UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_150109

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

MANUAL

OF THE

SCIENCE OF RELIGION

Oxford

HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

MANUAL

OF THE

SCIENCE OF RELIGION

BY

P. D. CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT AMSTERDAM

Translated from the German

BY

BEATRICE S. COLYER-FERGUSSON

(NÉE MAX MÜLLER)

LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

AND NEW YORK: 15, EAST 16TH STREET

1891

[*The right of translation is reserved*]

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

WHEN two years ago I undertook, at the request of the publisher of a collection of theological manuals, to treat the Science of Religion, I at once realised that I was not required to write an encyclopaedia of the subject in question, or a book of reference in which all names should occur, but a manual which should present, in a readable shape, the present state of these studies, and distinguish between the safely established results and those questions which are as yet unsettled. I have worked therefore with this object in view, and have tried to bring the results of the studies that have been carried on in the Science of Religion nearer to students of theology and to all those who interest themselves generally in the history of civilisation. I need not here speak of the importance of these studies for theology as well as for philosophy, and a few remarks will suffice as to the manner in which I have tried to carry out my work.

In the introductory section I have collected some material for solving the leading questions which occupy the Science of Religion. The philosophical treatment of these questions lay entirely outside the

limits of this manual, and therefore all controversial points are treated here, as throughout the whole book, as objectively as possible. The phenomenological section is, I believe, the first more comprehensive attempt to arrange the principal groups of religious conceptions in such a way that the most important sides and aspects should appear conspicuously from out the other material. A systematic treatment of the various doctrines, as such, was not attempted. The examples are as carefully and widely chosen as possible, but they are not too numerous. In the statement of the historical development of individual religions certain gaps were unavoidable, which can however be corrected by academical lectures, for which this manual is chiefly intended. The narrow limits of a manual did not allow of extracts from religious works nor of characteristic stories, and yet in many religions the narrative element predominates very largely. As has already been said, the academic teacher is expected to fill up this gap.

In giving books of reference I have limited myself to a minimum. I think that many titles and references would only trouble a beginner, and they are unnecessary for a more advanced pupil. Those works which are mentioned suffice to open the way to further studies. In transcribing the names I have followed no special system, but have always tried to use the simplest and most usual forms. But I must let the book speak for itself. If it helps to convince theologians of the importance of the results of the Science of Religion my work will be richly rewarded.

I must beg for a lenient criticism as regards the style of a book in which the foreigner may often be detected. I preferred to write it at once in German, because in a translation one so often loses the shades of expression and thought. What the book now is it owes to the kind assistance of my colleague, Professor Völter, whom I heartily thank for the time spent in revising the manuscripts with me. I also gratefully acknowledge the special care which Dr. L. Horst of Colmar gave to the revision of the proof sheets, during which he also corrected much in the style.

The second volume, which is to treat of the religions of Persia, Greece, Rome, Germany, and Islam, will, I hope, appear in 1888.

P. D. CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THOUGH the Science of Religion has of late years awakened a wider interest in England than anywhere else, there was hitherto no manual that could be used as an introduction to the study of that science. The lectures delivered during the last twelve years by the Hibbert and by the Gifford Lecturers in London, Oxford, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and St. Andrews, most of which have been published, treat each of a special branch only of the comparative study of religions. They are chiefly intended for more advanced students, and presuppose an acquaintance with the general outlines of the Science of Religion; but there was no book from which trustworthy information on the whole subject could be gained.

Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye has endeavoured to supply this want by the publication of his 'Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte.' This book has been most favourably received on the continent, and a strong desire for an English translation has repeatedly been expressed in England. Several of the most competent judges in this country have spoken of it in the highest terms.

I have therefore, on the advice of my father, undertaken a translation of the book. In carrying out this work I have not only had the benefit of his help, whenever I wanted it, but likewise that of the author himself. There were some technical and intricate passages which I could not have translated myself, and which my father has translated for me.

Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye has not only revised every page of my translation, but he has allowed me the use of his own notes and corrections, so that my translation may be read almost in the light of a second edition. Whenever passages which occur in the original are omitted or altered in my translation, it should be understood that the responsibility rests with the author. My chief object has been to supply a faithful and correct reproduction of his book, and I trust I have not altogether failed in this not always easy task.

The first volume of Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye's Lehrbuch forms a book by itself. It will depend on the success of this volume, whether it may be followed by the translation of the second volume.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY SECTION	1–66
CHAP. 1. The Science of Religion	3
,, 2. The Science of Religion and the Theory of Evolution	10
,, 3. Man and Beast	13
,, 4. Primitive History	18
,, 5. Prehistoric Archæology	23
,, 6. The Origin of Religion	29
,, 7. The Division of Religions	50
,, 8. The Principal Forms of Religion	59
PHENOMENOLOGICAL SECTION	67–242
CHAP. 9. Preliminary Remarks	67
,, 10. The Objects of Worship	71
,, 11. Idolatry	75
,, 12. Sacred Stones, Trees, and Animals	84
,, 13. The Worship of Nature	102
,, 14. The Worship of Men	111
,, 15. The Gods	122
,, 16. Magic and Divination	131
,, 17. Sacrifice and Prayer	142
,, 18. Other Religious Acts	153
,, 19. Sacred Places	161
,, 20. Religious Times	167
,, 21. Sacred Persons	175
,, 22. Religious Communities	187
,, 23. The Sacred Writings	195
,, 24. The Principal Forms of Religious Doctrines	200

PAGE

CHAP. 25. Mythology 204

„ 26. The Dogmatic and Philosophical Forms of Religious Doctrine 228

„ 27. The Relation of Religion to Morality and Art . . 235

ETHNOGRAPHIC SECTION 243–331

CHAP. 28. Anthropology and Ethnography 244

„ 29. African Races 251

„ 30. American Savages 266

„ 31. The Civilised Nations of America 275

„ 32. The South Sea Islanders 281

„ 33. The Mongolian Race 293

„ 34. The Fins 302

„ 35. The Semitic Family 306

„ 36. The Indo-Germanic Family 320

HISTORICAL SECTION.

The Chinese 332–374

CHAP. 37. Introductory Remarks 332

„ 38. The Sacred or Classical Books 337

„ 39. The Ancient Imperial Religion 343

„ 40. The Life and Teaching of Confucius 352

„ 41. Lâo-tse's Tâo-te-king 360

„ 42. The Philosophers 366

„ 43. Popular Beliefs and Customs up to the Present Day . 370

The Egyptians 374–457

„ 44. Preliminary Remarks 376

„ 45. A Survey of Authorities 382

„ 46. Different Opinions on the Egyptian Religion . . 390

„ 47. The Gods of Popular Belief 403

„ 48. Death, the Tomb, and the Lower World . . . 412

„ 49. The Theological and Cosmogonic Systems . 423

„ 50. Worship and Morals 433

„ 51. Sketch of the Development 443

„ 52. Egypt and Israel 451

The Babylonians and Assyrians . . 458–497

„ 53. Preliminary Remarks 459

„ 54. Survey of Authorities 471

„ 55. Magic and Divination 476

PAGE

CHAP. 56. Gods and Myths 480
„ 57. The Chaldean Genesis 491

The Hindus. 497–672
„ 58. Preliminary Remarks 498

I. *Vedic and Brâhmanic Times* . . . 503–557
„ 59. Survey of the Vedic Literature 503
„ 60. The Hymns of the Rig-veda 506
„ 61. The Authority of the Vedas 518
„ 62. Ritual 523
„ 63. Brâhmanism 527
„ 64. Justice and Morals. The Law-books . . . 532
„ 65. Speculation. The Upanishads 536
„ 66. The Schools of Philosophy 543
„ 67. Witchcraft 550
„ 68. The Hero Legends 552

II. *Gainism* 557–563
„ 69. *Gainism* 557

III. *Buddhism* 563–632
„ 70. Introductory Remarks and Books of Reference . 564
„ 71. The Buddha Legend 577
„ 72. Buddha according to Dogma 588
„ 73. Dharma 594
„ 74. Saṅgha 607
„ 75. Buddhism in India 614
„ 76. Buddhism in Tibet (Lamaism) 624
„ 77. Buddhism in China 627

IV. *Hinduism* 632–672
„ 78. Summary of its History and Literature . . . 632
„ 79. The Great Sectarian Religions 639
„ 80. Foreign Influences 653
„ 81. Religious Development under the Influence of Islam 658
„ 82. The Form of Worship 664
„ 83. The Present Day 668

ABBREVIATIONS.

S. B. E. = Sacred Books of the East.

J. As. = Journal Asiatique.

R. H. R. = Revue de l'histoire des religions.

Hb. Lect. = Hibbert Lectures.

Tr. Or. S. = Trübner's Oriental Series.

R. P. = Records of the Past.

Ann. M. G. = Annales du Musée Guimet.

Z. D. M. G. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

Enc. Br. = Encyclop. Brittanica (9th ed.).

Oncken = Oncken's Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen.

Lichtenberger = Lichtenberger, Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses.

ERRATUM.

P. 482, *read* Mullil (Bel) of Nipur, *not* of Eridu

INTRODUCTORY SECTION.

Books of Reference. A bibliography is to be found in numerous special catalogues by Trübner, Quaritch, Leroux, Maisonneuve, Brockhaus, Köhler, Harrassowitz, Fred. Müller (Amsterdam), &c.; but more especially in TRÜBNER'S American and Oriental Literary Record; in FRIEDERICI'S Bibliotheca Orientalis, 8 years 1876–1883, which was replaced in 1883 by J. KLATT and E. KUHN'S Litteraturblatt für orientalische Philologie, and in 1886 by A. Müller's Orientalische Bibliographie. The literary notices, reviews, and tables of contents in many periodicals should be consulted, more especially those in the Journal Asiatique, the annual reports of which are full of information, particularly the reviews written by J. MOHL for 27 years, and published separately after his death: J. MOHL, Vingt-sept ans d'histoire des études orientales, 1840–1867 (1879, 2 vols.). Besides this there are the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft (mit Jahresbericht); the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland; the Revue archéologique, and many other more specially ethnographic or philological collections which will be mentioned further on. Amongst theological periodicals none paid earlier attention to the science of religion than the Dutch Theologisch Tijdschrift (containing many articles by TIELE, HOEKSTRA, HUGENHOLTZ, RAUWENHOFF, BRUINING). In the Theolog. Jahresbericht (published by PÜNJER, and after his death by LIPSIUS) all literature referring to this subject is carefully collected.

A good deal of material for the science of religion is to be found in the reports of the Oriental Congresses, in the catalogues of museums, and in the collections of inscriptions. Amongst museums we must mention the Musée Guimet, formerly in Lyons, and now in Paris, which is dedicated to the history of religions, and it is for such studies that the Annales du Musée Guimet are published. The best encyclopædias for this study are: ERSCH und GRUBER'S Allgemeine Encyklopädie; Encyclopædia Brittanica (the 9th edition, the latest); LICHTENBERGER, Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses. The history of religion possesses its own organ since 1880 in the Revue de l'historie des religions (first

published by M. VERNES and now by J. RÉVILLE). We must also call attention to the HIBBERT Lectures (since 1878).

Amongst philosophical works we need only mention HEGEL, Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion (2 vols., 1832, 2nd edition, 1840); O. PFLEIDERER, Religionsphilosophie auf geschichtlicher Grundlage (2nd ed., 1883–84, in 2 vols.); G. CH. B. PUNJER, Geschichte der christlichen Religionsphilosophie seit der Reformation (2 vols., 1880-83). These two works complete one another. PUNJER gives a clear, objective statement without any criticism; a 'Grundriss der Religionsphilosophie,' published in 1886 from his posthumous works, contains his own views. PFLEIDERER attempts a comprehensive arrangement of the historical matter in a 'genetic and speculative' spirit. There is also: E. VON HARTMANN, Das religiöse Bewusstsein der Menschheit im Stufengang seiner Entwicklung (1882); J. CAIRD, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion (1880).

The fundamental problems of the philosophy of religion are, and continue to be, treated in very various manners. In France the contrast between Positivism (A. COMTE) and Spiritualism (CARO, SAISSET) is not overcome; in England, in spite of much opposition, HERBERT SPENCER'S system, which strikes us by its originality, pervades the intellectual atmosphere; in Germany dogmatic theologians are trying to bring about a reconciliation, or a clear separation, between philosophy and religion (LIPSIUS, BIEDERMANN, RITSCHL and his school); in Holland, where the literature on this subject in the various languages is perhaps most widely known and used, influential men have most thoroughly made a break between the philosophy of religion and dogmatic theology, although they may have done so from different points of view (PH. R. HUGENHOLTZ, A. BRUINING, L. W. E. RAUWENHOFF).

If we turn our attention to history, we find that the older collective works which were published, before really sufficient material could be obtained, possess now a merely historical value, or are of no value at all. We refer to the works of MEINERS (1806), B. CONSTANT (1824), DE WETTE (1827), WUTTKE (1852), to the thoughtful attempts of C. C. J. VON BUNSEN, Gott in der Geschichte (3 vols., 1857–58), and to J. P. TROTTET, Le génie des civilisations (2 vols., 1862), and many others. Till now there are but very few works which can really be recommended as an introduction to the study of the history of religion. These are: F. MAX MÜLLER, Introduction to the Science of Religion (1873), which has been translated into German; C. P. TIELE, Geschiedenis van den godsdienst tot aan de heerschappy der wereldgodsdiensten (published first in 1876, and afterwards often translated, so that some of the latter translations can be regarded as new and improved editions);

A. RÉVILLE, Prolégomènes de l'histoire des religions (1881, the first volume of a collection which will give a comprehensive history of the various religions; the other volumes, as far as they have at present appeared, will be mentioned under their own subjects). There is very good material in J. FREEMAN-CLARKE, Ten Great Religions (2 vols., 1871–73). We must still mention numerous essays, treatises, and lectures. The following collections are the most important: F. MAX MÜLLER, Chips from a German Workshop (4 vols., especially vols. 1 and 2, since 1867; German and French transl.); W. D. WHITNEY, Oriental and Linguistic Studies (2 series, 1873-4); A. M. FAIRBAIRN, Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History (1876); E. RENAN, Études d'histoire religieuse (3rd ed., 1858), Nouvelles études d'hist. rel. (1884).

CHAPTER 1.—**The Science of Religion.**

THE Science of Religion is a new science which has assumed an independent existence during the last decades only. It has hardly reached as yet its full growth, and is still fighting for the recognition of its rights. People like to consider men such as the Indian emperor Akbar or the Mohammedan philosopher Averroes as the forerunners of this science, because they recognised the relative merits of different religions; but their comparative treatment of religions was too restricted and their interest in the work too unscientific for us to regard them even as real precursors. It is only during the last half of our century that the essential conditions for founding a true science of religion existed. These conditions are three in number. The first is, that religion, as such, should become an object of philosophical knowledge. It is true that a dogmatic study of the Christian religion contained already the elements of such knowledge. We may speak of a philosophy of religion of the reformers; but it was nevertheless modern philosophy that first recognised religion as an object of philosophical study, without taking Christian revelation into

account. The fundamental principles of KANT'S and SCHLEIERMACHER'S systems supplied some foundation stones on which to erect a philosophy of religion. But we must recognise HEGEL as its true founder, because he first carried out the vast idea of realising, as a whole, the various modes for studying religion, (metaphysical, psychological, and historical), and made us see the harmony between the idea and the realisation of religion. No one approaches him in this respect. HEGEL thus gave an aim and object to the science of religion, and on this account we may well forget the many errors in his lectures on the philosophy of religion, given from 1821–1831.

The second condition for a science of religion is the philosophy of history. This philosophy tries to realise the life of mankind as a whole, and not merely to study the concatenation of outward events. In the place, or rather by the side of political history, we have now the history of civilisation, which teaches us not only the fates of nations, but also their social systems, their material advancement, the development of arts and sciences, and the history of opinions.

During the last century a few men interested themselves in these studies. In 1725 VICO brought out in Italy a book on a 'Scienzia nuova,' by which he meant much the same as what we call the philosophy of history, or the psychology of nations. In 1756 appeared VOLTAIRE'S Essai sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations. In 1780 we find LESSING'S Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts, which was followed in 1784 by HERDER'S Ideen zur Geschichte der Menschheit. These are all important dates in the development of studies to which in our century

scholars pay an almost exaggerated and too exclusive attention. Particularly since the publication of BUCKLE'S great work (History of Civilisation in England) in 1858, many students of the history of civilisation have run into wild extremes, and such masters of historiography as RANKE were perfectly right therefore when they laid particular stress on the importance of political history. Nevertheless the history of civilisation is a priceless acquisition; and it is essential to the science of religion because it reveals to us the connection of religion with other sides of life[1].

This framework, however, would be quite useless if there were no materials to fill it. The great work of the present age has been the collecting and studying of new materials, of the extent of which people had formerly no idea. The science of religion owes its steady growth to the discoveries and advances that have been made in the science of language, in archæology, philology, ethnography, psychology of nations, mythology, and folk-lore. It was the comparative study of language which threw light on the real relationship of nations, and thus supplied the principal means for a proper classification of mankind.

Philology has deciphered monuments written in languages that were hitherto unknown, and has advanced so far as to give us trustworthy translations and classical editions of the writings of the ancient nations of the east.

[1] Amongst many works the following is particularly to be recommended: M. CARRIÈRE, Die Kunst im Zusammenhang der Culturentwicklung und die Ideale der Menschheit (5 vols., 1st edition, 1863–73). That widely-read book by FR. VON HELLWALD, Culturgeschichte in ihrer natürlichen Entwicklung bis zur Gegenwart (2 vols., 1st edition, 1874), is neither genuine nor trustworthy.

The remains of ancient civilisations, not only on the Nile and in Mesopotamia, buried and forgotten under the débris of centuries, have been brought to light, and inscriptions have been collected and translated almost everywhere. We can now gain a clear idea of many savage races from the information brought home by intelligent travellers and missionaries. Political history totally ignored these savage tribes, and some of them had literally never been heard of.

The life of ancient and modern civilised nations is studied, not only in its higher strata and its literary productions, but in its popular manifestations, in customs, manners, and superstitions. All these studies furnish the materials necessary for the science of religion.

Nobody has a greater claim to be called the founder of that science than F. MAX MÜLLER, who besides being a recognised master in one branch of these studies, possesses also a wide knowledge of other branches, and joins sound learning to brilliant literary gifts. In his 'Introduction' he pointed out the direction that must be followed in a study of the science of religion; and though his method of explaining myths and religions by the study of language has roused much opposition, his merits as a teacher of the science of religion cannot be contested. He was the first who succeeded in convincing a larger public of the importance of the subject, and was able to persuade the best oriental scholars of Europe to combine in a translation of 'The Sacred Books of the East,' so that the general public might be able to read them. His call for a study of the science of religion has been obeyed by almost every nation, nowhere

more quickly than in Holland, where TIELE devoted his great powers to this subject, and among many other works published the first compendium, in which he gathered together the results of the study of the history of religion. In Holland the science of religion has now taken its recognised place amongst academic studies.

In Paris, Brussels, and lately in Rome also, chairs for the science of religion have been founded. Of course this has met with some opposition, partly from philologists and specialists who fancy that such a general study will lead to empty dilettantism, and partly in the interest of Christianity, since people are afraid that these studies will only increase scepticism and indifference. An honest, conscientious study of the subject alone can refute these objections. These studies have been carried the furthest in England, and the results are placed before the public in annual lectures delivered in various towns (for instance, the Hibbert Lectures in London and Oxford, the Muir Lectures and the Gifford Lectures). In Germany the single branches of the science of religion are well represented, but courses of lectures on the science of religion as a whole, like those, for instance, by R. ROTH at Tübingen, have but seldom been delivered. It is only quite within the last few years that the great importance of the subject has been generally recognised.

The object of the science of religion is the study of religion, of its essence and its manifestations. It divides itself naturally into the philosophy and the history of religion. These two divisions are most closely connected. The philosophy of religion would

be useless and empty if, whilst defining the idea of religion, it disregarded the actual facts that lie before us; and the history of religion cannot prosper without the philosophy of religion. Not only the order and the criticism of religious phenomena, but even the determining whether such phenomena are of a religious nature, depends on some, if only a preliminary definition of religion. The history of religion falls naturally into two divisions, the ethnographical, and, in a narrower sense, the historical. The ethnographical gives us details of the religions of savage tribes, the so-called children of nature (Naturvölker), or that part of mankind that has no history. The second division gives us the historical development of the religions of civilised nations. The collecting and grouping of various religious phenomena forms the transition from the history to the philosophy of religion. The latter treats religion according to its subjective and objective sides, and therefore consists of a psychological and a metaphysical part. The present manual deals with the historical side only. But the limits of this work must not be too restricted, and although we shall not discuss the actual philosophical difficulties, yet we feel bound to give an outline of religious phenomena. We shall best succeed in dividing our subject if, after discussing some more general preliminary questions, we proceed to treat the phenomenological, the ethnographical, and lastly, in a narrower sense, the historical facts.

This last division will embrace all religions which have had an historical development, with the exception of Judaism and Christianity. Not that we would place these two outside the pale of the science of religion;

on the contrary, they will be considered in the phenomenological section; for a philosophy of religion that did not take these two religions into account would indeed be defective. The unity of religion in the variety of its forms is what is presupposed by the science of religion. For merely practical reasons, however, it will be better not to include, in a still larger circle, the very comprehensive studies which have for their object the Christian religion and its forerunner, Judaism.

It is desirable also to use different forms of treatment for the science of religion and for theology, properly so-called. Lately, especially among Dutch savants, the question as to the relations between these two have been discussed in various encyclopædic sketches, and methodological treatises.

Some wish to assign to the general science of religion a subordinate place in the Encyclopædia of Theology, as being only an introduction to the historical or systematic section of the same. But this would only lead to a kind of Theologia gentilis, or a modification of the dogmatic Locus de Religione, even if it did not place the whole of the science of religion (as a science of false gods) in opposition to theology, which has for its object true religion only.

Others reverse this relation, and look upon Christian theology as a subdivision only of the science of religion. Although this is perfectly right in form, still theology can hardly submit to it; for even when it is not reactionary, but works with protestant freedom, it cannot surrender, without self-destruction, the character of its biblical and ecclesiastical teachings, which constitute the greatest part of its encyclopædia.

The science of religion, and the science of the Christian religion must follow, therefore, separate paths, and have separate objects in view. Of course they must mutually help one another. It is most important for theologians to study the science of religion. The well-known saying which MAX MÜLLER has applied to religions: 'He who knows one, knows none,' may rather exaggerate its value, but it is certainly true that the eye which has been sharpened, through a comparative study of religions, can better realise the religious idea of Christianity, and that the history of Christianity can only be rightly understood when one has studied the non-Christian religions from which Christianity borrows so much, or to which it stands in sharp opposition[1]. Finally, missionaries cannot possibly do good work without having studied this subject.

CHAPTER 2.—The Science of Religion and the Theory of Evolution.

Books of Reference. This question is touched on or thoroughly treated in almost all philosophical and historical books of modern times. We shall here only mention a few of the numerous smaller writings and treatises devoted to it. First of all what MAX MÜLLER wrote against DARWIN in his Chips (Essays), IV; then L. NOIRÉ, Max Müller und die Sprachphilosophie (1879); L. GEIGER, Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit (Lectures, 1871); M. LAZARUS, Ueber die Ideen in der Geschichte (1872); C. P. TIELE, Over de wetten der ontwikkeling van den godsdienst (Theol. Tijdschrift, 1874); J. I. DOEDES, De toepassing van de ontwikkelingstheorie niet aan te bevelen voor de geschiedenis der godsdiensten (1874).

Already in the last century Hume pointed out the necessity of a natural history of religion[2]. This idea

[1] See J. HAPPEL, Das Christenthum und die heutige vergleichende Religionsgeschichte (1882).

[2] HUME, Natural History of Religion (1757).

has been carried out more consistently and more completely in our own time, under the influence of natural science and a mechanical theory of the universe, which is so closely connected with it. Philosophers, psychologists, ethnologists, and historians wish to treat their studies according to the method of natural science, and to explain history as a psychological mechanism. Buckle was the first to give a classical form to this opinion; since his time many have followed his example: A. Bastian, Fr. von Hellwald, E. von Hartmann, W. E. H. Lecky, E. B. Tylor, H. Taine, A. Réville, C. P. Tiele, and others. These, although they start from very different points of view, yet all agree on the necessity of treating the history of human civilisation and customs like any other natural science, and of thus formulating the laws of its natural development. This idea has been most consistently worked out in the philosophy of H. Spencer, which points out everywhere in the whole world, in the regions of the suborganic, organic, and superorganic life, the same identical law of evolution. As to the manner in which the effects of the laws at work in social and spiritual spheres are to be more accurately defined, the followers of the theory of evolution vary much from one another. But they agree in their fundamental principles. Their fundamental dogma is: Natura non facit saltus. Everywhere the more complicated forms develop from the simpler forms, the higher from the lower, the human from the animal.

To explain the mental and social development of mankind, much weight must be laid on outer environment, climate, soil, flora, and fauna. With this we must take into account, as an inward element, the

natural disposition and the racial or popular character. Religion can only be realised as a product of these elements, and in connection with general development. All supernatural explanations, which recognise the influence of the free will of God or of man on this general development, are excluded. Strict evolutionary principles do not admit a real substance and ontological reason of phenomena, nor their teleological destination. The theory of evolution recognises in history causes and laws, but no aims or ideas; it is occupied only with what is, and not with what ought to be.

Cogent reasons have been brought forward against this system. Conceptions such as 'historical law' and 'natural development,' by which evolutionists would explain everything, are certainly nothing less than clear and explicit. It is quite right that one must take into account first beginnings, embryonic states, and lowest forms when explaining the life of mankind; but many will not admit that they should be taken into account, exclusively or even preponderatingly, to solve the riddle of life. The boundary drawn by speech and reason between man and animal is strongly emphasised, and has been brought forward more especially by MAX MÜLLER against the theory of evolution. Teleology seems so essential to the study of intellectual phenomena, that many who as a rule follow the theory of evolution (as VON HARTMANN), cannot entirely renounce it. The opponents of the theory of evolution consider that as natural religion, which was studied with such eagerness in the last century, turned out an empty abstraction, so also the treatment of religion as a natural science,

which is at present so highly thought of by many, is a mere illusion, and does not do justice to religious phenomena. At the same time the great importance of the theory of evolution must not be mistaken, nor its operations restricted to a very limited sphere. Some people have raised objections to the theory of evolution, with questionable success, by pointing out certain weak points, or a few exceptions. Nowhere can a fixed border-line be pointed out between the natural and the intellectual spheres, neither can one attribute a phenomenon exclusively to one or the other of these two spheres. But one must confess that the merely natural explanation of many phenomena is one-sided, and therefore false, and that the method of natural science does not suffice when we judge religious phenomena according to their inner worth. We believe with LOTZE and many scholars and philosophers of the present day, that there may be a possible solution of this dilemma with which finally both sides may agree.

We do not mean to underrate the great importance of the mechanical treatment, and the value of the theory of evolution, in the science of religion also, but we do not believe that this theory will be sufficient for a proper appreciation of the religious life of mankind.

CHAPTER 3. — Man and Beast.

Books of Reference. We shall here mention those works also which discuss the questions concerning the origin of religion in its fullest sense: H. SPENCER, The Principles of Sociology (2 vols., 1876-82); E. B. TYLOR, Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization (2nd edition, 1870); Primitive Culture (1872, this is a master work on account of the completeness, trust-

worthiness and methodical arrangement of the ethnographic matter); Sir John Lubbock, Prehistoric Times as illustrated by ancient remains and the manners and customs of modern savages (1865); The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man (1870); O. Caspari, Die Urgeschichte der Menschheit mit Rücksicht auf die natürliche Entwickelung des frühesten Geisteslebens (2 vols., 1st ed., 1873; the author is a thorough Darwinist, the matter is incomplete and untrustworthy, but the anthropological constructions are interesting); G. Roskoff, Das Religionswesen der rohesten Naturvölker (1880); E. Zeller, Ueber Ursprung und Wesen der Religion (1877, in Vorträge und Abhandl., 2nd collection); Tito Vignoli, Myth and Science (2nd edition, 1882).

We fully expect to be contradicted when we declare that religion is the specific and common property of all mankind. But here we are met by the question whether the origin of religion lies exactly on the border-line which divides man from animals, or, in other words, whether we can find animals with, or human beings without any religion?

Have animals a religion? We cannot be surprised that evolutionists answer this with a decided affirmative, and find a connecting link between man and beast even in religion. Fear and love, fidelity and respect, would thus receive a decidedly religious aspect with certain animals. The relations between a master and his dog are religious; and many other animals must certainly regard the mysterious and often hostile strength of man as a god-like power. Thus probably ants look upon man as some bad Moloch or Ahriman. Animals find religion in other ways besides their relations with man, social animals find it in their family and state communities; consider for example the homage paid by bees to their queen.

This is the opinion held by some people, with which

others only partially agree. They mark a difference between religious dispositions and feelings (fear, veneration, &c.), which we cannot deny that animals possess, and other powers, such as the capability of abstraction which LOCKE recognised as belonging solely to man, or disinterested observation, which are distinctly necessary to the formation of a religion, but which animals do not possess. GERLAND, v. HARTMANN, and others acknowledge that animals have religious qualities but no true religion, because religious objects are wanting to them.

These are the principal opinions held as to the religion of animals, in opposition to which stands the simple assertion that religion belongs exclusively to man. Thus on both sides we have a petitio principii.

If we consider the materials we can command to answer this question, we must at once confess that every scientific decision must be put aside. For although much has been thought and written since the time of Aristotle about the souls of animals, yet the question still remains open whether we have the right to draw conclusions from the standpoint of human consciousness to that of animals.

Many people use this doubtful right in the widest sense, and speak with the greatest confidence about the impressions and intuitions of animals.

All, however, who consider that the only means by which we can solve the difficult problems of the human mind is speech, and that animals do not possess it, will rather agree with MAX MÜLLER, who looks on the soul of animals as a 'terra incognita excluding all positive knowledge.' If v. HARTMANN therefore pretends that by the proof of a religious

disposition in the animal soul, he has gained his conviction of the uniformity of intellectual life throughout the universe, and of a difference in degree only with reference to religion, the case is probably the very opposite. The conviction came probably first, and the proof (which is really impossible) was not too minutely examined.

We find a firmer footing when considering the second question: Are there human beings without religion? Here again much depends on the right conception and limiting of the subject. The question is: Have we either in the present day, or in trustworthy historical records, reliable evidence of races without a religion? We take account exclusively of the so-called children of nature, the totally or half-savage tribes; we shall not take into account those educated people, many of them deep thinkers, who say they have or fancy they have given up all religion, as they do not concern us at present. The only question is: Are there any races known of which we can reasonably say, they are void of all religion? There are many witnesses who affirm this of certain Australian tribes, of the Bushmen and Hottentots, of the Terra del Fuegians and the aboriginal races of Brazil, of the whole of South America, of the Esquimos and Laplanders, of the inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, and many others. LUBBOCK has collected these witnesses and has deduced from them that most, in fact all, savage tribes are without a religion. Most ethnologists, and even TYLOR, have expressed their determined opposition to this theory. ROSKOFF more especially has refuted it. There are many reasons which prove LUBBOCK'S view

to be untenable. To begin with, much depends on how we define religion. LUBBOCK himself confesses that a fear of the unknown and a belief in witchcraft are found everywhere; but he will not call this religion, as a religion must contain the idea of a God. This narrow definition of religion really undermines his own theories as to races without a religion. What he calls no religion, most people look on as a low form of religion; the matter therefore would end in a mere question of words.

But the numerous witnesses themselves must be carefully examined. How is it that many people imagine they are living amongst religionless tribes? This may be explained partly by the prejudices of many travellers and the superficiality of their observations, and partly by the unwillingness of savages to explain their customs and beliefs to strangers. To look on things from another person's point of view presupposes, what BASTIAN calls, a 'psychological askesis,' which is very rare. It was certainly not possessed by many missionaries, who, because they could find no trace of their own religion amongst savages, at once declared they had no religion at all; nor by most scientific travellers, who often did not possess the power of realising religious symptoms. For instance, because certain words were wanting in the languages of savage tribes, people at once argued that the corresponding religious ideas or intuitions were also wanting.

We must also consider the superstitious fear that makes savages hide themselves from strangers, or deceive them rather than let them have an insight into their religious matters. We can thus easily see

how little we can rely on accounts of the absence of religion amongst certain nations. It is important also to note that positive facts are often absolutely opposed to these accounts. Witnesses have been taken from the same countries in which LUBBOCK got his reports, and are diametrically opposed to him. They show clearly that many savages really possess a religion, although we can infer their religious convictions from certain customs and habits only. It is worth while to compare the accounts in ROSKOFF'S book.

The same holds good of tribes without religion as of tribes without language (HÄCKEL'S Alalians) or without fire. They are to be found in certain systems, because they fit into them; but in reality no one can point them out.

CHAPTER 4.—**Primitive History.**

Books of Reference. The value of the biblical tradition of primitive history has been defended amongst others by H. LÜKEN, Die Einheit des Menschengeschlechts und dessen Ausbreitung über die ganze Erde (1845); E. L. FISCHER, Heidenthum und Offenbarung (1878), both Roman Catholics. Richer material and more careful judgment are found in FR. LENORMANT, Les origines de l'histoire d'après la bible et les traditions des peuples orientaux (3 vols. 1880-84). An introductory work on the value of linguistic studies as regards the question of origins is O. SCHRADER'S Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte, linguistisch-historische Beiträge zur Erforschung des indogermanischen Alterthums (1883), translated into English by JEVONS, Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples (1890).

As we have represented religion as something specific and common to all mankind, we must now look and see if we can discover its historical origin, i.e. the first primitive form in which it appeared. Are there any historical facts or other witnesses which give us any knowledge, direct or indirect, as regards the origin of culture and custom, of religion and morality? We must examine this question more closely.

To begin with: Is there any tradition, even in a legendary form, and yet containing some grain of historical fact, which reaches back to the origins? As such we can only seriously regard the biblical accounts of Gen. i–xi, which are by many maintained to be 'primitive history.' The principal events in this history—paradise and the fall, fratricide and the building of towns, the flood and the dispersion of mankind—are preserved in the memory of other nations also. And whereas the biblical account, as the clearest and purest, helps us to understand the traces of similar traditions among the heathens, though almost lost in mythic twilight, it receives in turn a welcome confirmation from them. With this biblical primitive history as our guiding star, we seem to discover historically the common origin of mankind, and may even indicate certain religious fundamental ideas as the common property of all nations. Such are the assertions of the apologists. But we have only too much reason for carefully examining their proofs. Many of them misrepresent facts with great arbitrariness, and wildly join together the most dissimilar and opposed facts. Less rash people, who choose their proofs more carefully, have at present produced no consensus gentium for the so-called facts of primitive history. Many important links are wanting to the chain of proofs. A flood myth is found, for instance, amongst the most remote nations (in America, &c.), but not amongst the nearer Egyptians and Indians (in India it is probably a borrowed myth and of much later date); and even the Assyro-Babylonian literature knows nothing of the fall of man. Many points of contact are much more apparent than real; many people have been deceived

by outward similarities, and have recognised with joy the trees of paradise, or the hostile brothers. But on a closer examination they had to acknowledge that such combinations joined together two totally heterogeneous phenomena. In this respect it is most instructive to study the parallels offered by the Persian legends and early biblical history. Here, in two well-known and not far distant countries, one might more reasonably expect safer results, than when the material is drawn from fragmentary and scarcely trustworthy reports taken from far distant nations; but even this limited comparison between Israelitic and Persian traditions has not proved successful. Even the last collector of prehistoric parallels, a man who lays weight on his orthodox catholic stand-point, and who attributes a special importance to the biblical account because of its religious and moral character—FR. LENORMANT—recognises in Gen. i–xi a tradition merely which is shared by the Israelites for the most part with certain neighbouring nations. But this is an archæological attempt the historical value of which no scientific and educated scholar can defend, and which possesses, to a greater degree than most people imagine, a symbolical or allegorical character. We therefore agree with RUMELIN: 'The biblical account of paradise and the fall is, it is true, more attractive, more thoughtful, and of more intrinsic value, but it is not more credible or more conceivable than the legends of other nations[1].'

The beginnings of the life of men, their spreading over the earth, the first grades of civilisation, the original forms of language and religion, of domestic and social arrangements, all this belongs to prehistoric times.

[1] G. RÜMELIN, Reden und Aufsätze, p. 430.

But the question arises whether at the point where historical tradition leaves us in the lurch, other witnesses can to a certain degree fill the gap. To a certain limit this is the case. The state of man at the moment when he steps into the light of history authorises retrospective conclusions as to his prehistoric conditions. Man as he appears on the stage of history, already possesses a language, some sort of social constitution, customs and habits which present to us in rough outlines the picture of a yet older time in which he either possessed, or else gained these goods. But since it is very difficult to separate all that is really primitive from what forms the intellectual possession of mankind at a given period, this retrospective conclusion concerning prehistoric conditions would remain a mere abstract possibility, if we did not get terra firma under our feet by a comparison of languages and customs. Historical and comparative grammar have led to a linguistic paleontology, which with complete safety carries our view beyond the limits of what is known to us by historical tradition. This comparison of language gives us reliable results, if it does not overstep the region of languages really related to one another. It can glean much within the limits of the single linguistic families, and has done so more especially for the Indo-Germanic languages. It has pointed out what belongs to the separate branches of this family (for instance, the Aryanic and the Germanic branches) and what is common to all languages of which that family consists. With the help of the study of language we can even distinguish many periods in the prehistoric times of the Indo-Germans: a primitive time when all

the members of the whole family lived together as yet undivided, and a later period when they had mostly separated, but when the Eastern so-called Aryanic branch—the primitive people of the Persians and Indians—was still one. A comparison of the radical words of these languages teaches us certain details regarding primitive times. Thus we learn something about the surroundings and institutions of this prehistoric people, about the plants and animals which they reared, the pursuits they followed, their family law, and even their religious conceptions. But even in the Indo-Germanic region, the results of linguistic research are not nearly so certain and extensive as some people imagine. Nevertheless they are most satisfactory. Similar but smaller results are obtained by the study of Semitic languages, and attempts of the same kind by students of the Mongolian, Malayo-Polynesian and other branches of philology, have proved more or less successful. By this means our acquaintance with the primitive culture and religion of various families of men will increase considerably; but we dare not therefore hope to be allowed to listen to the very first beginnings, or to discover the very origin of religion. We are warned to be careful by the repeated attempts made by numerous and well-known scholars to throw a bridge between the two most closely connected and best known families of language, the Indo-Germanic and the Semitic, and to trace an Indo-Germanic-Semitic relationship of roots. All these attempts have as yet proved fruitless; for the study of language does not show us any prehistoric connection between Indo-Germans and Semites. It is easy to see what

we may think of the knowledge of those who try to prove not merely the common origin of these two, but of all families of language, and who talk wildly about African, Ugrian, Tahitian, and American roots.

A comparative study of language does not disclose the beginnings of all things, but it would seem that where it leaves us in the lurch, a comparison of customs helps us further. In customs and opinions, habits and superstitions, fables and metaphors, there are strong analogies between many nations, in all stages of civilisation. In comparing these parallels we must not limit our view by the boundaries of the individual families of men. Ideas and customs apparently most casual, as for instance the bridge of the dead, the fountain of youth, the lame devil, the evil eye, the cure by suction, he couvade, &c., form a possession common to the most distant nations and races. Whether one can deduce the original unity of mankind from these coincidences is a question which A. GERLAND, amongst others, answers in the affirmative, and TYLOR in the negative. The latter is probably more correct, since induction in these matters is far less safe than in the comparison of languages. Analogies in customs, &c. do not convincingly prove a common origin, since in various places similar causes may have produced similar results. Therefore all origins are still hidden from our eyes.

CHAPTER 5.—**Prehistoric Archæology.**

Books of Reference. Besides the works by SIR JOHN LUBBOCK and CASPARI which we have already mentioned, we must add the following general surveys: HAMY, Précis de paléontologie humaine (1873); MARQUIS DE NADAILLAC, Les premiers hommes et les temps préhistoriques (2 vols., 1881; this gives a good survey and a thoughtful judgment of the sub-

ject); N. JOLY, L'homme avant les métaux (1879); G. DE MORTILLET, Le préhistorique, Antiquité de l'homme (1883); G. COTTEAU, Le Préhistorique en Europe; Congrès, Musées, Excursions, 1889. Besides this, important materials have been collected in many local collections and in numerous articles in periodicals (for instance in the Revue archéologique). An approximate idea of the extent of this literature is given in HARRASSOWITZ, Antiq. Katal., No. 104.

Natural scientists also have turned their attention to those problems which history, philology, and ethnography cannot solve. And it is certain that natural science has an important word to say as regards the age, the unity, and the original home of mankind, and that the opinions of such men as DARWIN, CHARLES LYELL, DE QUATREFAGES, and others, possess no small authority. But we cannot enter into this now. Nevertheless we must give a hasty glance at the discoveries from prehistoric times, and point out the value of studies connected with them, which are known as prehistoric archæology and paleontology in its narrower sense.

Prehistoric man, of whom we have no knowledge, who has utterly disappeared even from the memories of the most ancient traditions, has left us some remnants of his houses and tombs, his bones and limbs, his weapons and implements, his household furniture and vessels, and even some of his amulets and idols. In almost all parts of the world, in Siberia, Algeria, and India as well as in Europe and America, similar discoveries have been made. To these belong the menhir (upright stones), dolmen[1] (stone tables or rooms), cromlech[2] (circles of stones), which occur in numbers in many countries, in India as well as in western Europe, and which are often, but without

[1] English antiquarians use dolmen as the name for holed stones.

[2] English antiquarians use cromlech in the sense of large slabs supported by three stones fixed in the ground.

sufficient reason, considered to be Druidic or Celtic. Homer knew of ancient stones the purpose of which was then already forgotten[1]. The largest remains of such stone monuments are the two in England—Stonehenge on Salisbury Plain and the less well-known group of stones at Abury in Wiltshire: both are probably temples surrounded by graves. But these stones are not the only witnesses of a prehistoric period. In caves, mounds, and elsewhere many burial-places have been discovered and examined. Boucher de Perthes has found the implements of prehistoric man in the alluvial soil of the Somme at Abbeville, and Lartet in the caves of the Dordogne, and for nearly a century other caves and the deposit of other rivers have yielded their share. In the Swiss lakes the pile-dwellings have been brought to light, in Denmark the shell-heaps (kjökkenmödding) have been searched, in the valley of the Mississippi the artificial mounds have been explored by men like Squier and Davies. Schliemann's discoveries in Greece and Troy are for the most part concerned with prehistoric archæology, but of a different kind.

In using this already vast and ever-increasing material great care must be taken. This is necessary, to begin with, on account of the elasticity of the conception applied to what is prehistoric. The nations of Northern Europe without exception lived, until their contact with Rome, in prehistoric times, and as regards the Scandinavian North this period continued during many centuries after the beginning of our era. The tribes of North America remained in prehistoric conditions until the discovery of that

[1] Iliad, xxiii. 329.

continent by Europeans, and prehistoric conditions continue amongst some savages, even up to the present day, in all parts of the world. From this we see that one must not consider prehistoric and primitive as meaning the same thing. There are many finds from prehistoric times which are probably comparatively young, but it is impossible to give the approximate age of each. There exist various opinions as to the date, for instance, of the mound-builders on the Mississippi and of the Danish shell-heaps. We only have a firm footing in the case of remains in layers of earth, the age of which can be settled by geology, and it is thus that the opinion has been arrived at, that men have lived on earth from 200,000 to 300,000 years. Therefore prehistoric time attains a great expansion, and people have tried to divide it into great periods, according to the materials in which men worked. Ancient writers had also hinted at something similar[1], but modern archæologists have scientifically divided early history into a stone-age, a bronze-age, and an iron-age. The Danish students THOMSEN, NILSSON, and WORSAAE were the first to render useful service in this subject. Many people, like SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, distinguish in the stone-age, a paleolithic, and a neolithic period. DE MORTILLET continues this subdivision still further, and deduces various periods from minuter differences in the remains of the various finds; but this is risky, and often very arbitrary. Even in a division in its most general forms, we must be careful to avoid the dogmatic opinion, that all nations passed through these three periods at the same time, or in the same

[1] Lucretius, v. 1282.

manner. In many places implements of various materials have been found together. There are finds which show copper, but no bronze. At the beginning of the Middle Ages, in parts of Europe, stone implements and stone weapons were still in use. Amongst certain civilised nations who could work perfectly in metals, the memory of the stone-age was preserved by the use of stone vessels for worship. In the rites of the fetiales in ancient Rome the pig was sacrificed with a stone knife, and even in later times the priests of the goddess Cybele used a flint for castration, as the Jews do for circumcision. But these are survivals of an older time. We see therefore that, on the whole, the division of the prehistoric age into periods must be accepted with the greatest reservation.

From these facts we can easily see that these prehistoric discoveries do not bring us much nearer to the solution of the problem as to the origins of civilisation and religion. Much was deduced from these facts, after it had first been forced into them. Therefore it sounds strange when DR. A. RAUBER uses the primitive history of man as a weapon in modern social warfare (Culturkampf), and tries to show that the state is really the parent of all civilisation and religion. The opinion held by MORTILLET is equally untenable, namely that religion is a rather modern discovery, only about 15,000 years old, whilst mankind lived for 220,000 years without a religion. He bases this opinion on the statement that it is only in the more modern finds that amulets occur, and that care was paid to the burial of the dead; but these discoveries are far too fragmentary and their

chronology too uncertain to authorise such conclusions. There are too few reliable results to support any system. Implements of worship and amulets, amongst which people claim to recognise discs of the sun and sickles of the moon, tell us but little concerning their use, or the ideas of their possessors. We can deduce rather more from the tombs, the number and arrangements of which show us the great care bestowed on the dead. In the stone-age, at least in the neolithic period, it seems to have been more common to bury the bodies in a sitting posture, while in the bronze-age cremation was more general. This age of cremation had not vanished from the memory of man during the classical period of ancient Northern literature. Many graves show signs of sacrifices and feasts in honour of the departed. In the graves of the dead were placed their utensils and possessions, their ornaments, food and drink, and sometimes even wives and slaves. During the last few years (since 1873) French savants (PRUNIÈRES, BROCA) have drawn attention to the custom of trepanning which was wide-spread in prehistoric times, but the meaning of which can only be surmised. We find that the removed portion of the skull was often replaced at burial by a piece taken from another skull, whether the man had been trepanned during his life or after his death. A belief in a continuance of existence can surely be traced in these funeral customs; but they leave us in the dark concerning the exact meaning and form of this creed.

We cannot help drawing at least one conclusion from these prehistoric remains. Most of the men thus presented to us lived like savage animals. They had for the

most part to conquer their means of existence on earth, and their customs are revealed in the numerous human bones which are cleverly broken with tools, and therefore by man, and had been sucked.

One can excuse this cannibalism of prehistoric man by constraining need, or the pangs of hunger, or even derive it from a religious idea; anyhow the cave and pile dwellers did not live like people in paradise. Even from this we must not draw general conclusions. We know something about the material existence of a few prehistoric men; but we know nothing concerning their language, and therefore of their whole mental life. However old the material remains of which we have been speaking may be, yet they do not reach back to the first days of man on earth. Reliable evidence on these origins has not been preserved either in the memory of man, or in his dwelling-place, the earth.

CHAPTER 6.—**The Origin of Religion.**

Books of Reference. We recommend the general philosophical literature in chapter 1, and books mentioned in chapter 3. Besides this, FR. SCHULTZE, Der Fetischismus, ein Beitrag zur Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte (1871); on this subject there arose an interesting polemic between C. P. TIELE (Gids. 1871) and O. PFLEIDERER (Jahrb. für prot. Theol. 1875), and again TIELE (Theol. Tijdschr. 1875); F. MAX MÜLLER, Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religions of India (Hib. Lect. 1878); the general views of the first two lectures gave rise to almost numberless discussions; J. HAPPEL, Die Anlage des Menschen zur Religion vom gegenwärtigen Standpunkte der Völkerkunde aus betrachtet und untersucht (1877), a prize essay; its different parts are of unequal value, but it offers much of interest in chap. ii. regarding the questions under discussion; L. W. E. RAUWENHOFF, Het ontstaan van den godsdienst (Theol. Tijdschr. 1885), and KÖSTLIN in Stud. und Krit. 1890, give surveys, from which one can get to know the present state of the question.

The question as to the origin of religion is really a

philosophical one, and runs as follows: What causes or powers in man and mankind give rise to religion? What can be regarded as primitive in religious life? This question as to the origin of religion touches closely on that as to the essence of religion, but the two questions are not identical; for primitive and essential are not synonymous, and though our opinion as to the essence of religion may strongly influence our views on its origins, yet it would be a petitio principii to maintain that the essence of religion must clearly show itself in the earliest forms under which it appears. A detailed treatment of these problems must be left to the philosophy of religion, but even in a history of religion we cannot but touch on the principal points. For a philosophical view of the beginnings of religion must conform itself to the data of ethnography and religious history, as well as to those of psychology, and must account for the historical development, and the actual state of religion. Our conception of history varies according as we begin with the beginning, or the end, and consider retrogression, or progression either as primary, or secondary in the development of mankind[1]. Therefore without entering on the psychological and philosophical questions as to the origin of religion, we must dwell on those parts of them which are directly connected with ethnographic and historical studies.

Many old and modern ideas concerning the origin of religion, even though they boast of the authority of famous names, need only to be mentioned in order at once to realise their insufficiency. Such is, for instance,

[1] The reasons for both opinions have been clearly collected by DE WETTE, Vorlesungen über die Religion (1827), pp. 184 seq.

that formerly popular explanation which regarded religion as a human discovery sprung from the cunning deception of priests and rulers. Another opinion not less insipid, though at present sometimes regarded as the highest philosophy, is that which declares religion to be a madness, a pathological phenomenon, closely connected with neurosis and hysteria, &c.

