give nothing more than a *résumé* of the subject as it lived in his mind. But the interest of his audience was so great that the Professor was urged to write his lectures down and have them published—a request which he reluctantly granted. The lectures were published in pamphlet form by Trübner of Strassburg, and an English translation (in which the material was arranged more systematically than in the German original) appeared a few months later in the columns of *The Open Court*.

Professor Cornill's articles found much favor with many of our readers, who in private letters frequently expressed their satisfaction with both the intellectual depth and the noble spirit that animated their learned author. Several religious periodicals of this country reprinted some of them, with laudatory comments. And indeed the intrinsic worth of Professor Cornill's expository is so unquestionable that The Open Court Publishing Co. deemed it wise to republish them in book-form, and we can announce to our readers that Professor Cornill's book, *The Prophets of Israel*,<sup>1</sup> is now ready for the public.

Professor Cornill states in the preface that his lectures contain the results of the inquiries of Wellhausen, Kuenea, Duhm, Stade, Smend, and others, forgetful, in his native modesty, that he also is one of those who contributed his share to the solution of various problems. Moreover, the condensation of many learned books and the sifting of the material, too, is a work which requires skill, scholarship, and critical tact. But the most essential part

<sup>1</sup> *The Prophets of Israel*. Popular Sketches from Old Testament History. By Carl Heinrich Cornill, Professor of Old Testament History in the University of Königsberg. Frontispiece, Michael Angelo's Moses. Price, Cloth, \$1.00.

of the book is the attitude of the author, with whom the combination of a deeply religious sentiment with scientific accuracy seems to be so natural as to appear like a happy instinct.

In glancing over the pages of this little volume of scarcely 200 pages, into which so much knowledge has been condensed, we do not remember having seen a more popular and brilliant exposition of this chapter of the history of Israel. The lives and the conditions of the prophets of Israel are very little known, and yet they deserve the greatest attention. Professor Cornill speaks from the fulness of his knowledge, and his report is as if he himself had been among the ancient Israelites, as if he had moved among them and had seen the prophets face to face. They rise from the grave again, and we learn to understand their anxieties about Israel, their faith in the God of the fathers, their indignation at the fickleness of the people, and their enthusiasm for the great cause which they serve.

#### DR. THOMAS ON COLONEL INGERSOLL.

*The Chicago Tribune* publishes the following report of Dr. H. W. Thomas's sermon of last Sunday:

Before a large congregation at the People's Church, McVicker's Theater, yesterday morning, Dr. H. W. Thomas made a reply to Colonel Ingersoll's lecture on the "Foundation of Faith." Dr. Thomas used the same theme, but did not attack Colonel Ingersoll. In fact, there is a warm personal friendship between the preacher and the noted lecturer. Dr. Thomas carried out his theme in three lines, dwelling upon Ingersoll's attitude towards the literature of the Bible, his attitude as a moralist and as a patriot, and closing with a reply to the lecture on the foundation of faith. He said:

"The old view of inspiration, that all parts of the Bible are equally inspired and infallible, cannot be defended on literary grounds. It has gone down before the most conservative school of the higher criticism. And on moral grounds the doctrine of original sin, atonement, and endless punishment can no longer be justified before the higher, rational, and moral consciences of the present age. This is what Dr. Swazey meant when he said to me: 'The churches have made a place for Colonel Ingersoll.' It is what Dr. Drummond meant when he said: 'Orthodoxy is responsible for much of the infidelity there is in the world.'

"Colonel Ingersoll owes it to himself to do something more and better than he is doing. A man of his ability and love for mankind should not be content with simply tearing down. As a literary man he should be just to literature; he should not spend all his time pointing out the weak, the crude, the unfortunate things in the Bible; he should dwell upon its excellencies, its great and noble things as well. He should be just to the Bible. He should study it in the light of the ages, the forms of civilisation and social conditions under which its different books were written.

"As a moralist he should treat the evolution of moral ideas in the process of becoming the ideal, becoming the higher actual, and still the noble ideals rising up and leading on as the inspirations of a better future. It is no excuse that theologians have tortured the Bible, made it teach what it does not teach. The Bible should be judged by its own merits in the light of all the facts. In our age of slavery it tolerated slavery, but it sought to make lighter the bondage of the slave. In darker ages it tolerated the common custom of polygamy, but sought through all to elevate woman. Where in all literature is to be found a nobler tribute to wife and mother than the last chapter of Proverbs? Where is virtue so deeply centered and guarded as in the words of the Christ that condemns impure thought? Where in all the world is there such a tender and beautiful recognition of childhood as when Jesus took

little children in his arms and blessed them and said: 'Of such is the kingdom of Heaven?' But Colonel Ingersoll forgets all these things.

"Colonel Ingersoll is a patriot, loves his country, loves liberty, and surely he must know that however much the Bible may have been used in support of slavery and religious persecutions, still there is something in it that has given strength, confidence, and hope in the greatest struggles for the rights of man. The Pilgrims brought their Bible with them, and, if in their 'zeal for good without understanding,' they burned witches, still they had with all their narrowness some germs that grew at last into a great love of liberty that broke the chains of slavery.

"But the Bible is not the last foundation of faith; there is something deeper, something back of the Bible. Geology is in the earth; astronomy in the stars, and not in books about these sciences. The foundation of religion is in the spiritual nature and needs of man, and the answering fulness of the infinite reason, love, and life. Religion made the Bible, and not the Bible religion; and religion made the Church. The Bible and the Church are the creatures and expressions of this something deeper that lies back of them and breathes through them. They are the body of the soul that lives within.

"Creeds and confessions are not the foundation of faith; but the expression of a faith that already is, and hence as the life grows creeds and church forms should be permitted to grow with the life, and not become a limiting environment. The foundation of faith is not in books, but in the world beyond the books; in the reason and conscience of man as he faces the infinite. And when this truth is realised there will be less fear that faith will be lost in the growth and changes of a world."

## THE OPEN COURT.

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER.

DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$1.00 PER YEAR.

\$0.50 FOR SIX MONTHS.

N. B. Binding Cases for single yearly volumes of THE OPEN COURT will be supplied on order. Price, 75 cents each.

#### CONTENTS OF NO. 427.

THE PARISIAN BUDDHA. MONCURE D. CONWAY.....	4687
THE SONG OF SONGS. II. The Character of the Poem.	
THE REV. T. A. GOODWIN, D.D.....	4688
FABLES OF THE NEW ÆSOP. Sports of the Gods.	
HUDOR GENONE .....	4691
AZAZEL AND SATAN. EDITOR .....	4692
PROF. C. H. CORNILL ON THE PROPHETS OF IS-	
RAEL .....	4693
DR. THOMAS ON COLONEL INGERSOLL.....	4694