The psychological explanation also which derives religion one-sidedly from one single faculty or sentiment, is mistaken, whether with PESCHEL and many others we admit intellectual wants, 'pressure of causality,' or, according to the frequently quoted saying of the ancients, 'primus in orbe Deos fecit timor[1],' fear only. As opposed to this, another theory we think will prevail, which insists on the co-operation of different functions of our mind in the origin of religion, and discovers in it the rich scale of different human sentiments. Lastly, we must insist on this, that the psychological analysis can never suffice for the solution of the whole problem, for religion is impossible except by a simultaneous working of subjective and objective elements; it only arises from a contact between the desires of man and his impressions and experiences. Very heterogeneous thinkers agree nevertheless in recognising a connection between these two sides. FEUERBACH represents the gods in their double character as creatures of our desires (Wunschwesen) and creatures of nature (Naturwesen). FAIRBAIRN well describes these objective and subjective elements from which the idea of God takes its origin, and so do ZELLER and many

[1] This saying is not by Lucretius, as is often supposed, but is borrowed in Statius' Thebais (iii. 661) from Petronius.

more. They differ, however, considerably in defining religious sentiments and religious impressions, which they allow to be primitive ; and more particularly with regard to the question whether the first religious ideas should be derived from impressions of nature, or from experiences of life. Many believe that the impressions which man receives from surrounding nature arouse and determine his religious sentiment. But HUME already differed, and thought that the experiences of life which are constantly filling the human heart with fear or hope, constituted the true source of religion. This may also be taken to mean that the contradiction between the data of human self-consciousness, and the order of the world, in other words, the misery of life, supplies the true impulse for a forcible assertion of the ideal within the human soul [1]. Anyhow, this question, whether religion arises from a contemplation of nature, or from the experiences of life, constitutes one of the principal problems connected with the origin of religion.

Before we examine the different attempts at explaining the origin of religion in connection with historical facts, we have still to say a few words on the opinion that religion is to be derived from a primeval revelation of God. The solution of this question is historical in appearance only, and in reality is to be carefully distinguished from a formerly discussed admission of a primitive tradition which is supposed to be contained in Genesis i-xi. Even that account knows nothing of an event or an act by which religion has been founded, though it represents

[1] See S. HOEKSTRA, Bz., Bronnen en grondslagen van het godsdienstig geloof (1864).

to us the God-created man as in intercourse with his Creator. The question as to a primitive revelation must not therefore be treated as an historical or semi-historical question, but as a purely philosophical one. Many nations have cherished the idea of a divine origin of all civilisation, and therefore of religion also. Human belief takes naturally to the idea 'antiquitas proxime accedit ad Deos,' and therefore 'a Dis quasi tradita religio[1].' The defenders of a primitive revelation as the source of all religion, are not satisfied with admitting a divine origin of civilisation, but imagine a special communication from God, whereby religion was founded. Against such a view we may quote the words of SCHELLING, that if religion were to be derived from an historical communication from God, man would have to be conceived as without religion before that communication, and that if we admit an original atheism of human consciousness, it would remain inconceivable how such a consciousness could have received a revelation from God. But although this argument of SCHELLING's touches the weak point of the opposite opinion, it rests nevertheless on a wrong opposition between what is essential and actual. We cannot even recognise such a dilemma as that a religion arose either from the nature of man, or from an act of God. We can neither co-ordinate the two terms, nor reject one of them. To us, on the contrary, religion seems to spring from the very essence of man, but under influences and circumstances wherein the activity of God is manifest, even though we can-

[1] Cicero, de Legibus, ii. c. 11.

not determine the form and the conditions under which this activity showed itself.

But this is not the meaning attached to a primitive revelation by its defenders. They rather think of a primitive monotheism of divine origin, which can be traced in many religions as antecedent to its later development. GLADSTONE[1] has tried to do this with great ingenuity, but to us his theory seems untenable.

We now turn to the question as to which religious phenomena may be considered as primitive, and whether the historical development can be satisfactorily explained from such primitive forms. Let us examine the different and opposite opinions on this subject.

We meet first of all with the assertion, that savage races continuing up to the present in prehistoric circumstances give us a correct idea of the primitive state of religion. This opinion is held by TYLOR, LUBBOCK, TIELE, RÉVILLE, and many others, and to a certain extent also by WAITZ; while H. SPENCER tries to illustrate the picture of primitive man, which he deduces apparently from psychological tenets, with the help of descriptions of savage races. It is true they admit that, in the strict sense of the word, no part of the human race still exists in a state of nature, that a certain civilisation is to be found everywhere, and that the terms of 'savage' and 'children of nature' can be taken relatively only. Nevertheless these very savages, however great the distance which separates them from the first days of humanity, are supposed to give us an approximately faithful picture of those early days; they form the un-

[1] Homer and the Homeric Age (1860); Juventus Mundi (1868).

developed, or the least developed portions of humanity, and are therefore to the student of civilisation what the opossum and the sloth are to the paleontologist. But even if savages are looked upon, not as undeveloped, but as corrupt portions of humanity, their present state may nevertheless, it is thought, bear witness to primitive states, because a corruption and a lapsing from a high level is generally nothing but a relapse into a former lower stage. In more than one respect savages are supposed to be like the first man. In both, the sensuous elements are predominant, life is chiefly determined by external influences, while there is as yet no trace of an independent intellectual development. They follow impulses and impressions which change every moment, and they are almost entirely devoid of the faculty of abstraction. Even to-day we see how their consciousness is enclosed within the narrow limits of the senses, without any sign of an awakening intellect, and the same must have been the case with the first man. But there are weighty arguments against this view. It must be remembered, first of all, that in one respect at least, the life of the savage differs from that of the first man, considering that he is tied to a past. It is a mistake to imagine that because these savage races do not hand down any history, they are therefore not dependent on a past, and live as it were in a to-day without a yesterday. The past, though it does not live in an historical tradition, exercises nevertheless the greatest influence through the continuity of manners; and among these races more particularly, the power of custom is very tyrannical. Leaving alone the question whether savages are really a deteriorated race, the idea of com-

paring them with the childhood of mankind is a mistake, more particularly if it is intended as a real analogy, and not simply as a metaphor, for savages have a real past to which they are chained by customs and laws. The same applies to another argument in support of this opinion. Historians of civilisation have observed that many of the customs and views of savages occur also in the higher stages of civilisation, and they believe in consequence that they can best understand the whole intellectual development, if they dwell upon the level occupied by savages as its starting-point. The life of savages is thus considered as the foundation on which the laborious edifice of civilisation has been erected. This argument however may easily be inverted. If on one side the views and customs of savages may everywhere be detected amongst civilised races, traces and indications of higher ideals are not wanting amongst savages. This point will have to be established more fully hereafter, at present we can only mention it as a deduction from what we have mentioned before, so that the Patagonian, Tasmanian, and others should not be considered, as a matter of course, as the true image of primitive man. In considering the origin of civilisation it is necessary to take account of the whole man, and of the whole of humanity in its course of development, and therefore not to omit the state of childhood and savage races. The opinion however that a child and a savage represent exclusively, or even preeminently, the features of the first man has to be rejected. It is strange to observe what different impressions are made on different observers by the life of savages. Many, such as GERLAND for

instance, discover among savages clear traces of former civilisation; others see in these races nothing but herds of human beings still to a great extent in an animal state.

We must here examine carefully a doctrine with which the former view is closely connected, namely that of an original animism. This animism owes the prominent part which it occupies at present in the science of religion, to TYLOR, who in his Primitive Culture represents animism as a primitive philosophy, supplying at the same time the foundation of all religion. According to him, religion arose from the conception of spiritual beings borrowed from a coarse philosophy of nature. Animism comprehends the doctrine of souls and of spirits, but has its starting-point in the former. Apparitions during sleep and at death, dreams, and visions are supposed to have revealed to man his soul as distinct from the body, and as an indwelling vital force. This knowledge of the existence of a human soul was afterwards transferred to all other objects also. Animals, plants, and everything else have their own souls, which the savage represents to himself as like the soul of man. A belief that the whole of nature is endowed with life is indissolubly connected with these views, and mythology has borrowed this idea from animism. From this original doctrine of souls arises the doctrine of spirits. Spirits are supposed to be of the same kind as souls, only no longer belonging to individual beings or objects, but separated from them, and acting in different ways as demons, as tutelary, natural, or elementary spirits, as deities of species, &c. Sometimes they are conceived as roaming about and manifesting

themselves, sometimes as incorporated in certain objects which then become fetishes. On this animistic foundation TYLOR has attempted to explain not only a number of religiou phenomena, even in the higher strata of civilisation, but its whole development also. In spite of his clear and sensible way of representation he occasionally demands a little too much; as when he compares PLATO'S theory of ideas with the deities of the species believed in by the Red-skins of America. Nevertheless TYLOR'S theory has a great advantage over that of others, such as SPENCER, CASPARI, and SCHULTZE, whom we have now to consider more particularly.

In the first section of his Sociology SPENCER has described with his own literary excellence the genesis of the intellectual and religious ideas—the belief in souls. Though as editor of Descriptive Sociology he had at his disposal rich ethnographic materials, yet he always remains the philosopher; he derives the image of primitive man from psychological premises, and is for ever aiming after what he calls 'unified knowledge.' This explains why he combines the two sides of animism as represented by TYLOR (a belief both in souls and spirits) into one. According to SPENCER everything is belief in souls, and his delineation of the experiences which have led man to a consciousness of his other self is often correct. In his description of the meaning of dreams, diseases, and death, he agrees in the main with TYLOR; but he differs from him on other important points, owing chiefly to his always suggesting one and the same explanation (cult of souls, worship of the dead). Thus SPENCER protests against the idea that it

could be a primitive thought to ascribe life to the whole of nature. He argues that even the more highly developed animals know perfectly the difference between animate beings and inanimate objects, and therefore considers it erroneous to ascribe to man, who occupies a higher position in the process of evolution, so great an ignorance as to ascribe consciousness and will to all things. It is only by means of indirect syllogisms, and at the time when he has begun to philosophise, that man could have been brought to project his own soul on inanimate objects, while in his primitive and immediate impressions he knows that distinction perfectly well. SPENCER denies likewise that men ever ascribed to animals, plants, things and natural phenomena, souls of their own. He imagines that he can get rid of these souls of objects by his remark, that such souls would always have the qualities of animals, plants, and objects, while they are endowed without exception with the qualities of the human soul. He therefore maintains that they are all human souls, active within things. Here however there prevails a confusion of thought, against which TYLOR has guarded. The souls of animals, plants, and things have not the qualities of animals, plants, and things, but those of the soul, and are therefore quite naturally conceived in analogy with the human soul. Nevertheless they belong to animals, plants, and things themselves, and we must have recourse with SPENCER to the most desperate jugglery, in order to explain how the souls of the departed haunt plants, and animals, sun and moon, objects of nature, and fetishes. With TYLOR the worship of the dead is an important subdivision of animism, with SPENCER it is the one and

all of religion, so that consistently he ought, as LIPPERT really does, to replace the terms of animism, and belief in spirits, by that of worship of souls. It is clear that this is only a renewing of euhemerism. SPENCER was prepared for this accusation, nor has he escaped it. His explanations are in fact frequently as insipid as those of the old euhemerist. A belief in gods in heaven above originated, according to him, with a dread of chieftains who had their seat above on mountain fastnesses. Whenever the mythological struggle between storm and sunlight is mentioned, SPENCER thinks of persons who happen to be called storm and sun.

One important matter has not yet been mentioned, namely the influence which the discovery of fire may have had on religious ideas. On this point CASPARI has started a theory which has been adopted in the main by HELLWALD also. CASPARI admits in religion a preanimistic period, during which religious sentiment, which always strives after the sublime, discovered it in the circle of the family; as if the worship of elders and chieftains had been the first religion. Even worship of dead bodies and of animals would, according to him, have been anterior to animism. Animism arose only with the discovery of fire. When people succeeded in calling forth, by means of friction, blows, or boring, a spark from wood or stone, the thought of something invisible and supersensuous began to rise, and then only the concept of a soul would become possible. Fetishism also and witchcraft were possible only on this new soil. This theory however has been met by weighty arguments. The whole idea of a preanimistic religion rests on very unsafe conjecture; it is not probable that the phenomena comprehended by

it were primitive, or independent of the concept of a soul. The same applies to races without fire, which neither ethnography nor history, nor prehistoric research, have been able to establish. Indirect conclusions only lead to the supposition that man had not altogether lost the recollection of a time when the use of fire was not yet known. If one combines the myths of fire-messengers among different races with the great veneration shown to fire by almost all members of the human race, and with the primitive ways in which they procure fire [1] for the object of worship, we might really suppose that the discovery of fire formed a constituent element in the formation of religion. But these myths and customs admit of no safe conclusions, and it is a matter of ingenious construction rather than of cautious research if religious ideas are derived from the discovery of fire.

SCHULTZE has given a new turn to this problem. By analysing the consciousness of savages he arrives at a new view of the genesis of fetishism, which he describes as a worship of material objects. We can easily account, by the narrow circle of ideas among savages, for the fact that they admire and exaggerate the value of very small and insignificant objects, that they look upon these objects anthropopathically as alive, as sentient and willing, that they connect them with auspicious or inauspicious events and experiences, and, lastly, that they believe such objects to require religious veneration. These four facts are supposed to account for the worship of stocks and stones, bundles and bows, gores and strips (Wickelchen

[1] See on this subject A. TYLOR, Early Hist., chap. ix; WILSON, Prehistoric Man, chap. v.

und Schleifchen, Zwickelchen und Streifchen) which we call fetishism. SCHULTZE however, though he considers fetishism as a portion of primitive religion, never considers it as the whole of primitive religion. By the side of it he always puts a worship of spirits, and these two streams run parallel till they meet at a certain point, and then give rise to other forms of religion.

This will make it clear that it is a mistake to argue, in the first instance, against an opinion which makes fetishism the beginning of all religion. Most of the animists, such as TYLOR and SPENCER, look upon fetishism as by no means primitive, but as a later development of the belief in souls and spirits; and even SCHULTZE, who stands up for the primitive character of fetishism, nevertheless places by its side a belief in spirits. Little is therefore gained for refuting the animistic theory if we can prove no more than that fetishism was not primitive.

But the strength of the mythological school is not to be judged by the weakness of their opposition to the animistic school; what we have to do is to examine their positive work for the explanation of the origin of religion. Here MAX MÜLLER may speak in the name of all its representatives. In many of his writings, more particularly in the Hibbert Lectures, he derives the origin of religion amongst the oldest Aryans from the impressions of nature; according to his view, man even in viewing nature has a perception of something infinite. Every conception of the infinite is necessarily preceded by such a perception. Every nooumenon presupposes an aistheton; 'nihil in fide quod non ante fuerit in sensu.' Every sensuous

perception has its limits, and ceases to be a clear perception beyond these limits. It therefore leaves in man, with and beside the perception of the finite, the perception of an infinite also; a concept which is called forth also by the infinitely great and the infinitely small in nature. But the contemplation of nature calls forth other religious ideas also. The light of heaven awakes in him the sensus luminis; the order and regularity in nature, the idea of law and order. It is thus that our ancestors recognised God in nature, and this was the true source of religion.

In the violent polemic which MAX MÜLLER'S system has provoked, two arguments are particularly prominent. First, that religious faith should not be derived from sensuous impressions; secondly, that with him the infinite means the indefinite, and is therefore not quite an adequate name for the divine. Both objections however ascribed to MAX MÜLLER a superficiality which ought not to be charged against him. He has never said that sensuous perception alone could produce religious ideas, but he lays particular stress also on man himself, on the intellectual organisation of man. The perception of the infinite is not produced by the mere perception of nature, but that perception arouses religious sentiments in man from their slumber. Being endowed as he is, man cannot perceive nature without an awakening of something within himself. The sentiment of the infinite accompanies the perception of nature, is connected but not identical with it, is what is called a 'concomitant sentiment.' In the true sense of the word, a sensuous perception is never sensuous only, for our senses are always working in the service of our mind. MAX MÜLLER

denies likewise that he confuses the infinite with the indefinite. It is quite true that the infinite, though we perceive and know it, can never be clearly defined. The whole of history shows us man in his vain struggle to describe and define the infinite, or the divine. But it by no means follows that MAX MÜLLER has used one concept for the other. It is true that all doubts on this point are not yet quite removed. It seems objectionable in any theory on the origin of religion to lay stress so exclusively on belief, and to ignore the cult. Whether the explanation of the myths proposed by MAX MÜLLER and many other mythologists is correct, or not, we must discuss hereafter; at present we only ask whether we can agree with their derivation of religious ideas from natural impressions. H. SPENCER has produced a whole array of arguments, the greater part of which do not even touch the principal questions. He says, for instance, that the mythologists with their linguistic arguments explain words but not things; that their strongest support, the Vedic mythology, becomes weaker and weaker by more recent research; that they have a wrong conception of primitive man, ascribing to him all kinds of intuitions, sentiments, thoughts, and fancies, which he could never have had; that they explain the lower from the higher, instead of the higher from the lower, &c. SPENCER'S chief argument however is derived from the differences in the explanation of certain myths, which seem to him sufficient by themselves to upset the mythological theory. They seem to explain the same ideas if they occur among the South Sea Islanders as an apotheosis of dead persons; if they occur among the Greeks, as a personification of nature. This objection, however,

would only be justified if we supposed with SPENCER that all religious ideas must flow from the same source, and be caused by similar circumstances. The large-hearted views of MAX MÜLLER differ very favourably from the learned pedantry of the animists, and it is to be regretted that too many mythologists have surrendered them. Though he himself describes almost exclusively the genesis of a belief in gods as it was brought about among the Aryans by a contemplation of nature, MAX MÜLLER recognises distinctly that other impressions and experiences also call forth primitive religious ideas. Not only the contemplation of nature, but the perception of death, has awakened in man the sense of the infinite. Not only the order of nature, but the voice of conscience also, has called forth thoughts of law and duty. Not only the brilliant light which chases away darkness, but sympathy also with the joys and sufferings of his friends, has placed the first germs of love in the human heart. Thus the foremost representative of the mythological theory declines distinctly to give one and the same explanation of the origin of the gods, and he opposes to the assertion of the animists that all gods were originally spirits, the much more modest statement that many gods, and principally those of the Indo-Germans, were personified forces and phenomena of nature.

Here we come to another and important side of our problem. It is not only the question what ideas we consider as primitive, but also whether it is possible to understand the later development, if starting from these primitive conceptions and conditions. Even if we do not explain animism as secondary, but look upon it as a form of thought and faith thoroughly

in harmony with the primitive state of human consciousness and human society, the question still remains whether animism alone can be called primitive, and whether everything else must have sprung from it. This is the opinion of those who see in religion and metaphysics little more than decaying animism, and who incorporate the whole belief in gods in animism. We have to examine this view a little more carefully. It has been elaborated in his own way by SCHULTZE, who proposes the following scheme, namely, that the religion of savages has two sides, fetishism and worship of spirits. At first fetishism is concerned with mundane and visible objects only, but gains in a higher stage a new object—the sky with its phenomena. The worship of spirits advances towards polytheism, and the crossing of these two tendencies produces monotheism. The weak point of this system is the 'new object' of fetishism which man is supposed to have gained by the contemplation of the sky. SCHULTZE points out how with this new object a new form of religious consciousness arises, for while the savage worships the mundane fetishes for the satisfaction of his material desires only, he takes a more intellectual interest in the sky, in sun and moon. Thus, although SCHULTZE continues to call the worship of the sky and the sun fetishism, he has himself unconsciously, but sharply, traced the difference between these two forms.

The remarks of TYLOR on this subject are far more complete and valuable: he draws his conclusions, not from a narrow and one-sided, but from a rich and carefully classified material. He does not ignore the higher elements in the religion of savages, but tries

to derive them naturally from animistic thoughts. Even the belief in higher guiding deities grows, according to him, from a belief in souls after it has become enlarged into a belief in spirits. Referring to some statements of A. Comte, Tylor attaches great importance to the theory of deities of species, because by it individual souls become generalised to class ideas. The great gods of nature have sprung from spirits of nature, and becoming more richly endowed with the qualities of human personality, have assumed that shape which we know in mythology. Even the idea of a divine supremacy had its origin there. It was natural that a preeminent place should be assigned among the gods to the god of the sky and the sun, at a time when human society and government supplied the type for a hierarchy among spirits and gods. It should also be remembered that among ancestors special respect was shown to the head of the race. Lastly, the fundamental idea of mythology, that of nature being endowed with life and soul, is represented as thoroughly animistic.

Several things have to be urged against this view. It is difficult, no doubt, to draw a sharp line of demarcation between animism and other forms of religion, and to settle characteristic marks whereby to distinguish between gods and spirits. Many religions seem to show us clearly the transition from animism to polytheism. The Chinese religion for instance, though it has advanced beyond the lower form of belief in spirits, has not yet arrived at gods of distinct individuality. But it should not be overlooked that not only civilised nations draw a difference between higher deities and lower spirits, but

that many savages also distinguish the heavenly gods from souls, mundane spirits, and fetishes. Certain characteristic differences between gods and spirits may be discovered, though they are often quantitative rather than qualitative. Thus the gods have been individualised and personified, they have a name and form of their own, which is not the case with spirits. The sentiments also which man entertains towards the gods are different. Fear and egotistic calculation which prevail in animism have been replaced by more exalted sentiments and a less selfish interest. This by itself would speak against a derivation of the whole belief in gods from animism, and we shall see still more clearly how artificial it would be if we attempted to derive the whole intellectual wealth of civilised nations from that one source. Among people such as the Egyptians, the Hindoos, the Greeks, the Jews, animism has certainly possessed a far greater importance than was formerly believed. Among them also, animism has largely influenced law and customs, worship and superstition (worship of the dead, belief in spirits, totemism, &c.). But we cannot but see at the same time how difficult it would be to understand the religion of these people if we attempted to derive it entirely from a belief in spirits and in the dead. Nay, how arbitrary it would be to represent animistic phenomena only as primitive, and everything else as derived from them. We cannot resist the conviction that the worship of nature was general, and by no means less primitive than a worship of souls and belief in spirits; and that it was that worship which created the personal forms of gods and many myths. The

concept of God cannot have arisen exclusively from fear produced by certain biological phenomena. The elevating impressions of nature also have called it into being. We believe therefore that neither the animists nor the mythologists possess the key for the riddle of the origin of religion. But the explanations of both, though not sufficient for the whole, give a sufficient account of certain series and classes of phenomena; they are not altogether erroneous, but only correct in their mutual limitation.

We have not yet touched on one side of the problem, namely whether the origin of religion coincides with the origin of morality. We can here give a few general remarks only on this fundamental question of philosophical ethics. In their later development religion and morality are most closely connected. Morality looks for the sanction of religion, religion inculcates moral duties. Even during the earlier stages this connection may still be perceived, and in witchcraft itself a moral and educational element has been discovered because its success depends on self-denial and sacrifice. Even though religion and morality are occasionally opposed to one another, there is yet an essential connection between them. But what is essential is not always primitive. It is certain that morality was as universal and primitive as religion, but the question is whether both were originally connected and sprang from a common source. Many assert this decidedly, for religion according to them arises from the consciousness of duty, or from a sense of reverence for elders or chiefs. If however the origin of religion is discovered in animistic or naturalistic ideas and sentiments, there is no reason why the origin of religion

and of morality should be supposed to coincide. For neither the souls or spirits, nor the gods of nature, are originally or necessarily guardians of any moral law, and neither the benefits expected, nor the dangers feared from them are directly connected with moral conditions or thoughts. The answer to our question depends therefore entirely on philosophic suppositions. However essential the connection between religion and morality may seem to us, their common origin has by no means been proved. We ourselves believe that religion and morality, separate in their origin, became united in course of time.

Chapter 7.— **The Division of Religions.**

Books of Reference. H. Paret, Ueber die Eintheilung der Religionen (Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1855); C. P. Tiele, Religions (Enc. Br.); A. Kuenen, Lectures on National Religions and Universal Religions (Hib. Lect. 1882). See also the general works mentioned before.

It is most difficult to arrive at anything approaching to a satisfactory classification of religions. This division can only be made according to the characteristic features of these religions; but what to some is essential, is only of subordinate importance to others, and one is always in danger of separating what is homogeneous and joining what is heterogeneous. Nevertheless new attempts are always being made to arrive at a systematic classification of religions. Before everything else we shall have to treat of the nature of such a classification in general.

On this subject again it is Hegel who has answered the question in a way which still influences scholars. He says regarding the division which he brings forward: 'It must not only be taken in its subjective

sense, but it is the necessary division in the objective sense of the nature of the mind.' It contains 'the fundamental outlines which form both the stages of the development of the idea and at the same time of its concrete manifestation.' This is saying two things: on the one hand that this division gives the analysis of the concept, and brings to light the nature of religion in its unity and in its many-sidedness. At the same time the parts of this division form steps in the progress of development; religion runs through this process from the lowest to the highest, for which the ages of man form a much used analogy. Since the time of HEGEL these two demands are mostly made either together or singly with regard to any classification of religions. But no one accepts any longer the opinion of the master that such a classification answering all these demands has been discovered; though several of them betray even in their form the influence of HEGEL. It is clear at all events that the question as to a classification of religions possesses a great philosophical importance. It is not enough to put together whatever is near to each other in time and space; this might be sufficient for a clear and practical treatment, but a really scientific classification must be based on essential characteristics of the religious process. We shall now proceed to examine the most important attempts in this direction.

There are genealogical and morphological classifications of religions. The former serve more for the practical object of an historical survey, the latter answer the above-mentioned philosophical demands. A genealogical classification can only be determined in its leading features. Great help is given by the com-

parison of languages, which has placed the relationship of certain families of nations above all doubt. MAX MÜLLER wishes therefore to base the classification of religions on that of languages, 'and this because, in the earliest development of the human mind, language, religion, and national character are most closely united.' On this subject TIELE has justly remarked that the comparative study of religion itself must corroborate the results of linguistic studies before one has a right to unite the boundaries of families of language with those of families of religion. At all events, a comparative study of genealogically related religions has borne ample fruit. MAX MÜLLER confines his remarks to three of the principal families, the Indo-Germanic, Semitic, and so-called Turanian. It is necessary however, and possible also, to look beyond these three. It is true that a complete genealogical classification is at present possible for the Indo-Germanic and Semitic families only, and that not without admitting several prehistorical forms as connecting links in the religion of a family which was originally one, and became afterwards diversified. TIELE has given such outlines in his article in the Encyclopædia Britannica. We need not dwell on this at present, because in the ethnographic survey of religions we shall hereafter have to consider more closely the different families of men with their religions.

Every morphological classification is founded on a qualitative appreciation, for PARET is quite right in demanding that such a division should divide religious and not any other consciousness, and it is exactly the qualitative judgment which has to determine the religious sphere. This is clearly seen from the

many classifications which have been proposed. MAX MÜLLER has submitted some of the most popular classifications to a sharp criticism. The first division, into true and false religion, hardly deserves to be mentioned. Then follows a more scientific division, into natural and revealed religions. Many theologians still cling to it, but it is no longer tenable, because a natural religion as an empty abstraction is without historical reality, and because it is impossible to fix the boundaries between the sphere of revelation and that of nature. The third division also, equally condemned by MAX MÜLLER, namely that into popular and personal (grown and founded) religions, is unsatisfactory, though WHITNEY among others continues to patronise it. For here also the line of demarcation is wavering, as no one knows how many powerful, though to us unknown, personalities may have contributed towards the formation of those religions which are supposed to have grown up by themselves, and, on the other hand, how much of what was the common property of the people is reflected in the labours of the so-called founders of religion. Finally, the division into Monotheistic and Polytheistic religions also has been put aside by MAX MÜLLER, with the remark that it is incomplete because it puts together what is heterogeneous, and leaves out three classes, namely, the dualistic, henotheistic, and atheistic religions. Nevertheless, RÉVILLE and others fall back on this classification, though it is clear that a concept of the Divine, however important by itself, cannot possibly furnish by itself the exclusive principle of division.

There are many other classifications besides the four just mentioned. These classifications are made from

different points of view, either according to their ideas, or according to the form of doctrine, according to the cult or the character of piety or the peculiarity of sentiment, according to the objects desired, or according to the relation of religion to the state, science, art, morality, &c. Thus we get mythological and dogmatic religions; religions in which the understanding, or the sentiment, or the will predominates (rationalistic, æsthetic, or ethic religions); religions in which the sentiment is ecstatic or subdued, elevated, or depressed; religions with a worldly or an ascetic morality; religions which manifest themselves in works of plastic art, or in music, &c. Among all these classifications there are none so important as that into particular and universal, and that into natural and moral religions.

The distinction between the religion of a country, and the religion of the world, seems to have been adopted for the first time as a principle of division by VON DREY[1]. It has become very popular in more recent times. The fact that most religions belong exclusively to one nation, whilst Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam have spread among different races of mankind, is so important that the latter class of world-religions divides itself quite naturally from the rest.

KUENEN has most thoroughly treated the relation of the world-religions to the national religions from which they have sprung. But here also much caution is required. First of all, it is not complete, for we must separate from national religions, the religions of certain tribes which have not yet arrived at a national life, and those of religious communities which are no longer

[1] Tübinger Quartalschrift, 1827.

bound together by national relationship, but only by doctrines and laws. The distinction between national and territorial religions also has not been taken into account, and even with regard to the class of so-called world-religions there remain many difficulties. Their universal character can be taken either as a simple fact, or as an essential quality. In the former case, all that is asserted, is the undeniable fact of the immense spreading of these three religions; but we must not forget that other religious communities also, which have more or less loosened the bond of nationality, are more or less given to proselytising. Even Judaism had its proselytes, and Brahmanism counts adherents outside the frontiers of India and of the Indian people. It is clear however that universalism may be accepted as an essential quality. In that sense there can be only one real world-religion, whether such a religion exist already, though not yet fully developed, or whether it is to be expected from the future by a combination of different existing religions. But relatively also these three so-called universal religions are very unequal with regard to their freedom from national limitation, and their power of adaptation to different requirements and circumstances. This inequality has been clearly established by Kuenen, who on this account declines to place Islam among the world-religions. In fact, the objections to this classification are so strong, that Tiele, who formerly always followed it, has now entirely surrendered the name of world-religion, and accepts the difference between national and universal religions as no more than a subordinate principle of division. Now, his principal division is that, into natural and moral religions.

We have thus come to a classification which seems to us by far the most important, though it is carried out in many different ways. The difference is defined as either natural and intellectual, or as natural and moral. The former was HEGEL'S opinion when he taught us to conceive the three stages of religion (natural, artistic, and revealed) as a necessary process in the human mind. Primitive man is held in the bonds of the natural and the sensuous; he rises above this sphere and begins to assert his subjective freedom. Lastly, this difference is absorbed in the perfect and absolute religion in which alone the idea is realised. However closely this classification may be connected with Hegelian philosophy, its fundamental idea, namely the distinction between natural and spiritual religion, has been understood in different ways by different people, as for instance by ASMUS, SCHARLING, VON HARTMANN, and others. TIELE now contrasts natural and ethical religion: in the former the gods are conceived as natural beings, in the latter religion is determined by moral ideas.

After having described the general principles on which the classification of religions is founded, it may be desirable to give the complete outlines of some of them. We shall give those of HEGEL, VON HARTMANN, and TIELE.

HEGEL.

I. NATURE RELIGION.

(1) The immediate religion (witchcraft).
(2) The differentiation of consciousness in itself—religions of substance.
  (*a*) The religion of measure (China).
  (*b*) The religion of imagination (Brahmanism).
  (*c*) The religion of self-absorption (Buddhism).
(3) Nature religion in its transition to the religion of freedom. The struggle of subjectivity.

(*a*) The religion of the good or of light (Persia).
(*b*) The religion of pain (Syria).
(*c*) The religion of the enigma (Egypt).

II. THE RELIGION OF INTELLECTUAL INDIVIDUALITY.

(1) The religion of sublimity (Jews).
(2) The religion of beauty (Greeks).
(3) The religion of purpose or reason (Romans).

III. ABSOLUTE RELIGION.

Christianity.

VON HARTMANN.

I. NATURALISM.

(1) Naturalistic Henotheism.
(2) Anthropoid spiritualisation of Henotheism.
  (*a*) Æsthetic refinement (Hellenes).
  (*b*) Utilitarian secularisation (Romans).
  (*c*) Tragico-ethical profoundness (Germans).
(3) The theological systematising of Henotheism.
  (*a*) Naturalistic Monism (Egyptians).
  (*b*) Seminaturalism (Persians).

II. SUPERNATURALISM.

(1) Abstract Monism, or the idealistic religion of salvation.
  (*a*) Akosmism (Brahmans).
  (*b*) Absolute Illusionism (Buddhists).
(2) Theism.
  (*a*) Primitive Monotheism (Prophets).
  (*b*) The law religion, or religion of Heteronomy (Mosaism, Judaism, attempts of reform, amongst which is Islamism .
  (*c*) The realistic religion of salvation (Christianity).

TIELE.

I. NATURE RELIGIONS.

(*a*) Polydæmonistic Magical Religions under the control of Animism (religions of savages).
(*b*) Purified or organised Magical Religions. Therianthropic Polytheism.

Unorganised.	*Organised.*
Japanese religion.	The semi-civilised religions of America.
Dravidian religion.	The ancient religion of the Chinese Empire.
Religion of the Fins and Ests.	Chaldæan religion.
The old Arabic religion.	Religion of Egypt.
The old Pelasgic religion.	
The old Italic religion.	
The old Etruscan religion (?).	
The old Slavonic religion.	

(*c*) Worship of manlike but superhuman and semi-ethical beings. Anthropomorphic Polytheism.
The ancient Vedic religion (India).
The pre-Zarathustrian Iranic religion (Bactria, Media, Persia).
The younger Babylonian and Assyrian religion.
The religions of the other civilised Semites (Phœnicia, Canaan, Aramæa, Sabæans in South Arabia).
The Celtic, Germanic, Hellenic, and Græco-Roman religions.

II. Ethical Religions.

(*a*) National Nomistic (Nomothetic) religious communities.
Taoism and Confucianism.
Brahmanism.
Jainism and primitive Buddhism.
Mazdaism.
Mosaism.
Judaism.

(*b*) Universalistic religious communities.
Islam, Buddhism, Christianity.

We shall close our survey with a glance at the religious statistics of mankind. Here again there is much that is uncertain. The population of certain lands and portions of the world can only be approximately guessed at. The many hundred millions of Chinese are all counted as belonging to Buddhism, but this is only partly correct, since Buddhism is only one of the three religions which govern in China; but this calculation cannot be avoided, because it is impossible to draw a boundary between the adherents of these three religions. The following numbers in millions may be nearly correct[1].

[1] These lists are taken from Hübner, Geographisch-statistische Tabellen aller Länder der Erde (1884). The numbers are given rather differently by Wichman, Geographisch-statistische Notizen (in J. Perthes' Taschenatlas, 1885); Atlas Migeon (Paris, 1884); Wagner, Lehrbuch der Geographie (1882), &c. The best notices on the spread of Catholicism are in O. Werner, S. J., Katholischer Missionsatlas (1884).

Christians	... ...	432, or 30·2 P.C. (of which there are 218 Catholics, 123 Protestants, 83 Greeks, 8 other sects).
Mohammedans	...	120, or 8·3 P.C.
Israelites	... ...	8, or 0·5 P.C.
Buddhists	... ...	503, or 35·0 P.C.
Brahmans	... ...	138, or 9·6 P.C.
Worshippers of fetishes		234, or 16·4 P.C.
Total	... ...	1435, or 100 P.C.

CHAPTER 8. — **The Principal Forms of Religion.**

We must now give a short outline of some of the principal forms of religion. Many religious tendencies and phenomena will be more conveniently spoken of hereafter in treating of each religion by itself. Here we have only to explain the proper concepts of animism, fetishism, polytheism, henotheism, and monotheism.

With regard to animism we have only to make a few additions to what was said in chapter vi. Animism is a belief in souls and spirits belonging either to men or to objects, to individuals or classes. They sometimes roam about freely (spiritism), sometimes they are incorporated in single objects (fetishism). They appear to man in a more subtle material form, as image, vapour, shadow, and are feared by him, so that he tries to control their influence by means of magic. Animism therefore is philosophy as well as religion, and manifests itself in all religions, though principally in those of the lower races. But we have already pointed out that we cannot admit animism as the only or chief source of religion, nor can we enlarge its meaning so far that we suspect animism wherever we hear of soul and spirit. Nor can we admit that Positivism and Buddhism alone have been able to

overcome it. Though the influence of animism is widely spread, and is not absent altogether in any stage of civilisation and in any religion, yet its meaning should be limited. Two conditions are essential to it. First, that it should be confined to biological phenomena in analogy to which it explains all other phenomena, without however arriving at the unified concept of the world, or the concept of cosmic forces. Secondly, that it should keep aloof from ethic thoughts and motives. Within these limits its extension is very wide. A higher kind of animism which approaches to polytheism, in which the spirits are to a certain extent individualised and classified, has been called polydæmonism. Some phenomena which belong to animism have sometimes been extended too far, as when LUBBOCK uses Totemism for worship of nature in general, and PESCHEL Shamanism for everything connected with magic and ritual. We look upon these names, which we shall have to define more accurately hereafter, not as names of the principal forms of religion, but of important phenomena and tendencies of animism.

The same applies to fetishism, which we have to treat here by itself. It was DE BROSSES[1] who first recognised the importance of fetishism in the history of religions. He was a learned and ingenious lawyer of the last century, who hardly perceived himself the whole bearing of his observations. He derived the word fetish, the Portuguese 'feitico' (witchcraft, bewitched objects), from 'fatum.' We know now that it

[1] C. DE BROSSES, Du culte des dieux fétiches ou parallèle de l'ancienne religion de l'Égypte avec la religion actuelle de Nigritie (1760). W. J. Müller in his Die Africanische Landschaft Fetu, 1675, mentions fitiso, fetish, and fitisero, fetish-priest, as of Portuguese origin.

is derived from 'factitius.' This name was given at first to phenomena which had been observed among the negroes on the west coast of Africa; but DE BROSSES himself compared these phenomena with certain features of the old Egyptian religion. In this way the name fetishism became more and more general, till COMTE used it actually for the lowest stage of all religious development, the sense in which the word is even now used from time to time[1]. We may however with TYLOR, look on this theory as surrendered. But even if we follow him in considering fetishism as a subdivision of animism, many questions still remain unanswered. Fetishism is generally defined as a religious worship of material objects. The stock or stone which forms the object of worship is then called the fetish. Others, however, such as LUBBOCK and HAPPEL, insist that the fetish should be considered as a means of magic, not being itself the object of worship, but a means by which man is brought in closer contact with the deity, and which is endowed with divine powers. Most likely savages themselves do not distinguish between what we thus attempt to distinguish; to them, fetishes are both objects of religious worship and means of magic, and there are many instances of both ideas and of their close connection. It is true we should not avail ourselves of the confused state of the savage consciousness as an excuse for leaving the matter itself confused, but we ought as much as possible to try to define the idea more accurately. Thus, although a

[1] For instance in GIRARD DE RIALLE's work, La mythologie comparée, i. (1878), a work which contains much of interest, but is based on too superficial philosophical ideas.

fetish may often be used for magic purposes, yet it differs from mere means of magic as being itself anthropopathic, and often itself the object of religious worship. There is a difference also between fetishes on one hand, and idols and amulets on the other. An idol is the image, an amulet the pledge of the protection of a divine power, and however powerful the idol may be supposed to be, and however closely connected that protection may be with the possession of an amulet, the divine power itself remains above both, while it is wholly incorporated in the fetish. It may be true that sometimes idol and amulet sink down to a mere fetish. But the instances of this process, however numerous, do not disprove the distinction which we have made. The question as to the difference between the spirits at work in the fetish, and the souls of things, is more subtle. The savage himself may not make this difference, but still we have to point it out. A thing does not become a fetish by applying the general belief in souls to a special object, but by the process of the four stages as described by SCHULTZE. The spirit dwelling within the fetish is not the soul, or the vital power belonging to that object, but a spirit connected with that object and embodied in it. It follows from what has been said, that a definition of fetishism as a religious worship of material objects, requires several supplementary observations. Not every kind of worship paid to material objects can be called fetishism, but only that which is connected with magic; otherwise the whole worship of nature would be fetishism. Nor can every object be considered a fetish, but only single, we might almost say casual objects, which

attract attention. Differing from SCHULTZE, we must exclude all celestial bodies, and consider earthly objects only as fetishes. But agreeing with him, we admit that man ceases to be a fetish worshipper as soon as he has learnt to distinguish the spirit from the material object. Even thus the concept of fetish is still very wide; for there are fetishes of single persons, families, villages, and states. There are great and permanent fetishes, and others more casual, which are worshipped for a short time only and for a particular object. We shall have to say something more on this when describing the religion of the negroes.

The word 'polytheism' determines not only the number but also the character of the gods, and thus determines also the piety of the worshipper. The gods of polytheism are entirely imitations of human personality, not only anthropopathic, but also anthropomorphic. They do not personify single phenomena, but powers which man feels as influencing his life, powers both natural and ethical, and determining both the social and political life of man. On this polytheistic soil only do we see a rich growth of mythology; not everywhere however, but only where external nature most strongly influences the consciousness of man. Everywhere however polytheism involves the recognition, or the perception of something divine within the life of the world. It is only half true if pantheism is represented as the philosophical foundation of polytheism. Though both share the idea of a unity between the mundane and the divine, the concept of the unity of that divine life is essential to pantheism, while such monism transcends the limits of

polytheism. Polytheism rests on the division and specialisation of the divine powers in the world. Its poetic wealth arises from this, but likewise its intellectual and religious weakness.

Before we proceed to consider monotheism, we have still to examine another term which has lately become very popular, namely henotheism. The idea, though not the term, came from SCHELLING, who admitted a relative monotheism as the principle of the original unity of humanity. This relative monotheism recognises one god only, but this oneness is accidental, and not essential. A second god may follow on the one god, though on the other side this relative monotheism may develop into pure monotheism. According to SCHELLING[1], this first stage is the common starting-point both for polytheism and monotheism. This constructive theory however is nowhere confirmed by history; while MAX MÜLLER'S theory is of a totally different character, and applies the name of henotheism or kathenotheism to a definite historical form of religion. It is the religion of the hymns of the Rig-Veda which has this peculiar character, that in various invocations the single deity fills exclusively the mind of the worshipper, who without denying the existence of other gods, has only the single god, now one, now the other, before his eyes, and ascribes to him all that is divine. This worship of single gods is neither polytheism nor monotheism, but henotheism. But it has been rightly observed that piety always, and not only in the hymns of the Rig-Veda, elevates its object above everything else, and dwells on it exclusively,

[1] SCHELLING, Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie, Lecture vi.

so that it would be difficult to allow a separate classification for these phenomena[1]. Others again, wish to impart to the concept of henotheism a larger and more philosophical meaning. VON HARTMANN, for instance, though he accepts henotheism in about the sense given to it by MAX MÜLLER, does not represent it as a phenomenon by itself, but as the starting-point of the whole religious development. ASMUS, on the contrary, describes the religion of Indo-Germanic nations as henotheistic, because they recognise in the multitude of divine persons a unity of the divine essence. PFLEIDERER again, regards henotheism as a national or relative monotheism leading on among the Jews to real monotheism. This shows that no firm concept has been joined with the word, and that there is no necessity for it. It would be better to discard the word henotheism altogether, because at present it seems only to lead to confusion of thought.

The concept of monotheism also requires a more accurate definition than many have given of it. Some people speak not only of a primitive monotheism, but also of a monotheism among Greeks, Persians, and other people, who are generally considered polytheistic. There is some excuse for this, because we see in the most different religions a certain desire to arrive from a plurality at a unity of the gods. Even on a lower stage the idea of a divine supremacy may be discovered, though this, as TYLOR rightly remarks, should not as yet be called monotheism. Among

[1] MAX MÜLLER, History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 532; Chips, i; Hib. Lect. vi. On the other side, W. D. WHITNEY, Le prétendu hénothéisme du Véda (R. H. R. 1882).

civilised people this tendency towards unity is much stronger. There are several causes for this. Even mythology, which unites the single gods into a well-ordered society, often ascribes to the head, the king, the father of these gods, a far higher dignity than that of a primus inter pares. Philosophy is not satisfied with plurality; for in the minds of thinkers the many gods of the popular belief soon become the names of one only god, though often in the sense rather of a monistic and mostly pantheistic view of the world, than of a living religious faith. Piety also, particularly when the moral requirements have been united with a belief in the gods, works in the same direction, and elevates more serious minds above the limits of polytheism. Thus there are among many nations monotheistic tendencies and beginnings, but this does not justify us in speaking of monotheism wherever they show themselves more strongly. The word 'mono' in monotheism is not only numerical but qualitative, and implies the spirituality and supermundane character of the God who rules and fills the whole world. Thus monotheism differs from mere monolatry, the worship of one God, without the concept as yet of the one and only God. Monotheism, as religion, differs equally from philosophical monism. If thus defined, it is clear that the name of monotheism belongs by right to the prophetic religion of the Old Testament only, with its two daughters, Christianity and Islam. In order to prevent confusion of thought, it would be best to use the word exclusively for the Jewish, the Christian, and the Mohammedan religions.

PHENOMENOLOGICAL SECTION.

CHAPTER 9.—**Preliminary Remarks.**

The phenomenology of religion is most closely connected with psychology, in so far as it deals with facts of human consciousness. Even the outward forms of religion can only be explained from inward processes: religious acts, ideas, and sentiments are not distinguished from non-religious acts, ideas and sentiments by any outward mark, but only by a certain inward relation. We must leave the accurate definition of the character of religious phenomena to philosophy, and content ourselves with classifying the most important ethnographic and historical material connected with the phenomena of religion. We shall not therefore attempt here an analysis of religious consciousness, but only discuss the meaning of the most important classes of religious phenomena. PÜNJER has fixed on four such groups of homogeneous phenomena, namely, religious doctrines, acts, benefits, and sentiments. It is clear however that these four cannot be co-ordinated: the benefits which man possesses or desires in religion are ground or object, the religious states and sentiments are the efficient causes and forces of the external phenomena of religious life. There remain therefore the cult and the religious doctrine, or, to put it more generally, religious acting and thinking. But these cannot be separated from the benefits which man desires by them, nor from the sentiments that give rise to them. We shall therefore

deal with the most important sides of cult and forms of doctrine, without attempting a strictly systematic order, or a theoretic division which does not correspond to actual facts. I speak intentionally of the forms of doctrine, for we cannot dwell in detail on the rich contents of religious consciousness, such as they are divided into seven principal articles, by PFLEIDERER for instance.

The question whether religious acting or religious thinking comes first is easily settled. Every religious act must be preceded by a thought, however crude. On the other hand, many religious doctrines are much less primitive than the ritual act, and owe their origin to an attempt to explain them. In general, therefore, neither the act nor the doctrine can claim priority, and both are preceded by religious impressions, sentiments, and states. It may be admitted, however, that among the materials of which we dispose, those which are connected with ritual are the most original. Among the elements of religious life, those connected with ritual are most permanent. Ritual customs last for centuries, are differently combined and joined with other ideas, cease to be officially ritual, and become popular, but remain for all that the most stable elements of religion, carrying us back to the most distant time. Religious doctrines, on the contrary, develop, and without throwing away what is old they tend to adapt themselves to new requirements. There is here also a kind of tradition, which warrants a certain continuity, but not an unchanging permanence. Lastly, with regard to religious sentiment, every period, every group, every person, is more or less independent. In describing the religious history of

any period we find that we have collected at the same time documents with regard to primitive times in cult and customs, documents with regard to a nearer past in the religious doctrines, and documents of the present in religious sentiment. In addition to this, the materials concerning the cult are not only the most primitive, but also the most generally accessible. Among all peoples and races known to us, acts, manners, and customs are immediately taken cognizance of. With many, these are almost the only thing known to us. Of all so-called savages we really know nothing but what they do, and we have to deduce their ideas from it, and from communications which generally lead to very little. It is only nations standing on a higher stage of civilisation, historical nations in the proper sense of the word, that yield us religious doctrines, while with regard to religious sentiments we can only form an opinion during periods which are represented by the large and many-sided literature left to us. The richest material therefore for the phenomenology of religion is supplied by religious acts, cult, and customs; with regard to many nations and periods, it is the only mirror that reflects something of their religious ideas and sentiments. This throws quite a new light on the history of cult, and leaves it no longer simply as a part of archæology. It is no doubt of importance that we should not lose sight of the bond which connects ritual with other sides of public life, but ritual should first of all be understood as a religious act, and in that sense belongs essentially to the science of religion.

Ritual acts have to be considered from different points of view. They have a symbolical meaning, they are the 'sign-language of theology' (Tylor).

Rites consist of symbols which reflect the object of worship, or the subjective sentiments, and give a dramatic expression to religious thoughts. Many, as for instance SCHLEIERMACHER, have laid too much stress on the æsthetic side of the cult as a representative action. In reality it can never be severed from the other more important side of the cult, namely the practical. What man most desires in his religion is, not first of all a symbolical representation of his ideas and sentiments, but an attainment of certain benefits which he hopes to gain by means of his representative acts. The practical objects of these ritual acts are very various. Sometimes the interest centres exclusively in certain objects which satisfy material wants, sometimes what is desired consists in more general and spiritual objects, as when for instance a ceremony is meant to preserve a certain cosmic order, or to gain for man certain powers and superhuman faculties. On a higher stage, what is looked for in a sacrificial act is not so much the gift as the giver, and what is desired is the favour of the gods, or communion with them. These different points of view lead to different ideas about the gods for whom the sacrifice is intended, and to different kinds and stages of piety, for it is said that 'man grows with the growth of his object.' The history of ritual displays the greatest variety in these objects, and in the means used for their realisation. It is of great importance to find out whether the desired communion with the gods is to be taken in a moral or in a material sense. In the former greater importance is attached to man as acting, and in the latter to the communication made by God. The ritual act is therefore con-

sidered either as a human performance, or as a divine blessing (sacrament), and this forms the deepest line of demarcation between the ethical and mystical sides of religious life and action. From an ethical point of view the difference between the subject and object of religion, between man and God, is carefully preserved; from a mystical point of view that difference vanishes, and communion changes into identification. There is still one more side of the cult which must be mentioned, namely, the pedagogic. Cult is the form in which religion manifests, maintains, and extends itself. Rites are the bond of the unity of religion, by which individuals enter into communion with their brothers in the faith, however distant from them in time and space. Lastly, by means of rites, laymen, half-believers, and children are educated so as to become fit to participate in the benefits of religion.

Chapter 10.—The Objects of Worship.

As the most general definition of religion, Tylor has proposed a belief in spiritual beings. It would be more correct however, and more complete, to define religion as a belief in superhuman powers combined with their worship. At all events, the phenomenology of religion must begin with the consideration of the different objects of belief and of worship, therefore a few general considerations will be useful by way of introduction.

Religion has in reality but one object, the living God who manifests Himself among all nations as the only real God. Though by many He is but partially known, or not known at all, because divine honour is paid to His works and His powers rather

than to Himself, yet in the end all worship is meant for Him, and man cannot conceive anything divine that is not really derived from Him [1]. Considered from this point of view, the many gods worshipped by the heathen become either empty, meaningless, and even hostile beings, no-gods, false gods; or real divine powers, and qualities, only separated from their subject and represented singly. The former point of view was more common among the prophets of Israel, while so-called heathen thinkers in India, Egypt, and Greece were often led to look upon the many gods as manifestations of the one divine power.

At present we are concerned not with the one, but with the many objects of religion. It is not easy to say how we can define these objects in general. We saw before that the fetish is considered by some as an object of worship, by others as a means of magic, while in reality it is both, in inseparable unity. But even when the question is differently put, as for instance with regard to the worship of nature, it is still difficult to say definitely what constitutes the real object of worship. Is it the material object itself, or an indwelling spirit, or the divine power revealed in it? We shall be met by these questions again when we examine the various objects of religion, and we shall discover that there is no answer that applies equally to all. The worship of nature is so differently interpreted that it is impossible to discover a universal formula for its meaning. It is impossible on this account to devise a satisfactory division between the different objects of worship. The frontier line between the visible and invisible, the sensuous

[1] On this point of view see Malachi i. 11; Acts xvii. 23; Romans i.

and the supersensuous, cannot but be wavering. Max Müller has divided the sensuous objects to which worship has been addressed into tangible, such as stones and shells, semi-tangible, such as trees, rivers, mountains, sea and earth, and intangible, such as sky, stars, sun and moon. Perhaps a division into earthly and heavenly objects would be better, but there is no division which would suffice for an exhaustive treatment.

It is clear from all this, how close is the bond which unites belief and worship with one another, and both with their objects. These rules however are never without exceptions; there are religious ideas which are never manifested by acts. Some savages, for instance, believe indeed in good gods, but worship always the evil gods, because the good ones cannot by their nature do anything but good, and need not therefore be feared. It is still more curious that there should be ritual acts of different kinds which have no relation to any object, or in which that relation has been completely lost sight of. This is often the case in magical practices. Though the gods were often invoked in them, yet their success does not depend on the gods, but on the formulas recited and the practices performed. It is true that Roskoff in his ingenious explanation of magic, derives it from a belief in beneficent powers, ingrained in the human soul. It is with these powers that man wishes to be united in order to be able to overcome the evil powers that threaten him. But Roskoff has never proved that a savage really feels this dualism of beneficent and hostile powers, and desires to place himself by magic in communion with a superhuman power akin to his own spirit. Not only in the

practice of magic, but also on many a higher stage, the object of religion has often been thrown in the background by the ritual act and the religious practice. This is really the case whenever the ritual act is considered as an essential condition, as the productive force of religious benefits, in fact as opus operatum. Here the same supposition is made as in magical acts, and the process itself may rightly be called magical also. With some people the cult is far less a worship of divine beings than a more or less organised magical practice, as for instance in China, Assyria, Babylonia, and Rome. In other places a ritual act itself becomes divine, a process which we may still observe in the Roman Catholic veneration of the sacrament. This tendency, which places the ritual act in the place of the gods, culminates in India. Here at an early time the conviction prevailed that the gods are born in the sacrifice. Nay, the sacrificial ritual and meditation also, askesis and other exercises, became so independent that the gods were supposed to have no longer any influence on the success of these human acts. In this sense the original Buddhism also was atheistic; it did not deny the popular deities, but it allowed them no influence whatever for the attainment of religious benefits. We thus learn that not only the ritual act in its narrower sense, but study also and exercise, may become independent means of salvation. In the later period of the Jewish legal religion, in the Talmudic schools, the Law itself becomes far more an object of religion than God himself. As a last instance of religion losing sight of its object we may call attention to certain tendencies of

our own time. Though these tendencies have nothing to do with magical and ritualistic theories and attribute little value to ritual acts, yet religion is entirely absorbed with them in subjective piety, without any relation to any object. Widely spread in its philosophical and in its popular form is the so-called agnostic theory, which denies that the object of religion can be discovered or known, but which is by no means inclined therefore to surrender the care of religious dispositions and sentiments.

It may be objected that we allowed ourselves to be deceived by appearances, and that in reality no religion and no cult can exist without an object, because always and everywhere, even in acts which seem to have nothing to do with divine powers, something, though it be an abstract idea only, is conceived as a divine power, is deified and religiously worshipped. If we insist on an exact definition this may be right, but for the actual facts in which this religious consciousness manifests itself, it is not true, because the religious act by itself, and without any reference to something or some one else, is believed to be efficient. It was necessary therefore to explain this side of our subject before considering the various objects of worship.

Chapter 11.—Idolatry.

Books of Reference. There is as yet no exhaustive treatment of idolatry; the material for it is scattered in works on single nations. We shall here only mention the survey, as well arranged as usual, by Tylor, Prim. Cult. chap. 14, and by Goblet d'Alviella in an instructive essay, Les Origines de l'Idolâtrie (R. H. R. 1885).

In popular parlance the word idolatry is often used for heathendom in general, as a name for all worship of idols as opposed to true religion. This use however

is by no means justified, for idolatry is the religious veneration of idols. But what is an idol? There are two principal answers to this. The idol is described as the figurative representation of any divine being, particularly in a more or less perfect human shape; or as also in itself powerful, the material dwelling of that power, so that it is hardly to be distinguished from a fetish. We cannot choose one or the other of these two views, but must combine them. To us the bond between the image and what is imaged is ideal only, as between the name and the object named; but for people upon a lower stage of civilisation it is real; to them the essence and the power of the original are present in the image. Thus it happens that the same idol, which the more highly educated look upon as a mere symbol and reminder of the deity, seems to contain to a ruder mind the divine itself. These two views pervade the whole of idolatry. They must not be lost sight of even in treating the question of the first origin of idols. That origin cannot be traced back to one idea, but we must admit both views of the subject. RÉVILLE as well as TYLOR have seen this correctly. Both look upon the symbolical meaning as the original, but both likewise describe the transition from the merely representative image to an active fetish image, as hardly perceptible. GOBLET D'ALVIELLA ought not to have blamed them for this, as he himself takes essentially the same view, only laying little, we might say too little stress on the symbolical meaning, and using 'idol' as a name for the image only if it is conceived as animate and active. It admits of no doubt that idolatry owes its great importance particularly to this idea of the embodiment of a divine

power, and of the presence of the numen in the material object. It is impossible to draw an accurate limit between idol and fetish, for a small line and a few streaks of colour may change the fetish into an idol. One hardly knows to which of these two categories we should ascribe the little images, the so-called chemi, which in the island of Hayti were manufactured by thousands, in the crudest forms, for general use. The same applies to many dolls, hermæ, &c. which may be seen in our ethnographical museums. Perhaps we might say that the idol is best distinguished from a fetish by its being shaped, however little, by the hand of man, and by a more accurate and more individual indication of the god or spirit embodied in the image. Both the great gods and the more subordinate powers live and act in their images. Even the dead are still present in their images, and take an interest in the fates of the living. Though we cannot with SPENCER admit the worship of the dead as the source of all idolatry, we must not forget that the worship of ancestral images is spread among many nations. This was the case in New Zealand, in several of the Polynesian islands, in China, where ancestors are carried about on journeys in representative tablets, in Rome, where the imagines majorum were venerated in the atrium of noble families, and in Egypt, where the images of the dead by the side of the mummies waited for their revival at the return of the migrating soul.

Idolatry belongs neither to the most general nor to the most primitive facts of religion. It is curious that even in the fragments of Sanchoniathon the worship of images and worship in temples are reckoned among the later phases of religion. Modern research has

only tended to confirm this. Among tribes on the lowest stage of civilisation idolatry is altogether absent, as for instance, if we select nations in different parts of the world, among the Bushmen, Patagonians, Esquimaux, Andaman islanders, and Australians. It is an instructive lesson, to be learned particularly in America and Polynesia, that among races genealogically related to each other, it is the more highly, and not the less highly cultivated, who worship images. On the other side, the freedom from image worship in the ceremonial among the Hindus during the Vedic period, among the Persians according to Herodotus, among the Germans and others, has been pointed out as a proof of a purer and higher conception of the divine. This however may be a mistake. Our knowledge of Vedic India is very uncertain. In Persia we know of a cult which is the product of a religious reform, but we hardly know anything of its primitive and popular character. It is true that Tacitus denies that the Germans have simulacra, but he frequently refers to signa and formae; and GRIMM was able to collect a number of witnesses as to the existence of divine images, not only in the Scandinavian North, but in many parts of Germany also. It is true that these simulacra need not all have had the human form, but the human form does not belong to the essential characteristics of an idol.

We classify very different objects as idols; what is common to all is only the fact that they are considered and worshipped as symbols and images, within which the divine power is active. We thus include under the concept of idol, roughly hewn stones in which the form of man or animal, the head and other members, are indicated only, as in the case

of the so-called hermæ; likewise statues representing the perfect human form, images in which the animal and the human are mixed, others in which a large number of attributes and symbols has been grotesquely heaped up, the German Irminsäulen, &c. Even the ark of the Hebrews belongs to this class, for though it was taken over into Jahvism from an older cult and interpreted symbolically, the memory of a time in which it proved itself as a very powerful idol has been preserved in the history of the wars against the Philistines. Even relics might be added to the class of idols, so far as the power of saints is supposed to dwell and work in them. But in this direction, and likewise in that of stone and tree worship, the limits of the area of idolatry are often very faint. What we wish to insist on here is only the manifoldness of image worship. As with fetishes so with idols, we find that some are public, others private, some general, others powerful only within a certain sphere of activity. There are great images of the gods, which are exhibited in temples for public veneration, or are hidden away and withdrawn from the view of uninitiated persons. There are also more limited, domestic, personal idols, as for instance the Lares whom the ancient Romans placed on the domestic hearth or on public ways and streets; likewise the Teraphim, little oracle-giving house-gods of the Hebrews; and the images of saints which Russian peasants preserve in their dwelling-rooms, and which they veil if anything improper has to be hidden from their view. In these different forms, idolatry was and is spread in all parts of the world among tribes beyond the stage of savages. We

find idols among the more highly developed members of the Polynesian race, for instance the Maoris in New Zealand, among the Fins, the old Mexicans and Peruvians, the old Semites, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, and among the Hindus of the present day. The entirely or partially animal, the colossal and monstrous form of many idols with their many heads, bodies, and arms, is partly a survival of an earlier cult (the animal idol being the remnant of an old worship of animals), partly it has to be explained symbolically. Thus the Semitic idol of the young bull may indicate the creative power of a deity, the colossal statues their superhuman greatness and power, the accumulation of members and attributes their manifold activity. But we must not delve too deeply for the hidden meaning, because many things, for instance in the idols of India, may be no more than the product of a thoughtless and tasteless imagination. In the Greek religion idolatry plays a peculiar part, for from ancient times rude and small hewn pieces of stone and wood were worshipped, the λίθοι ἀργοὶ and ξόανα διιπετῆ which are mentioned by Pausanias in the different places visited by him. Then follow the hermæ, where the human form is at least indicated, and lastly the artistic statues wrought by Phidias and others in stone, marble, gold, and ivory. This development is of high importance not only for the history of art, but likewise for that of religion. It is due to plastic art that the anthropomorphic conception of the gods should have culminated in Greece. But in this artistic influence there lay already the germ of the decay of religion. It is true that even the work of a sculptor after it had been

consecrated and placed in a temple was considered as a divine image even in the time of Pericles, and people who despised it were banished from Athens. Nevertheless the impressions made by a Zeus or an Athene of Phidias were rather of an æsthetic and morally elevating nature, while the old shapeless but venerable ἀγάλματα were considered as more sure and efficacious pledges of a divine presence than the modern ones.

The consecration of the idol is a magic ceremony in the full sense of the word, for by it only does the inanimate image receive divine power. This takes place among different people, and according to the higher or lower dignity of the idol with more or less display, sometimes with a simple formula only; sometimes, however, the consecration of a great image requires all sorts of rites, so that in Greece the customs followed at the ἵδρυσις became gradually a separate art—the τελεστική. The images thus consecrated were worshipped in different ways, and were expected to grant different blessings. They prove that they possess real life by occasionally moving, walking about, weeping, sweating, and talking. That people expect all they wish for from the image itself is proved by various rites. A sacred image on the castle protects the town, like the Palladium of Troy, which Æneas is said to have carried to Rome. Therefore when Troy was doomed to fall, the gods themselves carry their images out of the town, as Sophocles represents in his lost play, the Ξοανηφοροι. A besieged city secured the protection of a deity by putting fetters on the image. The Romans, when in great difficulty, assumed new courage when the idol of the Asiatic Mater Magna had been brought to

Rome. The images themselves are supposed to deliver oracles and to bestow blessings, therefore prayers and gifts are offered to them, as by the priestess Theano to the image of Pallas [1]. The numerous ex voto offerings which were suspended near the idols prove the same thing. The Congo negro drives a nail into the idol in order to bring his prayer near to it, a custom which has lately been compared to the Roman clavi figendi. The image may also produce recovery from illness, and we see that a Pharaoh of the twenty-first dynasty sent the idol of Khonsu to Asia, in order to cure a Semitic princess. Dipping the idol into a river, or into the sea, is said to cause rain. Thus the service of the images which are dressed, ornamented, anointed, erected in different places, carried about in processions and implored with prayers and gifts, forms the necessary condition in order to obtain what is wished for, and to avert what is feared. If these effects do not follow, it not rarely happens that the idol itself is punished, whipped, or thrown away.

No doubt when a certain stage of civilisation has been reached, idolatry becomes impossible. Educated Hindus, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans looked upon these images, not as endowed with divine power, but only as symbols of the divine. Some Greek philosophers, as for instance Xenophanes, have made a determined onslaught on all idolatry, while others have attributed to it a symbolical and pedagogic influence only. To this class belong Varro and Maximus Tyrius, who wrote a little treatise on the question whether images should be erected to the gods [2]. A

[1] Iliad, vi. 300.

[2] Max. Tyr., Diss. viii 9, 2 sq.; Plotin, Enn. iv. 3. 11; Origen, c. Cels. viii. 62.

thoroughgoing opposition to the worship of images, however, has been carried out by the Jews only. We need not mention how the Law forbids all idols, and how the Prophets scoff at them. We should remark, however, that the power of the enemy may be measured by the violence of the attack, so that from the passionate way in which the Prophets again and again dwell on the vanity of idols, we may conclude as to the tenacity with which the belief in the divine embodiment was held. They succeeded, however, in making the idol an abomination to the Jews, and the history of later Judaism, as well as the Jewish tendencies in Christianity, show what deep roots this aversion had taken. In Islam also the same aversion continues, and it was the first act of Mohammed, after he had become master of Mekka, to cleanse the sanctuary of the Kaabah of its idols. Whatever foreign elements Islam had assimilated, it has never been able to digest idolatry. In Christianity this question has had a long history, and has even become a point of controversy between different Churches. In ancient Christendom idolatry was unknown, and the generally venerated symbols of the shepherd, the fish, the cross, &c., were not liable to become idols. The Fathers of the Church attacked idolatry by declaring the indwelling spirits to be evil demons [1]. Idolatry, however, found an entrance even into the Christian Church, and in the eighth century led to a long and bitter struggle in the Byzantine Empire, during which the iconoclastic emperors destroyed the images; though finally, the second Council of Nicea, 787 A. D., recognised their veneration, but

[1] The chief passages are: ARNOB., Adv. Nationes, vi. 17 sqq.; MINUC. FELIX, Octavius, xvii; AUGUSTIN, De Civit. Dei, viii. 23.

not their adoration; and the Empress Theodora (842 A.D.) established the festival of orthodoxy to celebrate their restitution, a festival even now observed by the Greek Church. Later, at the Tridentine Council, the Roman Catholic Church decided in the sense of the Council of Nicea, that images should be objects of veneration but not of adoration; it forbad to believe 'inesse aliqua in iis divinitas vel virtus,' and to trust in them after the manner of the heathen. The official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is not therefore guilty of idolatry, but the worship of the people often degenerates into it. Calvinism, finally, tolerates no images in the churches, not even as 'books of the laity.'

CHAPTER 12. — **Sacred Stones, Trees, and Animals.**

Books of Reference. The material must for the most part be drawn from collective works and mythologies which have already been mentioned, or will be mentioned later on. One finds much referring to this subject, and partly well arranged, in the works of TYLOR, LUBBOCK, SPENCER, SCHULTZE, WAITZ, RÉVILLE, and GIRARD DE RIALLE. There is no complete account of the worship of stones. An essay by FR. LENORMANT, Les Bétyles (R. H. R. 1881), contains much material, but very mixed. I. M. J. VALETON treats one important point most cleverly, Over den eed der Romeinen by Jupiter Lapis (Aant. Prov. Utr. Gen. 1883). There is a rich literature on sacred trees, plants, and animals, which tries to approach these objects from different sides and to point out their importance as regards myths, popular belief, and worship. Of these works we shall mention: A. BASTIAN, Der Baum in vergleichender Ethnologie (Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsych. 1868); C. BOTTICHER, Der Baumkultus der Hellenen, nach den gottesdienstlichen Gebräuchen und den überlieferten Bildwerken dargestellt (1856); W. MANNHARDT, Wald- und Feldkulte (1. Der Baumkultus der Germanen und ihrer Nachbarstämme, 1875; 2. Antike Wald- und Feldkulte, 1877, woran sich die mythologischen Forschungen aus dem Nachlasse, 1884, anschliessen); J. FERGUSSON, Tree and Serpent Worship (a work with illustrations, representing Buddhist monuments); ANG. DE GUBERNATIS, Zoological Mythology (2 vols. 1872), Mythologie des Plantes (I, 1878; II, 1882); H. FRIEND, Flowers and Flower-lore (2nd ed., 1884, with a complete Bibliography); R. FOLKARD, Jr., Plant-lore, Legends and Lyrics (1884, a rich collection);

J. F. MACLENNAN, The Worship of Plants and Animals (Fortnightly Review, 1869–70); W. ROBERTSON SMITH, Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament (Journal of Philology, vol. ix); J. G. FRAZER, Totemism (1887). In W. W. GRAF BAUDISSIN'S Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte (I, 1876; II, 1878) there is much which refers to the Semites.

We find the religious worship of stones spread amongst the most various nations, from the earliest antiquity to the present day. Thus stone-worship is found amongst the South Sea islanders and the races of Central Asia, the Fins, Laps, and the Negroes of Africa. It was also widely spread in ancient America; in Peru the sun-religion of the Inkas drove the ancient sacred stones into the background, but could not destroy them: it is told that once when an Inka was destroying a sacred stone, a bird appeared from it and disappeared into another, which in consequence received divine honours. In India, sacred stones are very numerous, especially in the south, and they are worshipped by the people up to the present day. How natural stone-worship was amongst the Semites can be seen in the name Betylia, which has become the general name for all sacred stones: we need only remember the numerous time-honoured stones mentioned in the Old Testament, and the Kaabah at Mekka. We have already mentioned the ancient λίθοι ἀργοί and the hermæ of the Greeks; to these belong the well-known thirty stones which were worshipped at Pharæ[1]. In Rome, stone-worship often rose to great importance: as once when the Mater Magna was transferred from Pessinus to Rome during the Punic Wars, and again under the Syrian emperors; for the Heliogabalus of Emesa was a black conical

[1] Pausanias, vii. 22.

stone. Litholatry existed far into Christian times, and in the early part of the Middle Ages, bishops and synods in France and England found it necessary to declaim against it. And even now one cannot regard this stone-worship as being utterly rooted out in Europe, for it is a fact that in certain parts of the Pyrenees, in the Hebrides, in Ireland and Norway, the peasants regard certain stones with religious awe, perform certain superstitious rites, wash and anoint them, and expect salvation from them. The stones worshipped by men are of various kinds. Sometimes they are rocks, either shaped like cones, or square, or erected as pillars, or recumbent, or rough unhewn stones, or partly hewn and coloured, or large or small, or single or in groups (for instance, in fives, as in Southern India). The worship consists in making requests of the stones and offering gifts, also in washing them, and still oftener in anointing them, or covering them with oil or butter, as did the superstitious Greek described by Theophrastus, and the Israelites in the days of the Prophets [1].

It is easy to mention numerous examples of stone-worship. But as soon as we come to any explanation, we must for the greater part be satisfied with the saying of Tacitus, 'ratio in obscuro [2].' At all events we cannot arrive at any uniform explanation, and TYLOR has most rightly remarked that it is very hard to distinguish whether stones are to be regarded as altars, as symbols, or as fetishes. It is evident that much is regarded as stone-worship which does not belong to it, more especially if the stone is not the object of

[1] Theophrastus, Charact. xvi; Isaiah lvii. 6.

[2] Tacit. Hist. ii. 3.

religious worship. This applies to the stone heaps, which are found nearly everywhere, on graves, at dangerous roads, at localities with which the memory of some remarkable deed or person is connected. Even though prayers are said at these stone heaps, and the memory of their original meaning is often lost, yet R. ANDREE is quite right in classifying the stones thrown down on the heaps by travellers, as sacrificial offerings. The same can be said with regard to the memorial stones of judgment-seats, the sacrificial stones, and the sacred stone vessels, which were none of them originally objects of religious worship. The stones in the Old Testament are mostly memorial stones, and though it may be possible that the new religion has given a new meaning to the ancient stone-worship in this sense, yet it is equally probable that many of these stones from the beginning were regarded as signs of some remarkable event. The Roman oath by Jupiter Lapis is especially interesting, and most people trace the clearest proof of an ancient stone-worship in it, since even Servius calls this stone 'antiquum Jovis signum.' In a careful essay, VALETON has proved that the oath by Jupiter Lapis is 'juris privati,' and that it must be clearly distinguished from the Fœdus oath of the Fetiales, though it has sprung from it, and that it in no wise involves the idea that Jupiter was a stone god. He holds that the name Jupiter Lapis originated simply from the ceremony of stone-throwing, and should be compared with Jupiter Epulo, Farreus, &c. From this important example, one can see how difficult it is to prove the existence of an old stone-worship from a rite in which stones occur.

The worship of stones either as idols or gods can be

explained from many conceptions. In many mythologies we find the conception of men or giants who have been changed into stones or rocks, and vice versa of men who have risen out of stones. The stones are regarded anthropopathically, as feeling, crying, &c.; Sanchoniathon calls them λίθοι ἔμψυχοι, and makes them descend from heaven. This fact is probably one of the commonest causes of stone-worship. Many stones by their formation show clearly that they are meteoric stones (aeroliths), others are said to be such by tradition. The sacred stones are often worshipped also as thunderbolts; long or hatchet-shaped stones (ceraunia and betuli [1]) were said to have descended with the lightning; and the Syrian rock-god Zeus Kasios was also represented as κεραύνιος. Although many witnesses can be brought to prove this, yet it has been often misused, since some people have at once argued the fact of thunder-gods from stone-worship, which is entirely arbitrary. But many other ideas are brought forward as lying at the bottom of stone-worship: first, the respect paid to boundary stones, not only by the Romans, who worshipped the god Terminus, but also in other localities; secondly, the conception of the stone as a likeness of the mountain on which the god was worshipped; thirdly, the fact that fire appears from stones; fourthly, the impressions on stones, and marks which have a symbolical meaning; fifthly, the connection of set-up stones with the Phallus, as whose image they were worshipped. There may be some truth in this or that explanation, but none of them gives a general explanation of stone-worship.

[1] PLINY, Hist. Nat. xxxvii. 51. Pliny does not seem to regard these two kinds as thunderbolts.

The worship of trees and plants is as widespread as the worship of stones. Here again we will not heap up examples, but will explain the chief points of view. Tree-worship is not only found amongst savages in all parts of the world, as widely spread as litholatry, but it has been less driven out in the higher stages of civilisation, and takes a high position in the religion of Semitic and Indo-Germanic civilised nations; even Buddhism was not detrimental to its growth. In the fragments of Sanchoniathon in Eusebius tree-worship is traced back to the first men; they are said to have worshipped the trees and plants which gave them nourishment: this is an insufficient explanation, though it is still defended by RÉVILLE. Amongst the impressions which have given rise to dendrolatry, much weight is laid on the weird sighing in the tree-tops, the growth in plant-life, or the feeling which man has of life, which, as SCHELLING says, wakes in man, dreams in animals, slumbers in plants, and sleeps in stones. Anyhow here also the symbolical and the animistic conceptions are opposed to one another, and the boundary and line of demarcation between tree and plant, as either a symbol or as the actual seat of life, cannot always be sharply drawn. We ourselves allow both explanations, for either accords with certain phenomena for which the other could only account in a very forced way. But we must not forget that not all so-called sacred trees were objects of worship. Some of them only marked the place where one felt oneself to be in the presence of the godhead, and worshipped it. Thus the sacred groves mentioned by Tacitus, in which the solemn silence gave people a religious feeling, which were not entered by profane

persons, and where no trees were cut down, are to be regarded as temples. This view, which is emphasised by Pliny also, does not refer to the Germans alone of whom Tacitus speaks, but also to many other nations whose cult has been overshadowed by sacred trees and groves, although the trees themselves were not worshipped, but other divine beings.

Yet it would be absurd to explain all dendrolatry by means of the veneration with which people entered the sacred groves. There are many reasons for this veneration, though we cannot admit all the reasons which are brought forward. For instance, the attempt which H. SPENCER makes to explain the worship of plants as ancestor-worship because the ancestors who were adored bore the names of plants, or dwelt in woody neighbourhoods, and were mixed up even with trees, is a complete failure. The third reason which he gives, namely the intoxicating effect of many plants, by no means explains such a general phenomenon. The theory, popular with so many, of connecting tree-worship with phallic ideas, is equally erroneous. The constant connection between snakes and trees is said to represent the union between male and female, and this opinion is upheld even by FERGUSSON. No less arbitrary is the nature-mythical explanation, which has lately been again defended by SCHWARTZ [1], according to whom it was not the actual trees which were worshipped, but the divine tree of clouds, storms, or light. It is curious that almost the entire mythical terminology seems to agree with this view, for the clouds are the leaves, the rays of the sun the branches, the stars the fruit of this tree, &c. Likewise in other and in much more thought-

[1] DR. W. SCHWARTZ, Indogermanischer Volksglaube (1885).

ful and successful ways the attempt has been made to transplant the sacred trees from earth to heaven. BAUDISSIN tried with rich and carefully arranged material to prove that amongst the Semites trees were only worshipped as 'signs of the life-creating power of God manifested in nature.' The evergreen trees, such as the terebinth, cypress, palm, the pomegranate tree with its abundance of seeds, and the oak as an emblem of strength, are sacred to the gods, and more especially to the goddesses, whose power and effect they symbolically represent. Some of these trees, such as the cypress of Aphrodite-Astarte, have been adopted by the Greeks also. On the other side ROBERTSON SMITH has urged the connection between tree and water worship amongst the Semites.

In the worship of trees as living beings, one can either consider their life as the soul of the tree itself, or as a spirit living in the tree. Both conceptions are often met with, and are not seldom united. Feeling and sensations are attributed to the tree; and if wounded, it bleeds. The conception of a relationship between animal and vegetable life and growth, which now belongs to poetical language only, is expressed in the myths which make men spring forth from plants, or trees. Such myths belong to the most different nations; they are found amongst the Zulus of South Africa as well as in the Persian and Germanic mythology. MANNHARDT has treated the various sides of the conception of tree-souls and tree-spirits in Germanic as well as in classic antiquity. The tree-dwelling spirit is often regarded as the guardian spirit of an individual person, of the house or the village. With these life or fate-trees (they are called Vårdträd

in Sweden) the life and success of the individuals or houses whose double they are, or whom they protect, is closely connected. I would not maintain that the conception of the Eddic world-tree Yggdrasil is to be explained in this way; the strongly symbolical description of this world-tree appears to me to be as little explicable by means of animistic ideas, as the equally symbolic description of the two trees of Paradise in Genesis ii. Still MANNHARDT is right in regarding the idea of a tree-spirit as a genius of growth, a demon of vegetation, and has pointed out this idea in numerous popular customs and rites of worship, in the Germanic May-trees, in the Greek Eiresione, in the Roman Arbor intrat, &c., which accompanied, or were to bring about the change of the seasons, or the success of the harvest. But it is doubtful whether MANNHARDT was right in placing here the wild people and wood-spirits, which he traces in Germanic and classic antiquity, but which appear also in other places, for instance in India, as the company that follows Siva; for they rather belong to the elementary and nature spirits. Anyhow I count the dryads, but not the centaurs and fauns, as belonging to tree-worship. There is no clearer proof for the opinion that trees were treated as living beings, than the custom of the marriage of trees which is carried out in India at the present day with great festivity. On stages of higher civilisation dendrolatry is officially preserved in certain ritual acts. Buddhism favours it to a high degree: in the stories of the former birth of Buddha, he appears forty-three times as a tree-spirit; a twig of the tree under which he attained the dignity of Buddha was transplanted

into Ceylon and receives religious honours; the monuments also which FERGUSSON has made known to us bear witness to the tree-worship of the Buddhists. Tree-worship flourishes in many of the rites of Greek and Roman public festivals (the Pyanepsia, Thargelia, &c.). We have already mentioned that it still lives on in popular customs.

The manner of worshipping trees was various. The roots were sprinkled with sacrificial blood; food and other gifts were placed under the tree or were hung on its branches; there were rag-trees hung with all sorts of shreds and threads. People also addressed trees for oracles, and imagined they heard them in the sighing of the tree-tops; the oak of Dodona, the palm of Nagran in Yemen, and the oak mentioned in Judg. ix. 37, belonged to this class of oracle-trees.

But other plants also were sacred. The belief in a power to protect and restore health, and to procure long life, which were in general supposed to be indwelling in water and plants, is proved for Indo-Germanic antiquity in the Rig-Veda, in the Avesta, and in popular belief. Many plants have attained great religious importance. Such in India and Persia was the soma or haoma plant from which the sacrificial drink was prepared, which developed into a mighty deity. In Brahmanism as well as in Buddhism the lotus plant was held in high esteem. In India at the present day the worshippers of Vishnu venerate the tulasi plant. In Celtic as well as in Germanic antiquity the mistletoe bough plays an important part.

Amongst religious conceptions there is hardly any as many-sided as that of animal-worship. On different stages of civilisation the most various sentiments

and ideas can be traced in it, and it is utterly wrong to accept a common origin and a single explanation as regards the whole. When the Vedic Indians call the clouds the cows of heaven, it has nothing in common with the worship of the cow as a sacred animal, which even in our time has led in India to bloody battles with Englishmen, who did not spare this belief; and when ancient Germans placed a bowl of milk for the house-protecting snake, it had nothing in common with the conception of a fight between a divine god and a dark snake demon. We are therefore right in allowing here also various explanations for the various groups of phenomena. Of course there are some amongst them which explain nothing, or at once prove themselves as useless. If we, as GRIMM still does, bring forward as one of the principal causes of the worship of animals that, 'with relation to single gods, they were to a certain extent in their service,' then this is exactly what was to be explained. The fact has probably in most cases been this, that the worship of the animal arose independently from that of the god, but has got fused with it, or been somehow brought in relation to it. The same can be said of many other explanations which we need not touch on. When the Greeks became acquainted with animal-worship in Egypt, they formed all sorts of ideas about it, many of which were very absurd, as can be read in Diodorus Siculus: but curiously enough, they overlooked similar phenomena in their own religion. Plutarch emphasises the difference between the Greeks, who regarded the animals merely as dedicated to the gods, and the Egyptians, who regarded them as actually divine. DE BROSSES made an im-

portant step towards an understanding of animal-worship among the Egyptians by comparing it with the animal-worship of the Negroes. But we must not argue from this that the fetish theories would explain the whole of Egyptian animal-worship, but only that the Egyptian belief must not be treated, as it formerly was, in an isolated way, but in connection with analogous ethnographic and historical facts.

The impressions which man received from the creatures nearest to him, namely animals, were especially deep. They both possess a common principle of life, and the consciousness of this relationship explains the sympathy as well as the antipathy which man feels towards animals. Sometimes he is disagreeably impressed by animal nature, sometimes he sees in it the manifestation of a common life. In such conceptions it is difficult to separate the symbolic from the animistic conception. Undeveloped consciousness can nowhere recognise the exact limits which divide the divine, the human, and the animal. Savages are often struck by the power, the reason, or the mysteriousness of animals; as, for instance, the Negroes who look on monkeys as miserable or suffering people. The combination of ancestors with animals is very general, which SPENCER explains by the fact that various animals, more especially snakes, creep round graves or dwell near them. It is a fact that the belief in animal humanity and human animality is widely spread. It can be traced in the fables and animal epics which from folk lore have entered literature, in the conception of werewolves, in the protection of all animal life which in certain religious spheres, more especially in Buddhism,

is made a duty, and in the doctrine of the migration of souls, and in many other conceptions.

Having now mentioned some of the fundamental ideas of animal-worship, we must follow out the various ideas which are connected with it. Animals are sometimes worshipped directly either in a single specimen, as the sacred snake of the Negroes in Whida, or as a whole class, of which, in that case, no individual may be killed. The sacred animals of the first class are carefully tended, they are served by priests and priestesses in their temples, choice food and lovely female partners are brought to them, and after their death they are buried with great pomp, as we learn more especially from the Egyptians. Of course it happened that when sacred animals deceived expectations, and brought no succour under calamities, they were threatened and killed. A curious custom amongst certain nations is that when an animal had been killed hunting, its forgiveness was implored in order to pacify the animal-spirit; the Kaffirs do this to elephants, and the Northern Asiatic races to bears; nay, they even expect that the head of the slain bear, which they hang up in their dwellings, should bring them blessings. The transition from the direct worship of the animal itself to the combination of the animal with the worship of the gods is often imperceptible; we only know to a certain extent how this came about. This phenomenon occurs amongst civilised nations, as for instance amongst the Egyptians, who worshipped the animal as the godhead come to life again; amongst the Indians, who represented their gods by animal symbols; and amongst the Greeks, who gave them animal attributes. What often may have happened

is, that a new meaning was attached to the worship of animals. It was driven into the background and was yet preserved, and the sacred animal then became either the living representation or only the symbol of the godhead. Analogy in sound or in writing has sometimes formed the bridge (homonymic and hieroglyphic). At last the priests step in, and work out an animal symbolism which reduces animal-worship to its philosophical meaning, namely the worship of universal life as manifested in the animal. These three grades are often found at the same time in the various strata of a nation, as must certainly have been the case amongst the Egyptians.

But we by no means claim to have clearly and entirely disentangled the knotted threads of this cult. This is not at all the case. We have hardly as yet touched on the great symbolic importance which animals attained in myths and rites. This importance can of course be exaggerated and wrongly represented. DE GUBERNATIS places the animals of mythology altogether in celestial spheres, and forms a 'celestial zoology' in which animals become the symbols of clouds, the thunder-storms, the sun, &c. LENORMANT in his treatment of the Semiramis myth has changed the fishes and doves of Semitic mythology into representatives of the aqueous and igneous principles of nature. BAUDISSIN also goes too far if he denies that the Semites worshipped living animals, and says that amongst them they are only figurative representations of attributes of the celestial gods; likewise RÉVILLE, who lays stress almost exclusively on that kind of nature-symbolism which represents the moon as a bird, the sun as a fish, the sea and the lightning as a

snake. This is all incorrect or one-sided; but what is unquestionably true is that mythical language and conception undeniably recognise such animal symbolism. The snake, with which the gods or heroes of Indian, Persian, and Egyptian mythology fight, is the dark cloud snake; lightning also is often represented as a snake. Every mythology gives proofs in support of our assertion, though it is sometimes not easy to discover whether we may explain a feature as a nature symbol, and how this is to be done. We shall now only call attention to the great importance possessed by dragons and tigers in China as representatives of the active and passive side of nature, and therefore as the foundation of the whole system of divination.

A list of animals forming the object of religious worship would, were it possible to give a complete list, embrace all kinds of animals—wild animals and domestic animals, dangerous and useful, dreaded and beloved, creeping, flying, running, and swimming animals. To some great power is attributed, and to others only a limited sphere of activity. If we wish to enumerate some of the animals whose worship is most widely spread, we find that amongst the Germans great honour was paid to goats, bulls, and horses, as oracular animals; amongst the northern races of Europe, Asia, and America, we must mention the bear. But no animal is so important or so widely spread as the snake, which is either religiously worshipped or feared all over the world, except in certain cold countries where it is not found. The most various motives are here at work. Many foolish ideas have been expressed on ophiolatry, and people have tried to find all kinds of speculative

notions. We desire to keep clear of such mysterious speculations, and only wish to emphasise the important side of snake-worship. Snake-worship is more especially indigenous among the Negroes of Africa and of America, amongst the savage tribes as well as the civilised races of Mexico and Peru. In India we find the snake-worshipping Nâgas, and in Greece and Rome the traces of snake-worship have not quite disappeared even from the official cult. It cannot be denied that similar traces also occur in the Old Testament. It is curious that snakes sometimes appear as antagonistic powers opposed to the gods, sometimes as friendly protecting spirits. We meet with the former in the already mentioned example of the Indian Vritra, the Persian Aji Dahâka, the Egyptian Apep, the Eddic worm of Midgart, besides everywhere among the Semites, where the snake represents 'the dark powers of nature, unorganised chaos' (Baudissin). On the other hand, in the Greek worship of Asklepios the snake is the symbol of recovery, of renewal, and of growth; the Roman genius assumed the shape of a snake, and in Germanic popular belief it is a protecting house-spirit. The mantic importance of the snake is widely spread. In Genesis it is called a wise animal; in many cases it gives oracles, so that in the age of Marcus Aurelius, the impostor of Abonotichus, wishing to organise a new cult with an oracle, could find nothing better than the symbol of a snake. With the exception of the snake no animal has been more worshipped than birds. Popular belief connects various kinds of birds with luck or misfortune; the cuckoo, raven, and crow are widely looked

upon as birds of fate. We shall later on dwell more on the fact that mantic art pays special attention to the signs of birds.

We have as yet not mentioned one of the principal forms of animal-worship, namely the worship of an animal as a totem, from which, as its ancestor, a tribe took its origin. The word totem, the proper form of which is not as yet known with certainty, is borrowed from the Redskins of America, amongst whom this conception first attracted attention to itself. The idea and custom connected with it was, that a tribe bore the name or mark of a certain species of animal, such as a dove, wolf, bear, or snake, &c. (sometimes also of a plant). This animal was then looked on as the progenitor of the tribe, was treated with honour, and under no circumstance was it killed by any member of that tribe; this may partly explain the widespread prohibition of certain foods. On the other hand, this animal was the friend and helper of the tribe and its individual members. This belief is connected with a certain social institution, known under the general name of matriarchate, which consists principally in the fact that relationship is only counted through the female line, and that persons of the same totem never intermarry (exogamy). Such totem tribes have been found not only among the Redskins of America, but also amongst Australians—the totem is there called Kobong—and amongst many other races of man. Lately, more especially owing to MACLENNAN, the area assigned to totemism has been much extended: nay, some people have even tried to explain the whole of animal-worship from it, or at least have, with TYLOR,

recognised in it one of the chief elements of animal-worship. There is much which points this way. Although as yet none of the most important Egyptologists have accepted it, yet it is very tempting to apply this theory to the Egyptian religion, where so many animals are worshipped in the single nomes. The study of ancient family law and of the religious customs of Indo-Germanic races also affords arguments in support of this opinion. Finally, a new support has arisen where it could not have been expected, namely from Semitic studies. In the names and in scattered traits which give us information of the tribal life of the old Arabs and of the Israelites, ROBERTSON SMITH has found a confirmation of MACLENNAN'S theory that totemism forms a stage of social life, through which the Semites also have passed. STADE too has joined this opinion. It is true that this question, which belongs more to social science than to the history of religion[1], is not yet decided; and MACLENNAN has found a vigorous opponent in SIR HENRY SUMNER MAINE, the defender of the patriarchal theory. We have here only wished to show that totemism forms a side of animal-worship, which is not limited to a few tribes in America and Australia.

In order not to leave out anything that is of im-

[1] Of the books on these questions, which were first treated scientifically twenty-five years ago, we mention—J. J. BACHOFEN, Das Mutterrecht. Eine Untersuchung über die Gynaikokratie der alten Welt nach ihrer religiösen und rechtlichen Natur (1861); J. F. MACLENNAN, Primitive Marriage (1865); L. H. MORGAN, Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family (1870); SIR HENRY SUMNER MAINE, Ancient Law (1861), Dissertations on Early Law and Custom (1883); G. A. WILKEN, Das Matriarchat bei den alten Arabern (1884); W. ROBERTSON SMITH, Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia (1885), and lately his Burnett Lectures (1889).

portance, we shall here add that animals are not only regarded as the ancestors of families, races, and tribes, but also play a part in the myths of the founding of certain cities, such as the wolf in the founding of Rome, the pig at Alba, the wild boar of Ephesus, and the bears of Berne, &c.; and the part thus played by the animal often consists in pointing out the position of the future town.

Chapter 13.—**The Worship of Nature.**

The worship of nature, of heaven and earth, of sun, moon, water, and fire, belongs to the most primitive and most general forms of worship. We find it among savage tribes by the side of animism, and often mixed up with it. Amongst civilised nations, the belief in more personal gods has not entirely superseded it, and by the side of these gods, gifts and homage are often bestowed on material nature. Nay, behind the myths and ceremonial customs of the official religion, remnants of nature-worship may often be discovered, and even in the highest spiritual religions, nature-worship survives in popular customs. By means of these many-sided relations, nature-worship seems particularly adapted to make us see the unity of religious development. Tylor therefore, and those who agree with him, are very anxious to represent it as a connecting link between fetishism and polytheism, though Tylor is obliged to admit that the single stages of this process defy any more accurate definition. We have described the different views on this subject when treating of the origin of religion. Considering the wide meaning which Tylor attaches to animism, it follows that he

ascribes to it the animation of nature also; and as in this case the soul and spirit animates material objects, nature-worship is ranged under the concept of fetishism. We ourselves have given a narrower definition of fetishism, and excluded from it what Schultze calls 'the new object.' It seems in fact impossible to consider nature-worship which bears the strongest impress of originality as a ramification of fetishism which is not original. Whatever points of contact there may be between the two, it is better with Réville to separate worship of nature (which he calls naturism) from animism. It is equally difficult to determine the limits of nature-worship in the opposite direction. The classification of religions shows how wide an area is assigned by many to nature-worship. It is true no doubt that mythological polytheism is not altogether gone beyond that stage, but here the gods are certainly more than personified natural beings, although many of their attributes and functions, many myths and ceremonial customs, belong to the worship of nature. Zeus who rains, is the sky, but it would be foolish to treat the Zeus religion simply as worship of the material sky. One has to collect the material for a representation of nature-worship from the mythologies and organised cults of civilised nations; but one ought to abstain from entirely including these in the area of naturism, and should institute observation in other directions also. The worship of nature is found in its purity where the sun is adored and the earth receives offerings. Sometimes it is more or less openly incorporated in the service of some other god and mixed with foreign elements, or it survives in many popular customs,

which are kept up for centuries without being understood. This fact is very useful for our enquiry, and what is called folk-lore should be here consulted far more largely than it has been hitherto. Great caution no doubt is required, because it is but too easy to go wrong. Not in all places, where some part or phenomenon of nature appears in religion, are there real traces of genuine nature-worship. We have no right to admit at once divine worship wherever a mythological deity becomes manifested in a natural phenomenon, or rules over a part of nature. Also wherever great importance or magic power is attributed to a natural element, the necessary though sometimes very difficult distinction between means and object of cult should never be lost sight of. The latter remark applies chiefly to water and fire, the former to other natural bodies.

Coming to particulars, we begin with the treatment of the elements. Greek philosophers, Egyptian priests, and others, have speculated much on water, fire, air, and earth in their cosmic and cosmogonic character. Among the Fins also, the gods are divided according to these elementary divisions; but that we must not there think of the elements as such, is clearly shown by the fact that by the side of air, water, and earth we do not find fire, but the lower world. We shall now proceed to examine the principal points of view for the worship of the single elements.

The water was worshipped, not in general as the aqueous principle of the world, or as a cosmogonic or anti-cosmogonic power, but in its concrete forms, as sea, lake, river, water-source. Sacrifices were offered and prayers addressed to the water, as waving,

roaring, or gushing forth. This is well attested for several nations, for the Redskins as well as for the people of classical antiquity. Amongst the Greeks the worship of the rivers was old, and though afterwards pushed into the background, it long survived in the cult of single rivers, such as the Alpheus. Some of these sacred rivers are not inferior to the highest deities, as for instance the Ganges in India, and the Nile in Egypt. The custom of killing a sacrificial animal and offering it to the sea for a happy voyage, was still known to Cicero. Lakes and wells also receive different offerings. We often find the lighting of candles as part of the worship of water. This may originally have had a mantic meaning. We also find the custom of bathing in the water, and girls offering their virginity to the river or the lake. In all these acts the real waters are meant; this observation becomes necessary in answer to an assertion that here also the ocean of the sky, from which all water falls upon the earth, should be considered as original and essential, or that, as BAUDISSIN tries to prove for the Semites, the holy waters stand in close relation to the deities of the stars. Rain occupies, according to its nature, an intermediate position, being counted on one side among the phenomena of the sky, as for instance in the well-known prayer for rain addressed to Zeus by the Athenians; but it stands also in such near relation to the water of the earth, that the charm by which it is produced consists in the pouring out of water or diving into it. The rain-maidens called Dodola by the Slavs and Πυρπηρούνα by the modern Greeks are well known. The different beings living within the

waters, such as naiads, nymphs, mermaids, water-sprites, belong to mythology. The monsters also rising from the sea, and the sea-born gods and heroes, mostly belong to cosmogonic myths. We need only mention still the divine efficacy which is attributed to the water. We said before that water, like plants, can bestow health and long life. This belief finds its peculiar expression in the almost universal conception of a fountain of youth (eau de jouvence). Finally sanctification, purification, and atonement are wrought by water, an idea which manifests itself even in the symbolism of Christian baptism.

Fire possesses great importance in mythic ideas and popular customs. Many deities are closely connected with it. The mythology of many nations tells of how fire was brought from heaven, or discovered elsewhere, as in the Greek myth of Prometheus and that of Maui in New Zealand. Ancient ways of producing fire by friction of wood (needfire), by drilling or by a burning-glass, have been preserved in several rites. The fire on the hearth was kept up perpetually by priests or priestesses, such as the Vestals at Rome, the solar-virgins in Peru, and even among several savage tribes. The renewing of the fire, which had become impure by daily use or contact, and had to be extinguished and kindled afresh at the sacred hearth, took place not only on extraordinary occasions, as when the Greeks extinguished the fires after the battle of Platææ because they had been contaminated by the Persians, but occurred regularly also in different places. To walk through the fire or jump over it, formed part of many ceremonial and popular customs, as for instance at the Roman Palilia and at

ordeals. Fire is looked upon as a consuming, but also as a vivifying and purifying element. But however important all this may be, it does not necessarily prove a direct worship of fire. It is not yet worship of the fire if incense or something else is thrown into it, or when, as amongst the Semites, children were made to walk through it. The flame in these cases is only the sacrifical flame, which carries the offerings to the gods. If we make this necessary distinction, the proofs for a worship of fire become more uncertain and smaller in number than we should imagine. They are not altogether absent, for in the worship of the Indian Agni, the adoration of the material fire and of the visible flame is still perfectly perspicuous. We find here also the different relations of fire to the sun and lightning, sacrifice, and the domestic hearth. The strongest proof however for fire-worship is found in the Persian religion. In Mazdeism the elements themselves, water, earth, and fire, are worshipped, but above all, fire. Fire is invoked with prayers; it is a religious duty to keep it burning with pure wood; to contaminate it is abomination; but if it has been contaminated, it must be purified again according to certain precepts. It may be quite true that the present descendants of the ancient Persians, or at least the most educated among them, ascribe a symbolic meaning to fire-worship; but in genuine Parseeism the material fire is meant. Among other nations who do not worship the fire directly and at public festivals, the fire on the domestic hearth is in their family religion a powerful deity receiving gifts and prayers.

What has been said of the fire applies in a still

larger measure to the air. The manuals of mythology are full of gods of the air, gods of the wind, and among them none occupies a higher position than Wodan in the German religion. But though it may be quite true that certain features in the image of this god can be traced back to the air, he is by no means altogether a personification of that element. The worship of the material air or of the winds, for it is impossible to separate the two, is only seen in certain customs, as for instance when flour is blown away in order to pacify the storm. The manifestations of the air are scarcely tangible enough to become, as such, objects of veneration. People tried to produce them, or to appease them by charms, but they did not form material objects of veneration. If we find single features in cosmogonic and other myths borrowed from the air, or if the winds of the four quarters are often represented as powerful spirits, as giants or dwarfs, we need not see in this a direct worship of the element of the air. The same applies to thunder, which must be reckoned among the phenomena of the air rather than of the sky. Mythology testifies to the powerful impression which the drama of the storm, the rolling of the thunder, the brilliancy of the lightning, and the returning serenity of the sky have made on man. That certain gods were really gods of thunder, and several myths were myths of thunder, will be seen later on. We only wish to point out here that the phenomena of the thunder-storm are not such that they themselves materially could be worshipped as natural beings. It is the god who thunders or the sky that thunders; the storm itself cannot, like the sky or the earth, be considered as a deity.

When we come to the worship of the earth, we stand

again on firmer ground. We need not look at the numerous traces preserved in mythology, and ask how far features of the earth-goddess show themselves in various divine forms; the sacred earth herself is worshipped as the nourishing mother from whose fertile lap all life springs forth, whose very touch imparts new vigour, the earth of one's home from which the emigrant carries away a handful. We must distinguish the goddess of the earth not only from the spirits which dwell in the earth, but also from the subterraneous deities, though they are frequently mixed up together in mythology. The material earth is worshipped by many nations, libations are poured on it, prayers addressed to it, and it is often invoked at the taking of an oath. It is easy to produce examples from the religions of the savages, Fins, Chinese, &c. It is curious that several religions have by the side of more personal deities, in which the earth-goddess may be discovered, retained her own appellative name for the divine earth—γῆ μήτηρ, terra mater, Jörd, among Greeks, Romans, and Germans.

To this class belong also, to a certain extent at least, the sacred hills. These are often regarded with awe, as places of worship, or as seats of the deity; nay, the mountains themselves sometimes received religious veneration. Less nearly related to the worship of the earth is that of the spirits of the forest. A real worship of the forest, in which the forest itself is a god, does not exist. Men worship in the forest 'secretum illud quod sola reverentia vident' (Tacitus), or they discover in it the spirits of the forest, such as the wild people whom we declined before to include within the worship of trees.

There is but a step from the worship of the earth to that of the sky. Many people consider the sky as the father, and the earth as the mother of all beings. The marriage between them is cosmogonic; the sky is looked upon not only as the abode of the gods, but as a god itself, the material vault of the sky. Nowhere is this more manifest than in China, where the sky, conceived as quite material, is accepted as the highest deity governing everything, and receiving the great imperial sacrifice. Herodotus tells us that the ancient Persians invoked the vault of the sky as Zeus. It would be easy to give a long list of gods of the sky, that is of gods whose names betray attributes and functions of sky-worship, and to indicate in the cult the ceremonies which testify to this worship. We shall, however, observe only that the worship of the whole vault of heaven by no means excludes that of the single phenomena in it, and that, on the contrary, other heavenly bodies, particularly the sun, are often worshipped together with the sky. In older works we often find the worship of sun, moon, and stars represented as an independent form of religion, under the name of Sabæism. But there is no real reason why these cults should be separated from those of other natural beings, or why an ethnographic name should be attached to them, which, as we shall show hereafter, is misleading. The worship of the brilliant heavenly bodies is sufficiently explained by the impressions which they produced on man. No doubt the sun here comes first, but the moon also is often worshipped, and, though less directly, the stars. Many nations have made their own observations about the stars, and these have been traced with more or less plausibility

in many myths. Frequently sun and moon are worshipped together, but some people worship the one without the other. Worship of the moon prevails among the savages of Brazil, the Hottentots, and many African tribes who do not worship the sun. It is too systematic of SCHULTZE and others to maintain that the worship of the moon is more ancient and indicates a lower stage than the worship of the sun. Nor is it true without exception, that agricultural people are chiefly worshippers of the sun. In China, for instance, the sky is preeminently worshipped, and yet the brilliant phenomena in it have not attracted general attention. However, we only mention these exceptions because the worship of the sun is so immensely extended. In Egypt, as in Peru, the sovereigns derive their origin from the sun; in India, as well as in Greece, where offerings and homage are offered to Helios, among uncivilised as well as civilised tribes, we meet with the worship of the sun. Many festivals which survive in popular customs testify to the worship of the sun in its annual course.

CHAPTER 14. — **The Worship of Men.**

Books of Reference. We do not here mention the above-named general works by TYLOR and SPENCER, nor the works on each particular religion which will be mentioned later on, which deal partly or entirely with the worship of the dead or of ancestors. But we must mention the works of J. LIPPERT, Der Seelencult in seinen Beziehungen zur althebräischen Religion (1881); Die Religionen der europäischen Culturvölker, der Litauer, Slaven, Germanen, Griechen und Romer (1881); Christenthum, Volksglaube und Volksbrauch (1882), in which the view, that all religion has been developed from worship of souls, is carried to the last extreme, and is supported with rich but often not over-trustworthy material. Lasting value can be attributed to the book by FUSTEL DE COULANGES, La Cité Antique (first published in 1864), in which the importance of the worship of the dead for the well-being of the society and of the state amongst the Greeks and Romans

is carefully pointed out. With regard to the connection and difference between the cult of the dead and the worship of saints much can be learned from an interesting example given in IGN. GOLDZIHER, Le culte des saints chez les Musulmans (R. H. R. 1880), Le culte des ancêtres et le culte des morts chez les Arabes (R. H. R. 1884).

The worship of the dead is closely connected with some of the most important doctrines; first with those of psychology, since it takes its roots in conceptions of the soul, which man on the lower stages of civilisation thinks of as a shadow, smoke, breath, image, and the seat of which he tries to find in the human body, whilst in higher stages he is occupied with its materiality and immateriality. On the other hand, the worship of the dead is connected with the theory of the continuance of human existence, with immortality and with the nether world. We shall not deal with these ideas here, but only consider the dead in so far as they are objects of religious worship. As we have already seen, it was this great importance of the worship of the dead which led SPENCER, the philosopher for ever striving after the unity of conceptions, to trace back religion entirely to this one factor. Some, but not many people, follow in his steps, as for instance LIPPERT. According to SPENCER, all gods were originally spirits, all spirits the souls of departed people, a generalisation from which TYLOR with ready tact has been able to escape. We have already proved that another side of religion is as original as the animistic; we have here to add that even the worship of the dead cannot be entirely explained animistically, as the cult of souls. Animistic conceptions may enter into the worship of ancestors, heroes, and saints; but other ideas are so essential to these cults, that they cannot be regarded merely as modifications

of the worship of souls. Sometimes living persons as well as the dead enjoy divine veneration. In order to comprehend the various items of the cult we have chosen a more general heading for this chapter.

Acts of worship of the dead appear in religions of the most various grades of civilisation. Amongst savages this worship assumes different forms; in the religions of civilised nations it has been systematically arranged, and forms a part of official religion belonging either to public or private worship, or to both. We must notice that in these religions the dead are most emphatically distinguished from the gods, and though religiously worshipped, their worship is clearly distinct from that of the gods. Amongst the Persians one cannot mistake the Fravashis for the gods; in India, Srâddha is the special sort of sacrifice offered to the dead; in Greece other names are applied to the altars, sacrifices, and offerings connected with the dead, than to those used in the worship of the Olympian gods; the altar is called ἐσχάρα, not βωμός; the offering of the sacrifice ἐναγίζειν, ἐντέμνειν, not θύειν; the libations themselves χοαί, not σπονδαι. The worship of the dead either refers to individuals, for instance those who died not long ago and whose memory is still living, or to the dead in general. Two objects are kept in view—the well-being of the dead, and of the living. The dead person can become dangerous; he can for instance suck the vital power of the living as a vampire, according to the idea which predominates especially amongst the Slavs; therefore it is necessary to avert this danger and to appease the angry or dangerous spirit. But the idea is more general that the dead occupy themselves with indi-

viduals, families, and estates, to bring blessing and protection, to increase the prosperity of the house, the fruitfulness of the field, and the welfare of the kingdom; therefore they are invoked and gifts are brought to them. For if one expects salvation for oneself from the dead who are worshipped, the advantage which accrues to them from this worship is likewise taken into account. One does not only consider what tends to their fame and honour, but the dead are dependent on the living for their direct needs. Burial is the condition of a happy lot in the other world, and it is therefore the first and most sacred duty of those who are left behind. The Greeks imagined that those who remained unburied wandered restlessly about without finding peace. Amongst the Egyptians the body was made as lasting as possible, so that when the soul returned it might serve again as a dwelling-place. There, as well as on the Roman graves, there were many inscriptions, which begged even passing strangers to recite a sacred formula for the benefit of the soul. In imperial Rome the poorer people formed themselves into collegia, the object of which was a worthy burial of its members; and these funeral collegia were at the same time sacrificial communities. The dead person did not merely require burial. In the other world he continues the life he led on earth; therefore the living have to be careful that he wants for nothing. Food and drink are placed for him, arms and ornaments are buried with him, the warrior is accompanied by his war-horse, and the husband by his faithful wife, for even the custom of burning widows is not exclusively Indian. Nowhere perhaps are the

butcheries in honour of the dead carried to such extremes as in Dahomey, on the western coast of Africa, where after the death of a ruler, hundreds of wives and slaves, soldiers and subjects, are sent willingly or by force after the departed. Even during the rule of his successor, from time to time, messengers are sent after him to tell him about current events. Sacrifices to the dead are offered with the supposition that the dead stand in need of them. The passage of the Odyssey is well known in which troops of the dead eagerly approach the blood of the sacrificial wether, and Tiresias has to drink of this blood before he can soothsay. Besides caring for the burial, and the sacrifices and gifts which either accompanied the dead into the grave at once, or were offered to them later, the worship of the dead consisted also in funereal games, as for instance those in honour of Patroklos in the Iliad, and in funereal feasting, which usually took place a few days after the burial, and yearly on the day of death. It sometimes happened that the grave was regarded as a place of refuge, and that the dead gave oracles. In this way the worship of the dead was closely connected with various sides of religion. But this worship not only dealt with individual beings, but also with the dead in general, who were looked on as divine beings. There is a curious connection between the individual and the dead in general, in the belief that if any of the food destined for the dead was accidentally lost or went astray, it fell to the lot of the poor souls who no longer had friends to bring them food. The dead as a whole, the Pitris as they are called in India, the Fravashis in Persia, and whatever names they had elsewhere, were invoked

and worshipped on certain days; but not only at these festivals of the dead were special sacrifices offered to them. Therefore most of the precepts contained even in the most ancient Indian laws, and which are still carried out to-day in the sacred rites of the Srâddha ceremonies, refer not to individual souls, but to the dead in general. The turn which the Hindus have given to these rites is very characteristic, for the Brâhmans receive the gifts and food as representatives of the dead, the whole ceremonial being laid down in minute detail in the complicated Indian ritual. Even when this is the case, it is not difficult to trace the animistic fundamental trait in this worship of the dead. It is the soul of the dead in its yet semi-material form, whose wants people wish to satisfy, and whose actions people desire to turn to a blessing.

If we now consider the worship of ancestors, the same ideas partly hold good. The ancestor is also a dead person, to whom almost all that has as yet been said applies, and of whose life in the other world the same ideas are formed as of other dead people. But there is something which distinguishes the worship of ancestors essentially from the worship of the dead, as in China, where separate names are used for the departed and for ancestors. It is thoughtless to recognise in every worship of the dead, nothing but the cult of souls. At the yearly festival of the dead held to commemorate the Greeks who fell in the battle of Platææ, it was the patriotic remembrance of the men who found their deaths for the freedom of their fatherland, which was the principal idea. The same can be said of the worship of ancestors. In it the individual soul is merely considered in its connec-

tion with the family. Traces of such a worship of ancestors can be found in various nations; but it was an organised worship chiefly in China, India, Greece, and Rome. In these countries it formed the basis of family religion, as well as of civil law. It was FUSTEL DE COULANGES who first clearly traced the connection between the religion and the laws of the ancient nations; a subject on which more and more light has been thrown by the study of Indian law-books. We now understand the great value which was attached to male successors, for it is through the son only that the continuity of the family as a religious community, and the debts due to ancestors, could be secured. If there is no son, the nearest relative is considered as such, nay even a more distant relative, or a stranger may by adoption take his place. The history of family constitution and of the law of inheritance are influenced by these sacrificial institutions. The law of inheritance and the duty of the funereal cult were indissolubly connected, and that duty was often so heavy that the Romans proverbially called an unmixed pleasure 'hereditas sine sacris.' Among the Romans this connection and everything relating to family religion are very transparent. Ancestors were worshipped, as Dii Manes, and the first ancestor who was considered the protector and genius of the house, as Lar familiaris. Daily or on certain days in every month, and every year, these domestic gods were worshipped. Their annual worship was that of the Dies Parentales in February which ended with the festival of the Feralia. These ceremonies consisted in taking flowers and food, salt and corn to the graves, in order to pacify the Manes. The next day a joyous

repast (Caristia) united the members of the family. Neglect in the worship of the Manes involved the danger that they would bring mischief to the house whilst roaming about as ghosts. To guard against this the father of the family performed certain ceremonies during the nights of the Lemuria. Similar ideas pervade the worship of ancestors elsewhere also: how the ancestor watches over the faithful members of his race, and punishes the crimes of the wicked, is clearly shown in Greek tragedies. We have only to think of Elektra at the tomb of Agamemnon in the Choëphorœ. The collective invocation of the ancestors as prescribed by family religion becomes amalgamated with that of all souls in the worship of the dead. The Dii Manes and the Indian Pitris belong to both, but when their worship forms part of family law their character as ancestors becomes prominent. That character cannot be mistaken in the Chinese religion; the songs of the Shih-king contain frequent descriptions of great ancestral celebrations with sacrificial meals. The precepts of the Lî-kî regulate the honours due to every member of a family according to the various degrees of relationship. In all private and public concerns ancestors are considered, consulted, and even taken along on journeys. It is a prominent feature in this cult that it nowhere rests on sentimental excitement. Excessive mourning is deprecated, the dead derive no advantage from it, and they demand, not tears, but the gifts due to them. Greek tragedy only has elevated these ideas, as in the case of Antigone and Elektra, and without weakening in the least the significance of the worship of the dead and ancestors as a sacred duty and strict ordinance, has excited the

deepest sympathy for the persons who have to fulfil this duty under difficult circumstances, and for the motives by which they were sustained.

Like the cult of the dead and of ancestors, that of ancestors and heroes also becomes merged together; but, as little as the ancestors, must the heroes be considered as essentially and exclusively souls. The transition, as I pointed out, is produced by the worship of the first ancestor as the progenitor of the family, and by extending the private into a public cult. Like the family, the gens also and the clan worship the progenitor, and there remains but a slight difference between him and the Heros Eponymos of a town, of a district, or of a guild. Thus we find that in China the worship of Khung-ʒze is in almost every respect the same as that of the ancestors, except that it is general, and intended for a single person. In Greece, singers, rulers, and benefactors of mythic times are worshipped, such as Theseus, Orpheus, and sometimes also really historical persons, such as Miltiades, Brasidas, Timoleon. Heroes are men who have obtained divine honour by battle and conquest, as for instance Herakles and the heroes of the Trojan and Theban wars. We need not enquire whether some of these heroes were originally gods and never lived as men, for in the belief of their worshippers they are nothing but deified men. This character of a half-god of human descent is essential to the concept of a hero, who arises, not by a god becoming man, but by a man becoming god through genius, virtue, or strength.

We must here refer also to the worship of saints in the great religions which have entered into the in-

heritance of more ancient cults, such as Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam. A saint is a religious hero, a man participating in divine honour, and able to guard and bless his worshippers. But we must distinguish carefully. The worship of saints is widely spread in those three religions, but it is not essential to any of them. We must try to find out historically how it found an entrance into them, and we shall see this when treating of two of them. It can be traced back to several causes. First of all, these religions formed to themselves a moral ideal, and they represent those who have realised this ideal, or have come nearest to it, as brilliant examples. The eyes of the people estranged from many gods turn with preference on those saints, and at last the functions and attributes of the old gods are transferred to them. This is particularly clear in the history of Islam and Christianity. In places where formerly an Arabian chief was honoured people now pray to a Mohammedan saint. Christian saints often show a striking similarity with the old German gods. Such concessions and adaptations were essential for the diffusion of the new religions. These however have always tried to limit saint-worship, and they have never allowed the saints a full religious cult. In Buddhism, the veneration of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and other saints consisting chiefly in the adoration of their images and relics, is widely spread, because that religion had no other cult to offer to the people. It is however a veneration of objects rather than of persons, and has no essential connection with Buddhism. Those sections of the Christian Church which have admitted saint-worship

separate it sharply from the adoration which is due to God only, and theoretically admit no other rank or character for the saints, than their belonging to the triumphant portion of the Church, and their being able by their intercession and merits to bestow blessings on men. In Islam there have never been wanting reactions against saint-worship, which arose from the standpoint of a strict monotheism. Without entering here on the moral contents of the concept of saint, we may point out how the three religions differ in this respect. In Buddhism the idea of a saint is least defined, but it comprehends, according to general Indian ideas, superhuman power and wisdom. In Islam the saint is generally a mystic; in Christianity, a martyr.

The worship of living human beings is not an originally religious phenomenon, and springs from different sources. Men who have something particular and mysterious about them, dwarfs, idiots, or madmen, sometimes white people among a black population, are accepted as divine beings, as endowed with higher powers, and as capable of bestowing help and salvation. The respect enjoyed by living saints in Mohammedan countries, particularly on the northern coast of Africa, where they are called Marabouts, is founded really on the same conception: almost everything is allowed to them, and they are believed to be possessed of superhuman powers. Sometimes sovereigns received religious worship, such as the Inkas in Peru as sons of the sun, the Emperors in China as sons of heaven, the Pharaohs in Egypt as incarnations of the deity. In these cases the worship was meant for the royal dignity rather than for its personal representatives. The same applies to the

Brâhmans of India, who are sometimes worshipped as visible gods. In the cult of Roman emperors we can distinguish several elements; the apotheosis of the Divi and Divæ of the imperial family, comprehended not the ruling emperors only, nor all of them, and took place only after their death. In the provinces, however, their cult was sometimes anticipated even in their lifetime. Some of them, like Augustus, followed in this respect the policy of moderation; others, like Caligula, recognised no limits. His purpose to have his image placed in the temple of Jerusalem is well known. In the imperial cult of that period the following ideas are mixed up together. Some rulers, like Caligula, had themselves worshipped as gods from pride and madness, though this occurred elsewhere also, as for instance in the case of Demetrius Poliorketes and of Herod. According to the moderate policy of Augustus, the worship of the emperors in the provinces by the side of the goddess Roma was really no more than the adoration of the Roman empire, of the state, and its rulers. What is important in this is the expanding of the cult of the imperial family into a state cult. The Lar of Augustus was worshipped publicly by the side of the other Lares. We have thus shown that the worship of living human beings can always be traced back to other and more primitive sources.

Chapter 15 — **The Gods.**

A survey of the objects of religious worship ends naturally in the consideration of the gods. It is true there are many creatures who occupy an intermediate position between God and man: the Hindus recognise

many classes of them ; amongst the Germans, we find giants and dwarfs ; the Greeks, besides the gods, recognise demons and heroes. There are also followers, servants, messengers of the gods, who are reckoned as secondary beings sometimes with the gods, and sometimes not. We have already spoken of the heroes as deified men, the rest we need not consider here, especially as many of them are not at all or hardly the objects of any cult.

We now pass to the gods, but shall not begin with any general definition of their nature or their attributes, such as vital power, or strength, or love. The determining of the various meanings which the idea of a god possesses amongst various nations we shall leave to the later historical descriptions of each religion. We must here deal with a few fundamental ideas and general distinctions only, and shall consider exclusively those gods who possessed a cult, not the various concepts of the infinite, which more or less approach to an idea of the godhead, but do not occupy any place in religious worship.

We are first of all struck by the fact of how many different stages of personification have been reached by the gods of different nations, and even of the same nation. If we compare the heaven (Tien) of the Chinese with the Germanic Wodan, or, amongst the Greeks, gods like Athene and Tyche, their difference is perceived at once. There are gods who are worshipped, even most eagerly, but whose names have remained pure appellatives, whose sex is nothing but grammatical gender ; whereas amongst other gods and goddesses a clearly developed sexual character is traceable. Those gods who remind us only of their

functions and actions, who are entirely conceived as divine powers, we characterise with the well-known name numina, which is taken from the Roman religion in which they are largely represented. Each of these gods possesses his fixed sphere of work, and is entirely absorbed in it. Nevertheless they are invoked like personal gods, nay, even more, for on certain occasions, and in the ordinary circumstances of life, it is just their help that is needed. This is so important that the cult often treats the more personal gods as such numina, and this is indicated by an epithet added to the god's name. If no particular numen watches over the oath, and the highest god has to be invoked, this Zeus is then called Horkios. But myths and art love more personal forms; therefore in nearly all civilised nations these occur by the side of the numina. This is found most especially amongst the Greeks, with whom the personification of the gods attains its greatest height. The Greek gods are, according to the saying of Herodotus, not merely like the Egyptian gods, *ἀνθρωποειδεῖς*, but also *ἀνθρωποφύεις*; we express nearly the same by calling them not only anthropomorphic, but also anthropopathic. The grades of a more or less personal character of the gods are very numerous; sometimes it comprehends only the individuality, and sometimes the likeness to man, whilst the spirit of each religion fixes the meaning in which the personality of the gods is to be understood.

Let us now pass from the outer forms of the idea of god to its meaning. Our attention is first called to the connection between gods and nature. We have already treated the worship of nature-beings, and have proved that though this is an element in it, it

by no means constitutes the whole cult of the gods. It can clearly be seen from myths and from acts of worship that the great gods of mythology are closely connected with certain parts and phenomena of nature; but we cannot therefore at once declare that Zeus is heaven, Wodan air, &c. The mythologists, who are for ever doing this, know quite well that, firstly, a god like Zeus is connected with more than one natural phenomenon, and, secondly, that he exercises numerous functions which have nothing to do with nature. This is generally explained thus: Zeus is originally sky, the many phenomena in the sky belong therefore to his essence; but later on, in the course of development, he has received other functions and attributes without losing his nature-character. We need here only call to mind that the first of these periods is withdrawn from our eyes, and that we nowhere meet with the great gods of mythology as simple nature-creatures. The god of heaven is also the guardian of the people, the disposer of fates, the protector of the law, and therefore possesses attributes which would not belong to him as a mere nature-being. Besides, these gods differing thereby from the deified individual nature-beings, represent the general order of things, the regularity of phenomena, the battle of the elements, the light of heaven, which might be called the more abstract side of nature.

In spite of all this, the connection between most of the deities of mythology and the life of nature cannot be mistaken. But besides this connection, their difference also from nature-beings must be emphasised. This has been often attempted; the process of the spiritualisation of religion and divine

beings has been described with great tact and taste by WELCKER as regards the Greek system of gods, and most cleverly by ASMUS[1] as regards the Indo-Germanic religions. This fertile idea forms also the foundation for part of VON HARTMANN'S theory. Of course this development cannot be proved historically; the reform of the Greek religion described by WELCKER was complete already at the time of Homer, and that process took place everywhere in prehistoric times. We must not forget that the adoption of a development, by which the mere nature-creatures became the gods of historic times, depends entirely on the analysis of these divine beings. Whoever has occupied himself with the mythology best known to us, namely the Greek, knows how difficult it is to get possession of even part of the history of a god, and how utterly impossible it is to trace it from its very beginning. We shall here mention the principal elements necessary to the raising of the divine beings above this sphere of nature-life. Firstly, the organisation of the divine families. The gods are joined into larger or smaller groups, which are connected by relationship with one another; they form families or commonwealths, are subordinated to a ruler who governs as lord over all, or else occupies the first place as primus inter pares. Those who trace these relations of the gods back to relations of nature as their last source, are on a wrong track: Apollo, the son of Zeus, does not mean the sun, the son of heaven; and Horus, the son of Osiris, did not, at least originally, mean the

[1] P. ASMUS, Die indogermanische Religion in den Hauptpunkten ihrer Entwickelung (2 vols., 1875, 1877).

returning sun, the son of the setting sun. Groups and cycles of gods as in Egypt, a hierarchy of divine beings as in Persia, a family and a state of the gods as in Greece and Germany, have arisen partly from the fusing of various cults, partly from the necessity of finding again in the world of the gods, the characteristics of human society. But this was one step only towards the transforming of individual gods, who as members of a great whole, and through their reciprocal relationships, attain a peculiar stamp. Other causes worked in the same direction. Art represented the forms of the gods plastically, and the heart of man connected with their service certain moral blessings and cravings. Thus, through æsthetic and ethic spiritualisation, the gods were brought nearer to man both outwardly and inwardly, and raised into ideals of human perfection. With deities developed in this way we almost forget whatever of their natural character still clings to them. We only see the sharply defined person before us, the god or the goddess who represents one side of life in a concrete form, but in ideal glorification. Both are absent when the gods are transformed into intellectual ideas, but the result is nevertheless the same, namely, the loosening of the bond between gods and nature. Our thought strives after the general and the abstract, and therefore seeks also in the single gods their general nature, and is inclined to put the individual gods in the background, for the general idea of the divine. This has the greatest influence on the conception of the idea of god; but cult follows unwillingly, or not at all, this work of thought. Thought realises, though not completely, the idea of a world-

unity; it grasps the idea of a natural ritual and moral world-order, which the gods also have to enter. In this way concepts are formed for that unity and world-order, such as *Rita*, Asha, Maat, τὸ θεῖον by the side of οἱ θεοί. And the whole world of the gods is represented as moving on this more general basis, nay as perishing with the world, as can be seen in the Greek system of the gods in their relation to μοῖρα, and more especially in Germanic mythology. These thoughts find their mythical expression in the description of the cosmogony which is at the same time a theogony, and in the theory of the renewal and the annihilation of the world with which the gods themselves are included. The single gods are here represented as transient and limited in their nature; they depend for their support on the food of the gods, which is sometimes conceived as sacrificial, but sometimes also as the cosmic element that constitutes the world. It cannot be denied that in these myths, ideas borrowed from nature-life play a part, but the leading idea, namely the incorporation of the single gods into the universal life, is by no means taken from the observation of nature-conceptions, but belongs to the abstract conception of the theory of the gods.

Till now we have only discussed those gods who have a distinctly nature-side attached to them. But there are others who are either not at all, or not originally, but only secondarily, connected with nature. These are not merely subordinate forms, personifications of abstract ideas, or even numina in the sense explained above, but many of the chief gods of civilised nations belong to this class; first of all many gods of tribes, nations, and localities. It

is possible that Assur, the chief god of the Assyrians, may possess a meaning in nature-life also. This is nearly certain as regards the Babylonian gods, like Bel, Maruduk, and Istar; and it is also very probable as regards the Roman gods Jupiter and Mars, as well as the Greek Dionysos and the Indian Siva. Nevertheless these gods are not essentially nature-gods, for the former are national gods, and the two last represent certain spheres of life. The gods of death and of the lower world are to be understood in the same way. The part of the world where they dwell, the upper kingdom of light of Yama and the gloomy lower world of Hades, must not be considered as a nature-region, but as the dwelling-place of the dead. A particular class of gods is formed by the gods of cult, that is, by those who have arisen from the deification of a cult, or of its single elements. But one must not imagine that the god disappears behind the cult and is only considered as its postulate, for the act of worship itself, the sacred formula which operates with such power, the drink-offering which is poured out, is looked upon as a great god, and is even prayed to. The history of Indian religion will show us the great importance which these ideas may assume.

The superhuman influences which tell upon man and determine his life are either beneficent or hurtful. Hence he conceives his gods as good or bad, and his fear of the bad gods preponderates often so greatly, that he adores them most. This struggle among the gods is again not to be conceived as exclusively a struggle of the powers of nature, for it is not nature only that makes man conscious of the opposition between what

is useful and what is hurtful, an opposition which he expands ethically to one between good and bad. With regard to this struggle, different nations stand on very different stages. Where the gods are entirely numina, it is possible to distinguish the beneficent from the hurtful, but there is no sharp opposition between the two. Among certain civilised nations also, the Chinese, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Romans, this opposition shows itself either not at all, or slightly only, as for instance in some of their less developed myths. Among others it occupies a very prominent place in two different directions. Either the noxious powers are conceived as hostile, opposed to the gods, demoniacal beings attacked and conquered by the gods; or the evil one is himself a god of the same nature and origin, as for instance the Persian Ahriman, the Egyptian Set-Typhon, and the Northern Loki. A higher stage is reached by the Israelitic religion, which comprehends the good and the evil in Jahve, and thus in principle overcomes the belief in a devil. This, however, can only happen on the foundation of monotheism, which recognises one only God as the ruler of the whole world. In other religions also there are beginnings of this conception of one god who rules the whole world, or at least what seems to be the whole world from a limited point of view. Thus the gods Pragâpati, Visvakarman, and others whom we find in India, are only general concepts gained by abstraction and do not influence religion. The Persians have advanced furthest in this direction, and represent the evil spirit as subordinate to the supreme good god, and as conquered by him. A universalistic idea of the godhead which

dominates religion also, has in the old world been reached by the prophets of Israel only. Further discussions on the contents of the idea of God, we may safely leave to the philosophy of religion and to dogmatic theology.

CHAPTER 16. — Magic and Divination.

Books of Reference. In regard to this very comprehensive literature, we refer to the general works (for instance by TYLOR) and to those on magic and divination which must be mentioned later with the individual religions. At present we only mention the last chapters of J. GRIMM'S Deutsche Mythologie, with the appendices of the 4th edition. We must still refer to ALFR. MAURY, La magie et l'astrologie dans l'antiquité et au moyen-âge (1860); A. BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité (4 vols. 1879-1882, in which the literature on divination can be found). Since we do not include the Israelitic religion in our survey, we must now mention the small but important essay by W. ROBERTSON SMITH, On the forms of divination and magic enumerated in Deut. xviii. 10, 11 (Journal of Philology, vols. xiii and xiv). Rich material on the importance which a belief in witchcraft exercised on the Christian world also, has been cleverly put together by W. E. H. LECKY, History of the rise and influence of the spirit of Rationalism in Europe (2 vols.), and by W. G. SOLDAN, Geschichte der Hexenprocesse (1843). Besides all this, collections of Folklore yield some material.

'To work wonders means to let superhuman forces exercise a beneficial influence; to use witchcraft, is to make them exercise harmful and improper influence. Wonders are divine, witchcraft is diabolical; witchcraft was attributed only to fallen or despised gods.' We shall not take this definition of J. GRIMM'S as our foundation; for it gives rise to many doubts. It contains an ethic condemnation of witchcraft in the same way as Plato rejects magic arts, because man thus tries to make divine power suit his own ends. Some take the following view of the matter, that it must be presupposed that man could obtain supernatural powers. If this is properly carried out, then it

is called the power of working wonders, whilst witchcraft is the illegitimate working of wonders. Others again regard the supernatural as belonging entirely to magic. But the importance of magic does not lie in these contrasts. Four principal features must be considered in a belief in witchcraft and its practice. Firstly, one must regard witchcraft as the clumsy unsuccessful attempt made by man to govern nature. In order to do this he does not follow the safe road of knowledge, but hastily considers ideal coincidences as real ones, and thus tries to influence and alter circumstances. This feature has been well brought out by TYLOR. At the same time witchcraft is closely connected with animism and fetishism, as can be clearly seen in our former description of these tendencies. Through the object which is the fetish, power is exercised on the indwelling spirit, and other results depend on the spirits whom the magician thinks he influences by certain means or formulas. The last feature emphasised in the above-mentioned words of GRIMM also, is very important: namely, that the more highly developed nations look with contempt, if not without fear, on the older, lower, or foreign nations and their gods, as magicians. Thus did the Christians regard the Germans, and the Normans the Fins and Laps. In these two last causes lies the inducement to connect witchcraft with demonology and belief in devils, which is so often done. Finally witchcraft is not merely systematised for practice, but it forms also the foundation of a complete philosophical view of the universe. Before we come to examine this, it will be well to take a survey of the most important phenomena of this subject.

We shall not enumerate the races and nations specially given to witchcraft as the list would contain all. Magic belongs to the most general phenomena of the life of man, in all parts of the world and on all stages of civilisation. Amongst savages nearly their whole religion consists in witchcraft, in which, in form only, there exist important differences, for instance, in the means used (magic wands, drums, touchings, and invocations, &c.). They differ also, in so far, as with some these means, and with others the ecstatic state of the magician (as amongst the Shamans) is considered of the greatest importance. As a proof of the truth of TYLOR'S definition, mentioned above, we may mention that an image, or a part of the body (either a hair or a nail) of a man or an animal possessed by the magician, gives him power over the being itself, and that a symbolical or imitative treatment produces a certain result; for instance, if water is poured out, rain will be produced. In the religions of civilised nations magic has its firm and prominent place in the organised cult, more especially amongst the Chinese, Assyrians and Babylonians, Egyptians, Indians, and Romans. We cannot maintain that the Persians have strongly developed this side, as one might imagine from the name Magi, which is taken from their priesthood; on the contrary, their law-book contains ordinances against magicians. The Greeks in particular always objected to magic. The characters in which magic was embodied in their mythology, Medea and Kirke and the goddess Hekate, were looked upon as strangers to real Hellenism, and magic arts were repeatedly prohibited in Athens. One may in general measure the greater or smaller importance of magic

in any religion, by finding out whether the gods are conceived more as numina or as personal beings, and likewise by observing whether the liturgic texts and the sacred songs have the character of magic formulas. No organised cult has entirely freed itself from this magic character, or if such is the case, as in the confessional assemblies of Buddhist monks, or in the hours of edification among Protestant sects, the true character of a cult has almost entirely vanished. On the higher stages of religious development magic continues only as a survival, but even there, in the lower strata of society, it is often diffused as superstition, or in secret societies, and surrounded with the charm of higher art and deeper wisdom.

It is not our intention to enumerate every kind of magic. There is witchcraft for averting dangers in general and likewise particular dangers. The commander of an army tries by witchcraft to bind victory to his colours, the architect to secure the strength of his building, the householder the security of his house. Witchcraft is used against dangers on journeys, against wild animals, to secure fair weather, to avert illness, to bring about happy delivery, to avert the evil influences of demons or enemies. One may injure one's enemies by magic means, bewitch them by the evil eye, or through injury done to their images. Diodorus Siculus mentions three means which answer such purposes: *καθαρμοί*, *θυσίαι*, *ἐπῳδαί*. Sacred words and formulas are most widely diffused, some of which have been preserved to us from ancient times, for instance, in the Atharva-Veda, the Tantra literature of Buddhists and Sivaites, the Egyptian funeral texts, and the Assyro-Babylonian forms of conjuration. There

were, besides, magic words also, the secret names of the gods, many unintelligible words which had to be murmured or written down, pictures which had to be carried about; many amulets or talismans consist of such written formulas. Other magic means are, restorative draughts, life-elixirs, philtra, magic knots, rings, images of gods, wax figures of men, and many more. But nowhere has magic proved more mischievous than in a belief in witches. It was believed that men could sell themselves by contract, or carnal intercourse (incubi and succubi) to evil spirits or even to the devil. They thus acquire superhuman powers, and bewitch other people. This belief in witchcraft which shows itself as perfectly harmless in popular tales, has led in Christian Europe to the horrors connected with the persecution of witches. We shall not write this tragic history here, but we must say that even those who do not like rationalistic enlightenment will learn from that history its historical necessity and its beneficial influence.

This belief in witchcraft has led even to a pseudo-scientific theory; we find the beginnings of it in the old religions, as for instance in that of China. Such a theory is implied in the magic exercises of the Buddhists, who by a constant meditation of the universal spheres, try to gain superhuman powers, dominion over nature, and freedom from her limitation. It was brought to its highest perfection by the neoplatonic philosophy which undertook to seize the religious inheritance of the whole world, and to impart to it a philosophical foundation and a new life. The magic practices of the old religions were adopted and adapted to a philosophical demonology. This was

called theurgia, the rites of which were borrowed from the Egyptian [1], the Persian, and other religions, while its doctrine consisted in a perfectly elaborated demonology, so popular among later Platonists. Amongst Jews (Kabbala) and Christians similar ideas of demoniacal beings and influences led to a belief in witchcraft, to which older and more modern theosophists were attracted by cosmic speculations. It is assumed by them that the world forms a unity, and that this cosmic unity fully accounts for the influence exercised by one portion on the other. The means employed, which are apparently quite inadequate for their object, and the senseless formulas, are supposed to have an essential connection with the whole, or the cosmos. The draught is believed to be a real life-elixir because it contains the vital element of the world, and the secret word is the formula of the universe, and therefore the key which dissolves the ban and solves the riddle. In fact here also analogy, which sober science treats as merely ideal, is taken to be real. Usually this philosophical or theosophic foundation of magic includes the conception of demons also, as representatives of cosmic powers.

Divination (mantic) is closely connected with magic, for it is not only prophetic and tries to discover the future, but is intent also on discovering and afterwards producing good omens, favourable circumstances for enterprises, and means to avert misfortunes. There are cases where one hardly knows whether they should be reckoned as magic or as divination, as, for instance, when the divining rod discovers hidden

[1] The Tractatus de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, ascribed to Jamblichus, is well known.

treasures. Wherever magic flourishes, we find also much practice of divination, but not always vice-versa. The Greeks, for instance, as we saw, did not care much for magic, but oracles formed one of the most prominent features of their religion. The history of religion is full of mantic; it comprises ordeals also, tests of innocence or guilt, by means of fire and water. These ordeals are widely spread among savage nations, and were employed even in Christian Europe at the trials of witches. Mantic has an official place in the cult of several civilised nations. Its ministers have the important duty of interpreting signs, not only for private individuals, but for the state also. As there are nations who believe so strongly in omens that without them they undertake nothing either small or great, no public or private affairs, it is easy to see that soothsayers hold a prominent place by their number, their authority, and their influence. This was the case in the old Chinese state religion, and even in modern China, the peculiar system of divination called Feng-shui which we shall have to treat hereafter, dominates a great part of Chinese life. The Babylonian Chaldeans are the very representatives of soothsaying. At Rome no less than three collegia presided over the different kinds of divination, the Augures, the XVviri S. F., and the Haruspices; while the right to discover the will of the gods in the interest of the state belonged properly to the magistrates, who depended on the assistance of the augurs.

The writings which served as manuals of divination in these colleges, and most of what classical authors have written in Greek περὶ μαντικῆς have been lost. We have only two books of Cicero's de Divinatione

and some treatises on oracles in Plutarch's so-called Moralia. In spite of its sceptical spirit, Cicero's work is interesting on account of numerous notices which are not to be found elsewhere, and likewise by giving us some philosophical views on mantic, particularly those of the Stoa. Plutarch's treatises give us an insight into the great mantic institutions of the time, and contain likewise a specimen of a philosophical explanation of mantic. Such an explanation attempts to derive the significance of certain signs from their cosmic connection, as for instance in the Yî-king in China; it also describes the nature of inspiration, of enthusiasm, and religious madness. These two explanations correspond to two kinds of divination which Cicero distinguishes as artificial and natural, modern writers as inductive and intuitive. Perhaps it would be best to distinguish between an external and internal mantic.

External mantic is occupied with reading signs, and has therefore as many subdivisions as there are signs, τέρατα. One may soothsay from almost everything which one sees or hears, from the rustling of trees, the flickering of fire, the falling of stars, the lines of the hand, playing cards, the burning or dying of lamps, from casual meetings or random words. Historically the most important kinds of sign-mantic are the following; first, astrology which was cultivated as a kind of systematic science by the Chaldeans. The movements of the stars, more particularly of the planets in changing their places in the sky, were brought in connection with certain events on earth, and the life of everybody was under the influence of the horoscope at their birth. A similar

belief prevails also amongst savages in other parts of the world; among the nations of classical antiquity however it was always considered as of Babylonian origin, and connected with the name of the Chaldeans. That it survived in more recent times is proved by the well-known case of Wallenstein, and by many others who have believed in their star. Two other prominent forms of sign-mantic are concerned with birds and with the entrails of sacrificial animals. In Greek the word οἰωνός, bird, took the general meaning of a mantic sign, and in the two words augur and auspicia the word avis has been recognised. Birds are considered as prophetic animals, their appearance on the right, or on the left, and their voices also are full of meaning and reveal the will of the gods. The examination of the entrails, which forms a very developed mantic art, is important in so far also as divination is shown to be closely connected with sacrifice, many animals being killed solely for the purpose of discovering signs in their entrails. Another branch of mantic was concerned with the observation and interpretation of lightning. This fulgural science was considered of Etruscan origin at Rome. Soothsaying by lots also, called cleromantic, was widely diffused. These lots were of different kinds, small staves or dice, they are mentioned several times in the Old Testament, and the priestly oracle of the Urim and Thummim belongs to them. A peculiar way of casting lots consisted in the casual opening of a book. This may have been done by the XVviri when they had to consult the Sibylline books; it is certain that Roman poets (sortes virgilianæ), and later the Bible, were frequently used for that purpose. Lastly, we

have to mention portenta or unusual appearances which caused surprise and terror, and therefore required atoning ceremonies. A belief in the meaning of this and other signs is found in all stages of civilisation. Savages, however, differ from civilised people in two ways. The latter have systematised the art of interpretation, which has become the subject of tradition or research, and the property of a guild. Secondly, they do not look upon signs by themselves, but as being sent by the gods and revealing their will. On this foundation rested the institution of Oracles, which culminated in Greece in the service of Apollo and other deities, and the importance of which can only be understood in their essential connection with the whole of Greek civilisation. Here, however, we meet not only with external, but with internal mantic also.

Internal mantic appears when man himself, without any external signs that have to be interpreted, becomes the organ of a clairvoyant or prophetic spirit, by which he is possessed or inspired. This may be either transitory or permanent, so that man either loses himself and his own consciousness, falling under the power of a foreign spirit, or finds his own spiritual organs intensified and sharpened by that spirit. We cannot attempt here a theory of enthusiasm, but may mention that among philosophers it was particularly Plato who had an eye for its significance. There are three principal divisions of internal mantic ; the first is reading of dreams. How great its value was in the old world is known to every reader of the Old Testament. Among Greeks and Romans also, dreams were much considered, and during the imperial period, Artemi-

dorus wrote his well-known treatise on the interpretation of dreams. The second kind of internal divination, necromancy, is closely connected with it. Instances from the Old Testament, where it is forbidden, and from the Odyssey are well known. Neither the shade of Samuel, nor that of Tiresias, appeared to their questioners in a dream, but in general this must have been the case. The dead manifested themselves by incubation in sleep to those who had prepared themselves by sacrifice and purification for the reception of their oracles. The highest form of divination, however, is that by which the man himself becomes a seer, able to see what is hidden, to discover the divine, and to reveal the secret. This power, which is often ascribed to men in their hour of death, is possessed by some favourites of the gods, or highly-gifted persons, often to their own destruction, as in the case of Kassandra. To this class belong Tiresias and Kalchas, the old Sibyls, and the wise women of the Germans mentioned by Tacitus. Without wishing to sketch here the history of the Israelitic prophets, we must just mention it as the highest manifestation in this domain of internal mantic. If we accept the well-known theory of ROTHE on the coincidence of manifestation and inspiration in divine revelation, we might say that in the Israelitic prophets the internal mantic coincides with the external. The whole history of the world and the fates of their own nation are the signs which they interpret, because they comprehend them with the help of the divine spirit which inspires them. Here, however, where the concept of mantic touches that of revelation our survey must end.

Chapter 17. — Sacrifice and Prayer.

The object of cult is to maintain the relationship between man and God, to reinstate it when it has become clouded. This is done on a lower stage, because man feels that he needs the gifts of the gods, and on a higher stage, because communion with them is a necessity to him. To obtain this object, he on his side brings gifts to the gods, or offers his supplications to them. Sacrifice and prayer are the two chief elements of cult, and are closely connected one with another; for sacrifice is a prayer offered with gifts; and wherever there was an occasion for prayer, there was also an occasion for sacrifice.

The simplest idea connected with sacrifice was that expressed by the Greeks in the almost proverbial saying, πείθειν δῶρα καὶ θεούς; gifts were offered to the gods to obtain their favour and to receive gifts in return: do ut des. These gifts consist in food and drink which are absolutely necessary to the gods. Indra needs the Soma sacrifice to be strengthened in the battle against the demons; Jahve becomes changed if he smells food sacrifices; and even where the connection between the food of the gods and the sacrifice is broken as in the Greek system, yet the gods are always represented as needing sacrificial gifts. As a general rule, however, the idea prevails that sacrifice is the food and drink of the gods. It is placed for them either on their altar or table, in front of their images, or elsewhere; but the manner in which it is transmitted to them differs very much. This is very often conceived in a coarse material way; thus most savages consider that the gods consume the actual substance of the sacrifice. It is seen how the elements

devour the sacrifice, for instance, when things are thrown into water as a sacrifice. The animals also who are religiously worshipped enjoy materially the actual gifts which are offered to them, and even what is placed for the other gods is eaten by the priests who represent them, or else the idols are anointed with the offering. But there are also more spiritual representations of this process. The gods only lick the sacrifice which otherwise remains untouched, or not even the sacrifice itself, but only the finer elements of it, as it were its soul, reaches the gods. This idea can be traced in many forms of sacrifice, for instance in the smoke sacrifice, in which the gods are only offered steam, or incense (to this belongs the smoking of tobacco amongst the Redskins); also in fire sacrifices in which the fire brings the sacrificial material in a spiritualized form to the gods; also in bloody sacrifices, since blood is considered the seat of the soul. With this idea of a feeding of the gods, the thought of a table-communion between gods and men is connected. The dead, ancestors, and gods are said to take part in the meals of men, or at the sacrificial meal a part of the whole which is offered, is taken from the possession of men to that of the gods, and is given back for the sacrificer to enjoy, so that he thus becomes the guest of the gods. Both ideas are important, but it does not seem justifiable to seek the origin of sacrifice, as PFLEIDERER does, in this table-communion.

In what we have said, man makes himself essentially equal with his gods to whom he brings offerings and food. But he raises himself above this point of view as soon as he feels himself bound to offer homage and

thanks to the gods. It is true that man is not uninterested in the sacrifices which, for these reasons, he offers to the gods, but he already gives a deeper meaning to his relationship with the gods, whom he has recognised as superior to himself. The same occurs in regard to the propitiatory sacrifices. As long as these sacrifices possessed the character of averting sacrifices only, to propitiate the gods, to avert all that is evil and horrible, they stand on the lowest stage; but when the idea is added that the reason of divine anger lies in the omissions or commissions of men, then the propitiatory sacrifices for debts or sins possess in different degrees an ethical character. This side appears also in the sufferings and self-denial that man puts upon himself to give satisfaction to his gods. He does not only give of his superabundance, but frequently renounces what is valuable. In sacrifices, egoistic calculation and painful self-denial are often closely connected.

Nearly all events in nature, in political and private life, both the regularly returning and the exceptional, became occasions for sacrifices. Sacrifices were offered by various people on various occasions: at the seasons, at the solstices, at the new year, at new and full moon, at sowing and harvest, during a famine and bad weather, during the breeding of cattle, and pestilence. Sacrifices were offered during war and peace, before battle and at the ratification of treaties. Birth, marriage, and death required sacrifices. But during sickness and danger also, at the building of a house, or the beginning of a journey, on receiving good news, and at every undertaking, sacrifices were offered; nay, there are people who pour out a libation to the gods at every

meal. We must still mention the lustration sacrifices, for the purification of localities, vessels, and people; the mantic sacrifices which we mentioned above; the vows, the kind of private sacrifice which man for certain causes and often for previous promises dedicates to the gods. Amongst civilised nations of the old world the sacrifices not only recurred with great regularity, but they formed the principal part of an organised cult or a ritual. Owing to this they received another meaning besides being intended to produce certain effects on certain occasions. On the contrary, without attributing any special meaning to every sacrifice, the diligent and conscientious observance of the ritual was the condition for an unbroken relationship with the gods, for an undisturbed course of nature, for the welfare of the state, and for the prosperity of families and individuals. Disturbances in any of these spheres point therefore to negligence in the sacrifice, and had to be allayed with special sacrificial gifts.

We meet with the greatest varieties in the sacrificial material. If we look amongst both savages and civilised nations we discover that nearly everything is offered to spirits and gods: human beings, animals, plants, often also costly votive gifts, such as pictures, ornaments, and clothes. In ritual precepts, we find details referring to the choice of gifts and the preparation of food for the gods, regulated with painful exactitude. The sex, age, and colour of animals vary according to the god to whom they are offered. Domestic animals are offered as a rule, but wild animals are not prohibited; sometimes the animals sacred to, or hated by the god are offered to him. By the side of animal sacrifices the offerings of butter and

mashed food are very prominent. In preparing these, oil and salt are often considered essential, and incense also, either by itself or connected with other gifts, is often found. We could enumerate a vast quantity of ordinances concerning the sacrificial material from the books of ritual which are known to us, as well as from what we know concerning the ceremonial customs, for instance, of the old Germans; but it is often impossible to interpret the individual features, or to trace the thoughts from which they have arisen.

We shall only deal more closely with some of the principal questions, and first of all with regard to the priority of bloody or non-bloody sacrifices. In most religions of civilised nations they both occur side by side, but sometimes we can clearly trace a tendency, as in India, to replace the bloody sacrifices by non-bloody ones. It has often been asked which of the two sorts was the most ancient, and important reasons can be brought forward for both sides. For theoretical reasons numerous Greeks, Empedokles and later on Porphyrius, decided in favour of unbloody gifts. And several observances in Greek sacrifices point to the same conclusion, for instance, the strewing of a few barley-corns on the head of the sacrificial animal, the persecution of the man who had killed the animal at the Buphonia, and the punishing of the axe, and likewise the fact that at Delos the altar on which no bloody sacrifices were offered was called *εὐσεβῶν βωμός*, &c. On the other hand, the great antiquity of bloody sacrifices has been sufficiently proved; even in Indo-Germanic antiquity sacrifices of horses were customary. Therefore the question as to priority cannot be decided. As regards this we must still combat one error which is

found but too often even amongst theologians, who might know better from the Old Testament. We may often read the statement that the shedding of blood is most closely connected with propitiatory sacrifice, and that therefore the universality of bloody offerings proves also the universality of the consciousness of sin amongst men. But here later combinations of ideas have been wrongly generalised and transferred to primitive conditions.

Human sacrifices formed a great part of bloody sacrifices. In ancient religions also, which have not received it into their ritual, the memory of the earlier custom is clearly preserved, as in China, India, and also in the Old Testament; amongst the Greeks it occurs even in historical times. Many stories tell of a reaction against this old custom, as among the Greeks, the story of Atreus and Thyestes and that of Iphigenia, and in the Old Testament, that of Abraham's sacrifice. But still its traces and remains are not entirely wiped out. Amongst the ancient Germans also human beings were sacrificed, and in Mexico at religious festivals they were butchered by hundreds. The conception of sacrifice as a meal of the gods, and the sacrificial feast which followed it, seemed to point back to an original connection between human sacrifices and anthropophagy, though in many places this was forgotten later on; but it can still be clearly seen amongst many savages. Though such a connection can really be proved here and there, it cannot be established as so universal as to enable us to draw a safe conclusion from the existence of human sacrifices to cannibalism. The sacrificial human victims need not always be regarded as food for the gods; they

were often sent to them as servants and messengers, or offered by the people as their dearest to avert the divine wrath. In this light we can comprehend the self-sacrifice of a king, which occurs amongst the Germans, and the giving up of a son as is told about the Moabite king, Mesa. By the side of this offering of the noblest and dearest beings, which we see, for instance, in Carthage, we find also that enemies taken in war, slaves, and malefactors were used for the great butcheries of the Mexican gods. It was in Mexico also, that the victims were considered as representatives of the god, and were clad and honoured accordingly. As therefore the sacrificed beings need not be regarded as food for the gods, we cannot trace back all anthropophagy to sacrificial motives. The madness of hunger, the desire of revenge against enemies, and the idea that one appropriates the power and courage of any one whose heart, eye, and tongue are devoured: these are all reasons for anthropophagy, and have nothing to do with human sacrifice [1].

Some sacrifices are merely offered symbolically or vicariously; some people claim to see in this only the traces of an older, and later on altered form of cult. To these belong sacrifices in which part is given instead of the whole; this refers especially to the custom of sparing the life of a man, by making a wound and letting blood flow to pacify the god. To these likewise belong the numerous maimings which form part of religious customs amongst savages. Thus we find the wide-spread sacrifice of a finger, the sacrifice of hair, amongst the Arabs, and also in the Malayan Archipe-

[1] On this subject see the interesting work by R. ANDREE, Die Anthropophagie (1887).

lago; as well as the bloody scourging of youths before the altar of Artemis in Sparta; circumcision, which is so common in Africa, the original meaning of which was not quite forgotten amongst the Israelites, as can be seen from the account given in Exodus iv. 23 seq. Mutilation also, which was practised still in later times in the service of the goddesses of Asia Minor, and the tatooing of the Polynesians, formerly possessed this meaning, by which we do not mean to deny that in the course of time all kinds of other ideas were introduced into it. Substitution likewise occurs in which the animal is sacrificed for the man, as the ram was for Isaac. The offering of gifts in effigy is also very common; thus dolls are burnt or drowned instead of human beings, and dough or cake shaped like animals is offered to the gods in place of these animals.

To the greater part of mankind at the present day, the sacrifices which in the old religions played such a prominent part are a thing of the past, of which only a few survivals exist. The idea of sacrifice is quite foreign to Buddhism; it is, according to the principles of this religion, not possible to name a being to whom such gifts should be offered, nor to attribute any worth to these gifts. Nevertheless the Buddhist people, who cannot dispense with forms of worship, offer gifts consisting principally of flowers and incense to the images and relics. But we need hardly say that this is merely a miserable remnant of sacrifice. Rather more has survived in Islam, for at the feast of Mekka, and at the Beihram, many sacrificial animals are slain throughout the whole Mohammedan world. Here again we see a few preserved

remains of ancient religions placed before us; for this custom does not belong to pure Islam. Just as little is the idea of sacrifice essential to Christianity, and in the course of centuries it has also become foreign to Judaism. The Jewish religion has never abolished sacrifices; but since they can be offered legally in the Temple of Jerusalem only, the worship of God without this Temple, which has been forced on the Jews for centuries, has produced the necessary result that this nation has accustomed itself to a new form of worship without sacrifice, though in principle it desires the return of the old cult. Christianity is a daughter of the Jewish synagogue, and therefore, from its very beginning, a religion without sacrifice. Still Christianity has often represented the redeeming death of Christ as a sacrifice, and in the Roman Catholic church the ceremony recalling this act, namely the mass, is therefore considered as a sacrificial act. The gifts, which are made a duty to the faithful, culminating in their highest point in the resignation of self to God, the offering of one's whole person to His service, are viewed by all sections of the Christian church as sacrificial. But sacrifice is here taken in such a symbolical meaning, and in a sense so utterly different from that assigned to it by ancient religions, that we cannot bring ourselves to regard sacrifice as belonging to the essence of Christianity.

Prayer is often the language which accompanies sacrifice; it becomes a magic formula, in so far as operative power is attributed to the words themselves. Such fixed formulas which admit of no deviation were probably everywhere in use; they are known to us in many religions, even amongst civilised nations, al-

though they are not always comprehensible. Anyhow it is difficult to draw a sharp boundary line between those formulas which we reckon amongst prayers and those which we regard as conjurations. Many magic sayings to produce rain, cannot be considered as prayers, but the simple formula of the Athenians asking Zeus for rain, was considered by Marcus Aurelius as the type of a prayer, ἁπλῶς καὶ ἐλευθέρως. In Buddhism the 'Thou' does not occur in prayer, for there is no one to whom the pleader turns; nevertheless the formulas which are repeated thousands of times in prayer-wheels and prayer-flags (om mani padme hum) are counted as prayers. In prayers we have to consider various sides. First of all the request for external goods. Amongst the many prayers of savages collected by Tylor, these requests for health, children, rain, harvest, cattle, and similar things are very prominent. But man also implores the gods for mental gifts, and Cicero's saying, 'virtutem nemo umquam deo acceptam retulit[1],' is refuted by several witnesses in classical antiquity, as for instance Socrates, who first prayed to the gods for inward beauty, and only then for outward beauty answering to it. From Socrates originates the beautiful prayer for good in general, because the gods know best what is good. We have here got beyond egoistic prayer; the same can be said as regards the prayers of thanksgiving, in which one gratefully offers thanks to the giver for the gifts received. By the side of request the most important element in prayer is adoration, in which one reverentially does homage to the godhead, and lifts up one's heart

[1] Cicero, De Nat. Deor. iii. 36; cf. Xenophon, Memorab. i. 3. 2; Plato, Alkib. ii. 143 A, Phaedrus, 279 B; Maxim. Tyr. Diss. xi. 8.

to it and is reverentially absorbed in the thought of its majesty. Such adoration can be clothed in various forms, it can be traced in the simple words of a Samoyede old woman, told us by CASTREN, who greeted the sun when it set and then went to bed. It can be traced also in many of the Old Testament psalms and Greek hymns in honour of the gods, in the first requests in the Lord's prayer, as well as in the Salât ceremony which the Moslem has to repeat five times daily. Our survey of the principal ideas contained in prayer would be incomplete if we did not touch on the confession of sin; not only in Israelitic and Christian, but also in Indian, Persian, and Assyrian prayers the consciousness of sin is expressed, or at all events the feeling of some neglect towards the godhead.

The most various customs occur in the manner and ways of prayer: sometimes a person stands erect, gazing towards heaven, sometimes he kneels with bowed head, the hands folded or spread out, the head covered or bare. In great suffering or contrition the beating of forehead and breast often occurs. The following thoughts seem to have suggested the various positions of the body: eyes or hands are raised towards the place where the dwelling of the godhead is thought to be, from whence help is expected; or the same attitude is taken to which one feels in duty bound if imploring the protection of a mighty ruler, or the imploring man shows by his very position that he 'offers and submits himself as a defenceless sacrifice to the powerful god, to his conqueror.' (J. GRIMM.) A series of positions and movements form often an essential part of prayer. The Mohammedan ceremony of Salât,

for instance, consists equally of such movements, and of the formulas which accompany them. Orientation is also important in prayer, either towards the east where the sun rises, or towards a fixed sacred place like Jerusalem and Mekka, or some other spot, such as the north, which was the sacred direction amongst the heathen Germans.

Oaths and cursings are a form of prayer; and ordeals also, of which we have already spoken under the head of mantic. We find among several nations the invocation of God as a witness, and therefore the surrendering of oneself to His vengeance in cases of perjury; and curses also, which people imagine they can call down on their enemies. That all these really belong to prayers, is clearly shown by their character, but we cannot here enumerate the various forms and the symbolic acts which accompany them.

CHAPTER 18. — **Other Religious Acts.**

It would be labour lost to attempt an enumeration of all the acts of which cult consists, or which are undertaken in the service of the gods. We need only mention some of the most important. Music and dancing occupy a preeminent place in cult almost everywhere. If the success of the formula depends on the precision with which it is repeated without any mistake, then it is as essential that it should always be repeated with the same modulation of the voice. In this way the cult formula becomes a cult hymn, and is developed both poetically and musically. Thus the bacchus songs of the Greeks became the choruses of tragedy. Or else a hymn remains in use for centuries in an antique form which has become incomprehensible, like

the song of the Arval brothers in Rome. But music plays a part in cult, not in the form of song only, for instruments also are used to accompany religious acts. This occurs even among savages, who not only make a fearful noise to drive out evil spirits, but use rough drums and trumpets also at their religious ceremonies. Savages, however, have never produced a theoretically developed musical art. It is commonly said that Pythagoras was the first to connect music with arithmetical proportions; but amongst other nations also, as for instance amongst the Chinese, the theory of music was independently developed. However this may be, we hear of musical instruments used for accompanying the singing of sacred songs, or otherwise used in cult, in the Old Testament, as well as amongst other nations. Thus we know from Plutarch's description that the sistrum was used in the worship of Egyptian deities. In Christian church music, the organ has superseded all other instruments, because, owing to the richness of its tones, it seems to contain many of them in itself. However, here also the vox humana has a place of honour by the side of instruments. We shall here only touch in passing on the difference between the development of church music in the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, and the importance of Christian church music, which expresses or arouses finer shades of religious feeling.

Dancing is closely connected with music; it possesses such great importance in the religions of lower races, that some people have even seen in it the most ancient form of worship. During the singing of the songs or the playing of the instruments, all kinds of rhythmic movements are made, the symbolic meaning

of which remains for the most part unknown to us. It is clear that dancing was used to arouse a religious frame of mind; the magician-priests of savages often bring on a state of madness by wild dances, and when they fall down exhausted they are said to be inspired or possessed by the god. From the same ideas we can explain the wild dances of the priests of the mother-goddess of Asia Minor, and those of the dancing and turning dervishes, which Islam has allowed to be introduced into its religious customs. Dances amongst savages are mostly of two kinds, either warlike or lasciviously erotic. Whether we should see in this a totemistic ceremony connected with the clan worship of animals, or an imitative representation of physical phenomena, or stories of the gods, we may leave undecided. But it is certain that amongst civilised nations, the religious importance of dancing is much less than amongst savages. It is true that dancing here and there retains a place in cult, as at the vernal rites in Rome when the Salii brought out the sacred shields, but generally it is on the wane, or is changed into solemn processions or mimic representations at festivals.

Such processions occur in most organised cults; we find them amongst the Egyptians as well as amongst the Greeks and Romans; amongst the ancient Germans, the procession of Nerthus was something similar; and the carnival processions which last to the present day in popular customs, are the remains of ancient heathen practices. The cult of the Roman Catholic church has preserved processions in their full meaning, which is this, that the pictures or symbols of the gods (for instance in the phallic processions) are carried about, so that the people may gaze on

them and be blessed by their presence. Of course the gods themselves or their representatives do not always form part of the processions, for it is often their priests or servants who go to their sanctuaries in solemn order. By the side of processions we must mention pilgrimages to shrines or sacred spots. Everywhere where a central sanctuary, a famous grave, or a festive Panegyris possess sufficient attractions, the pilgrims stream thither, as formerly the Jews during the Diaspora towards Jerusalem, and even now the Moslems towards Mekka. But besides these great and generally well-known places of pilgrimage there are many others in India, as well as in China, in the whole Mohammedan, as well as in the Roman Catholic world.

We shall not here consider the many ceremonies and performances connected with religious festivals, because we shall later on come back to them in our survey of religious holidays. There still exist many rites which either by themselves, or connected with others, occur over a very extended area, as for instance in America, the widespread vapour baths; but we cannot enter into details. We must still touch on three rites which possess an almost universal and profound meaning: these are fastings, purifications, and consecrations.

The object of fasting is either to arouse or subdue sensuality. Amongst savages it generally occurs with the former object. Fasting belongs to the rites by which a magician prepared himself for an important act, or to those which a youth passes through at the age of puberty, when he is declared to be a man, and chooses his fetish. These rites aim at producing a state of ecstasy or stupefaction, and fasting contributes to it, as it is well known that abstinence as well as

immoderate enjoyment calls forth a nervous crisis. In the same way monks excite their fanaticism to the utmost degree by fasting and flagellations, as may be seen in the Christian as well as the Mohammedan world. Other ideas also are connected with fasting. In the Old Testament it often occurs as a sign of mourning, still more as a sign of repentance, and we can see from St. Matthew, that amongst the Jews in the time of the New Testament, it was practised with great ostentation. Amongst Hindu as well as Buddhist monks fasting was a means of killing sensuality, of overcoming the limits of the finite and of gaining superhuman powers. In Islam no particular reasons are given for fasting, but it is simply regarded in the light of a religious duty, and as a positive command. The Roman Catholic church regards fasting from the standpoints of mortification of the flesh and of spiritual exercise. There are various kinds of fasting. Sometimes certain restrictions of enjoyments are unconditionally imposed on all followers of a religion, as for instance the Moslems, who must abstain from wine, and the Buddhists from meat. Sometimes fasting is only commanded on certain days or certain occasions: some people must prepare themselves for important religious ceremonies by fasting or abstaining from sexual intercourse, more particularly the priests. Sometimes certain religious communities are bound to a severe ascetic course of life, as the Pythagoreans, the Essenes, and many monastic orders. There is this other difference, that fasting often occupies a fixed place in an organised cult and therefore recurs regularly, as the great fast in the month of Ramadhân amongst the Moslems, and the

carnival of the Roman Catholic church, while it is also left to the free will, and is practised under great affliction, or in fulfilment of a vow. Fasting represents the ascetic side of religion. In this custom we see the idea, that although enjoyment itself is not sinful, yet the abstinence practised by men brings them closer to the gods.

A similar idea, that man by himself, at least in certain circumstances, is not fit for communion with the gods shows itself in the no less widely spread rites of purification. We must not however confound ritual purity, produced by such ceremonies, with moral purity, or with cleanliness: the object of ritual purity is only the preservation or restoration of the conditions requisite for the performance of religious acts, or for remaining within a religious community. Therefore the priests, more particularly those who undertake the rites of cult and approach the gods, are bound by all kinds of precepts of purification, which vary amongst different nations; they are often made to wear linen clothes only, to eat vegetable food and to observe chastity, or they must carry out with great exactitude certain ordinances, as did the Flamen Dialis at Rome; they must avoid seeing or touching anything unclean, and before sacrificing they must carry out certain ablutions or other ceremonies. Similar laws of purification hold good in certain sectarian or monastic religious societies which have been mentioned under the head of fasting, such as the Pythagoreans, the Essenes, and others, amongst whom these rules are universal laws of life, unconnected with any particular ceremony. The same refers to the prohibitions of certain foods, which some religions impose as a

duty on all their followers. Amongst many nations an important place is occupied by the purifications on entering life and on leaving it. Not merely the religious laws of certain nations who have codified them, but also the religious customs of many savage races, prescribe that a child during its first days must pass through many purifying acts, and that the mother also must submit to similar purifications. Death is regarded as a great source of defilement, and even the sight of a dead person causes impurity and necessitates purifications. By rites of purification, which work almost as magical means, men try to place a physical barrier between the living and the dead. Small and involuntary errors, and certain illnesses make people impure. The impurity of a murderer such as Orestes is of a different kind, and necessitates purifications; in a capital crime the conceptions of purification and expiation are closely connected.

Amongst almost all nations we find some, though often unwritten, precepts of purification. These laws are peculiarly developed amongst the civilised people of antiquity, Egyptians, Indians, Greeks, and Romans, and amongst Persians and Jews they form even a principal part of their sacred writings. But not persons only were objects of purification. Fire also could be purified and renewed by the bringing of pure wood, and by the dividing of the impure fire amongst several hearths, which were then extinguished, with the exception of one. A previous lustration of sacrificial vessels was also necessary. A house or road which had become impure owing to the presence of a dead body had to be cleansed. In Rome a lustratio pagi took place at the Ambarvalia for the success of

the fields, a lustratio populi after the census, and a lustratio urbis in times of trouble. Among means of purification the first place is occupied by water, which is used for washing, bathing, or sprinkling. We need here hardly call to mind the purifying rite of baptism. If water is wanting, as sometimes happens to Arabs in the desert, it can be replaced by sand. By the side of water, fire is an important means of purification; many things have to pass through fire, or to be fumigated. Amongst Indians and Persians, but also amongst far distant savage races, urine and more especially cow urine is used for the same object. But sacrifices also are offered for the sake of purification, such as suovetaurilia at the Roman Ambarvalia, and purifying powers are attributed to the blood of the sacrificial animals. To these Roman lustrations belongs also the procession in which the sacrificial animals were led round the object which was to be lustrated. By the side of all these means and connected with them, purifying formulas are repeated. Purification did not always consist in one single act, but sometimes in a series of similar acts, as at the great lustration ceremony, which is described in the Persian Vendidad, and which lasted nine nights. Lustration therefore occupies a prominent position in the ritual. If one gets beyond this point and emphasises the moral instead of the ritual side, the purification becomes atonement, as was the case more especially in the Roman Empire. These two ideas touch one another, but are not identical.

A different shade of meaning is connected with the idea of consecration, which we find in certain religions. Amongst some nations a sharp line is drawn between what has been consecrated and dedicated to the gods

and what is left for common use. Such consecrated people and things are called amongst Polynesians tabu, amongst Hebrews קדש, amongst Romans sacer. The act by which they are declared as such, or are made such, namely consecration, is carried out with various ceremonies. The anointing with oil, which amongst the Hebrews betokened such consecration, is well known, and preserved this meaning late into Christianity at the anointing of kings. But religious consecration possesses yet another meaning, for on entering a religious community closed to the outer world, where foreign forbidden customs prevail or esoteric deep wisdom is imparted, initiatory consecrations take place. This was the case with the Greek mysteries, which only the initiated might behold. It is true the boundary between consecration and lustration cannot always be clearly defined. The trials which youths on attaining manhood had to pass through amongst certain savage nations, can be regarded from both points of view. The consecrations, at the mysteries also, show a striking relationship with purifications. But in purifications one thinks of the past rather, and what must be cast off, whilst in consecrations one thinks of the future, and what one wishes to attain.

Chapter 19. — Sacred Places.

The sanctity of certain places consists in the fact that the gods dwell there, or are worshipped there; but these two ideas do not exclude one another, since many temples are at the same time dwellings of the gods and places of worship. The gods dwell in heaven, but even on earth there is no place void of their presence, at least, according to the ideas of certain nations.

They dwell more particularly in the unapproachable parts of the earth, in deserts, caves, clefts in the rocks, and mostly on mountains and in woods. The conception of a mountain of the gods is found in many mythologies, but even without this, many nations regard mountains with religious awe. The solemn stillness of the forest likewise has powerfully awakened the feeling of the presence of God. This we know more especially from the Germans. The great importance of the forest as an architectural motive in the building of temples can clearly be seen in certain styles. In groves, on mountains, or wherever occasion was given, the godhead was worshipped under the open sky and sacred rites were performed. The locality was then dedicated to their use by some kind of ceremony; but this was not always essential. The cult under the open sky, when the altar was erected on the bare earth, was universal amongst certain ancient nations, such as the Indians and Persians, and was continued even when temples were built to the gods, as was the case amongst the Greeks.

We can no longer historically trace what gave rise to the building of temples. The statement that in this respect also, religion emanated from the worship of the dead, and that temples were originally graves, holds good in certain cases only, as in China, where the room of the ancestors became the temple of the ancestors; but this cannot be considered as a universal rule. To a certain degree, the use of the temples enlightens us as to their origin. Temples were first of all repositories of the symbols or images of the gods. Even savages possess their fetish huts, in which they collect a number of fetishes, or where one great, principal fetish

is kept. When large, costly, and artistic images of the gods were made, a house was built for them in which the many vessels and offerings were also kept. This meaning is preserved by the sanctuary, even when it possesses another meaning also. Thus the temple at Jerusalem is essentially the house of the ancient sacred ark of the covenant, and the Kaabah at Mekka of the many deities of Arabian tribes, before Mohammed cleansed it of them. Therefore the building of temples attests the value attributed to certain objects as symbols or images of the god, and is closely connected with the development of idolatry. But another cause has worked in the same direction, namely, the dominion of the kings, who displayed and cemented their political power by wonderful buildings, which they erected in honour of themselves and their gods. Thus arose the palaces and temples on the Nile and the Euphrates, and it is well known that Solomon was actuated by the same motives in the building of the temple. The vast buildings of Babylon and of Egyptian Thebes are known to us by their remains, and by descriptions of them; there we already find, as later in Olympia and Eleusis, the temple precincts, inside which there were numerous larger or smaller sanctuaries which were connected with one another and thus formed one whole.

The Greek temples, which had the same crude beginnings as elsewhere, are distinguished in their highest development by great artistic perfection. The development of their forms belongs to the history of architecture; we need only mention that it is chiefly determined by the rows and arcades of columns at the entrance, or surrounding them. We must take longer in considering Roman sanctuaries, for no

people have more sharply distinguished various kinds of sacred places than the Romans. They recognise loca sacra, templa, and loca religiosa: names which are applied as much to buildings as to other localities under the open sky. The loca sacra or fana are those which have passed over by pontifical consecration to the possession of the gods; to these belong also, it is true, the ædes sacræ of the gods, but equally the time-honoured nemora and luci, as for instance the groves in which the cult of the Arval brothers took place. The templa are the spots chosen according to the observations of the augurs and were consecrated by their rites, for originally the 'templum' was that part of the sky which had been measured by the lituus of the augurs, and afterwards on the earth it was the conceptis verbis locus effatus, on which the augur stood. All ædes sacræ are fana, many are also templa; in the latter case they must be square, otherwise they may be round, as the ædes Vestæ. The loca religiosa are those places which lie outside these two categories, but yet were regarded with religious fear: such as sanctuaries for private worship, graves, and localities which the lightning had struck (fulgur conditum), &c.

We must notice a few things about the building of the temple, in so far as it expresses religious ideas. Here orientation occupies a preeminent position, as in prayers and in the building arrangement of graves. Egyptian temples as well as the pyramids are carefully orientated. A Greek temple has its entrance towards the east, the templum varies somewhat, but it is no less carefully orientated, and it is well known that Christian churches also show the same tendency. The building, arrangement, and ornamentation of

temples often have a symbolical meaning. Thus the colossal temples of modern India are often overladen with symbolic ornamentation; the building of the Babylonian terrace-temple, as well as that of the Egyptian labyrinth, is as full of symbolic meaning as the arrangement of the sanctuary at Jerusalem. The adyton, to enumerate a few of the principal ideas, or the enclosed and sometimes dark inside of the temple, reflects the sublime and unapproachable character of the deity, and the various divisions of the temple which still remain in the choirs of Christian churches, represent the separation between the priests and the laity, the initiated and the profane. But we cannot hope to succeed in explaining in detail the symbolism of temple buildings. Sometimes it seems to refer to the structure of the world, sometimes to the religious relationship of men to the gods. Greek art has almost freed itself from this, at least it has been influenced by æsthetic considerations in the building of temples. Nevertheless, the character of the Greek religion is mirrored in Greek temples. 'The Hellene takes the middle road between the weighty oppressive massiveness of Egypt, and the mediæval Gothic style which conquers weight by elevation; it does not tell by colossal greatness, but by the transparency and beauty of form' (Carrière). Christian church-architecture, which developed itself from the type of the basilica, attains its highest point after passing the Byzantine and Romanic styles in the Gothic architecture, but expresses in this style the ideas of Christianity of the Middle Ages more than the original and essential ideas.

The temples served for many purposes. We have

already mentioned that they were universally used for affording shelter to the image of the god and the sacred vessels. But sacred ceremonies also took place either in the temple itself or in its vicinity within the precincts, and thither also went those people who might not enter the sacred building itself. On certain occasions only, the temple had to accommodate the whole community, as was the case at Eleusis with the initiated, for whom larger localities were necessary. Moreover the difference between the house of God and the house of the community is often carried to the very opposite, as the temple in Jerusalem by the side of the Jewish synagogues. The Mohammedan mosques are merely localities where the community meets for prayer, as also the Christian churches, although Roman Catholic cathedrals remind us more of actual temples owing to their idols and relics. We should be forgetting one important fact if we did not emphasise the great political and social importance, connected with the temples in more than one respect. Many great temples are places of pilgrimage, places of assembling, where a larger or smaller religious circle meets together, and protected by sacred peace, leaves feuds alone, to unite on religious ground. Such a centre then easily becomes a sort of Pantheon, as the Kaabah at Mekka, in pre-Islamic Arabia. Among Scandinavian nations the circles (Fylke) had their central sanctuaries, and we need hardly mention the importance of many Greek temples as the centre of an Amphictyonia, or even as a meeting-place for all Greeks, as at Olympia. We have already mentioned sacred peace. Thus most temples enjoyed the privilege of asylum, which really

follows from their conception, since the fugitive who flies thither, be he a slave, thief, or murderer, places himself directly under the protection of the godhead. Numerous examples from Greek history (Demosthenes, Pausanias) prove that this right of asylum was used, while in the Roman empire under Tiberius, the constant misuse of it gave rise to restrictive ordinances. Finally, at least amongst the Greeks, the temples were sometimes used as treasure-houses, where one could most safely deposit sums of money or valuables.

We shall close this survey with a remark of RENAN'S, that mankind likes to preserve the same sacred places of worship, and when an old religion gives place to a new one, the latter receives the inheritance of its predecessors, more especially the once sanctified places of worship.

CHAPTER 20. — **Religious Times.**

The order of festivals is closely connected with the division of time. It is true that amongst savages this does not exist. Their observation of nature does not go beyond the single phenomena. They greet the new moon, they strive to assist eclipses of sun and moon with noise or the shooting of arrows, as is still the case in China, but otherwise their festivals take place on certain occasions, such as at war dances, feasts of the dead, &c. The choice of certain days is universal and occurs often amongst savages, since many days, and even whole months, are considered as unlucky and unsuitable for business; but this is connected rather more with divination than with any regular division of time.

As soon as a certain stage of civilisation is reached, the observation of the course of nature is used for calculations which go beyond the limits of direct perception, and thus the calendar is formed. It is not difficult to understand the general principles on which this takes place. The phases of the moon bring about a division into months, and the changes of the seasons, into years. But these two divisions are not quite compatible: for if we count strictly according to lunar months, then the yearly events in nature fall on different days from one year to another. Therefore the two measurements of time must be made to harmonise by intercalation, so as to make the lunar into a solar year. However simple this may be in general, yet it becomes most complicated if we come to details. These intercalations sometimes took place after longer periods only, or were left to the pleasure of pontifical collegia, as in Rome, before Cæsar gave a fixed arrangement to the calendar according to the principle of the solar year. It is well known what vast difficulties are opposed to a study of the Roman calendar. We must also notice that amongst many nations the ritual and civil year do not correspond. In later calendars also, divisions and customs of very different origin were introduced. Much therefore remains for critical studies to complete, and we must be satisfied with a few general remarks.

The change of seasons has been one of the principal causes of religious rites. Certain hours of the day, certain days of the month and the year, are quite naturally given up to them. In the morning, at midday, in the evening, and sometimes oftener, sacrifices or prayers are offered; thus Islam still prescribes the five daily

prayers as a religious duty. The monthly festivals were first of all connected with the phases of the moon, the first appearance of which is carefully watched, and is the sign for religious ceremonies. It was thus in Israel, and thus the Indians also offered their sacrifices to the new and full moon. The Roman calendæ, nonæ, and idus also were originally the new moon, first quarter, and full moon. The sabbath again, which occurs not in the Old Testament only, but also in the Assyrian calendar, can be traced back either to the phases of the moon, or to the observation of the five planets, which together with sun and moon form the number seven. Annual festivals are caused by the appearing of a star, as in Egypt by the rising of the Sothis, but as a general rule they are fixed by the direct perception of the course of the sun; or of the change of seasons. Thus the equinoxes and solstices are times of religious ceremonies; in ancient Peru the four great feasts are supposed to have been founded on them, in China they are celebrated with music and prayers. In India at the present day many of the great festivals are connected with the course of the sun. In reality the seasons of the year are always at the foundation of the calendar of festivals, though the fruitfulness of the earth is as important therein as the course of the sun. The six Persian Gahambars, which were later seen to be six periods of the creation, were originally a division of the year. Amongst the Semites the death, and coming back to life of nature, were celebrated with the wailings and rejoicings of the Tammuz and Adonis festivals. The fetching in of the fair season and the driving out of winter are well known from many of the acts of cult amongst ancient nations,

and in the popular customs of the Germans. Special mention must be made of the midwinter festivals, the feast of Sol invictus, the Yule feast which the Germans carried out with sacrificial meals and solemn vows.

The seasons are also closely connected with human occupations, which are regulated according to them. The ancient Scandinavians offered three great yearly sacrifices: in the autumn for a successful year, in the winter for a good harvest, and in the summer for victory. Not agricultural pursuits only, but the rearing of cattle also is connected with the seasons, and therefore annual sacrifices are offered for both. The festivals of sowing and reaping are especially numerous: firstlings and a good harvest are celebrated, and also the gathering in of fruit, corn, and wine. Therefore some of the great Athenian feasts such as the Thesmophoria and Dionysia refer to the cultivation of fields and wine, others like the Anthesteria and Thargelia are rather feasts of the seasons, but essentially refer to the fruitfulness of the soil. It is true the above mentioned feasts are most complicated; for much has been added to their celebration, although the primitive meaning is still quite clear. Amongst the Israelites also the three principal feasts are harvest festivals; at an early date it seems that the first of these, that of unleavened bread, was connected with the shepherds' feast of Passover.

The year was not the greatest division of time; for longer periods gave rise to regularly recurring festivals. Thus at Upsala a great festival took place every ninth year. These periods were often fixed according to the above named intercalations, and made to equalise the lunar and the solar year. We find this for instance

amongst the Greeks, with whom such a period 'a great year' embraced eight years, during which the great games usually were celebrated twice. Longer periods of fifty years occur in the Old Testament; the so-called Sabbatical year would have been of profound significance for civil life, if it had not almost exclusively belonged to the merely written law. In Mexico the Toxilmolpilia were celebrated every fifty-second year with great sacrifices as the beginning of a new cosmic period. In ancient Rome there were propitiatory ceremonies at every lustrum, but in later times the secular festivals became more prominent. Sæculum, an idea of Etruscan origin, meant originally a generation, the extinction of which was announced by the gods by means of portenta. The attendant ceremonies have been amalgamated by the Romans with indigenous rites, and admitted into their cult; the sæculum being then fixed as a period of 110 years. It was the secular celebration under Augustus, often repeated by later emperors, which made the ludi sæculares widely known.

Festivals were originally connected with the natural divisions of time, but they assumed a secondary meaning as festivals in memory of men or of historical events. Thus the birthdays of living or dead persons were celebrated, and other festivals were connected with political events or simply with events in the life of princes. In Egypt the accession and the birthday of Pharaoh were publicly celebrated. Even in ancient religions, we meet with festivals which owe their origin to certain political occurrences, such as the Magophonia of the Persians and the Athenian victory of Marathon. Other people have imparted

an historical meaning to their originally natural festivals, especially the Israelites. Christian festivals have from the beginning been assigned to historical facts of evangelical history; but they coincide with the times of the old heathen nature-festivals, and many a popular custom at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide owes its origin to them. The numerous days of saints and martyrs belong essentially to the category of historical festivals, among Christians as well as among Mohammedans, as for instance the Moharram festival in memory of the tragic death of Hosein.

Nevertheless these two classes of festivals are not sufficient to account for all that are found in the calendaria. We possess several of them, some preserved in cuneiform characters in Assyria and Babylon, others discovered on the walls of Egyptian temples, particularly at Thebes, and the Persian Sirozah which have been incorporated in the Avesta. The order of festivals among the ancient Greeks is sufficiently well known, particularly at Athens, while at Rome we have calendaria preserved to us in inscriptions, though dating from imperial times only. Ovid's Fasti form a valuable mine for that half of the year which he deals with. The ecclesiastical year of the Roman church and the scanty remnants of it in the Protestant cult, as well as the festivals of Islam, contain many things in which customs and ideas of the older religions survive. An exhaustive treatment of all these calendaria would really amount to a complete history of the religions in question. We shall touch on a few points only. Some, as for instance the Persian Sirozah, assign each day of the month to a certain deity, and

there are several festivals in the calendaria which cannot be referred to any of the categories hitherto described, for instance the monthly or yearly festivals of the dead, intended not for certain individuals, but for the dead in general. There are some festivals of the gods, intended to celebrate a mythical event, the birth, the apparition, and the victory of a deity, as for example the birthday celebration of *Krishna* in India and the Mithra festival in Persia. Here and there we may still discover a natural background, and in certain temples the order of festivals keeps alive the memory of the foundation or dedication of the sanctuary. In the Roman calendar we must carefully distinguish the civil, and the ritual character of certain days. To the first class belong the dies fasti (per quos prætoribus omnia verba sine piaculo licet fari) and nefasti, on which neither judgments nor assemblies were allowed, but which nevertheless often coincided with religious festivals. The religious festivals are either feriæ stativæ which fall every year on the same calendar day, or conceptivæ which return annually, but not on fixed days, or the imperativæ, on exceptional occasions. The latter two are sometimes called indictivæ because they must be announced by the pontifices or magistrates. They do not of course occur in the calendaria.

It is in the festivals, the days specially dedicated to the service of the god, that the cult culminates. The dominant ideas of these festivals are consecration, peace, and joy; though some of them are meant for mourning and lamentation. On the days dedicated to the gods, all public and private business stopped. The Latin word feriæ reminds us of this, if not by its derivation, yet

by its use, while the rigorous sabbatical precepts of the Jewish lawgivers show to what extremes this observance can be carried. Festivals are characterised mostly by a number of great sacrifices and an accumulation of ritual ceremonies lasting often for several days. Some of them have a more or less transparent symbolical character, as for instance the feasts of lanterns among many nations, torch-processions, the Arrhephoria in Athens and the 'Arbor intrat' in Rome. Solemn processions and joyful feasts were never absent, thousands of people came together in order to take part in the celebration, as in ancient Egypt at the festival in Bubastis, in Greece at Olympia or in Athens, and among the modern Hindus at Puri in Orissa. Such panegyria brought fairs and public amusements, and were of great importance for the political and social union of kindred. All social barriers were often removed for a time for the sake of licence rather than of fraternity. This may be seen at the festivals of the Hindu sects, at the Greek Kronia, and the Roman Saturnalia. The greatest attraction, however, consisted in theatrical representations and other games. Theatrical plays found their origin in a mimic or scenic representation of a portion of the history of the gods, and are often mentioned. Even in Christianity the Middle Ages witnessed the growth of ecclesiastical plays (mysteries), and among Mohammedans the death of Hosein is represented dramatically. In Greece and Rome athletic games obtained great importance. In Greece, where originally they consisted in poetical and gymnastic contests, the Pythian, Isthmian, Nemean, and above all the Olympian games have contributed powerfully to develop the noblest sides of the Greek

character. In Rome we at first see races of horses and mules in the service of Mars and of Consus; afterwards follow ludi in fulfilment of vows. Under the emperors these contests lost their religious meaning, and became by their profuse display and their cruelty, a demoralising institution, and an offence in the eyes of more serious people, such as Seneca and Marcus Aurelius.

CHAPTER 21.—Sacred Persons.

It was the fashion formerly, to look upon religion as an arbitrary invention of cunning priests. At present everybody knows that it is not the priests who made religion, but rather religion that made the priests. It is not easy to bring the institution of the priesthood under a general concept. RÉVILLE suggests that priests are essentially to be considered as mediators; according to him, the feeling that men were incapable and unworthy of communion with God, was the source of a desire after mediation, so that a priest should represent the people before God, and communicate to the laity divine words and blessings. But though this thought may be essential in many religions, we cannot accept it as the foundation of the whole institution of the priesthood. Among most people we look in vain for the desire after mediation, as the foundation of priestly influence. Nor can we agree with LIPPERT, who explains the institution of the priesthood from the cult of souls; we prefer to survey, without any preconceived opinion, the various facts as we find them among different people.

It is difficult to speak of priests among savages, for

their cult is not organised, and the priesthood therefore is not a well defined institution governed by fixed rules. There are persons who perform the magic acts and sacrifices, but they do not often form a class by themselves, for they owe their influence to their cleverness only, and lose their place as soon as they disappoint expectations. The Fetizero of the Negroes, the medicine man of the Redskins, the Shaman of high-Asiatic tribes, have all under varying circumstances to discover magic means, and to employ such as are demanded from them. He is often himself regarded as divine, for like the fetish, the Fetizero also is the vessel of a spirit. In Polynesia we are told that the priests were actually called receptacles of the gods. Among lower tribes it is characteristic of these persons that they combine in themselves numerous functions. They are mostly magicians, rather than real priests, who have to perform the acts of the cult. They discover secrets, cause victory, bring blessing, avert misfortune, produce rain, in fact accomplish nearly all that is desired by magic means. This implies their function as soothsayers, and their representing all kinds of mantic, particularly that which depends on ecstatic conditions, produced by artificial means. They are likewise called in as physicians, and many other things are expected from their knowledge and cleverness. Thus we find in these magicians and soothsayers, the type of priest and prophet, of sage and counsellor; but they do not form a caste by themselves. The father often bequeaths his knowledge and his position to his son, or the teacher to his pupil; but there are other kinds of succession also, as for instance where the murderer

of the former priest occupies his place, a custom which survived in a Roman temple of Diana near the lake of Nemi. The magic priests of savages do not yet form a hierarchy, or any kind of corporation, though we find the beginnings of it, as for instance among the Negroes, where by the side of the king, we find a high priest, who has to lead and to superintend all religious matters. In Polynesia also, several more organised priesthoods have been met with.

The position of the priests is quite different among savages, from their position in the organised cult of civilised nations. Here the priesthood has its definite constitution, certain privileges, revenues, and duties, but at the same time a position limited by other classes. This accounts for two things which we find amongst civilised nations, for the struggle of the priests against other powers, and for the separation of the different functions which formerly were united in them, but which in the progress of civilisation became necessarily divided, more particularly their priestly and prophetic character. Of the prophets we shall have to speak hereafter. The struggle between the priests and the royal or noble families is shown to us most clearly in ancient India, where numerous half-mythical stories bear witness to it. There have been periods in Egyptian history also, when these two powers were struggling for primacy, and the high-priest of Amon at Thebes succeeded for a time in placing the royal crown on his own head. In other countries this tension did not exist, because the priests acted as officials of the state, as in China, for instance, and in ancient Rome; and because the magistrates possessed at the

same time priestly privileges. However we need not turn to ancient races in order to witness similar conflicts, for they form the theme of the ecclesiastical and political history of mediæval Europe, and even in modern times, a movement which has been called 'Culturkampf' stirs the life of nations in various ways.

The influence of the priests depends chiefly on three conditions. First of all they must form a class by themselves, secondly they must have the monopoly of certain functions and peculiar knowledge, lastly they must be really qualified to teach and guide the people. The position of the priests varies according as they fulfil these three conditions.

The more a priesthood is hierarchically organised internally, and separated from other classes, the greater is the power which it exercises. Sometimes the priests do not form a class by themselves, but they are officials, like other state officials, as for instance in China; sometimes they are so completely separated from other people, that they are considered as higher beings. Though this was not always and everywhere the case in India, yet the caste of the Brâhmans has been able at times to establish such claims. Between these two poles, there are several intermediate stages. In Egypt for instance, there were powerful collegia of priests, but even a low-born man might rise to high priestly dignities, nor was it considered sinful to give to a stranger like Joseph the daughter of a priest as his wife. In Greece the fact that priests did not hold their office for life prevented a very prominent position of the priesthood. It was simply a function which one might

leave for, or combine with, other work. In the same manner the Pontifex Maximus at Rome could at the same time hold several other offices. And yet this position was important enough not to be despised by men like Cæsar, and several emperors. What separates the caste of priests from other castes is the hereditary character of the priesthood, special education, consecration, a connubium limited to persons of their own caste, and a hierarchical organisation with their own jurisdiction independent of the political power. Some priests claimed to be above the law and of divine nature, like the Brâhmans as described in the laws of Manu; or to be incarnations of the deity, as for instance the incarnate clergy under the Dalai Lama in Thibet; or at least infallible in the execution of their duties, as the Roman Catholic Pope. It happens but rarely, however, that a priesthood possesses all these characteristics of a caste, and even where there are powerful priestly families, there are usually other powers in the state and in society, to balance their weight and influence.

The position of the priests is secured, more even than by their birth and station, by their privilege of being alone able to perform sacred acts, and to speak sacred words. In India, only the priests knew the Vedic texts and were able to perform sacrifices. Something like this existed in most countries. The Persians required priests for all legal purifications; among the Babylonians, the educated Chaldæan priest alone, was allowed to interpret dreams, and to exercise other kinds of soothsaying. All ordeals were in the hands of the priests, among savages as

well as among Germans and elsewhere. Even when, as at Rome, supreme power rested firmly in other hands, namely in those of the magistrates, cum imperio, the pontifices and augurs were nevertheless necessary in order to perform the rites correctly, and to interpret signs. It is in the Roman constitution that we find a limitation of pontifical prerogatives, because it allowed the magistrates also, to perform sacrifices and other sacred acts. We find the same in Greece, for instance at Athens, where several of the Archons possessed priestly rights and duties, particularly the Archon Basileus, the head of the state cult. Wherever kings or magistrates are allowed to offer sacrifices, priestly influence is not predominant. In Egypt also, their power was subordinated to that of the Pharaohs, but they possessed there the monopoly of a secret doctrine, cultivated and handed down in their schools. This was so, at all events, under the new empire.

We pointed out as the third pillar of priestly power, the ability of the priests. What they have done for the advance of civilisation can hardly be overrated. Even among savages they are the principal supporters of tradition and customs. The first regular observations of the course of nature, the calculations founded thereon, and the crude beginnings of science, were no doubt the work of priests. Writing was cultivated and used by them, and in their schools the oldest books, collections of sacred formulas, historical annals, songs and stories of the gods were composed and preserved. They exercised the greatest influence on the study of law, and even among the Romans, where the government of the state was not

as we saw in their hands, their influence on the formation and the practice of public law has been great. Anybody acquainted with the history of the Middle Ages, knows how important was the share of the clergy in the diffusion and protection of Christian culture. Parallel with examples, not unfrequently occurring, of a degraded, ignorant and rightly despised clergy, as for instance in the Byzantine church, history knows of numerous cases in which the priestly class stood at the head of civilisation, which they tried to spread among the people. Often they represented the tradition, the preservation of which was really precious for the maintenance of civilisation.

There is one side of priestly activity which we have not yet mentioned, because it does not belong to the priests exclusively, but is exercised by others also, in union with, or in opposition to them. This is the personal cure of souls, as educators, father-confessors, councillors, and public preachers. It is often the priests who exercise this office also, and thereby gain a deep and widely-spread influence. It was thus in Egypt and in India, where the priest and the Brâhman were the educators and councillors. In Christianity the power of the clergy emanates chiefly from the confessional and the pulpit, however different the form of its exercise, whether in exciting sermons addressed to the populace by mediæval monks, or in the intrigues of abbés who at the court of Louis XIV were the 'directeurs' of worldly consciences. Among many nations, however, there arose teachers of the people unconnected with the priests, as for instance the Jewish scribes, who were sometimes the allies, sometimes the opponents of the priests. Neither among Greeks

nor among Romans had the priests any influence on popular education; quite different people were engaged in the education of youth, and of the people at large, such as sophists and rhetoricians, both in the good and the bad sense of these words. The official religion of classical antiquity offered so little satisfaction to the requirements of personal piety, that these had to be provided for elsewhere; among foreign cults for instance, where priests knew better how to work on sentiment and imagination, or from philosophers whose schools were more and more occupied with practical religious questions, and with the leading of a pious life. During the Roman empire, men such as Seneca and Plutarch seem to exercise within their own sphere the office of religious councillors or 'directeurs,' whilst cynical philosophers act the part of popular preachers.

It is difficult to speak in general of the requirements made on the priests, for they are too dependent on place and time. We may, however, mention as a general rule that gods are mostly served by priests; goddesses by priestesses, though not without exceptions. Sometimes the rule of life for priests was very severe, more frequently however, they were only under few, and easy precepts. In particular they had to be pure, in a ritual sense, which included sometimes certain prohibitions of food and very often chastity also, for a longer or shorter time. The Flamen dialis at Rome, with the whole of his house, had to observe in his whole manner of life the strictest requirements of purity. He was not allowed to see fighting, or killing, and wherever he went ordinary business had to stop for the moment.

The dress, the ornaments and insignia of the priests vary of course as much as possible. Without dwelling long on single instances, we ought to mention the numerous staff of servants, who had to assist at sacrifices without belonging to the priesthood or occupying any but the lowest place in it. Thus we find the Levites by the side of the priests, according to the Jewish law. The lot of the lower priesthood in Greece, the temple slaves, according to the Ion of Euripides, cannot have been very hard. It was the business of these lower officials to keep the localities and implements clean, and to attend and serve the priests, particularly during the performance of sacred acts. The temple music also required numerous attendants. Women, for sacred prostitution, occur in the worship of goddesses such as the Babylonian Mylitta and the Greek Aphrodite.

Besides the priests there are other persons also, who exercise a determining influence on the development of religion; these are particularly the prophets, the ascetics, the monks, and the saints. They differ from the priests in as much as they have nothing to do with the ritual, but only exercise an influence by their personal character, and their whole mode of life. They do not care about an exact observance of the ritual nor about the preserving of a tradition, on the contrary they are often opposed to the existing rules of religion or care little for them, because they represent something quite different from the priesthood. While the priests are the supporters of a continuity of an organised cult, the prophets represent personal inspiration, the ascetics and monks

realise the idea of a flight from the world, and the saints incorporate the ideal and realise the superhuman even here in this human life.

We need not say much about the prophets, as we should only have to repeat what we have said when treating of internal mantic, of which they are the highest representatives. The Israelitic prophets exhibit very strongly their opposition to the priesthood, though some of them, such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, were of priestly origin. The word of Jehovah as preached by the prophets contains throughout, a condemnation of the popular cult, and opposes to it, not another more purified cult, but only moral requirements. We see this clearly in Jeremiah, but no longer in Ezekiel, because his ideal is a new temple, with a new cult.

Ascetics, hermits, anchorites, monks, or whatever other names they may have, persons who try to reach the highest goal of life by their flight from the world, are found in ancient times, especially in India. The normal course of life of a Brâhman required that after the father of a family had lived, as such for some time, and had thus fulfilled his duties towards society, he should retire from the world, generally into a forest hermitage, not in order to do penance, but in order to loosen by an ascetic life the fetters of the senses and of finite desires. Such thoughts form the foundation of the religions of the Jainas and Buddhists, who were originally nothing but monastic orders. With a few not unimportant differences, the monastic order of Buddhists shows that it had been constituted after the pattern of Brâhmanic hermits. Their *Śramaṇas* and Bhikshus

had borrowed their names and their rules of life almost entirely from those more ancient examples. We can see here very clearly the negative morality of the ideal of monks and hermits. The Buddhists teach that the exercise of positive virtues constitutes a lower stage of morality only, while on the higher stages a clear distinction of objects and even self-consciousness are lost in contemplation and meditation. We find the same in the Middle Ages where mystic devotion is praised by many, whereas the active and spiritual life are considered as a preparation only. Monastic life, which is so important in the Indian religions, does not exist in most of the other religions of antiquity. So far as we know, neither Egypt nor Syria, in later times the chief seats of monasticism, had monks in ancient times. It is only by a forced interpretation that the Israelitic Nazarites who had been dedicated to God by special vows, and the Rechabites who clung to the old-fashioned mode of life and despised the cultivation of the vine, can be counted as such. Of the Chinese Taoists in ancient times, we know too little to be able to decide whether, to a certain extent, they might be considered as monks; but it is clear that the Chinese state-religion and Confucianism must condemn monasticism, and we see that in later times the genuine Chinese took great offence at Buddhist monks. Monasticism is most flourishing in the three universal religions, Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam. Properly speaking it is opposed to the principles of the founder of Islam, to whom tradition assigns a condemnation of monasticism; but in its spreading over the world, Islam has adopted this part of foreign

manners and views with many others, and at the present day the Dervishes belong to the most zealous defenders, and the strongest pillars of Mohammedan faith. The description of the origin and the fates of the numerous Christian monastic orders, we may safely leave to ecclesiastical history. The idea of a flight from the world and a negative morality are predominant here also in the threefold monastic duty, poverty, chastity, and obedience, as well as in the mystic devotion and the contemplative piety, after which both monks and nuns are striving. Nevertheless we should form a false judgment of the institution of monasticism in Christianity, if we did not point out that this isolation from the world was intended at the same time for a concentration of spiritual strength, so as to be able to work all the more powerfully and successfully for the world, nay, in the world. The first is realised in vicarious prayer, the monks forming the number of those who sanctify themselves for the world; the second is carried out in different ways, through missionary activity, through the cultivation of learning (Benedictines), by attacking the heretics (Dominicans), by popular preaching (Franciscans), by a striving after political influence (Jesuits), by works of beneficence, and by other means. History teaches us that the monks acquired a very extensive influence, but incurred at the same time bitter hostility also. The lay clergy often envied the influence of the monks who stood at their side as a separate class, and all the more so because they were independent of episcopal supervision, and subject immediately to the Pope. On the whole, however, these two sections of the Roman Catholic clergy, the priests and the monks,

worked for the same object. Protestantism has not only condemned the whole monastic institution, but also the principles on which it rested, and has given quite a new meaning to a Christian flight from the world, and dominion over the world. The important bearing of this difference has never been brought out so clearly as in RITSCHL'S works on the history of dogmas.

Saints are not far removed from monks, for many who in Christianity and Islam have been declared as saints, whether by ecclesiastical canonisation, or by the vox populi, had been monks, and in Buddhism the two are really identical, for every saint must have been a monk, though not every monk, a saint. The two concepts of monk and saint are not identical, and where the two are united in the same person, we think, in the case of the monk, of the ascetic mode of life, the flight from the world; in the case of the saint, of his moral perfection or his superhuman powers (miraculous powers). For the rest we have already become acquainted with saints as objects of worship.

Chapter 22. — **Religious Communities.**

A religious community is founded on a common cult, not on common persuasions or doctrines, at least the latter are only of secondary importance. A common cult is the most important part of the organisation of human society, and seems to us to be rather the cause than the result of it, at least we should not like to maintain with Varro, that the state existed first, and then instituted religion. Here again all origins are withdrawn from our eyes; only the common cult seems to us to be so essential

to religion that we cannot see in it an arbitrary contrivance made by men, who had joined themselves together to undertake religious acts, or to nourish convictions. As far back as we can see into the past, individual piety always arose from the soil of a common religion. This community of religion, as we have already stated, goes hand in hand with the organisation of society. Where no bond, or only a slight one, connects families and clans, the religious community also is weak; it becomes strong in a firmly organised social stage.

From this rule it at once follows, that much less can be said with regard to the community of religion amongst savages, than amongst civilised nations, and that amongst the latter, religion is most closely connected with social life. The great question laid before us is, to what extent does common cult coincide with the social divisions, such as family, clan, people, and state, and to what degree does it go beyond or run parallel with them?

We have had occasion to mention most of the features of family religion. The family worships its ancestors, its domestic hearth, and its household gods (called Lares and Penates amongst the Romans). At births, marriages, and deaths this religion reaches its highest point and acts of cult are multiplied. Family law, marriage arrangements, rules concerning adoption, inheritance, and relationship all possess a sacred character. With matriarchal customs we find totemism, and with patriarchal, the worship of ancestors. Analogous to family religion, is that of the clan, φρατρία, gens, the members of which are closely connected by blood relationship, or a common cult.

The Roman priestly law places these cults as sacra privata in opposition to the sacra publica. The latter are held under the supervision or direction of the magistrate at the cost of the state. At the same time one can distinguish between the cult of the people and state cult. The former, sacra popularia, are those in which all the people can take part; the latter, sacra pro populo, are those which, without this general participation, are undertaken for the good of the state. In this case the whole nation and the state are regarded as a religious community, to which all belong. This was the case not only in Rome, but in the Greek States, in China, in Egypt, and amongst the Semites, with whom this feature is so strongly developed that their religions have sometimes been called theocratic, a word originating with Josephus. Thus the common cult has exactly the same limits as the family, the clan, the people, and the state.

Nevertheless there are in the ancient world many phenomena, which point to something else. Certain cults break through the limits of natural relationship, or are based from the very beginning on another foundation. Thus amongst savages in different parts of the world, more or less secret societies have been discovered, to which people of different clans and classes belong. The Negroes, more especially those on the west coast, have many such societies, the rites and beliefs of which are imperfectly known to us; we find something similar amongst the Redskins; and the powerful Areois, who enjoy such great respect in Tahiti, and in the neighbouring islands as divine beings, open their ranks to people of a lower origin

also. Even in the religions of civilised nations, natural relationship is by no means the only basis of a common cult. In India it even occupies quite a subordinate position. The various cults, of which Vedic literature unfortunately teaches us but little, were probably originally based on blood relationship, but they have quite acquired the character of schools, which were no longer held together by common descent but by the peculiar development which they gave to ritual and ceremonial law. Although in Brâhmanism, cult was the possession of one class, yet the religion did not consist entirely of this one cult, for there were other roads of salvation, which were open to people of a different class. Besides this we must notice that Brâhmanism has established itself amongst races of entirely foreign origin, and has made them participate in the blessings of the Brâhmanic cult. Finally there has never existed in India any national or state religion, for although in later Hinduism there were great Panegyria, yet there was no cult dependent on the consciousness of a national unity or the existence of the state, and this, simply because such a national unity never existed in India. Thus the religions of India show us the formation of a common cult, on quite different foundations to those of natural relationship. Such associations which are held together by ritual and law, have been called nomistic, and besides Brâhmanism, the Persian (Mazdeism) and the Jewish religion have been classed as such. It should be remembered that such nomistic associations do not at once obliterate the limits of nationality. This has not happened either in Parseeism, nor in the prophetic and the Levitic

period of Judaism. It is true that, particularly among the Jews, we see the beginnings of a universalistic community in the ordinances with regard to strangers and proselytes. In nomistic associations the natural bonds of relationship become looser also, on account of the insufficiency of mere rites for religion, and of the higher value ascribed to convictions and moral precepts. In fact the common cult tends to become a common creed.

Even the people of classical antiquity who ascribe such high importance to family and class, to people and state with regard to cult, have nevertheless formed religious associations of a totally different character. Such are the religious societies, to which one did not belong ipso facto by birth, but into which one was received by free choice, and often with a peculiar consecration. Persons of the same trade chose a god or hero as their patron and offered to him a common cult. We find associations of seamen, merchants, actors, and artisans; they were called *θίασος* in Greece. According to Jacob Grimm, the German guilds also derive their names from sacrificial feasts. In Rome we find the sodalitates for maintaining cults, originally confided to certain gentes who were no longer able to perform them. We find collegia which were likewise political, and sacrificial societies, often called collegia funeraticia, the members of which were not related by blood. Besides these societies we find in Greece and Rome foreign cults, mystic cults, and several philosophic schools, which also formed communities not based on natural kinship. With regard to the foreign cults there were several which had become so much assimi-

lated to the official cult, that they were no longer regarded as foreign. With others it was different, as for instance with the worship of the Syrian goddess in the Piræus, with that of Isis and that of Mithra in imperial Rome. These were joined by free choice, and their expenses were not borne by the state, or exceptionally only, as when several emperors sanctioned the public worship of Isis, after it had been persecuted under the Republic as well as under Tiberius. These cults continued to exist owing to the satisfaction which they offered to religious wants, and not because they rested on any time-honoured tradition. The mysteries, particularly those of Demeter at Eleusis, had much deeper roots in popular sentiment, at least in Greece. Without attempting to explain the opposition between these mystic cults and the other sides of the Greek religion, we have here only to point out that the mystics formed a circle of initiated persons outside the public religious community. Though they belonged to it also, yet it did not satisfy their higher wants, so that they went to Eleusis in order to see there, what gave them a better hope for life and death. We mentioned last the philosophical schools, not only because the philosophers occupied themselves with religious and ethical problems also, but particularly because several of their schools were so organised that they could hardly be distinguished from a religious association. This applies chiefly to Pythagoreans and Epicureans; the heads of their schools were looked upon as founders of religions, and Seneca calls them sacrarum opinionum conditores. Even religious rites were not absent in such associations, for the Pythagoreans were only

received after a novitiate and a consecration, and the disciples of Epicurus had in the beginning at least their own holidays. Lastly, Neoplatonism is almost more of a religion than a philosophy. Its followers strove after a union with the deity, by means of certain rules of life and all sorts of mystic usages.

With regard to the religious community, Christianity and Islam, however much they may differ from each other, show striking points of similarity. First of all neither of them was in the beginning above national limitation. Christianity, in its first period, had to pass through hard struggles, before it could change the character of a Jewish sect into that of a Catholic church. In Islam this break took place at one decisive blow. It was here necessary to remove the tribal constitution which influenced the whole life of the Arab and his religion also, and thus to form one community, consisting of all the faithful, whatever their origin might be. Mohammed achieved this, immediately after the flight, at Medina. The break however was not complete, because the old sanctuary of his tribe, the Kaabah of Mekka, was made the central sanctuary of Islam. A second point of similarity is found in the fact, that though the religious community in both religions is essentially a community of faith, yet it does not lose its original character of a community of cult. One of the five pillars of Islam consists in prayer five times a day. The Christian church also is a community of prayer, and counts the celebration of the sacraments as one of its chief characteristics. A third point of similarity between the two religions is, that their community or

church claims to dominate the world, and thus to guard the rights of religion. They differ, however, because Islam possesses in the Koran a guidance for political and civil, as well as for religious life, and emphasises a religious law but not any civil law by its side, while Christianity by the side of the canonical law acknowledges a civil one also. The church has indeed struggled hard in order to secure the spreading, preponderance, and independence of the canonical law, but it has never entirely ignored the civil. The most powerful popes dreamt that the power of the state was like the power of the moon, their own like that of the sun, but they never conceived an exclusive dominion, like that belonging to the Kalif in Islam.

We cannot undertake to discuss the concept and constitution of the church among Roman Catholics, Greeks, and Protestants, because we should have to enter too deeply into questions concerning the history of churches and dogmas. We shall only make two remarks. A doctrine peculiar to Christianity is that of the kingdom of God, of which the church is but a very imperfect realisation, as being only one of its many manifestations and preparations. It is therefore in Christianity alone that we find a difference between a visible and invisible church. This is of great importance, because the religious communion is thereby raised above its visible manifestation, and becomes an invisible communion of saints. We must also point out that though the concept of the Church among Protestants has been greatly modified as compared with its Roman Catholic development, and is very differently interpreted by Lutherans, Calvinists,

Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and the more sectarian communities, yet it has by no means been abolished, as some superficial critics maintain.

Chapter 23. — The Sacred Writings.

We shall not here treat only of the sacred writings of nations, which have been called the Bibles of mankind; since it would be difficult in every case to answer the question as to whether a book belongs to these Bibles or not. We shall deal also with the various influences exercised on religion by literature, which, by fixing tradition, represents a settled order of cult and religious authority. We thus include magic formulas, liturgical texts, ritual treatises, ceremonial laws, pontifical documents, historical and mythological literature, canonical collections, symbolical and ecclesiastical writings, and finally books of devotion.

The most ancient sacred utterances are the magic formulas, which were preserved in a settled and unchangeable form by memory, and fixed by writing. These are found in larger collections, for instance in the Atharva-Veda, in the great Chaldæan incantations for conjuring spirits, and in the Egyptian texts of the dead. The transition from these magical to liturgical formulas is hardly perceptible. We call sayings and writings liturgical, if they are used in a cult that has already been organised. These liturgical formulas still possess a really magical character, if their actual repetition is regarded as efficacious; and they still preserve their ancient and sometimes very incomprehensible wording, so that it is often impossible to say under which category sacred songs, sacrificial hymns, and

forms of prayer should be placed. Such is the case with many of the sacrificial hymns of the Rig-Veda, of the Roman Indigitamenta, and of the Carmen Arvalium. We must also regard the hymns and pæans which the Greeks sang at the cult of their gods, and which unfortunately have not come down to us, as belonging to the liturgical texts. The three first parts of the Avesta, arranged in a peculiar manner, form the Vendidad-Sade, the great liturgy of he Persians. The Roman Catholic church has possessed many liturgies. They were especially numerous in the Eastern church, but less so in the Western, where the Missale plenarium has come into almost general use. But this mass-book contains more than a complete liturgy, for the introduction gives, amongst other things, a survey of the ritual. The same applies to one of the collections of the Yajur-Veda, in which liturgical formulas and ritual precepts are found mixed up together. The difference between liturgical and ritual texts is this, that the liturgy contains the formulas of the cult, the 'Common-Prayer,' whilst the books of ritual contain the precepts for the cult; they form a sort of handbook, and sometimes are explanations of what takes place in the cult. Ritual treatises like these existed everywhere, if the cult was in any way complicated, as for instance in Egypt. They are particularly numerous in India, where the Brâhma*n*as and part of the Sûtras of Vedic literature consist of them. As regards Etrurian mantic also, represented in Rome by the haruspices, the rules were fixed in the books which were attributed to the ancient mythical Tages. In many books there are other

ordinances which do not refer to the acts of cult, but to other religious duties, as for instance in the Israelitic priestly code, where, by the side of rules for the sacrifices, there are general precepts for purification. This is called the ceremonial law. The Indian Dharmasûtras, the Persian Vendidad, and the Chinese Lî-*kî* are collections of similar ceremonial precepts. These precepts are carefully developed in Judaism, and the Talmudic writings are almost entirely devoted to them.

Besides these four kinds of religious texts, which were probably for the most part arranged or collected by priests, the priestly collegia have written down other rules which claim authority. Such temple-archives existed probably in Egypt, Greece, and elsewhere. It is well known to us that in Rome the pontifices preserved the decrees of their collegium, the decisions of their meetings, and the lists of their members.

We are not here dealing with the sources of the history of religion, but with the books which, for some cause or other, possess religious authority; and it is for this reason that we must not leave unmentioned certain mythological, cosmogonic, epic, and historical writings, which, although they were not counted among the actual sacred books, were yet regarded with awe as containing an old and holy tradition. This is why later collectors of sacred books have admitted many narrative portions in which there are god-myths, stories of ancient heroes, and similar things which have no connection with the cult. Examples can be found in the Old Testament as well as in the Avesta. In India also, the cosmo-

gonic and mythic material, which has passed into the Purâṇas and the epic poems, was regarded as sacred tradition. The poetry of Homer and Hesiod is wholly profane, not hieratic; but when Herodotus says that these two poets gave the Greeks their theogony, it is clear that a certain religious authority was attributed to them.

In speaking of sacred books, one first of all thinks of those which possess a canonical value, that is, those which are regarded officially as a canon, as a rule for cult, and faith, and the life of a religious community. Such are the Kings and Shus of the Chinese, the Vedas of the Indians, the Tripiṭaka of the Buddhists, the Avesta of the Persians, the Old Testament of the Jews, the Bible of the Christians, and the Koran of the Mussulmans; these are in a narrower sense the Bibles of mankind, to which may be added a few more like the Taoteking of the Taoists, the Âdi Granth of the Sikhs, &c. The canonical authority of these works is seen in the ideas concerning their origin. The Avesta is the law revealed by Ahura Mazda to Zarathustra, the Vedas are of divine origin, the Bible is inspired, and the Koran is eternal. Or else the sacredness of the books is based on their human origin, because they are the work either of the founders of religions, or of their first disciples. Their canonical value consists in this, that people, in their religious concerns, or even in different relations of life, follow these writings, and submit to their decisions.

We have still to mention another class of writings which possess an ecclesiastical, though not a canonical authority. They are of as much importance for the faith, as ritual and ceremonial writings are

for the cult and religious practice. These symbolical writings comprise not only the confessions of faith accepted by different Christian churches, and by Islam, as well as the catechisms sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority; but other writings also, which give expression to the faith, not of an individual, but of a whole ecclesiastic communion, and which are used so largely that they may be considered as symbolical types of doctrine. This character belongs not only to the decisions of councils and synods like those of Nicæa, Trent, and Dordrecht, but quite as much to the dogmatic works of such men as GHAZZALI for Islam, THOMAS AQUINAS for Roman Catholicism, LUTHER and CALVIN for the two principal churches of Protestantism.

The same applies to certain books of devotion which are so widely used and have obtained so deep an influence, that they have almost gained a footing of equality with the Bibles; for instance the Book of Rewards and Punishments in Modern China, the Bhagavat Gîtâ among Indian Vaishnavas, and among Christians the Imitatio Christi by THOMAS À KEMPIS and BUNYAN'S Pilgrim's Progress.

There are certain writings which belong at the same time to several of these categories. Much has been received into the canonical collections which was formerly liturgical, ritual, or ceremonial, and portions of the canon are used, as such, for liturgical purposes. The Persian Vendidad, for instance, consists chiefly of ceremonial precepts, and together with other portions, forms the liturgy of the Vendidad-Sade; but it has likewise its place in the Avesta, the canonical collection of the sacred writings of the Parsis. Many

Psalms also, were originally nothing but expressions of individual piety, they were then received into the collection which was used in the second temple for liturgical purposes, and they now belong to our own biblical canon, and have thus again acquired a place in the liturgy of the Christian churches.

Chapter 24. — The Principal Forms of Religious Doctrines.

We have already said something about religious conceptions, in connection with religious acts, in chapter 9. The problems dealing with this subject belong for the most part to the province of philosophy, and more particularly to that of psychology. The latter has to determine in what the religious character of a conception consists; it has to indicate the place which religious conceptions occupy in the world of thought, amongst nations on different stages of civilisation; it has to discover whether there is a permanent substance in the many forms of religious conceptions, or not. From a phenomenological standpoint we need only make the following remarks with regard to these questions, which can nearly all be reduced to one. Firstly: the often repeated opinion, which regards the doctrines of religion as preeminently an attempt to explain the world, is not merely philosophically weak (because the need of an explanation of the world, even though it is in a certain sense a religious need, is nevertheless not the inmost kernel of religious life); but it does not even accord with historical facts; for there are many religious conceptions which can hardly, or even not at all, be regarded as attempts to explain phenomena. Secondly: it is impossible to find a definite

test for distinguishing between religious, and many other doctrines. In mythology, for instance, religious and non-religious doctrines are found side by side, and mixed together. Much that belongs to philosophy belongs also to religion, more particularly the treatment of cosmology, psychology, and ethics. Lastly: it is not true that the same religious doctrines or common fundamental dogmas are to be found in all religions; though no doubt religious conceptions deal with certain subjects, though in different ways. Some doctrine about the soul, some idea of a god, and the thought of some continuation of existence occur generally in all religions. We do not mean to represent these three subjects as the minimum of dogma or religion, and thus reestablish the long surrendered fiction of a general natural religion. We only wish to state, that certain, though very undeveloped and but half-realised conceptions on these three points, are at the bottom of religious rites and thoughts.

For reasons already explained there is little to be said of the religious conceptions of savages. We can only say that these conceptions occur singly, being not so much parts of a well-arranged whole, as germs only, which never attain their full growth; or else preserved but misunderstood fragments of higher thoughts belonging to a former period, or of foreign origin. It is among civilised nations only, that religious doctrines become really important. The doctrine is more developed and systematised, traditional material has been both carefully reduced and added to, and personal systems have been formed, dependent on, or opposed to it. But it is not the

doctrine which forms the bond of communion. The idea of heresy is foreign to most of the ancient religions; people were condemned because they defied the rights of the gods or endangered their cult. The threefold division of theology, proposed by Varro and often mentioned by the fathers of the church, as poetical, philosophical, and political, is very significant. Antiquity was never thoroughly in earnest with regard to mythological ideas, or philosophical systems, but only with regard to the third, namely the religion of the state, in which rites alone and not doctrines were of importance.

With regard to the form of these religious conceptions, the chief difference is whether imagination or thought preponderates. The forms of doctrine determined by imagination, are the symbolical and mythical; while thought forms dogmas and philosophies. Other distinctions with regard to the form of doctrine are of subordinate importance, for however great the influence of aesthetic and ethic ideals may have been on the formation of doctrines, it tells chiefly on the substance, and afterwards only, on the form of conception. If we represent symbols and myths as products of imagination, we do not mean to ascribe to them an arbitrary character. Even the apparently capricious influence of imagination may follow certain rules, and is at all events determined by experience and tradition, though accidental and personal influences exercise more sway in it, than in the much more impersonal work of thought. This is the reason why symbols and myths create much greater difficulties than dogmas and philosophies; but nevertheless, no student can afford

to ignore them. The symbol depends on a purely ideal analogy, which is considered as real, and whereby one object or being is brought into relation with another, or it is used for the expression of a thought. Thus we find an animal as the representative of a deity, or a tree as an image of power or fertility. Ideal analogies of this kind are by no means foreign to mythology also, but in a myth, the principal point is the ascribing of life to different beings, and their anthropopathic conception. The symbol is mostly a single conception; the myth is a whole history. The symbol points to one side or one quality of a phenomenon only, the myth represents it in its entirety.

There is no absolute opposition between the imaginative and the conceptual forms of religious doctrine; there are not only intermediate forms, but one always takes something from the other or tolerates it by its side. From early times single myths are arranged as a whole, and form mythologies. More highly civilised nations are not satisfied with this, but form religious concepts, which they either foist into their myths, or develop independently of mythology. Even dogmas have never entirely outgrown the symbolic language of mythology. If they had, they would have ceased to be religious conceptions. Pure abstract thought is unfit for religious doctrine, because it has lost touch with practical life and sentiment. We shall have to illustrate this more fully, but we wished to make these introductory remarks before beginning our treatment of mythology.

CHAPTER 25. — **Mythology.**

Books of Reference. In the history of the explanation of myths, the literature belongs for the greater part to the history of single religions under which we shall mention it. From a Roman Catholic apologetic point of view J. VAN DEN GHEYN, S. J., wrote, La mythologie comparée; Histoire et critique des systèmes (in Essais de Mythologie et de Philologie comparée, 1885), for which he got the material for the most part from a larger work by an Italian theologian: DE CARA, Esame critico del sistema filologico et linguistico, applicato alla mitologia e alla scienza delle religioni (1884).

Amongst older attempts to explain myths we mention the ingenious treatise by FR. BACO, De Sapientia veterum liber (1609); the book by C. F. DUPUIS, celebrated in his time, Origine de tous les cultes, ou la religion universelle (3 vols., 1795); the heavy, phantastic but thoughtful works by F. W. J. VON SCHELLING, Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie, and Philosophie der Mythologie (published first in 1856–57, but really nearly thirty years older); the works of HEYNE, G. HERMANN, and their opponent J. H. VOSS (Mythologische Briefe, 2 vols., 1794); FR. CREUZER, Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Volker (6 vols., 2 ed. 1819–23, the last vols., by F. J. MONE, deal with northern heathendom), and the other symbolists such as F. C. BAUR, FR. DE ROUGEMONT, &c. All these works now possess an historical interest only. The scientific treatment of mythology dates first from K. O. MÜLLER, Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie (1825).

The road for comparative mythology was cleared by MAX MÜLLER'S book, Chips (Essays), and in this more especially the essay on Comparative Mythology (1856), and besides this his two series of Lectures on the Science of Language (1861 to 1864): to the first brilliant specimens of the results of comparative studies belong the writings of M. BRÉAL, Hercule et Cacus (1863), which was comprised later in his Mélanges de mythologie et de linguistique; AD. KUHN, Die Herabkunft des Feuers und des Göttertranks (1859, new ed. 1886). We must still mention, AD. KUHN, Ueber Entwicklungsstufen der Mythenbildung (1874); F. L. W. SCHWARTZ, Der Ursprung der Mythologie (1860), Die poetischen Naturanschauungen der Griechen, Römer und Deutschen (2 vols, 1864–79), Indogermanischer Volksglaube (1885); G. W. COX, The mythology of the Aryan nations (2 vols., 1870), An introduction to the science of comparative mythology and folklore (1881); J. G. VON HAHN, Sagwissenschaftliche Studien (1876); J. FISKE, Myths and mythmakers (1873); J. DARMESTETER, Essais orientaux (1883); the works by A. DE GUBERNATIS, which have been mentioned before, and many other books and treatises. MAX MÜLLER'S chief opponent on linguistic and mytho-

logical subjects is W. D. WHITNEY, whose Oriental and linguistic studies we have already mentioned. E. VON SCHMIDT also, Die Philosophie der Mythologie und MAX MÜLLER (1880), and many others have tried to establish antagonistic views. The mythologies of individual nations possess great importance for the history of the explanation of myths, such as the works on Greek mythology by WELCKER, H. D. MÜLLER, GERHARD, PRELLER, DECHARME; and those on German mythology by GRIMM, SIMROCK, UHLAND, MANNHARDT, &c., and besides this many single essays.

Emanating from TYLOR an anthropological tendency is making its way, the representative of which A. LANG, Mythology (Enc. Br.), Custom and Myth (1884), Myth, Ritual, and Religion (2 vols., 1887), has a great following of Folklorists. Everywhere societies or periodicals are being founded to enquire into and collect popular ideas and customs. This is done in Italy, Spain, and Portugal; in France H. GAIDOZ and E. ROLLAND founded in 1878 the periodical Mélusine, which was in abeyance till 1884, but now comes out regularly; in 1886 a Société des traditions populaires was founded, and besides this Messrs. Maisonneuve and Leroux publish two collections of Folklore, mostly taken from the French provinces, but also from foreign countries. In England, towards the end of the last century, J. BRAND collected his Popular Antiquities, much enlarged afterwards; since 1878 a rich harvest has been gathered by the Folklore society, by the editing of books as well as by the periodical, first called Folklore Record and now Folklore Journal, in which G. L. GOMME has given the richest bibliography which can be found on this subject. In 1890 a quarterly review called Folklore superseded the Folklore Journal and the Archæological Review. In Germany, following the example of the brothers GRIMM, Kinder- und Hausmärchen, there are many collections, taken from various parts; we must mention those by MULLENHOFF (Schleswig-Holstein), KUHN and SCHWARTZ (North Germany), K. BARTSCH (Mecklenburg), U. JAHN (Pommerania and Rügen), WITZSCHEL (Thuringia), VERNALEKEN (Austria), ZINGERLE (Tyrol), &c. A periodical, Zeitschrift für Volkskunde, is in its third year. There are also beautiful collections of fables, myths and customs of other countries: THIELE (Denmark), AFZELIUS (Sweden), ASBJÖRNSEN and MOE (Norway), RALSTON (Russia), KRAUSS (southern Slavs), and CRANE (Italy). In America also, an interest in these studies is aroused, as may be seen by the interesting book by F. S. BASSET, Legends and Superstitions of the Sea and of Sailors (1885). At the same time collections are being made in other parts of the world, in Hindostan and in Algiers, amongst the Mongolians as well as the Kaffirs. The importance of these studies for mythology and the science of religion has been repeatedly discussed in the above-named periodicals (Mélusine,

Folklore Record) and also in some treatises by TIELE, CH. PLOIX, LANG, J. RÉVILLE (in R. H. R. 1885–86), in which the question is treated in various ways. Amongst more recent Folklorists many follow the method which TH. BENFEY introduced in his Orient und Occident, paying particular attention to the literary filiation of fables and their origin and spreading from Indian literature. This has been done by E. COSQUIN, Contes populaires de Lorraine (2 vols., 1886); W. A. CLOUSTON, Popular tales and fictions (2 vols., 1887), and others.

We shall best examine the various sides of mythology, by giving a survey of the most important explanations of myths, which have been attempted up to the present day, and, after a critical sifting, by emphasising all safe results and useful methods.

As soon as the civilisation of a people reaches a certain point, the traditional substance of mythology, the histories of the gods and heroes begin to seem strange to educated and thoughtful persons. This has happened to a certain extent in India, and in Egypt, but more particularly in Greece. That the Greeks were offended at their myths is shown by their ignoring or even rejecting them (as was done by Xenophon, Plato, and other philosophers); or by their reforming them more or less, in order to make them acceptable to a more refined taste, or to higher moral and religious sentiments (as was done by Herodotus and Pindar); or by ascribing to them another than their usual and direct meaning, namely by interpreting them allegorically. This last attempt at imparting plausibility to myths has been stigmatised as useless by Sokrates, in a remarkable passage in Plato's Phædrus, 229. But what he condemned was carried on more and more zealously. The Orphics had begun to mix old with modern myths and to use them for representing philosophical and religious thoughts. Later on Stoics and semi-Platonists, such

as Plutarch, endeavoured to make myths more transparent. According to the saying of an anonymous mythograph this was done by explaining them πραγματικῶς, ψυχικῶς, and στοιχειακῶς. The pragmatic explanation saw in the gods of mythology, kings or merely men; the psychic, the soul in its various stages; the stoic, the elements of natural phenomena. Athene, for instance, is according to the first explanation, a queen, according to the second, the understanding, according to the third, the thicker air between moon and earth. These are the principal grooves followed for a long time in the allegorical explanation of myths, and they are to a certain extent followed still.

The idea that mythology is founded on historical events, was represented in antiquity chiefly by Euhemerus, who under the Macedonian king Kassander wrote his book ἱερὰ ἀναγραφή. In this he maintained that he had discovered in the Isle of Panchaia the true meaning of myths, namely, that the gods had really been men: Hephæstus, for instance, was the discoverer of fire; Demeter was a woman, who had taught the art of baking. His explanation was adopted by many, for example by Diodorus, who gives us an abstract of the book of Euhemerus; by Ennius, who popularised his explanation at Rome; by Polybius and by the mythograph Palæphatus, who produced the most insipid explanations. It was adopted by several Fathers of the church also, to whom, in their attack on heathenism, this explanation of myths was more welcome than the allegorical, which discovered behind the veil of myth either natural phenomena, or profound truths. This historical explanation of myths

has retained in history the name of euhemerism, and has counted many followers among earlier mythologists, such as VOSSIUS (Theologia gentilis), BANIER, HUET, the bishop of Avranches, and others. They tried to recognise in the Greek gods, the Hebrew patriarchs, or to represent myths as mere stories; one of them, LECLERC, going so far as to maintain that Greek mythology consisted of the diaries of old merchants and seamen. At present euhemerism haunts a few writers only, and the reaction against it has become so strong, that it is considered as the greatest evil in mythological research, and has driven many to an opposite extreme. Whether there is a glimmer of truth in this much abused theory, will have to be discussed hereafter.

The other two interpretations, the psychological and natural, we can comprehend under the common name of allegorical; they often go hand in hand. To the former belong the interpretations of BACON, who discovers in Narcissus, self-love, in Dionysus, passion, and in the Sphinx, science. The second, which, as we remarked, does not exclude the first, has more numerous representatives; NATALIS COMES (1653) sees in mythology omnia prope naturalis et moralis philosophiæ dogmata. Thus when we are told that the gods cannot drag down Zeus by a golden chain, we are asked to see in this the picture of the temptations of greed and vanity, which try, but in vain, to seduce the brave man. DUPUIS, the French revolutionist, professes purely natural explanations, and sees in mythology, astronomical poems. Not much better are the labours of two men, well furnished indeed with sound philological knowledge, HEYNE and G.

Hermann; of whom the latter only, though under manifold instigation from Heyne, has elaborated a complete system. It is the object of this system to show that mythology contains a scientific explanation of the world, cosmogony, astronomy, &c., invented by priests in an anti-religious spirit, but offered to the multitude in the disguise of stories about the gods, so that they might not perceive the secret esoteric meaning. J. H. Voss in his sober mythological letters has pointed out much that is nonsensical in that system, without however arriving at any positive results himself, since he represented mythology as exclusively the product of poetic imagination, and protested against ascribing to it any other meaning.

The mythological works of Schelling and Creuzer showed a double advance as opposed to the former systems, because they emphasised the philosophical as well as the religious conditions of mythological research. According to all former views, mythology possessed throughout, an arbitrary and artificial character; Schelling was the first to describe the myth-forming process as a necessary one, connected with the formation and development of the life of nations. He did not possess the severe logic of Hegel to carry out this idea, and therefore his mythological discussions advance by fits and starts, but yet to him belongs the honour, of having been the first to lay stress on this essential condition. The same can be said of Creuzer's merits, who opposed Hermann, by maintaining the religious character of mythology, and refused to accept any explanation which systematically ignored this side. He himself fell back on

the system known as the symbolic school, but in doing this he could not quite avoid the old dangers, and fell also into many new ones. It is true that his 'Symbolik und Mythologie,' although containing nothing any longer useful to our scientific needs, was nevertheless the first mythological system on a grand scale. In this work he treated the substance as well as the form of religious doctrines, and brought Greek myths into connection with the religious conceptions of the East. According to CREUZER, mythology is by no means a philosophy, but a religious teaching, proceeding from direct intuitions, and fostered and cared for by priestly schools. This ancient wisdom of the priests originated in the East, and passed over to Greece also as a secret wisdom, and there became the kernel of all myths. The substance of this teaching is an ancient original monotheism, its form is symbolical. To explain this symbolism, and to understand this hidden wisdom, is the task of the mythologist, who must therefore grasp the organic whole of a myth by direct intuition, and must let its spirit work on himself, without being too exacting with regard to witnesses. The mythologist as well as the poet, nascitur non fit. In the flat surroundings of Leyden, whither he had migrated for a short time from Heidelberg, CREUZER felt unable to conceive any mythological thought. The shortcomings of this symbolical school are palpable. First of all CREUZER mixes myth with symbol, admitting but a slight difference between them, and confounding always the primitive and natural symbolism of the religious ideas of the people, with the artificial symbolism of the priests. Neither the primitive monotheism nor the priestly wisdom

in Creuzer's system can be defended, and the worst is that he chooses his materials arbitrarily, that he confounds different periods, and systematically ignores a strictly scientific treatment, and critical analysis of his materials. Welcker was not far wrong when he reproached him with delivering sermons on mythological texts with great unction. Creuzer's system bears the impress of the romantic period of German literature and science, in which it arose. Nevertheless, considerable learning and good taste kept Creuzer from falling into many errors, which his pupils have not been able to avoid. The youthful labours of F. C. Baur in elaborating a system of symbolism and mythology, have fortunately been forgotten on account of the great merits of his later works. Among other things, he explained the net in which Ares and Aphrodite had been caught, as the cosmic nexus. German, French, and English symbolists have achieved incredible things in their absurd explanations. At present there only remain the heads of the Theosophical Society, who are busy in unveiling Isis, and representing an esoteric doctrine as the essence of all religions (Sinnet, Olcott, and Countess Blavatsky). Among men of science the symbolical school is forgotten.

A truly scientific treatment of mythology begins with the appearance of K. O. Müller's Prolegomena. Before him all attempts were directed to a systematic explanation of mythology; even later writers, and among them Welcker, have claimed that mythology should be treated in general, because the whole comes always before its parts. K. O. Müller declared his decided opposition to this course, and

thus opened the road for the actual historical treatment of mythology. He did not wish to hurl himself into mythology with a salto mortale, but to approach it by a thousand ways. He established the principle, which has since then been the guiding star of all mythological enquiry, that the explanation of a myth must consist in nothing but the explanation of its genesis. Sometimes he has himself been unfaithful to this rule, and has wished to separate the 'real' element from the 'ideal' in myths, but his merits as having been the first to clearly formulate the proper task of mythological science, are not therefore diminished. It was owing to this historical treatment, that he regarded mythology in connection with the whole popular life, and made all our knowledge of antiquity an indispensable help for the investigation of myths. He also drew the very necessary distinction between the actual myth, and its treatment by poets and writers, and formulated the necessity of resolving mythic materials into their original elements. These are all settled results, which no enquirer into myths can ignore, without at once renouncing all claims to a scientific character. In considering the errors in K. O. MÜLLER'S work, we are first struck by the fact, that he attributes too much significance to the local character of many myths, however important this may be, and more particularly that he isolates Greek too much from Oriental myths. It is true he advises mythologists to study other mythologies besides the Greek, so as to enter fully into the mythical atmosphere of thought, but he rejects any historical connection between Greek and foreign civilisation. We know this narrowness of view to be an

error, but we can hardly blame him for it, considering, that he saw the mischief done by constant references to Oriental priestly wisdom, and did not yet see the light which comparative studies were sure to bring after his time.

The new life which, according to K. O. Müller, was required for the study of mythology has come to it from a comparative study of languages. The founder of comparative mythology is incontestably, Max Müller. We have first to examine what kind of importance he ascribes to the study of languages; for it is intimately connected with the whole of his philosophy of language. Language according to him, is not the arbitrary expression, but the necessary condition of thought. Words and names contain therefore the key to concepts and thoughts. If on one side language is determined by thought, thought also is determined by language; nay, language may acquire an independent power, and react on the mind. Mythology according to him is properly a form of thought, not a 'quid' but a 'quale'; a form of thought so essentially determined by language, that it may almost be called a 'disease of language.' This peculiar phenomenon is characteristic of a stage in human development, in which concrete intuition, not abstract thought, predominates. We find it therefore in all childlike and natural times and conditions in antiquity, and in those strata of modern society, which have preserved their popular character. The mythopœic process may therefore be observed, in what is called modern mythology also. The peculiarities of language, which lead to the formation of many myths, are the gender of words, polyonymy and

synonymy, poetical metaphor, &c. MAX MÜLLER[1] has strongly protested against the misunderstanding that his expression 'disease of language' contains the whole of his view of mythology. Mythology, according to him, is a form of conception, for the understanding of which language is the principal, but not the only means; many things, not everything, can be explained by a reference to language, and MAX MÜLLER himself warns people against the exaggeration, which generally follows every new theory. However, this great importance of language for mythological studies has only been secured by means of comparative philology, and principally on Indo-Germanic soil. G. HERMANN, and others before him, had consulted etymology for the explanation of myths, but they went wrong because they were restricted to the Greek language only. But after BOPP and others had created comparative philology, linguistic studies not only opened a wider horizon, but supplied a firm foundation for mythological studies. The relationship of the Indo-Germanic languages is an established result, and has become the foundation for other results in etymological, grammatical, mythological, and historical research. Not long ago, in answering some recent objections against the value of linguistic studies for mythology, MAX MÜLLER represented the equation:—

Diaush-Pitar = Zeus Pater = Jupiter = Tyr,

as the greatest historical discovery of the 19th century, by which every student of ancient history and mythology must guide his course, like the sailor by the com-

[1] In the Preface, which is worth reading, to W. W. GILL'S Myths and Songs from the South Pacific (1876).

pass [1]. Thus the question as to any connection between Greeks and Oriental nations, which formerly was a chaos of the wildest fancy, has suddenly been raised by comparative philology to a scientific certainty. We can speak of a primitive time, and of a primitive people amongst Indo-Germans. The treasure of words, shared in common by the people belonging to that family, allows us an insight into the conditions and mode of life, and into the religious ideas of this undivided race. More particularly by means of the interpretation of the names of their gods do we begin to understand their mythology.

Many objections have been raised against the part which Max Müller assigns to linguistic studies, in connection with mythological research. We need say nothing of objections which are entirely due to misunderstandings. Some paradoxical expressions of Max Müller's have been so turned and twisted, that a meaning totally different from what they really possessed, has been falsely ascribed to them. An abuse of his method cannot be charged against the method itself. It is quite true that some so-called results of comparative philology, are by no means so certain as the equation just quoted. Another, more real objection has been raised against this method. Digging in the mines of language, it has been said, is of great value, but it is dangerous for determining the substance of thoughts; and while philosophy in general is just surrendering the dangerous habit of giving an etymology, instead of a definition, something very similar is introduced into mythology. We often

[1] Max Müller. The Lesson of Jupiter (*Nineteenth Century*, Oct. 1885).

forget that the original meaning of a word, may be totally different from its later employment, and that we find similar mythic conceptions with totally different names, and very different ones with the same names. This objection should be seriously considered. We may conclude that the part played by comparative philology in the explanation of mythology is more humble than was at first supposed; but it by no means follows that the great and famous discoveries of philology are almost worthless in this direction. However much mythologists may wish to narrow the use of etymology, they can never forget entirely the 'lesson of Jupiter,' or leave the grooves into which research has been brought by comparative philology. It is all very well to use the watch word, 'not words, but concepts,' but many an opponent of MAX MÜLLER, for instance E. VON SCHMIDT, has fared badly by escaping too soon from the discipline of philology, and by hunting after concepts, without properly examining their vehicles, words.

MAX MÜLLER has illustrated this theory of the right interpretation of myths, by several examples. We select from them the myths of Kephalos, Eos, and Prokris. Kephalos is the sun, the son of Herse, that is the dew, therefore, the sun rising over dewy fields. Eos has retained his own appellative meaning of dawn. Prokris, from a Sanskrit root PARK, to sprinkle, applied to raindrops, is again the dew, therefore = Herse, which is likewise derived from a Sanskrit root VRISH, to sprinkle. The myth may therefore be dissolved in the following four sayings:— Kephalos loves Prokris, that is, the sun kisses the morning dew; Eos loves Kephalos, that is, the dawn

loves the sun; Prokris is faithless, but her new lover, though under a different disguise, is still the same Kephalos, that is, the rays of the sun are reflected in manifold colours by the dew-drops: Prokris at last is killed by Kephalos, that is, the dew is absorbed by the sun. We can see from this example that the linguistic method of interpretation sheds light on the contents of myths also, showing how, behind the names of gods and heroes there are natural phenomena, so that mythology represents the history of nature as the history of the gods. The followers of the comparative school of mythology have worked without exception in that direction, though there were also considerable differences of opinion. Not only was there, in spite of the supposed certainty of linguistic results, a considerable difference as to etymologies and interpretations, but there was no complete agreement even on the principal points. The two schools, called the solar and the meteorological, diverged in different directions; the former, whose recognised chief is Max Müller, and Cox its zealous advocate, sees in almost all myths, stories about the sun, which rises and sets, runs, drives, roams about as a valiant hero, a faithless or happy lover, sending down his arrows, then becoming decrepid and dying. Max Müller sees myths of the dawn in the stories of Saramâ, Helena, the Erinnyes (Sara*n*yu), Aditi, Athene, Eos and Tithonus, Kephalos, Eos, and Prokris, Daphne and Apollo, Urvasî and Pururavas, Orpheus and Eurydice, Charis and Eros. All these myths, which according to Max Müller are in the main of the same import, are explained differently by other mythologists. The followers of the meteorological school in

particular, such as KUHN, SCHWARTZ, and DARMESTETER, discover everywhere the drama of the thunderstorm. According to them, maidens and treasures are kept in the heavenly stronghold, watched by dark monsters, till the strong god, or the bold hero, kills the dragons, delivers the maidens, and carries off the treasure. This would mean that the light and the water of heaven are kept imprisoned in the dark thunder-clouds, but shine forth, and pour down on the earth when the clouds have been burst asunder and the air has been cleared. Some mythologists admit both interpretations, and choose one or the other in explaining individual myths. Other natural phenomena, from which myths have been derived, are the cosmogonic marriage between heaven and earth, the growth of plants, and the changing forms of the earth in the different seasons of the year, the annual course of the sun through the signs of the zodiac, and the inundations of great rivers, as for instance the Nile. In general it is the ordinary, regularly returning, and generally visible phenomena of nature which are discovered in myths; but sometimes only more local, or scattered phenomena. LAISTNER, for instance, has tried to interpret several myths from certain nebular formations which can be observed on certain heights of the Alps [1]. The school of comparative mythology has exercised an almost uncontested sway; only of late years many have deserted it. The charge is brought against it, that though supported for thirty years by such excellent authorities, it can point to so few

[1] L. LAISTNER, Nebelsagen (1879). Das Räthsel der Sphinx (2 vols., 1889), in which he points out that 'der Alptraum' is at the root of most myths.

perfectly certain results. Not only are there opposite explanations for the same myth, but many of them, at first sight of convincing certainty, display many difficulties, if more closely examined, and do not fit the myth without pressure. At present many people are inclined to see in comparative mythology, not much more than ingenious attempts, scientifically fruitless. This is certainly unjust, and we have only to transport ourselves back, for one moment, into the time before the foundation of comparative mythology, in order to see how much we owe to it. It is quite right that its results should be carefully examined, and that besides the way which it has pointed out, others also should be tried which may bring us nearer to our goal.

This has been done by the anthropological school, which follows Tylor as its leader. If one reads the chapters on mythology in the first volume of Tylor's Primitive Culture, we shall see, that he does not take by any means the same hostile position against Max Müller's method, as some of his later followers. There is one difference that can be easily perceived. It is true that Max Müller has taken an interest in the myths of other races also, which are totally unconnected with the Indo-Germanic family; one has only to read his Chips, and different books on South Africa and Polynesia, to which he has written various Prefaces, in order to be convinced of this. But in his interpretations of myths he takes his firm stand nevertheless, within the limits of Indo-Germanic studies. Tylor, on the contrary, wants to study myths among races and nations where they exist to the present day. Max Müller always begins by questioning the word, in order to find the key

of a myth; TYLOR maintains, that real and sensuous analogy form the basis of mythology, and that the change of word-metaphors to myths, is a secondary phase. But here also, a physical interpretation is applied to many myths, only not so uniformly as by comparative mythologists. These suggestions of TYLOR, however, have not directly influenced the treatment of mythology; this took place by a more extended study of Folklore. Folklore comprises all that is popular, not only in literature, but in conceptions, manners, and customs. There is often a most striking similarity between what is prevalent almost exclusively among lower races, and what survives in the lower strata of civilised people. It is this material which has been called Folklore. It comprises tales, legends, all kinds of superstition, popular songs and melodies, proverbs and plays, customs of domestic, rural, and ecclesiastical life, in fact all sorts of things of which we cannot here give a classified account. Several comparative mythologists, such as DE GUBERNATIS, SCHWARTZ, and KUHN, had carefully considered Folklore, but had always tried to fit it into the frame of their scholastic ideas. More comprehensive, and essentially different also, was the use which JACOB GRIMM, in his German Mythology, made of the 'never ceasing stream of living customs and legends.' But most of his pupils entered into the grooves of comparative mythology, though the school of LACHMANN kept at a certain distance from it. MANNHARDT, in his preface to the 'Antike Wald- und Feldkulten,' 1876, declared decidedly his transition from the comparative to the anthropological school, in opposition not only to his

own former labours and to the pupils of GRIMM, but also in declared opposition to GRIMM himself. At present, the opposition between the comparative method, and that of anthropologists and folklorists, has become extremely sharp, particularly amongst French and English folklorists such as GAIDOZ, A. LANG, and others. Both sides carry on their controversy, not with real bitterness, but with an ironical air of superiority. The folklorists scoff at the comparative method, which restricts its comparisons to the Indo-Germans only, and refuses to take account of the strongest analogies between the thoughts of Indo-Germans and savages. They take it for granted that myths should be explained from Folklore, not Folklore from myths, in other words, that mythic tales have sprung from states of human consciousness, such as we can study even at present among savages and the lower classes. This is the very opposite of what was done formerly, when survivals of old, pure, and sublime wisdom were discovered in Greek myths, while at present the same myths with their crude, and to the Greeks themselves, most offensive tales, are represented as survivals of a period, during which the ancestors of the Greeks stood on the same intellectual level, which is now occupied by Bushmen and Australians. It is true that a kernel of truth in these assertions may be separated from the strong exaggeration with which they are offered to us. A decided advantage of this method consists in this, that by it the examination of Folklore has been freed from the trammels of mythological systems, and that it has rejected the claim of using the results of these studies

as a kind of 'basse-mythologie' by way of illustration only, for well-established mythological views. But mythological research derives a positive gain also, from these studies. Hitherto, interpretations have taken a myth simply as a form of an idea, and tried to discover its outward form and inward meaning; but the connection between human thoughts and actions, between myth and cult, between legend and custom, between tales and manners, has been entirely neglected. This is the point to which the anthropological school pays great attention. It no longer, as comparative mythology does, explains a custom, from a mythological conception, but the latter from the former. Though neither of these interpretations always hits the right point, yet there is less danger of error in the latter, than in the former. The thoroughly antiquated school of mythologists tried to discover the doctrines which were supposed to be hidden in the myths. The comparative school is chiefly interested in the form of mythic conception, while the anthropological throws light on the general intellectual conditions, and the external circumstances in which myths arise. From this point of view the different directions of the interpretation of myths contain a common fund of truth; but they must allow themselves to be corrected, supplemented, and limited, one by the other.

This historical survey of different schools of mythological interpretation will show that much has been done, but still more remains to be done. This will become still clearer if we now cast a glance at the whole field of mythology.

We saw that the explanation of a myth ought to

be nothing but its history. Our object is not to discover a rational kernel in irrational tales, but to describe the genesis and the development of a myth. This no doubt is very difficult. Mythology has so many sides, that we must not exclude any method of interpretation, and it would seem very conceited to attempt an explanation of everything, by means of one key. We shall mention some of the most important classes of myths, and first of all those which have an historical background. Though euhemerism has a very bad name, yet we cannot deny, that in the ideas which ancient nations form of their origin, legends with an historical kernel, and myths, are often so closely interwoven that it is impossible to find out what historical facts were originally contained in them, though we cannot but admit an historical event as the foundation of the legend. We cannot deny, and Grote has admitted it as regards Greek antiquity, that the stories of old wars and voyages cannot consist of pure nature-myths, that legendary heroes cannot all be gods brought down to earth, but may occasionally have been deified men. It may be useless to attempt to distil history from myth and legend. Though this might lead to absurdities, yet it is not less absurd, to attempt to discover in half historical personages, nay even in the legends and histories of the Old Testament, nothing but nature-gods. Why should not the legends about the foundation of cities, the history of the Trojan war, the song of the Niebelungs, the legends of the Israelitic patriarchs, and the stories about the migration of the New Zealanders, &c., contain some historical elements,

however impossible it may be to extract them completely? The name euhemerism should be a warning against falling into old mistakes, but we should not be afraid to recognise what is really evident, namely, that several myths have sprung from historical events. Our opinion of a more modern form of euhemerism propounded by H. SPENCER, who derives all religion from the cult of departed spirits, has been stated before.

We shall always have to consider as an important class of myths, those which depend on the personification and animation of the phenomena of nature. If the anthropological school gives itself the air of rejecting all explanations of nature-myths, this is only affectation, for there can be no serious doubt of the great importance of nature-myths. All that we protest against is, that this interpretation should be applied even where it is not appropriate, and that people should deny the existence of any myths but nature-myths.

Besides these two classes there are the cult-myths, which owe their origin to a custom, or to the locality of a cult. There are besides, myths of civilisation, which ascribe the origin of civilisation, the discovery of fire, agriculture, &c., to gods and heroes. There are also cosmogonic myths which describe the origin of the world; ætiological myths which give an account of any impressive circumstance, as when the Redskins of North America declare the red earth of their pipes to be the flesh of their ancestors. There are geographical myths, fully treated by PESCHEL; romantic myths embellished by imagination; and etymological myths produced by language. TYLOR

and LANG have enumerated several kinds of myths, of which we have here mentioned only a few. Many a new discovery shows us the traces of a new mode of forming myths, thus CLERMONT-GANNEAU maintained a few years ago that many Greek myths were nothing but little stories invented by the Greeks, in order to explain pictures on pottery which they had bought from the Phœnicians. Whatever we may think of this ikonographic interpretation, it shows us at all events that the possibilities of mythical interpretation are by no means exhausted, as new circumstances can always be discovered which have influenced the formation of myths.

In a truly scientific study of mythology it is necessary to distinguish, far more than is usually done, between the original substance of a myth, and its later development in literature, in plastic art, or in sacerdotal theology. The interpretation of mythological names and the whole of comparative mythology can only lead to a knowledge of the mythic material, and even this but partially. A comparison of the mythologies of related people shows us what the undivided prehistoric race possessed in common. This prehistoric mythology, however, must not be confounded with national mythology. It happens, but too often, that the two are mixed together, or that instead of Greek mythology, prehistoric mythology is offered to us. But the latter explains the former to a small extent only, and the two should be strictly kept asunder. Prehistoric mythology, as established by comparative studies, is very useful in disclosing to us the meaning

of names and epithets, of mythic features, and ceremonial customs, by giving us in fact the traditional material, which has been transformed by nations in their historical development. But the Indian, Persian, Greek, Roman, and German mythologies have to show us what myths have been for each of these nations, how they have looked on them, what they have done with them, and how far their religious thoughts depended on, and are reflected by them.

Conceived in this way, the task of mythology becomes no doubt very difficult, and it is easy to see that there will always remain many gaps in our science of mythology. Before all things it is necessary, that all the material which has been preserved, should be completely collected and critically arranged. This fundamental condition has not yet been fulfilled; how much would be required for it may be seen, for instance, from the meritorious undertaking of W. H. ROSCHER, whose very full dictionary of Greek and Roman mythology, carried out with the help of several excellent philologists and historians, represents a first attempt of an exhaustive collection of materials with reference to their sources.

It is not sufficient to collect and sift authentic materials, but it is of the greatest importance to analyse myths, and to discover their constituent elements. It is easy to see why this labour should attract the anthropologists and folklorists, and it was really the collection of popular tales, which gave the first impulse to an elaboration of the fundamental types and formulas of mythic narrations. So far as

I know it was J. G. VON HAHN[1] who for the first time, attempted to carry this out systematically. LANG followed him; and recently several others, as for instance R. C. TEMPLE, have worked more or less decidedly in the same direction. It is certainly curious that the same stories should occur as fundamental types in so many, and such distant myths and popular tales. Such are, parting and returning (Penelope formula), delivery from a monster (Andromeda formula), the false bride or daughter (Berta formula), &c. The explanation of these formulas in mythology and Folklore, and in connection with customs and manners, has hardly been thought of, though it is one of the most important problems for the science of mythology. In order to account for the wide spreading of the same formulas, even among nations who stand in no historical connection with each other, we must appeal to psychological unity, and similarity of outward circumstances. This is at all events much more plausible, than to admit the possibility of an intercourse in prehistoric times between remote races, possibly by means of slave trade or exogamy.

We have thus touched on all the problems with which mythological research is occupied. We have left out of consideration those myths only which are purely literary fictions, like that of Eros in Plato's Symposion or that of Herakles at the cross-roads, or those of the Gnostics, Neo-platonists, and many Hindu

[1] J. G. VON HAHN, Griechische und Albanesische Märchen (2 vols., 1864); R. C. TEMPLE in the remarkable preface to The Legends of the Panjab (2 vols, 1886); in many of the publications of the Folklore Society a classification of mythical traits has been attempted.

theologians, which are founded on abstract concepts, because they are not myths in the proper sense of the word.

Chapter 26.—The Dogmatic and Philosophical Forms of Religious Doctrine.

All religions, at all events those of civilised nations, have developed a didactic character. Such didactic elements can be seen through the myths, or are more or less separated from them, but always in such a way that they never quite belie their mythical form of thought and expression. Concrete perception, and abstract concept are always more or less mixed up in religious doctrine; the former becomes the bearer of the latter, and the concept cannot quite renounce pictures and symbols. What we have already said about the spiritualisation of nature-gods refers also to myths. Max Müller, Asmus, Darmesteter, and others, have given most conclusive examples. For instance, in light, the transition from the material perception to the spiritual idea is very natural and imperceptible: thus, brilliancy, clearness, truth and purity. The words infinity, and order, (regularity, law) express at the same time perceptions and thoughts. As soon as one takes account of the meaning of natural events, one arrives at the conception of a cosmos, and conceives the single phenomena in their connection with the course of the world. Thus myths are formed about the beginning of the world, the renewal of the world, and the end of the world; or rather, the myths of the rising and setting of the sun, perhaps also the thunder-myths, and certainly the year-myth and the myths of the catastrophes of nature are expanded into world-

myths, in which nevertheless a cosmogonic and cosmologic doctrine cannot be mistaken. We do not mean to state that the origins of this didactic character are to be found in the myths themselves, that dualism for instance arose from the impressions only which the conflict in nature produced on man; we only show that mythic form and didactic character do not exclude one another, but that on the contrary, they attract one another in many stages of religious development. When the Chinese talk of the order of the world, they think of the material heaven. Nobody will hesitate to consider the Greek stories of Hades as belonging to mythology, and yet these stories were the chief form in which the Greeks clothed their doctrine of what was to happen after death. This mixture strikes us very forcibly in the Persian religion, which laid great emphasis on the dogmas of the creation and end of the world, and developed them mythically.

But although the didactic elements have entered into mythology from all sides, yet they are treated independently also. This takes place either by the didactic elements being clothed in myths, and lending to them a deeper, and allegorical meaning, as is the case amongst the Egyptian priests and Greek Orphics; or by the religious idea freeing itself of the mythical form, as amongst Indian thinkers; or even developing itself in direct opposition to it, as amongst most Greek philosophers, and the Israelitic prophets. But even in the latter case, religious conception can never completely assume the robe of pure thought, and of abstract idea; it requires so essentially a figurative form and concrete body that it loses its religious

character as soon as it tries to become pure philosophy. The god of religion, and therefore of religious doctrine, is always conceived anthropopathically or anthropomorphically; an abstract idea, such as that of the absolute, can never occupy the place of a religious conception of God; therefore the idea of personality, which is never entirely free from figure, is absolutely indispensable. Much confusion of thought might be avoided, if one always bore in mind, at the right time, this figurative character of every system of religious doctrine.

We have till now only spoken of religious doctrine and not of dogma. It is true the word 'dogma' itself, means tenet, and it would therefore have been perfectly allowable if, in what has already been said, we had talked of the dogmatic elements in the various religions. But it is better to define more closely the conception of dogma than we have done in previous descriptions, in which we considered the general characteristics of myth and doctrine. Dogma presupposes a church, a communion, which is essentially a communion of belief, in which the belief is fixed by a canon, a sacred book, a common symbol, or a creed. Church doctrine as a bond of communion, as an expression of piety, as the development of a confession of faith, forms the conception of dogma in the history of religion. We do not speak of dogma where there is no church, therefore not in discussing the mythological religions of the ancient world, although these may possess numerous doctrinal elements; nor in the individual developments of religious doctrine; nor in the sects in which religious communion is based, not on a common creed, but on

common pious sentiments only; in fact nowhere where the communion of worship is not also a communion of faith. But there are four ecclesiastical communions in which the development of dogmas can be admitted: these are the Jewish community after the exile, the Buddhist, the Christian, and the Mohammedan churches. In Judaism, however, no actual development of a doctrine of faith was attained, at least no connected dogmatic system. The Jewish doctrine consisted in the Halacha, meditations on the law and discussions on its decisions, and in the Haggada, tales sometimes in a rather fantastic form for the edification of the people. We find a greater formation of dogmas in Buddhism, in which the formula of taking refuge with Buddha, Dharma, and Samgha formed a starting-point for dogmatic development, which indeed is not absent, though in the canon as well as in the history of the church, disciplinary preponderate over dogmatic questions. A complete development of a dogmatic doctrinal system was only attained in the two other churches: it was uniform in Islam, and confessionally very varied in Christianity. The formation and development of dogmas in Christianity and in Islam show a striking similarity in very essential points, but at the same time no less important differences also. Of the latter we shall mention one only, because it is purely formal. In Christianity, dogma only claims to be the doctrine of Christian faith, but the sphere of this faith is very variously defined both in substance and in compass. In Islam, on the contrary, religion embraces from the very first, the whole extent of civil and political life, and political ideas belong unquestionably to the ruling ideas of Islam.

Besides this ecclesiastical development of religious doctrine, which we call dogma, we must still mention the systems of individual thinkers and schools, which, though they are often considered as philosophy, possess an incontestably religious character. It is certainly entirely wrong to regard religion as a kind of popular philosophy; for it has to supply quite different demands to those of a theory of the world. Nor can we regard the work of philosophy simply as part of religion; for it treats of many problems which in no ways interest religious thought. But it is a fact that at a certain stage, religion endeavours to base and develop its doctrine philosophically, and that philosophy, from Plato to Hegel, was not only occupied with religion, but claimed for itself a religious character. If we enumerate the thinkers of India, the priests of Egypt, the great teachers of Islam, and the scholastic philosophers of the Middle Ages, everybody will at once see how difficult it is to draw a line between theology and philosophy. Religion forms the substance of philosophical speculation, the truth of which philosophy desires to establish, and defend independently. Or else philosophy moves on untrammeled, but regards religion as a forbidden ground, and carefully avoids all conflict with a respected orthodoxy. Or else, theology and philosophy try to agree with each other by means of what is called double truth. Or else, the theologian, still maintaining his fixed position within religious truth, clothes it in the raiment of philosophy, from which he borrows the logical form of his dogmatic system. It is curious that Christian theology has most deeply felt the influence of Plato

and Aristotle, the two great philosophers of the Greeks, that is, of the nation which developed philosophy quite independently of religion. That Christian theology nevertheless borrowed so much from them, arises not only from the fact that Plato and Aristotle were always the best school of thought which existed in the world up to modern times, but likewise from the value which many of their forms of thought possessed for Christian theology. This is not the place to describe these historical connections, and still less to criticise them. We shall only remark that in the theological schools of Islam, Aristotle has been used for the same purpose as in the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages.

But there are still other phenomena to be considered. In the ancient world philosophy was often not altogether regarded as a system for the explanation of the world, or for comprehending all human knowledge, but entirely as a means of salvation. It was so in India, where several schools were striving after knowledge, which should free mankind from the fetters of an existence, separated from its real source. The later systems of classical antiquity also, neglected logic and physics more and more as compared with ethics, and pretended to give their guidance for a good and blessed life. Such a school easily became a religious community, as we mentioned above, and philosophers, for instance under the Roman emperors, often played the part of teachers of religion. In our century much the same has been seen in the founder of positivism, A. COMTE, who allowed himself to be honoured as the high priest of humanity.

As we are discussing the connection between philosophy and religion, we cannot forbear mentioning one tendency, which occupies a peculiar and very isolated position in the history of religion, attracting small circles, but being hardly in touch with the great progress of development, we mean Theosophy. Theosophy in China, India, in Islam, as Neo-platonism and as Gnosticism, in the church of the Middle Ages, and in Protestantism, is for the most part very indifferent to religious, ecclesiastic, and confessional differences; it dispenses with the severe discipline of a philosophical method, but grasps directly at the highest truths touching the ground, the essence, the perfection of the universe, the roads leading to higher knowledge, the unity of the natural and the moral, the physical and the spiritual. Theosophy soars on its own wings to giddy heights, and boldly throws its measuring rod into depths, which imagination hardly dares to realise. It has the merit of rousing the spirit, though it cannot lead it into right grooves; but it contains this danger, that not being subject to the discipline of logical and moral laws, it leads people to imagine that they can be led to the highest summits of truth, on other but the toilsome and safe road of honest effort.

We will still touch on one point, namely, the question as to the material relation between religion and philosophy. Since KANT this problem has become inevitable. Philosophers and theologians cannot help occupying themselves with questions such as, Why and how far does religion require philosophy? What influence is exercised by the apparently innocent logical formulas which the former has borrowed from

the latter? Lastly and principally, Which philosophy is best adapted to religion? With regard to the last question, there are some who maintain that there is only one truly religious system of Christian philosophy, namely Theism; others incline to the opinion that religion and philosophy are really indifferent to each other, and that the former may well come to an understanding with several philosophical systems. From an historical point of view, we have to remark, firstly, that religions which exclude philosophy are doomed to stagnation; this is true of Buddhism, and of Islam after the times of Ghazzali. Secondly, that religion is on the best terms with two systems, namely theism and pantheism. However strongly one may contrast these two, history teaches that religion, the Christian not less than others, is apt to fall back into the language of pantheism, and does not seem afraid of it, in spite of repeated warnings as to the great dangers of this view of the world. But here we touch again on ground which we promised to avoid, for the treatment of the material of doctrine itself, would require the development of a complete philosophical system.

Chapter 27.—The Relation of Religion to Morality and Art.

We have already given our opinion in chapter 6 on the independence of religion and morality, and their separate origin. But, on the other hand, the two are so closely connected, and influence one another so much, that a history of religion must always consider moral ideas, and vice versa. In order to discuss this connection thoroughly, it

would be necessary to examine the religious value of the fundamental ideas of morality, and this must be carried out with as much philosophical acuteness as historical knowledge. Considered from the standpoint of the history of religion, and the psychology of nations, this question has been partially treated, but it has hardly been touched on in its whole extent[1]. We shall here only make a few remarks on this point, as otherwise our phenomenological section would be wanting in one important subject.

Although the gods do not owe their origin to moral ideas, they acquire, nevertheless, a high importance for morality. The order they represent is the order in nature and in cult; but it faces man as something which ought to be, as something to which he must submit, in fact as a moral law. This unity of the natural, ceremonial, and moral order of the world appears very clearly in several of the old religions, for instance in that of China. But the gods are also watchers over the acts of men, and punish transgressions. This idea is expressed in several hymns to Varuṇa in the Rig-Veda. It is here of less importance how the gods judge the behaviour of men, and whether they only care for the honour shown to themselves. It is clear that the fundamental idea of duty is connected with the religious worship of the gods, and that both thus acquire a deeper meaning. No doubt there are stages in

[1] We must here mention the two works by E. VON HARTMANN, Phänomenologie des sittlichen Bewusstseins, and: Das religiose Bewusstsein der Menschheit. A suggestive essay was also written by O. FLÜGEL, Ueber die Entwicklung der sittlichen Ideen. (Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft, XII.)

which a belief in the gods sanctioned by religion prevents the attainment of a higher degree of morality. For the gods, conceived in human shape, become imperceptibly moral examples or ideals. As therefore moral principles have outstripped these deities, who were formed in earlier, ruder times, the teachers of the people are pained at seeing how the immoral stories told of the gods, serve as a pretext for all sorts of iniquity. For this reason, Greek philosophers have again and again attacked mythology which represents the gods as deceivers and adulterers.

In the very thought of a religious duty, the connection between religion and morality is implied. As soon as the cult becomes something different from a merely selfish act, it acquires an essentially moral character. It has the same character also by the self-denial which it entails, and the self-control which it presupposes. It is true that the directly moral elements in the cult, and particularly in the sacrifice, have often been much exaggerated. The thoughts of guilt and atonement which have been readily discovered in all sorts of expressions and customs, have by no means such deep roots in the old religion as many suppose. Religious morality has passed through the following three stages; at first, the gods demand only a careful observance of rites, and watch over their own rights, in the cult as well as in social ordinances, so far as these are of a religious nature. Secondly, the gods require men to observe certain duties towards each other, and watch over all righteous acts. Lastly, they look to motives; they want man to be virtuous from his heart, and

they are pleased with the virtues of humility and love. This separation of religious duty from mere ceremonial observance, is one of the most important sides of the activity of the prophets in Israel. God has no pleasure in sacrifice, but in righteousness and compassion. In India ritual was for the most part superseded, not by morals, but by philosophical speculations and magic. The virtues of the heart are by no means unknown among so-called pagans. Persian morals require not only right deeds and words, but right thoughts. Buddhism also, lays great stress on this, and with the Greeks, ὕβρις was especially hated by the gods. Thus cult as well as moral action becomes a duty, and a pure heart, with or without cult, is considered as part of the service of God.

The influence of morality on religion shows itself in a third important point, namely in the doctrine of the future of the world as well as of the individual. A doctrine of the ages of the world, of its catastrophes and renewals, always rests on moral ideas, not only in Persian and northern mythology but also among the Indians, in Hesiod, and among the Mexicans. The way in which morality has influenced the originally animistic belief in a continuance of existence, is most interesting. Among many nations, life after death is only a continuation of life on earth, whether in a shadowy existence or in a state of blessedness; it was so in Homer's time. But very soon a moral element comes in, reward and punishment wait for the good and the bad in the next life, the mere description of the lower regions becomes a serious moral lesson: discite justitiam moniti: and on the other hand, morality receives in the human desire for happiness

a powerful, though a somewhat dangerous ally. The eudæmonistic and utilitarian tendency which arises from the connection of religion and morality, and affects the doctrine of a future life, has its dangers, but whether it is right to stigmatise the alliance between morality and eudæmonism as wholly immoral, is another question.

We have thus seen how religion and morality determine and help each other in different ways. Religion admits such moral thoughts as duty and virtue, thus giving to the moral law its sanction, and the character of a positive, revealed, and divine will. That there are dangers also, arising from this intimate alliance, we saw already in the case of the one-sided eudæmonistic tendency of piety and morality. Asceticism represents what is against nature, as the demand of religious morality, and drives self-discipline to self-annihilation, and independence from the world to a complete negation of it. Ritualistic and nomistic piety cares only for a strict observance of rites and the ceremonial law, and thus leads to a casuistry pernicious to all morality, the results of which may be seen in Talmudic Judaism and Jesuitism. What is called moralism represents morality as being by itself piety, and proclaims the honest man as the ideal of all religion. Methodism on the contrary, which is prominent in Buddhism as well as in Protestant churches, is so entirely absorbed in the method of reaching blessedness, that in spite of the many exercises which it prescribes, it often neglects true morality. Lastly, there is a peculiar error arising from a recognition of an opposition between the moral and religious

ideal of perfection on one side, and reality on the other, leading to the admission of a double morality; one, for those who devote their life to an ideal, the other, lower one, for those who cannot shake off the fetters of the world; a morality for monks in fact, and one for the laity. The former is mostly negative. People hope to reach perfection by ascetic exercises, contemplation, and abstraction, and they ignore at all events the conditions of a life in this world. The latter consists of duties which can and must be performed by man, living in the world. The most dangerous sides of this separation, which is found in India as well as in Christianity, are, that active morality is represented as a lower stage conducing not at all, or only in a very secondary way, to perfection, and that the higher ideal is entirely eliminated from the life of the people at large, who must be content with worldly virtue.

Thus we have seen how closely the threads of religion and morality are intertwined. That religious life has not only an ethical but also a mystic side, and in what relation the two stand to each other, are points which we can only touch on, without attempting fuller discussion.

Lastly, art also, forms a certain opposition to morality, and SCHLEIERMACHER for instance, has on this ground divided all religions, into those in which piety is preeminently æsthetic or teleological. It follows from the division which we gave in chapter 9 of cult as either symbolical or practical, that it is only with regard to the former that religion can require the help of art, because here the chief interest is directed, not to results which are

to be obtained, but to the form of the representation. A rich development of religious art therefore will bring the representative and symbolical side of religion into prominence, leaving practical piety more in the background. The services rendered by art to religion should not be undervalued. By giving expression to religious thoughts and feelings it develops and makes them alive, present, and concrete; but it may also materialise them, and thus produce the danger of our dwelling on the beautiful external form and forgetting the inner meaning. Instead of lifting the spirit into a higher sphere, art strives to make us see the harmony in this world. This applies particularly to plastic art, and it becomes intelligible therefore that the controversy, as to the rights of art in religion, has been carried on chiefly with regard to images. On the other hand, art owes to religion its highest thoughts and inspirations, though it has also been driven on the rocks of a tasteless religious symbolism, and had again and again to free itself from the shackles of types too much stereotyped by ecclesiastical tradition.

Amongst the different arts in the service of religion we find dancing, chiefly on the lower stages of development; architecture, plastic and dramatic art on the middle stage; poetry and eloquence on the higher and the highest; music on all its stages. According to their nature and character different religions vary greatly in their cultivation of the arts. After what we have before said on different arts, we need only add a very true observation of Réville's, that when certain religions are said to be without art we ought to distinguish between the 'not yet' and the 'no more.' If the Semites in

patriarchal times, the Greeks and Romans in the earliest period, and the Germans of Tacitus worshipped the deity without temples, without any, or at least with very rude idols, they must be judged in the same way as savage tribes, for they had as yet no art sufficiently advanced to offer its aid to religion. But the fact that Persians, Jews after the exile, and Mohammedans admit no images, is not to be explained from their artistic deficiencies, but because their religions have conceptions of the deity which admit of no plastic representation. In Christianity also, the different views of the relation between art and religion are intimately connected with the different phases of the conception of religion, and the various forms of piety.

ETHNOGRAPHIC SECTION.

Books of Reference. Amongst the writings from which we can collect ethnographic materials for the science of religion we have to include geographical and missionary literature in its widest extent. The following are especially valuable for the science of religion: Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, since 1869 (Editors—A. BASTIAN, R. WARTMANN, R. VIRCHOW, and A. VOSS); Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft, since 1869 (Editors—M. LAZARUS, H. STEINTHAL).

In Anthropology the works of PRICHARD, DARWIN, HUXLEY, and DE QUATREFAGES are especially important. Much has been done for anthropology as well as for ethnography by A. BASTIAN, who is a great traveller. He worked up the rich materials which he collected in all parts of the world in systematic treatises (Der Mensch in der Geschichte, 3 vols., 1860, Grundzüge der Ethnologie, 1884), and in numerous and detailed works on single subjects, unluckily in such an abstruse style, and in such badly arranged masses, that his books, with a few exceptions, are almost unreadable. G. GERLAND'S first, and unfortunately only volume of Anthropologische Beiträge (1875) is very suggestive, though challenging much opposition. R. ANDREE'S collection, Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche (1878), Neue Folge (1889), is of great interest; G. GERLAND, Atlas der Ethnographie (1876). As general surveys we mention: E. B. TYLOR, Anthropology (1881); he also wrote the article on Anthropology in the Enc. Brit.; O. PESCHEL, Völkerkunde (1874, the 6th ed. 1885, is very little enlarged); the other works also by this author on geography are most instructive; Fr. MÜLLER, Allgemeine Ethnographie (1873, 2nd revised ed. 1879); he also edited the ethnographic portions for the anthropological part of the journey round the world of the Austrian frigate Novara (1868).

Amongst larger works, G. KLEMM'S Allgemeine Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit (10 vols., 1843–1852) is still valuable on account of the numerous extracts from travels which it contains. But KLEMM has been quite surpassed by TH. WAITZ, Anthropologie der Naturvölker (6 vols., 1859–1872); the first vol., Ueber die Einheit des Menschengeschlechtes und den Naturzustand des Menschen, has appeared in a 2nd edition, 1876. The fifth and sixth vols. are not written by WAITZ, but by G. GERLAND; the whole is an indispensable work with a rich bibliography, and though somewhat antiquated, the facts are thoroughly reliable, but the opinions as to religious matters, especially in WAITZ, are

not always correct. The somewhat strange idea of having ethnographical and anthropological materials tabulated, both as regards savages as well as the ancient and modern civilised nations, has been conceived by H. SPENCER, and has been carried out under his supervision, in accordance with his scheme of philosophy. This has produced the following works under the general title of Descriptive Sociology: 1. English, by J. COLLIER; 2. Ancient Mexicans, Central Americans, Chibchas, and Ancient Peruvians, by R. SCHEPPIG; 3. Types of lowest races, Negrito races, and Malayo-Polynesian races, by D. DUNCAN; 4. African races, by D. DUNCAN; 5. Asiatic races, by D. DUNCAN; 6. American races, by D. DUNCAN; 7. Hebrews and Phœnicians, by R. SCHEPPIG; 8. French, by J. COLLIER. Although the materials are not always collected from the best sources, and are arranged according to philosophical points of view, yet one can make use of them, particularly of DUNCAN'S collections, with profit, but cautiously.

Religion is treated in the works of TYLOR, LUBBOCK, FR. SCHULTZE, &c., which have been mentioned in the general section, other books will be mentioned in the individual groups. A pleasantly written and concise survey of the religions of savages is given by A. RÉVILLE, Les religions des peuples non-civilisés (2 vols., 1883), in which the best authorities are mentioned and used. To serve the Catholic polemic against the theory of development W. SCHNEIDER has published from interesting materials, Die Naturvölker; Missverständnisse, Missdeutungen und Misshandlungen (2 vols., 1885–1886).

CHAPTER 28. — **Anthropology and Ethnography.**

Anthropology occupies itself with the physical, ethnography with the social side of human life; the former treats of man as a natural being, the latter as a rational social being. It can be easily understood that these two sciences cannot be clearly separated; for at all points their enquiries clash with each other. There is no reason for making yet another difference between ethnography and ethnology, as some wish to do. Although ethnography can include in the domain of its enquiries the whole mental development of man, yet people generally divide the ethnographic description of low races from the historical treatment of

civilised nations, and thus place ethnography between anthropology and history. In this ethnographic section we have a double object in view. We shall first of all, as far as science can help us, give a survey of the ethnographic divisions of mankind, because these partly help to determine the development of religion. Then we shall cast a glance over the religions which are found amongst the various races of mankind, and we shall not limit ourselves to savages, but shall include in our statement those half, or totally civilised nations, whose historical development is hidden from our sight; such as the Fins, the Japanese, the civilised nations of America, Celts, Slavs, and even the Phœnicians.

We can put aside the exclusively anthropological questions. One of the most important is the unity of mankind. The actual state of the controversy between monogenists and polygenists is this: that unity of descent cannot be proved either historically or linguistically, but that a physical and psychical unity of mankind is chiefly confirmed by the fertility of mixed races, and the agreement in their requirements, customs, &c. We must examine more closely the question as to the divisions of man into various classes. Men are divided into races, according to certain hereditary and typical differences of a physical kind, and into nations and families of nations, according to linguistic and historical connections; the first division belongs to anthropology, the second to ethnography, but they cannot be separated from one another. Amongst savages, race is the only thing we can consider, but in higher states of civilisation this only forms the foundation on which the development of nations has

been carried out. One very seldom finds in a monarchy, in which various races are politically combined, a uniform national feeling. But various branches of the same race can, by a common destiny, grow together into one nation. Well-known examples of this statement are given us by Austria and France.

For the classification of mankind several criteria have been taken into account. First, the colour of skin: even the ancient Egyptians recognised this distinguishing sign; on their monuments they painted the Syrians yellow, the Libyans fair, the Negroes black, and themselves red. In BLUMENBACH'S still popular classification also, which really divides the five races of man according to the five continents, he emphasises colour as the chief distinctive mark by which Negroes, Malays, Caucasians, Americans, and Mongolians are distinguished. CUVIER speaks of white (Caucasian), yellow (Mongolian), and black (Æthiopian) races; in the same way TYLOR mentions black, brown, yellow, and white races.

But many other physical and anatomical characteristics have been taken into consideration. Thus QUETELET has measured the height and proportion of the limbs of a medium-sized man (homme moyen) amongst various races; he finds that the tallest men, the Patagonians, exceed on an average only by one-fourth the shortest men, the Bushmen. As a principle of classification the form of skulls is more important. The Swedish anthropologist, RETZIUS, has divided mankind into dolichokephalic-orthognathic, dolichokephalic-prognathic, brachykephalic-orthognathic, and brachykephalic-prognathic, and in his various writings he has placed the different races in four ways under this category.

Besides this, the classification of mankind, principally according to the nature of the hair, has been recommended. Thus, FR. MÜLLER gives the following plan—

I. Woolly-haired nations :—
  (*a*) Tuft-haired (Hottentots and Papuans).
  (*b*) Frizzy-haired (Negroes and Kaffirs).
II. Sleek-haired nations :—
  (*a*) Straight-haired (Australians, Hyperboreans, Americans, Malays, and Mongolians).
  (*b*) Curly-haired (Dravidians, Nubians, and Mediterraneans).

Against this principle of classifying by the hair, GERLAND and others have brought forward the fact, that no zoologist would use it in his classification of animals as a characteristic sign. Similar considerations prevail against all classifications based on any single physical characteristic. None of these distinguishing marks is characteristic enough by itself; the majority are not constant, but are influenced in a high degree by external circumstances, and vary much in individuals of the same race. Therefore most people combine many points of view in their classification; ethnological (linguistic) phenomena are subordinated, or added to anthropological (physical) phenomena (by FR. MÜLLER also); or a principle of classification is derived, not from a single trait, but from all traits taken together. By this last means PESCHEL arrives at seven races:—Australian, Papuan, Mongoloid, Dravidian, Hottentots and Bushmen, Negroes, and Mediterraneans. In this classification the most objectional group is the Mongoloid, left by most authorities very undefined, and comprehending, according to PESCHEL, a varied assemblage of Mongolians, Americans, and Malays. The ethnological features, which, with the physical, must be considered

in a classification of mankind, do not of themselves afford us a sufficient system of classification; but yet they have to be taken into account. We must turn to language and customs; but since customs cannot be put into systematic order, we must consider language almost exclusively. Not till philology had opened the way, did ethnography receive its equally rightful place by the side of anthropology. In the study of comparative philology the forms of language (monosyllabic, agglutinative, and inflectional) must be taken into account, as well as the treasures of words (the vocabulary). But the problems of the relationship of nations can never be quite solved by these means. Even if various gaps in our present philological knowledge were filled in, it would always remain impossible to decipher clearly the history of many languages from their present forms. We must also consider that many nations have exchanged their language for that of their foreign rulers and immigrants, or have intermixed it with theirs (Negro-English, Arabic in North Africa, and Spanish in South America); a similar process, of which we have no record, may have been carried out in other places. Therefore it is not always safe to determine a nation's origin from its language.

We must mention one more classification; namely that which GERLAND has based on the influence of natural surroundings. According to their various situations in the countries they live in, men are classified as Oceanic, American, Mongolian, Arabic-African, Indo-European races, to which we must finally add the isolated Dravidians. The greatest doubt is raised here, by the daring classification of Arabs and Semites

with all races of Africa, in which GERLAND can certainly appeal to the example of LATHAM'S Atlantidæ, and to a remarkable similarity between, not only North-Africans, but also Kaffirs, and the Semitic races.

With regard to our ethnographic survey, we shall not bind ourselves to any of these attempts at a scientific classification of nations, but shall, on the whole, follow the popular geographical divisions. We will therefore shortly describe the various forms of religion as it appears amongst the Africans, Americans, Oceanians, Mongolians, and Mediterraneans. Amongst these separate races, we come across variations in stages of civilisation. The names, civilised and uncivilised nations are only partially correct, for no nation exists in total savageness, but everywhere there are already in language and social forms, certain elements of civilisation. With this proviso, however, we can retain the usual terms. The safest thing to do is to follow a proposition of TYLOR'S. He defines as savages, races who do not cultivate the soil, or possess domestic animals, who keep themselves by hunting and fishing, living mostly in the woods and using only the roughest wood and stone implements. But as soon as the soil is tilled and flocks are kept, a higher stage of civilisation is reached. TYLOR calls the races on this middle stage, barbarians; they mostly lead a settled life, living in towns and villages, or if they wander about as nomadic herdsmen, they have raised themselves above the state of savages by the secured possession of their herds. In general, barbarians can work in metals. For the third stage, that of civilisation, the use of writing is the condition with which an his-

torical life begins, when results of the past are consciously received into the life of the present. In religion also, one can distinguish three stages, but they do not exactly run parallel with TYLOR'S three stages of civilisation. In the lowest stage we find everything, in theory as well as in practice, utterly unorganised; spirits are not individualised, and the almost exclusively magical forms of worship are connected with the special needs of daily life. In the middle stage, there is a well organised cult, with a priesthood, regularly recurring festivals and forms of worship, which have no special effect in view, but are practised because they belong to the system of the worship of God. A consciously cared for, and developed religious teaching handed down in writings, characterises the highest stage. We have already seen in chapter 7 how difficult it is to give a really satisfactory classification of religions, and therefore do not wish these general remarks to be regarded as such.

One important question remains; how can we account for these great differences in civilisation and religion? In considering this, most people think of the natural dispositions which one race possesses, and another does not. Formerly, people, amongst others KLEMM, spoke much of active and passive races; now, the peculiarities of the various races are more minutely and clearly determined. However difficult it may be to distinguish original tribal and national dispositions, from those that have arisen in the course of history and are acquired in the course of development, the opinion prevails with many people, that blood brings certain dispositions, and that one of the explanations of higher civilisation lies

in the peculiar mixture of races. Interest has been aroused by this question in wider circles, particularly by the animated controversy called forth by RENAN'S description of the natural disposition of the Semitic races. But the view, that certain powers and dispositions are given by nature to races and nations is not generally accepted. There is a school which explains everything by outward environments and circumstances; some consider this to be a materialistic and democratic prejudice[1]. But even WAITZ is inclined to lay aside a difference in the original mental gifts of various races, as being not only incapable of proof, but also improbable. In opposition to this, people appeal not only to the insufficiency of explanations based purely on outward circumstances, but more especially to the often proved incapability of races to overstep certain mental limits; and on the other hand, to the rapidity with which a nation grasps and retains whatever harmonises with its natural dispositions. If we compare the sanguine Negro with the melancholy Malay, we can hardly maintain that if these two races had exchanged their homes and circumstances, they would also possess inverted mental abilities. Such differences can only be accounted for by original disposition.

CHAPTER 29. — African Races.

Books of Reference. A rich Bibliography up to 1859 is given by WAITZ, II. A history of more recent researches is given by Ed. SCHAUENBURG, Reisen in Central-Africa von MUNGO PARK bis auf DR. BARTH und DR. VOGEL (2 vols., 1865), and a survey is given by

[1] On this subject there is an important article: Race in Legislation and Political Economy (Anthropolog. Review, 1866).

C. M. KAN, who collected a Bibliography of Dutch works also. Full materials are supplied by the already mentioned general literature, as well as by the numerous descriptions of travels, and missionary reports. We shall mention at least the names of the principal discoverers and collectors: BAKER, BARTH, BURTON (East Africa), CAILLIÉ, (in Timbuctu), CAMERON (across Africa), DU CHAILLU, HANOTEAU and LETOURNEUX (Kabylia), KLUNZINGER (Upper Egypt), LIVINGSTONE, MOFFAT, MUNGO PARK (Central Africa), ROHLFS, SCHWEINFURTH, SOLEILLET, SPEKE (Sources of the Nile), STANLEY, VOGEL (his Travels described by H. WAGNER). The value of the materials on ethnography and the history of religion contained in these works varies very much. A survey of all the languages of this part of the world is given by R. N. CUST, A Sketch of the Modern Languages of Africa (2 vols., 1883). W. H. J. BLEEK'S enquiries into South African languages are most valuable. On dwarfs we have A. DE QUATREFAGES, Les Pygmées (1887). From a different point of view, A. H. POST'S Afrikanische Jurisprudenz, Ethnologisch-juristische Beiträge zur Kenntniss der einheimischen Rechte Africas (1887), is important.

R. HARTMANN, Die Völker Africa's (1879); he also gave a minute account, Die Nigritier (I. 1876). We mention amongst especially interesting works for the history of religion, W. BOSMAN, Nauwkeurige beschrijving van de Guinese Goud-Tand-en Slavekust (3rd ed. 1737); A. BASTIAN, Ein Besuch in San-Salvador (1859, this work is a favourable exception to the author's usual style, and forms the foundation for most of Fr. SCHULTZE'S discussions on Fetishism); B. CRUICKSHANK, Achtzehnjähriger Aufenthalt auf der Goldküste (1834); J. L. WILSON, Western Africa, its history, condition and prospects (1856).

As regards Egypt of to-day, many descriptions of travels, partly illustrated (such as EBERS' Aegypten), are well known. In some the description of monuments forms a prominent subject. The best book on the modern state of Egypt is still E. W. LANE, An account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians (2 vols., 1835), and also F. BÄDEKER'S Aegypten can be studied with advantage by others besides travellers.

On South Africa the best work is G. FRITSCH, Die Eingebornen Süd-Afrikas (1872). Besides this, interesting from a religious point of view, are CASALIS, Les Bassoutos (1859, by a missionary who lived amongst them for 23 years); TH. HAHN, Tsuni'-Goam, the supreme Being of the Khoi-Khoi (1882); CALLAWAY, The Religious System of the Amazulu (1868–72, appeared in 4 vols. and was reprinted by the Folklore Society in 1884).

With regard to Jews, Moslems, and Christians in Africa one should consult A. OPPEL'S Die religiösen Verhältnisse von Africa (Zeitschr. d. Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde, Berlin, 1887).

On Madagascar also there is a rich literature collected by J. SIBREE. The principal works are by J. SIBREE, ELLIS, and others.

The numerous nations in Africa cause ethnographists many difficulties. Apart from the many foreign immigrations and conquests, from the most ancient to more modern times, by which Africans have been drawn into intercourse with the outer world, the question as to the original relationship of the nations of this part of the world with other families and races, is most complicated. Even amongst themselves the tribes of Africa show such dissimilarity, that most scholars admit of five or six races in this continent. The Lybian population on the North coast, the Egyptians and Ethiopians, are looked on as belonging to the Mediterranean race, forming the Hamitic family, which is most closely connected with the Semitic family. But, on the other hand, people have thought that they have found traces of an original relationship between the North-African Berbers and the Basques. To the South of this Hamitic group we find the Nubians on the Upper Nile, and along the south edge of the Great Desert, the Fulas. These two together form a separate race. The centre of the continent as far as 20° s. lat. is possessed by the real Negroes. The south is inhabited by two or three races, the Kaffirs, Hottentots, and Bushmen. These last are held to be either degenerate Hottentots, or they are looked on, together with the scattered dwarf tribes of Central Africa, as a peculiar race of men, perhaps even a survival of a primeval population.

This classification can certainly not yet be regarded as settled. The origin of the ancient Egyptians in

particular is very uncertain. All Egyptologists count Egyptians as belonging to the Mediterranean races; at best, some allow that the civilisation of the old Pharaonic empire sprang from a mixture of African and Semitic blood. They even lay weight on the points of similarity between Egyptian and Indo-Germanic ideas (LE PAGE RENOUF), or try to find in Egypt the prehistoric unity of Semitic, and Indo-Germanic races (LIEBLEIN). That Egypt had primeval relations with Western Asia, and that there was traffic with Babylon, as well as repeated immigration of Semitic tribes and settlements of Phœnicians in the Delta, has been clearly proved to us, by EBERS amongst others. Whether we must therefore consider Herodotus as in the wrong, and deny all connection between the Egyptians and the nations of Central Africa, is quite another question. Language alone cannot in this case quite decide it; although that certainly points towards Asia. The characteristics which distinguish ancient Egyptians, initiative originality and perseverance, which EBERS particularly dwells on, are not such as occur in Negro races. Whereas, animal worship (which DE BROSSES had already pointed out), Fetishism, worship of the dead, and circumcision are strong points of similarity between Egyptians and Negroes. The results of anatomical examinations of mummies would be most important, if not quite decisive: according to R. VIRCHOW these results are not in favour of African relationship. On the whole the matter stands thus: the connection of ancient Egyptian culture with Western Asia, still outweighs the not unimportant traces of relationship with the Negro.

The unity of African races which had been asserted by Gerland, who included Arabians and Semites, is at present eagerly defended by R. Hartmann. He wishes to exclude altogether from Anthropology the 'blue-black, bull-necked, woolly-headed Nigger of the imagination' and to substitute the 'Negritian,' who is found in his purest form in Central Africa, but can still be traced from north to south. R. Hartmann appeals to the fact, that nowhere in Africa can we find sharp lines dividing the so-called different races; the Berabra, Bedja, and others in the north, the Bantu in the south, show startling affinity with the Negritians of Central Africa; if one separates the races it is difficult to say of some tribes, whether they belong to the Nubians or the Negroes. This difficulty is not yet settled, and it is questionable whether anatomical and linguistic studies will ever solve it. Nevertheless, Africa divides itself naturally for an ethnographical survey and study of the history of religion into three large divisions; the South, the Centre, and the North.

The South of Africa is inhabited on the east by Kaffirs, on the west by Hottentots, and everywhere we find the Bushmen repressed and trodden under foot. The name of Kaffir was taken by the Portuguese from Arabian merchants, who by this word, Kâfir, designated the unbelievers. These people really call themselves A-bantu, or, the men. The same meaning is attached to the name Koi-Koi, by which the other race calls itself; the nickname, Hottentot, was given them by Dutch colonists on account of their clicking, clucking, stuttering language. The Bushmen

belong physically and mentally to the lowest human races, they are distinguished as savages from the two other tribes who are looked on more as barbarians. Hottentots and Kaffirs are pastoral tribes and have a fixed tribal government. Amongst the Kaffirs, who are said to have migrated from the north, people fancy they have found traces of former culture, and historical traditions of former chiefs and wars. Their principal tribes are the Amaxosa, the Amazulu, the Bechuana (to which the Basuto belong), and more towards the west the Ovaherero (or Damara). To the Hottentots belong the Namaqua and Korana, whilst the Griqua and half-bred Hottentots have arisen from a mixture with European blood. We do not here treat of the history of the colonisation of South Africa, through which, since 1652, these tribes have been more and more pushed back. At present the Kaffirs and Hottentots live in friendly relations, mostly as servants or labourers, in the domain of the four colonial states; thus, for instance at the Cape, the Amafengu race of Kaffirs enjoy the protection of the Colony. But several of the aboriginal tribes live independently on the outskirts of the colonies, to which they are often a source of great trouble and danger. Their relationship with the aborigines is one of the most difficult problems for the colonial governments of South Africa.

For everything concerning the important progress that Christianity has made amongst the aborigines of South Africa, we refer to the missionary writings on this subject. We shall only deal here with the religious conditions of heathen races. These conditions are so confused and scanty that the statement

has often been made, especially in regard to the Kaffirs, that these tribes have no religion at all. This is most certainly untrue; for amongst all these races, we know of many religious rites, even though a clearly defined idea of God is wanting, or at least is kept from our knowledge. We know many names which various tribes give to their gods; amongst the Hottentots: Utixo, Tsui'goab, Heitsi-eibib; amongst the Kaffirs: Morimo and Umkulumkulu. But we do not know whether they are nature-gods, evil spirits, deceased powerful magicians, or ancestors. Th. Hahn has interpreted Tsui'goab as the dawn, Réville explains it as the moon, and Heitsi-eibib is said to be a moon-god. These explanations are uncertain, although the dances which are held at the time of new moon and full moon by the Hottentots, evidently point to a moon-worship. With greater certainty we can look on Umkulumkulu, the Great Being, as the ancestor who came from the original tree (others translate this from the bed of reeds). The worship of the dead and of ancestors is found largely amongst these tribes. The dead generally appear to their relations in animal forms. The custom, that every passer-by should deposit a stone at a particular spot, has probably something to do with soul worship, and this is how the numerous stone-heaps have arisen. Besides the idea that men sprang from trees, we have proof amongst certain tribes, such as the Damaras, of the belief in descent from animals, in connection with tribal government and prohibitions of food (i. e. Totemism). That these tribes are not utterly devoid of poetic fancy, can be gathered from many of their myths and fables. Thus the Damaras tell how man dis-

covered fire, so that wild animals ran away frightened, whilst domestic animals remained in the society of man. This tribe has also a sacred fire kept up by virgins. The history of the origin of death is most curious, and is told in many different forms in South Africa. Amongst the Hottentots it is the moon who sends the hare as a messenger to mankind, to say to them: 'as I (the moon) die and live again, so will you (the man) also die and live again.' But the hare delivered his message wrong and said, 'as the moon died, so man also would die and not live again.' The Amazulu say that: Umkulumkulu sent the chameleon to mankind with the news that man would not die; but the chameleon dawdled on the way, and meanwhile Umkulumkulu had changed his mind, and sent the salamander after it to announce death to man; the salamander hurried, and brought the fatal news before the chameleon had arrived. In a far distant part of the world, in the Fiji Islands, we find a similar story of the origin of death. The religion of Hottentots and Kaffirs is distinguished from that of Negroes by the absence of fetishism. Offerings are brought to souls and spirits, but actual fetishes are never, or rarely found. It is true, amulets are used, and all sorts of witchcraft play a prominent part. The wizards, doctors, and soothsayers united in the same person have authority over all sorts of secret powers. The manner in which they practise them varies; sometimes they form a corporate body into which people are received by consecration. We often find that they work themselves into a state of ecstasy, by singing and dancing, in order to conjure up spirits. They are looked to for the curing of sick-

ness, and of snake-bites, for victory, rain, and the discovery and exorcism of adverse witchcraft. In league with the chiefs, they thus have terrible power to revenge themselves, or to remove unpopular people; but they themselves have often to forfeit their lives, if they do not accomplish what is required of them.

In South Africa, as in fact all over this continent, all sorts of mutilations are looked on as religious rites; such as the knocking out of teeth, the sacrifice of a finger-joint by a widow who remarries, and above all circumcision. Boys submit to this when they come of age, and then must at once subject themselves to strict rules for a certain time, afterwards to be instantly plunged into a life of licentiousness. As a general rule they lead a riotous life and have wild dances, so that it is said of a newly-converted Christian: 'he dances no longer.' Amongst all these ideas and customs it is difficult to pick out those which are peculiar to individual tribes. Kaffirs and Hottentots have probably borrowed many customs from each other.

The Negroes, properly so called, inhabit the centre of the continent, but the limits of their habitations cannot be sharply defined, either in the north, or in the south. Reliable criteria also are still wanting for an ethnographic division. We know as yet far too little of many races inhabiting the country round the large lakes, and in the river districts of the Zambesi and the Congo. We know rather more of the tribes who form a series of states from the Senegal to Darfur; even their history is partially known to us. The Jolof (Wolof), Hausa, and Sonray live there, and so early as the tenth century A. D. they founded a powerful Mohammedan empire. We find also the Mandingos,

whose state of Melle (also Mohammedan) was known in the thirteenth century by its conquests; and above all the Fulas (Fellatah, Pulbe, and Peul) who formerly came from the east, but in the beginning of this century spread themselves from the west as conquerors, under Danfodio, the fanatic regenerator of Islam. In these districts the political and ethnical relations are very complicated. The town of Timbuctu on the Upper Niger, which has been visited by very few Europeans, is said to be the meeting-place of several races, who fight amongst themselves for the possession of this important emporium.

For many centuries Islam has been carrying out a mission of civilisation in Central Africa. The laws or customs of states in the Western Soudan are Mohammedan, and even further south we find Islam spreading. Islam is here the popular religion, and is followed with fanatic zeal; every year many pilgrims from Central Africa visit the Mekka festivals. It is true, Islam has tolerated many popular superstitions, and has not rooted out some of the heathen beliefs and practices. Christianity has spread much less amongst the Negroes. Formerly it had its rapid triumphs. At the first discovery and colonisation by the Portuguese on the west coast, at the end of the sixteenth century, Christianity propagated itself in Benin and later in Congoland. Here for almost two hundred years it was the religion of a great kingdom, closely allied with Portugal, whose capital was San Salvador, but since then it has disappeared, leaving hardly any traces. The Protestant missions of our century can show more fruitful but less brilliant results. With the exception of the colonies of converted negro-slaves (Sierra

Leone, founded in 1787 by Englishmen, and Liberia, founded in 1823 by Americans), Christianity still remains amongst Negroes the religion of foreigners, to which only a few are converted; it is nowhere a received national religion, even though on the Upper Niger a successful mission is carried on by Negroes.

The Negro by no means belongs to the least endowed class of mankind. He usually possesses an excitable imagination, and a lively comprehension; he is sanguine, sensuous, really kind, and only cruel when angry, very impulsive, but without perseverance or fixed aims. Réville reproaches Negroes with love of quaintness, and unconnected ideas. On the whole, he says, they are wanting in energy to use their mental abilities. They certainly can in no way be classified as savages. They form a succession of states, in which we actually find quite important towns. Brutal wars and slave-trade disturb their social conditions. A touching example of their feeling of inferiority to Europeans is given by the Negro, in the story of the two brothers, of whom the eldest, the black man, had the choice between gold and a book, and chose gold for himself, so that the younger brother got the book, which made him very clever and superior to his brother. The American Redskins in Florida have invented a similar myth.

The lands of the Negroes are the home of the coarsest fetishism, which can be studied here in all its forms. The fetishes, small and large, public and private, are called gris-gris, and ju-ju. When people come of age, the choice of a fetish takes place at the same time as circumcision, with fasting; the signs also which many tribes cut in their skins and then paint

(tattooing) show that they belong to some fetish. The division between fetishes and amulets is not clearly marked, particularly amongst those races where Islam has hardly superseded paganism; on the other hand, many fetishes strongly resemble idols, as a human head and limbs are suggested on them, as in the case of the Greek hermæ. Fetishes have their temples or dwellings, many are taken on journeys, and others are always carried about by their owners. However strongly fetishism is found amongst Negroes, yet we must not overlook the fact that religion is here by no means pure fetishism, and that by the side of it belief in spirits, and the worship of ancestors and nature are very common.

All sorts of natural objects, the sky, the sun, especially the moon, mountains, and rivers are worshipped; even here and there we find a belief in a Highest God, the creator of the world; but of course this God is not worshipped, since as a general rule Negroes worship cruel, dreaded gods much more than friendly gods. Worship of ancestors is also very general. In Dahomey, and Ashantee, large human hecatombs are offered to deceased rulers. Amongst animals, serpents in particular receive religious worship. The worship of serpents has reappeared amongst the Negroes of America, in Haiti, and in Louisiana as the worship of Vodu, but it is licentious and cruel.

The conducting of religious ceremonies belongs to the Fetishman, magician and priest, who is called Fetizero, Ganga, and Chitome. He offers the expiatory sacrifice (to keep off evil) to the spirits, he brings food for the departed, he prophesies, calls down rain, heals sicknesses, &c. One of his principal

duties is to find out evil doers. The belief is everywhere common, that sickness and death are not natural events, but are caused by evil magic, and that therefore it is necessary to find out the guilty persons. Amid fearful noise, which Negroes make on every opportunity, the suspected person is dragged in and submitted to an ordeal, which mostly consists in swallowing a poisoned drink (the red water ordeal). The innocent man simply brings it up again, whilst the guilty man dies.

Secret societies are a striking feature amongst Negroes, of which several have become known to us, and amongst them are some which have existed several centuries, such as the Empacasseiro. We hardly know the real object of these secret societies; some seem to carry out objects of civilisation, others perhaps have the mutual protection of their members in view. But there is no reason why we should ascribe to them a higher perception or a pure monotheistic teaching. As a general rule, people speak too much of the natural tendency of Negroes towards monotheism, which prepared them to receive Islam.

We will here mention something about the Island of Madagascar, which belongs geographically, but not ethnographically, to Africa. Certainly the aborigines, who still exist as the Vazimba of the west coast, and have erected their stone-heaps (cairns) all over the island, appear to be connected with the Negroes. But they were driven out long ago by immigrants, or have become intermixed with them. First Arabs, and later on Malays, settled here. The ruling tribe of the Hova, as well as their enemies the Sakalava, are Malays, which is evident from their physical

nature as well as from certain psychic and social peculiarities. The religion of the heathen Malagassee has no very prominent characteristics: belief in spirits, worship of ancestors, and ordeals are here the order of the day. In our century the island has passed through wonderful changes, ever since the energetic Hova prince, Radama (1810–1828), introduced Christianity and European civilisation, a work that was interrupted under his successors through persecutions, but which has never been quite extinguished. During the last few years the whole state of Madagascar has again been unsettled by the interference of France.

The inhabitants of North Africa are the most mixed race. The question as to whether relationship with Negroes or Asiatic descent prevails strongest, has been already discussed. Egypt has always been inundated by all sorts of nations; in ancient times by Semites, Persians, Greeks, and Romans; in the Middle Ages, and in the present day by Arabs, Turks, natives of Asia Minor, and Europeans. More towards the south, amongst the so-called Ethiopian nation, a great deal of Arab blood has been intermixed, for the mountainous part of Abyssinia was colonised some centuries B.C. by South Arabians (Himjarites), therefore the language, Ethiopian or Geez, is Semitic. To the west of Egypt along the north coast, the aboriginal population may be found in Berber (Imoshag and Berabra) as well as in the Tuarech and the Tibbu of the Sahara Desert; but Semitic colonies and Roman conquests in ancient times, Syro-Arabian armies and Turkish authority in the Middle Ages and in modern times, and also many of the Christian slaves who were dragged thither and must be espe-

cially taken into account, have produced a sort of mixed race which is generally called Moors (Morisks).

Islam is common throughout almost the whole of North Africa. Only a few tribes on the Upper Nile are still heathen, and amongst the Egyptian Copts, as well as the Abyssinians, we find monophysitic Christianity. The Copts, under their Patriarch, during many centuries of oppression have kept tenaciously to Christianity, though it must be admitted that they have degenerated. Still more debased are the religious and moral conditions of Abyssinia, where Christianity is amalgamated not only with Mohammedan and Jewish (Abyssinian Jews are called Falasha), but even with heathen elements. Magic and all sorts of superstition, fear of the evil-eye and of witchcraft, the conception of Buddas, so-called sprites who transform themselves into animals, are found everywhere. Christianity itself really consists in the observance of certain ceremonies only; the priesthood is distinguished by its ignorance and immorality. Therefore in Abyssinia, Christianity is hardly superior to Paganism, and it would rather be a progress than a retrogression, if the country fell entirely under the dominion of Islam, which is steadily increasing.

Islam in North Africa is strictly orthodox, and recognises the Sunna as well as the Koran. Egypt has been for centuries the head-quarters of Mohammedan civilisation; the town of Cairo with its splendid mosques, of which the Al-Azhar mosque is also used as a university, is still a centre of Mohammedan learning. That Islam on the Upper Nile, in Nubia, and the Soudan, can turn the inhabitants into utter fanatics, has been proved repeatedly in modern history

by the continual appearance of Mahdis. In the desert the puritanic sect of the Snussi has many followers. Along the north coast, the states, when they are not colonised by Europeans as Algiers and Tunis are, exclude as far as possible all foreign influences; Morocco is a state entirely closed to our civilisation. From the first introduction of Islam these countries have been famous for their religious zeal; in the Middle Ages they gave two dynasties to the effete Spaniards, the Almoravides and the Almohades. At the present day we find the worship of dead and living saints (Marabout) flourishing there. Few traces are to be found or expected in those countries of an actual or future revival of Mohammedan culture, which had reached its culminating point in the Middle Ages.

CHAPTER 30.—**American Savages.**

Books of Reference. The bibliography is contained in WAITZ, III (1862) and IV (1864). Of special catalogues, we mention the very complete one, especially as regards geographical and also ethnographical books, by FRED. MÜLLER (Amsterdam, 1877). The older descriptions of travels dating from the 17th century are now only of bibliographic value. This also applies to collective works, valuable at their time, made by the catholic missionaries of the 18th century (LAFITEAU and CHARLEVOIX) on North America. The minute descriptions of the circumstances of the natives in the great historical work by ROBERTSON, The History of America, and in PRESCOTT'S Conquest of Mexico and Conquest of Peru are still of importance. Of modern descriptions of travels the most valuable, both on account of their illustrations and their contents, are those by A. VON HUMBOLDT and MAXIMILIAN PRINZ OF WIED.

A résumé of the various religions of this part of the world, full of information, was made by J.G. MÜLLER, Geschichte der Amerikanischen Urreligionen (2nd ed. 1867), a rich mine of information, but in consulting it, one must remember that the theory of the author entails throughout a discrimination between a northern belief in spirits, and a southern sun-worship. In regard to Greenland the principal source of information is still P. EGEDE, Nachrichten von Grönland (1790). The

works of Catlin, Schoolcraft, and the numerous books by D. G. Brinton, which must certainly be used with caution, contain important notices about the Indians of North America. A valuable but rather too vast a collection was made by H. H. Bancroft, Native Races of the Pacific States of North America (5 vols., 1875).

A. Réville deals with the religions of the civilised nations in his Les religions du Mexique, de l'Amérique centrale et du Pérou (1885); he delivered the Hibbert Lectures on this subject in England in 1884 On Mexico: E. B. Tylor, Anahuac, or Mexico and the Mexicans (1861), the same in Enc. Brit.

On Central America: Brasseur de Bourbourg, Histoire des nations civilisées du Mexique et de l'Amérique centrale, durant les siècles antérieurs à C. Colomb (1857–59, 4 vols.). On Peru, the work of R. B. Brehm, Das Inkareich (1887).

The documents, consisting of native writings and old Spanish reports, have been collected by Kingsborough, Antiquities of Mexico (1831–48), and in the valuable French collection by Ternaux-Compans (since 1837), and in several publications of the Hakluyt Society.

The questions which occupy ethnographists in connection with this part of the world are the unity and independence of the American race. Even those who look on all Americans as belonging to one race, do not include the Esquimaux and Greenlanders, who inhabit the northernmost parts; these are either counted as belonging to the Mongolians, or, together with certain tribes in the Polar region of Asia, are looked on as a separate race, namely, that of the Arctics or Hyperboreans, who however have many points of contact with the Mongolian, and likewise with the American races. The admission of a separate American race is disputed on different sides. It was, and partially still is, usual to represent them as a species of Mongolians, or as a mixture of Mongolians and Malays. Whereas Fr. Müller defends not only the independence but also the unity of the American race, many anthropologists and ethnographists, more especially Americans, like to distinguish two or

more independent groups. Science will probably never possess the means of solving these problems with certainty. No convincing proof can be shown for the connection of Americans with other races; but there are a few traces of a connection between America and the Old World, before the discovery of America. That Icelanders of the Middle Ages knew Greenland, and perhaps even pressed further south along the coast, we know from their literature. And it is at least very probable, that the tribes along the west coast of America had intercourse with Asiatic nations. But in both these cases one does not know how far this intercourse went, and what meaning it had. Neither the physical nature of the inhabitants, nor the flora or fauna, seem to allow of trustworthy conclusions. On the other hand, by means of the civilisation, especially of Mexico and Peru, a connection with ancient civilised nations has been inferred. Thus only, people thought and still sometimes think, can the extraordinary similarity in the arts, customs, and ideas of these nations, with those of the Old World, be accounted for. The suggestion has been made that their teachers were dispersed Jews, Phoenician seamen and colonists, Buddhists from Asia, or others. Even quite recently the tradition that we find in China, in the fifth century, of an eastern country called Fusang, has been applied to America. Some people have wished to derive Mexican ideas from another side, namely from the ancient Kelts; but all these attempts must be considered to have failed. FR. MÜLLER'S opinion seems the most probable, although its principal support is at present the insufficiency of all other explanations. Whether philo-

logy will ever prove the unity of the American race, must be left undecided. At present we are still in the state of examining the single families of language, in which subject important work has been done by J. C. E. BUSCHMANN for the Sonoric languages (Mexico), and by J. J. VON TSCHUDI for the Kechu languages (Peru).

We cannot therefore as yet expect a reliable scientific classification of the aborigines of America. The following short survey contains nearly all the most certain results. Amongst the North American Indians, called in a narrower sense Redskins, a separate group is distinguished in the west of the Rocky Mountains, and in the district of Oregon as far as the sea. The principal Redskin tribes are the Athapascans (Chippeway), Iroquois, Algonquins, Dakotas (Sioux), Appalachians (Creeks), whilst the Natchez of the Mississippi are in close contact on one side with the Appalachians, and on the other with the inhabitants of Mexico. In Mexico we can recognise three strata, that of the aborigines, to which amongst others the Chichimekes must have belonged, that of the first Toltek, and of the second Aztec immigration. The Tolteks came in from the north, but it appears that after their rule had lasted a few hundred years, they were driven towards the south by the aborigines, whereon the warlike Aztecs, who were related to them, conquered the land from the north. Central America was occupied by the Maya branch to which the Quiché also belonged. The Arowaks and Caribes lived along the north coast of South America and in the Antilles. Our knowledge relating especially to the South American nations is very scanty. We

can distinguish the Brazilian tribes (Tupi and Guarani), the Abipones and Pampas Indians, the Araucanians, the Patagonians (Tehuelhet), and Terra del Fuegians. Along the west coast was a rather narrow strip of land inhabited by civilised nations; in the north (the present New Granada) the Chibchas and Muiscas had settled, and more to the south, Peruvian civilisation flourished, the oldest settlement being round Lake Titicaca; whilst later, the race of the Inkas, coming from the neighbourhood of Cuzco, assumed a governing position. The Inkas belonged to the Quichuan (Kechu) people, with whom the Ayamaras are related.

The racial characteristics of the Americans remind us strongly of the Malays. The American is reserved, serious, and dignified, and has great fortitude, especially in bearing pain. He is silent and sly, brave, artful, cruel, and revengeful. He cannot easily grasp anything new, and suit himself to circumstances, he broods on by himself, but his inner life is richer than that of many other lower races, even than that of the Negro, who is as a rule his superior in material civilisation. American culture is closely connected with these characteristic traits, as well as with the nearly total absence of cultivated plants and useful animals. The American is a hunter, a fisher, a warrior on land and sea, but not a cultivator of the soil or a herdsman. It is extraordinary that in this part of the world the middle grade of civilisation is utterly wanting; Americans are either savages or civilised, though hardly emerged from the stage of barbarism. Peru, Central America, more especially Yucatan, Honduras, and Mexico, are ancient centres

of civilisation in America, whilst the mounds on the Mississippi and Ohio also, are witnesses of former civilisation. The rest of the tribes on the continent lived in a savage state. Certainly the warlike Redskins and the piratical Caribes stand higher than the aborigines of Brazil and the Terra del Fuegians, who are usually looked on as among the lowest of mankind.

At present we have only spoken of the aborigines of America. They have been almost entirely driven out and destroyed by European colonists and conquerors, and have only partially intermixed with them. The tribes of the Redskins have been swept away by wars and their own vices; most ethnographists prophesy certain destruction for them, and do not expect much from their sporadic attempts to accustom themselves to a settled agricultural life. Only a few thousand remain of the once powerful Caribes. In South America, on the other hand, as well as in Central America and Mexico, Europeans have intermixed largely with the natives; but in the United States of North America this has hardly been the case at all. In the North, it was mostly Germanic (English) colonists who took possession of the land. There was however a certain mixture of the French element in Canada and Louisiana; and in Mexico and all over the South the population is intermixed with a Romanic element (Spanish and Portuguese). As a third element, we must take into account the Negroes who were dragged to America in large numbers as slaves, because the natives were not able to do regular work. Particularly in Mexico, in Central America, and in the Antilles, there are numerous varieties of mixed races: Mulattos

(European and Negro), Mestizos (European and American), &c.

But we must now look at the ancient religions of America, and shall begin by considering the religions of the savages. As we have already seen, we must treat the Greenlanders and Esquimaux, who call themselves Innuit (men), by themselves. Amongst these people, missionaries have made many converts to Christianity during the last century, although they have naturally not been able to root out all heathen superstitions, even from the Christians. The ancient religion has a few peculiarities: these are a belief in nature-spirits, in life after death, and in witchcraft. The magician, Angekok, has great influence.

We shall not, in considering American savages, touch on those traits which they have in common with all or most other savages, and for which we can refer to our description of Animism and worship of nature. But we must refer to certain strongly marked peculiarities, such as Totemism, amongst the Redskins. A tribe or clan has its sacred animal which is worshipped and regarded as an ancestor. Unfortunately, we are no longer in a position to study thoroughly amongst American savages, the whole social system which is connected with Totemism. All over the continent we find lax marriage laws; polyandry, exogamy (for example amongst the Caribes where men and women speak different languages), and maternal relationship are strongly developed. But at the time when people had the opportunity of collecting more minute details on the aboriginal Americans, attention was not yet sufficiently directed to these questions. The other side of Totem-

ism is animal worship; this we find in various forms all over the continent, and especially amongst the Redskins. Spirits were presented in animal shapes, as birds, hares, tortoises, &c. Pantomimic dances in animal masks had a religious meaning, as the dancer identified himself with the worshipped being. A youth, who in his early years had to choose his medicine bag, which he always took through life with him, made it out of the skin of the animal he first dreamt of. The religion of the Redskins is a worship of spirits. These spirits, Manitu, are but little individualised, and seem to be connected with the elements of nature. Amongst these spirits the chief is looked on as 'the great spirit;' a conception which has often been used to prove, that the Redskins had a pure, almost monotheistic, religion. This is distinctly a mistake; whatever great deeds are attributed to 'the great spirit' he still belongs to a low grade of religion, and is generally represented in animal shapes. It is owing to a want of individuality, that he unites in himself almost all divine qualities which are worshipped by savages; he is connected with the worship of nature, as well as with the worship of ancestors, and his form of worship is not of a higher order than witchcraft. Sometimes he is conceived of as a man, and then all sorts of myths are told of him. Manabozho, the westwind, is generally the hero of a cycle of epic myths, of whom all kinds of adventures are related, which still survive amongst the people. Schoolcraft has collected these myths, and from them Longfellow borrowed the materials for 'Hiawatha.' An extraordinary idea, which is found not only

amongst Redskins but also amongst other tribes, is that which attributes a mother or grandmother to the great spirit; in this J. G. MÜLLER tries to discover the recognition of a fate superior to these spirits.

Amongst religious ceremonies, human sacrifice and anthropophagy are spread all over the continent. A curious custom, particularly amongst Redskins, is the offering of tobacco, and smoking the pipe of peace is also a religious ceremony. Steam baths to arouse religious exultation, purgative drinks and emetics are often used as means of purification.

It is remarkable that in America we find a development of religious ideas which is comparatively high for this grade of civilisation. Myths about the creation, the flood, and civilisation are found in almost all parts of America; they vary in form, but their purport is much the same. The highest spirit is the creator; and the creation of the world is presented in various forms, most of which contain struggles and catastrophes. The hostile element from which the world is to be saved is the water; stories about the flood belong here essentially to the cosmogonic myths. All sorts of ideas have been formed not only about the creation of the world, but also about the creation of man: man either grew from trees, or else proceeded from caves; at first he lived in dark animal conditions till a god or some culture-hero taught him the elements of a nobler and higher life. These are the general features of the principal myths.

We must still make two remarks. First: it would seem strange if in the eighteenth century, people tried to show that the idea of man in a pure state of nature is realised in these American cannibals.

Secondly: we are much struck by the strong resemblance between the ideas and customs of American savages, and American civilised nations; and this proves the independent autochthonic formation of this civilisation.

CHAPTER 31. — The Civilised Nations of America.

In speaking of American civilisation we think of the agricultural population of Mexico, Central America, New Granada (the Chibchas or Muiscas), and Peru, and of the traces of civilisation in the regions of the Mississippi and Ohio. The civilisation of Central America is closely connected with that of Mexico; but Peruvian civilisation is so independent that we can find no traces of mutual influences. If we compare the buildings, social arrangements, and religious conceptions of Mexico and Peru with those of the Old World, we find points of similarity especially with Assyrian and Egyptian culture. In Mexico also, powerful princes liked to erect pyramids, temples, and palaces; and a high stage of development is marked by the calendar, which in Mexico was arranged by the solar year. But if we accept, as TYLOR does, written records of traditions as forming the border line between barbarian and civilised nations, then Peru cannot yet, and Mexico can hardly, be said to have reached the highest grade of civilisation. It is true that in Peru the sons of royal families received a careful education in schools, and were instructed by wise men in all knowledge necessary for priests and princes, and in the deeds of their ancestors; but the memory of their country's history was only preserved by oral traditions, and

they had to strengthen their memories by means of Quipu, or memory strings of various coloured threads and knots. We need hardly mention how unreliable and arbitrary were the explanations of these Quipu. Much later, after the conquest, Peruvian traditions were collected by an author descended on his mother's side from the Inkas, who put them together in his Spanish commentary: GARCILASSO DE LA VEGA, whose book appeared from 1609–1617. It was rather different in Mexico, where the historical and priestly traditions were preserved in writing, if we may designate as writing the irregular, and as it seems not definitely arranged, drawn and painted pictures used as helps for the memory, a sort of hieroglyphics, which hardly differ from the rough drawings of the Redskins. Nevertheless numerous documents existed in this writing, though they have suffered from a cruel fate. The fanatic zeal of the first missionaries destroyed many of them; others were lost later on, but some have been placed in museums and are laid before us by Lord Kingsborough in his great collection. These documents have not yet been successfully deciphered; Ixtlilxochitl, the descendant of the kings of Tezcuco, realised this great difficulty when he wrote his history of the Chichimeks, using these native documents, which he only understood with the help of others. Besides this work, we possess from Mexico the Codex Chimalpopoca, from Guatemala the Codex Cakchiquel, and from Central America the Popol Vuh or people's book, a collection of local traditions, which was made by a native when their transmission was gradually dying out. This last book was

translated by Brasseur de Bourbourg. All these writings, written in the American languages but with Latin letters, were composed by natives after the conquest. For the rest we have to depend on the reports of Spanish authors, amongst whom are Bernal Diaz and Sahagun.

The Mexicans worshipped a large number of divine beings, small household gods (Tepitoton) as well as gods of nature, such as Tlaloc the rain god (also plural), Centeotl the goddess of the earth, and others. But the three principal gods are Quetzalcoatl, Tetzcatlipoca, and Huitzilopochtli (Vitzliputzli). The first had the winged serpent as his symbol, the second the shining mirror, and the third the colibri; the names are said to have similar meanings. Although these gods have idols in human shapes in their temples, yet these, and other symbols are widely spread. In Mexico as well as in Central America, where the chief gods Gucumatz and Votan have probably the same origin as the Mexican Quetzalcoatl, the symbols of the snake and the cross are often found. The latter, which caused great astonishment to Spanish conquerors, is referred generally to the wind god, as Quetzalcoatl and Gucumatz also are generally regarded as the air god. But the explanations of these symbols and of their physical meaning is by no means easy or reliable. Quetzalcoatl is the god of the Tolteks, whose culture he represents; his shape and history offer the best means of euhemeristic explanation; the accounts of his rule in Tula, from whence he was driven by the intrigues of Tetzcatlipoca, and his wanderings in Cholula, give us the impression of

referring to the fate of some mortal prince. On the other hand, his god-like character is unmistakable. He is the culture-god, who brought the elements of civilisation and of morals to man. He is a gentle god, who abhors human sacrifice; and as a venerable prophet-figure he introduced ascetic life. The idea of a golden age is connected with his reign; then undisturbed peace and prosperity ensued and the fruitfulness of the earth was marvellous. But he has disappeared since then, and sleeps either in Tula or Cholula, where he is expecting his awakening; or he is gone over the sea, from whence he will return; the arrival of the Spaniards was first of all looked on by the Mexicans as the return of Quetzalcoatl. The priests of Quetzalcoatl were therefore not antagonistic towards the Spaniards and they did not join the conspiracy of Cholula, and the priesthood of the Aztek gods who urged the king into a war for destroying the Spaniards. The myths about Tetzcatlipoca are much less developed, he stands more in the foreground in their worship and is generally addressed in prayer. He is principally the creator of the world, and most cosmogonic myths are connected with him. The chief god of the Azteks is Huitzilopochtli; he is the brave war-god, who led the tribe of the Azteks during their wanderings, and helped them to conquer the land. Cruel human sacrifices are generally offered to him, although they are sometimes offered to Tetzcatlipoca and even to Quetzalcoatl whose worship did not formerly admit of them. There is great temptation to make historical capital from the traditions of the wanderings which are so prominent in the myths of Quetzalcoatl and Huitzilo-

pochtli. It certainly cannot be denied that historical reminiscences and ethnical circumstances are presented in them, but even here it would probably be impossible to separate the historical kernel from the mythical shell.

In Mexico worship was fully organised. The Teocalli were large altars in the form of graduated pyramids; the Teocalli of Mexico formed the centre for numerous temple buildings. The cupola-shaped dwellings of Quetzalcoatl were more actual temples. Numerous and richly ornamented idols were erected to the gods. Numerous feasts, mostly annual, were celebrated in honour of single gods, or of many principal gods together. At these feasts, human sacrifices played the chief part. They not only consisted of prisoners of war; but noble youths who had been chosen a year beforehand, and represented the god himself, were offered every year to Tetzcatlipoca and Huitzilopochtli. The whole Mexican religion is cruel in character, and the agonies of the martyred victims are said to be pleasing to the gods. Connected with this we find an ascetic trait; for there were several convents for monks and nuns. The fervent form of several of their prayers as communicated by SAHAGUN, in which the faithful seek refuge with God as a merciful being, form a striking contrast with the more cruel aspects of their religion. Of course SAHAGUN may have made additions himself.

We have already referred to the highly developed chronology of the Mexicans. The intercalations required by the solar year of 365 days made a cycle of 52 years necessary, which was begun with religious ceremonies. But the Mexicans knew of larger world-

periods also, which lasted some thousand years, and were connected with the myths of the great world catastrophes. There were five such periods of the world. The period of the earth, during which giants lived, was terminated by famine or earthquake; the following by fire; the period of the air came to an end by violent hurricanes; the fourth was the period of water, which ended with the great flood. Finally, at the time of the conquest, the Mexicans were living in the fifth period. We cannot say whether the Mexicans had really systematised this myth in the form in which it was transmitted by the Spaniards.

In the history of Mexican religion we must especially draw attention to one figure, that of the great prince of Tezcuco, Nezahualcoyotl, who lived in the fifteenth century. After being kept from his birthright and wandering about as a fugitive, he at last ascended the paternal throne and distinguished himself by a thoroughly wise and happy reign. He also worked much as a religious reformer, by raising a Teocalli to the 'unseen god of the world,' in which the latter was worshipped without idols, and only received gifts which did not include bloodshed.

Although they stand on the same level, yet the worship and religion of Peru were very differently constituted from those of Mexico. In Peru sun-worship was prominent. It was Manco Capac and Mama Oello, the children of the sun, who first brought culture to mankind; they became the ancestors of the race of Inkas. Some of the daughters of royal families lived as sun-maidens in monastic separation. Together with the sun, other gods, such as Viracocha, Pachacamac (perhaps water and fire-gods) and many spirits

called Huacas, were worshipped. The worship was not less organised than in Mexico, but it was far less bloody. A chief point of difference lay in the religious position of the princes. Whilst in Mexico, the prince of a district was only the first amongst many other rulers, more or less dependent on him, the Inka in Peru, the son of the sun, had unlimited temporal and spiritual power, and was himself looked on and worshipped as a god. Amongst these Inkas there are said to have been some enlightened men; some seem even to have outgrown their sun-worship from rationalistic considerations. Tupac Yupanqui, in the fifteenth century, is said to have maintained that because the sun always followed the same course it was not really a free agent; over 'our father the sun,' there must be a higher power who could force him to this service. Others are said to have argued in similar ways, but this has had no influence on religion and hierocratic state laws.

CHAPTER 32. — **The South Sea Islanders.**

Books of Reference. There is a rich literature up to 1870 in WAITZ-GERLAND, V and VI; these volumes, mostly written by GERLAND, are of more value to the ethnographist than the earlier volumes by WAITZ himself, who is more of an anthropologist. On this whole subject both ancient and modern records of travel and missionary work are of great value. Of certain islands, however, we know as yet very little. A. FORNANDER wrote on the Polynesians in general, an Account of the Polynesian Race, its origin and migrations (2 vols., 1880), full of very risky combinations. In the works of W. MARINER (Tonga), W. ELLIS (Sandwich), and TURNER and O. FINSCH (Samoa), we possess on the whole reliable reports with reference to more or less limited areas. Especially interesting as regards religion are—G. GREY, Polynesian Mythology and Ancient Traditional History of the New Zealand Race (1855); C. SCHIRREN, Die Wandersagen der Neuseeländer und der Mauimythus (1856); W. W. GILL, Myths and Songs from the South Pacific, with

preface by MAX MÜLLER (1876). R. N. CUST treats of the language in A Sketch of the Modern Languages of Oceania (1887).

The works concerning the Malay archipelago are more numerous. The older English works by CRAWFURD (1820), and RAFFLES (1817), particularly those on Java, are still valuable. One can consult LASSEN'S Indische Alterthumskunde, especially vol. IV, about Indian influence on the Island world. On Java we now have P. J. VETH, Java (3 vols., 1875–82); on Borneo also P. J. VETH, Borneo's Wester afdeeling (2 vols., 1854–56); on Sumatra, the great work on Midden-Sumatra (4 vols., 1880–84), in which the results of the Dutch expedition (1877–79) are described; on the Molucca islands, J. S. F. RIEDEL, De Sluik-en Kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua (1886, a very careful ethnographic description), is most to be recommended. We learn about the Alfures in the north of the Celebes (Minahassa) from missionary literature, and on the inhabitants of the south of the Islands (Makassaren and Buginesen) information may be found in several works by B. F. MATTHES. Much that is of interest for ethnography and for the history of religion is contained in the VERHANDELINGEN and the TIJDSCHRIFT of the Bataviaasch Genootschap which has existed since 1778; and also in the Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederl. Indie (since 1853); Indische Gids (since 1879). In these periodicals there have been during the last years very important studies and essays, by P. A. TIELE, On the Europeans in the Malay archipelago, by C. SNOUCK-HURGRONJE, On Islam amongst its inhabitants, and especially by G. A. WILKEN, who wrote a treatise Het animisme bij den volken van den indischen Archipel (Ind. Gids 1884–85), also on the rights of marriage and inheritance, on the sacrifice of hair, and other practices in use amongst these nations.

The islands of the Pacific Ocean can be divided geographically into five groups. Nearest to Asia lies the Indian or Malay Archipelago; to the north-east of it Micronesia, to which the Mariana, Caroline, Marshall, and Gilbert islands belong; in the middle lies Melanesia, which includes New Guinea, the New Hebrides, New Caledonia, the Fiji Islands and a few others; to the south the mainland of Australia, formerly called New Holland, and Tasmania; the great eastern group is formed by the numerous groups of Polynesia. This region is inhabited by various races. The admission

of three races is the most probable. The first is the Australian race which inhabited Australia and Tasmania. The second, the Papua race which is found most pure in New Guinea. Sometimes people wish to amalgamate these two dark races, but the differences between the frizzy-haired Papuans and the straight-haired Australians seems too great to permit of it. In Melanesia and Micronesia, the Papuans are mixed with Polynesian and Malay blood; this is also the case in several other islands, such as the Philippine and Molucca Islands, where in the centre and on the hills remains of a dark race (Negritos) live on, having been driven out by Malay immigrants inhabiting the coast. Some people consider that the Papuans originally possessed the whole of the Malay Archipelago, and were the aborigines who withdrew under the influence of the Malay invasion. The theory maintained by many that the Mincopie of the Andaman islands belonged to the Papuans, would well agree with this. But the principal race in these islands is the Malayo-Polynesian, whose unity is as little doubtful as their Asiatic origin. The question as to their connection with other races has been answered in various ways. Whereas Peschel treats them as Mongolians, Fornander says they sprang from a mixture of Aryan and Cushitic blood: both these statements have but slight foundations. Whether their original home is to be sought on the Malay peninsula or further inland, so that they would be the aborigines of Farther-India, cannot yet be decided. We have already seen in our survey of Africa, that far in the west, the ruling population of Madagascar belongs to the Malay race.

Australians are generally regarded as belonging to the races standing lowest in respect of civilisation, although GERLAND thinks he has found amongst them traces also of a decline from former better conditions. Still they belong to those races who are least able to fight the battle of life. To all appearances they are rapidly dying out. Their religious conceptions and ceremonies are little known; and what we do know about them agrees with the conditions found amongst other low races. They believe in all sorts of spirits and ghosts, and their religious practices consist in magic. Their minds are much occupied with the life of the soul after death; and they believe that white men are the dead returned to life again. Religious conditions amongst the Papuans are rather more elevated; but in Melanesia, and especially in the Fiji Islands, we must attribute much to the mixture with Polynesians, with whom these populations have many myths and customs in common. Many of them believe in one supreme God and they possess myths about the creation, but still they worship all sorts of spirits, nature-spirits as well as the souls of the departed. From the latest ethnographical researches by RIEDEL, WILKEN, and others, we can see that the Papuans as well as the Malays offer rich materials for studying the characteristics of animism. Moreover the character of these two races is very different. The Papuan is lively and passionate, irritable and noisy, the Malay is retiring, quiet, but bloodthirsty and cruel. The Polynesian, although of the same race as the Malay, stands rather between these two extremes. Nevertheless the similarities between Malays and Polynesians are very marked. No race is so thoroughly

a cannibal race as this, although anthropophagy has been put down almost everywhere by foreign influences. But what still characterises Malays as well as Polynesians is that they both lay great weight on ceremonious politeness, decorum, and social etiquette. In outward behaviour and speech, they show their respect not only for princes, but for all authorities, and also towards inferiors they preserve a dignified bearing.

Polynesia has only been made known to Europeans by travellers (WALLIS, BOUGAINVILLE, and COOK) for little more than a century. At that time the population was warlike and cannibal. In this part of the world missionaries have had their greatest triumphs, and have introduced Christianity and civilisation almost everywhere. Whereas the colonists in the Australian continent have driven back the aborigines and destroyed them, the aborigines of the Polynesian Islands, which are now mostly under various European governments, have shown themselves quite ready to receive our religion and culture. Both missionaries and officials have appreciated the songs and myths of the aborigines, and have carefully collected them in Tonga, Samoa, Tahiti, Raiatea, the Hervey islands, the Sandwich Archipelago (Hawaii), and more especially in New Zealand, where they have learnt all they could from the chiefs and priests of the Maoris, the name given to the inhabitants of New Zealand.

The Polynesian religion has many unmistakable points of similarity with the religions of all savages and barbarians. Here also we find animism and the worship of nature, witchcraft and all sorts of superstitions. Many gods called Atua are worshipped; this name is variously explained, whilst

the spirits, the guardian spirits in general and the souls of the departed are called Tiki. The most remarkable thing in Polynesia is the extraordinary development of mythology, which is actually not without certain poetical attractions, as may be seen by reading the collections made by GREY and GILL. We will here notice some of the mythical ideas. The principal god in all Polynesia is Tangaloa (Tangaroa, and Taaroa), who is mostly regarded as a god of the sky and of the sea. He is also the creator, and the way in which the earth was created is given in various forms. Apart from the symbolic pictures of the world-bird and the cosmogonic egg, which are also found here, the creation of the world by the supreme godhead is pictured in the following ways. The world is sometimes a shell, the body of Tangaroa, sometimes it only appeared after many unsuccessful attempts, or sometimes it is fished up out of the sea. Sometimes also we find mention of a relationship between men and gods; for men are said to be heavenly beings who have lost their way from the dwellings of the gods.

In New Zealand, cosmogony has preserved a peculiar form of the myth of the separation between Papa and Rangi (heaven and earth) through their children. Amongst the Maoris, the principal character in myths is given to Maui, who appears in many other parts of Polynesia, but we cannot clearly separate his personality and acts from those of Tangaroa. Most people look on Maui as a sun-god, with which many of the myths agree, especially those referring to wanderings and death, or in which he occurs as the fisher of the world or fetcher of fire, or he even catches the sun. On the whole his myths seem to have developed into

fairy-tales. He is also connected with the myths about the wanderings, as the first man or the culture-hero. In these journey-myths historical reminiscences are probably mixed with mythical elements; and SCHIRREN is in the wrong if he ignores the existence of the former, and refers all traits mythically, either to the sun or lower world. The Polynesian conceptions also of the heavenly dwellings of the gods and the underworld kingdom of the dead (Po, Pulotu) are greatly developed and not clearly defined. However rich the accounts may be which we possess about Polynesian belief, yet they do not suffice to draw out, as GERLAND does, a regular development of Polynesian religion. He distinguishes three stages: in the lowest, fear produced the faith in Tiki, guardian spirits in animal forms; in the second, an admiring contemplation of nature gave rise to the form of the principal gods, who faded away in the third stage to make room for souls and demons. This construction is improbable in itself, and cannot be sufficiently proved.

Amongst religious customs tattooing must be mentioned in the first rank; it is found amongst other races, but it is nowhere so general and comprehensive as amongst the Polynesians. The painful operation was mostly begun on coming of age; but the cutting of figures, more especially on the loins and stomach, was continued for many years. Men were generally tattooed, women seldom, and slaves never; strangers were sometimes forced to submit to it, but in some cases, even if they wished it, they were not allowed to undergo it. There is no doubt that this was a religious custom; it was performed by priests to the singing of

religious songs, and it was said to take its origin from the gods. Amongst various explanations, GERLAND'S has been most widely accepted; 'People painted themselves with the sign of the god to whom they belonged, whether as an individual or as a member of a tribe; sometimes they painted themselves with the signs of both gods, their own protecting spirit and the tribe-god.' Taken in this way, this custom is closely connected with Totemism, more especially as the scratched-in figures often represented animals: such as snakes, lizards, fish, and birds. Under the influence of Christianity the custom of tattooing has greatly fallen off and is limited to certain remote districts. Circumcision was a religious practice amongst the Polynesians as well as tattooing.

The laws of taboo are peculiar to this race and harmonise with the strict social differences of aristocratic regulations. Persons, things, circumstances were divided into taboo, as related to the gods, and into noa as free for general use. There were public and private taboos, some of which were lasting, and others which only existed for a time. Taboo was everything which had any connection with worship. Princes and nobles were included in it, but women only exceptionally and under certain circumstances. Tabooing gave protection and privileges, but also imposed all sorts of restrictions; the word itself is said to mean 'strongly marked, forbidden.' The laying on and taking off of taboo took place with religious ceremonies, at the latter, water was mostly employed. More especially taboo was the society of Areoi, which originated in Tahiti and from thence spread to other islands. This corporation traced its descent mythically from the god

Oro and claimed divine honours. Persons were only received into it after a novitiate and with great ceremonials; it included seven grades, which were distinguished from each other by different tattooings. It was left to the lowest grades to perform the dances and actings, with which they travelled from island to island, representing episodes from the history of the gods. One strict taboo enforced the murder of all children who had sprung from marriages between these licentious Areoi and native women.

If we turn to the Malay Archipelago we find that matters are much more complicated than in Polynesia. Here the population consists not only of Malay immigrants mixed with the aborigines (perhaps connected with the Papuans), but at an early period it fell under the varied influences of civilised nations. Although it is impossible to fix the time of the first contacts between Hindustan and this archipelago, yet they cannot have been later than the first centuries of our era; the culmination of Hindu culture in Java however is much later. It lasted till 1478 when, with the fall of the kingdom of Madjapahit, Islam gained a decided victory in eastern Java. Thus Java had already a developed civilisation, a powerful state-organisation, and a history of many hundred years before the arrival of Europeans. The conquests and colonisations by European nations, first the Portuguese, then the Dutch, need only be mentioned in order to bring out the manifold influences and mixtures which have so decidedly affected the ethnographic configuration of the archipelago. The same can be said also of the numerous Chinese workmen and merchants who settle in many places.

Amongst the Malays the old heathen religion has given place officially to the higher religions which have been the results of missions rather than of conquests. Formerly animism and nature-worship ruled supreme, but they were too quickly driven into the background to produce a perfect poetical mythology as in Polynesia. Certainly many of the most barbarous races have remained heathen up to the present day; as for instance, the Dayaks of Borneo amongst whom the collecting of heads is looked on as an offering for the dead; and the Battaks of Central Sumatra, who are cannibals to this day; but amongst both tribes Christian missions have worked with some results. The Tagalas of the Philippine Islands have been Christianised under the Spanish dominion, and the Alfuras of the Minahassa by Protestant missions. Amongst the races on the islands between the Celebes and New Guinea, which have been described by RIEDEL, Christianity has only taken root in a few exceptional cases, as in Ambon; but most of these races continue in heathen conditions. It is true that everywhere, even in Java, these still exist, and are barely concealed by Hinduism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity. Belief in ghosts, the worship of nature and of the dead, sacrificial feasts, and all kinds of magic occur in Java, as well as amongst the inhabitants formed of mixed races in the Molucca Islands. The knowledge of various magic arts and formulas (Ngelmu, Rapal) is more especially developed. Gifts are often offered to the dead; and people believe in their transformation into animal forms, and dread their revenge or punishments. Thus we find a widespread belief that the souls of women who have died

in child-birth are dangerous to men and children. WILKEN has shown how animism governs popular belief and popular customs in the Indian Archipelago and in Java, no less than amongst races of a lower grade.

Hinduism has mostly spread over Java, Bali, and Madura; but in other islands, even amongst the Dayaks of Borneo, we find customs which can be traced to Indian influences. Literature originated and developed itself in Java under the influence of Indian thought and forms; the ancient Javanese, or Kawi language, the study of which has made great progress since the time of A. W. VON HUMBOLDT, under FRIEDERICH, COHEN STUART, KERN, and others, is a Malay idiom cultivated under the influence of Sanskrit. In this language, inscriptions as well as literary productions have been preserved; the latter are partly of an epic character, themes from the Indian Mahâbhârata worked up in local Javanese settings. Later on, native hero-fables were included in Javanese literature. Moreover there are many examples of religious, moral, and mystic writings composed in a Mohammedan spirit, and a popular literature, such as the dramatised stories of the Wajang (a sort of marionettes). Let us return to Indian influences which are also most important in religious matters. Numerous images of gods, symbols (Linga, Phallus), and especially remains of buildings, bear witness to the spread of Indian culture in Java. These are now mostly destroyed, more by nature than by the hand of man, but enough remains to enable us to judge of their former greatness. Hindu temples were chiefly found on the mountain plateau of Dieng and at Pram Canam,

whilst Buddhist temples are found in the province of Kadoe. Of the latter the colossal building of Borobudur is the most wonderful. Its numerous walls, passages, and terraces, ornamented with rich sculpture and bas-reliefs, and its statue of Buddha, intentionally left unfinished, as some suppose, afford us a glimpse of the importance to which Buddhism grew in Java. Still Hinduism seems to have been more widely spread. In Java we find Vishnu and Brahma, and more especially Siva with Durgâ and Ganesa. The stern ascetic life to which many Javanese submitted and the wild licentious worship of Linga are of Sivaitic origin. Now although the Indian religion has long ago disappeared from Java, it still leaves these traces: but the ascetic life has assumed a Mohammedan cloak, and licentiousness has remained a national custom, sometimes connected with heathen practices. A striking form in the Pantheon, not only in Java but elsewhere in the archipelago, is Batara Guru, who is generally worshipped as the highest, the creative God. His name shows an Indian origin and he may be related to Siva; certainly some native conceptions have become blended with him.

Islam is widely spread in the archipelago, though without having altogether superseded heathen ideas and customs. In Java, Islam is the national religion; it has an official character at the courts of the native princes and nobles, and is even recognised and protected as such by the Dutch government. Amongst the people obedience to religious duty may often be but laxly observed, but the participation in Mohammedan festivals recalls people to Islam again, and the pilgrimage to Mekka inflames fanaticism. The

heart of Mohammedan life in the archipelago is the permanent Djawah colony in Mekka, which has been described by Snouck-Hurgronje. From that centre a knowledge of religious law, and membership of mystic societies in the archipelago, receive strong support.

In the Malay Archipelago, Christianity has only achieved glorious successes amongst the Alfuras of the Minahassa. For the rest the numerous missionary societies do not work amongst these islands without some success; but, with a few exceptions, they have not progressed beyond the stage of individual conversions and the formation of small congregations. As a rule these results ripen more quickly amongst savages and totally heathen races, than for instance in Java, where, however, in certain places congregations of natives have been collected, but where in general, Islam has gained an advantage over Christianity. Wherever this is the case experience shows us that Christian missions have to work under the most unfavourable circumstances.

Chapter 33. — The Mongolian Race.

Books of Reference. A want that has never been replaced is the absence in Waitz' work of anything on the Mongolian race, the material being scattered in descriptions of travels, in ethnographic reports on the population of the Russian empire, and in various periodicals and reports of learned societies, &c. To obtain a general survey one must use those parts of Fr. Müller's Allgemeine Ethnographie which refer to this subject; he is as usual thoroughly trustworthy, but says too little about religion.

With reference to Siberia, the following are of great interest: A. Castren, Reiseerinnerungen aus den Jahren 1838–44 (1853), and Reiseberichte und Briefe aus den Jahren 1845–49 (1856), both edited by A. Schiefner; W. Radloff, Sibirien. Lose Blätter eines reisenden Linguisten (1885, in it there is a chapter Das Schamanenthum und sein

Cultus); Proben der Volkslitteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens (8 vols., 1866-1872). A. SCHIEFNER, Heldensagen der minussinschen Tataren (1859). Amongst older writings on Central Asia we must specially mention I. J. SCHMIDT, Forschungen im Gebiete der älteren religiösen, politischen und literärischen Bildungsgeschichte der Völker Mittelasiens (1824), &c.; amongst more modern works there are ARM. VAMBÉRY, Die primitive Cultur des turko-tartarischen Volkes auf Grund sprachlicher Forschungen (1879); Das Türkenvolk in seinen ethnologischen und ethnographischen Beziehungen geschildert (1885). Japan is thoroughly treated by J. J. REIN (2 vols., 1881–86), whilst amongst numerous books of travels, we must mention the beautifully illustrated book by C. NETTO, and the clever descriptions of MRS. ISABELLA BIRD. Much trustworthy material is to be found also in the works and essays of PH. F. VON SIEBOLD, J. HOFFMANN, LÉON DE ROSNY, A. PFIZMAIER, and B. H. CHAMBERLAIN. As regards the Mongolian elements which may be found in the languages of India Proper and Farther-India we can compare the valuable catalogue of the languages of both countries by R. N. CUST, A sketch of the modern languages of the East Indies (1878).

The name Mongolian is really that of an ethnic family which forms a small branch of a large race, but it is often applied to the whole race, which others prefer to call the 'high-Asiatic race.' We have already mentioned that this race with some ethnographists is a large bag into which they throw every conceivable thing. Thus PESCHEL unhesitatingly includes all Americans and Malayo-Polynesians in the 'mongoloide' nations, just as MAX MÜLLER includes the Malayo-Polynesians and the Dravidian nations of Hindustan, which last, according to PESCHEL and most ethnographists, form a race by themselves. FR. MÜLLER has, more than any one else, limited the domain of the Mongolians, since he considered even the tribes on the north coast of Siberia, Kamtschatkans, Ainos, and others, with the American Esquimaux, as a special race —that of the Arctics or Hyperboreans. But even thus, the Mongolian race remains not only the most numer-

ous of all, but it is the race whose unity and connection are most withdrawn from our eyes. Even tradition can no longer give any information as to the wanderings of the Mongolian tribes in ancient times, and their relations with other nations, whom they perhaps drove out from their possessions, or with whom they intermixed; the study of language is the only means, though hardly a sufficient one, to discover anything about this. Therefore the grouping of various branches of this family is very uncertain. Max Müller distinguishes a northern and southern division. Fr. Müller, from a linguistic point of view, distinguishes nations possessing a polysyllabic and others possessing a monosyllabic language. Without giving a fixed classification we shall just mention the principal branches of the race. First of all, the large Ural-altaic family, to which, amongst extinct nations who have played a certain part in history, belong the Huns, Avars, Bulgares, and to which, amongst living nations even though they exist but in scanty survivals, belong the Samoyedes, Fins, Laps, Ehsts, Livonians, Tunguses, Mongols, Kalmuks, Turks, Tatars, Kirgises, Usbeks, &c. This family can be divided into a Turco-Tataric and a Finno-Ugrian branch. To prove how little certainty there is on this subject, we can quote the Magyars, whom most people, for instance Hunfalvy, regard as being closely related to the Fins, while they are counted as Turko-Tatars by Vambéry. In the east of this continent we find Chinese, Coreans, and Japanese. Our knowledge is far from being sufficient to enable us to examine the ethnographic features of China. It is highly probable that the 'hundred families' to which Chinese culture is traced back, and

who immigrated in ancient times from the north-west, as well as the Mandshus, who have in modern times acquired the dominion over China, belonged to the high-Asiatic race; but in what degree of relationship they stood to the aborigines can absolutely not be discovered. In Japan the inhabitants are probably formed by a mixture of the Ainos, the original savage aborigines belonging to the Hyperboreans, with various Mongolian immigrants who came from the mainland of Asia. Malay blood also seems to have been introduced in no small measure; some people even claim to discover a relationship with the Papuans. If we look again at the mainland, we find in Thibet, and on the northern side of the Himalayas, nations and tribes who certainly can be counted as belonging to the Mongolian race. With the Burmese we get across to Farther-India where the Tai and the Annam people are likewise generally counted as Mongolians. Very little is known ethnographically about Farther-India, and since the nations living there have adopted the Buddhist religion and Chinese civilisation it is most difficult to discover their original relationship. Certainly some contact or mixture with Malay elements, if not original relationship, may be regarded as a probability. The latest enquiries into the language and antiquities of the Khmers (in Cambodja) do not reach beyond the ancient times of Hindu influence, and therefore throw no light on original conditions.

The racial character of the Mongolian is often described as phlegmatic, gentle, and prosaic. As an inhabitant of the steppes he is usually a nomad, his occupation consisting mostly in cattle-rearing; he also practises agriculture; he is only a hunter or fisher

when nature precludes other occupations. He is thus the type of a barbarian. Poetic gifts, strictly speaking, are only found in this race amongst the Fins. The materials for stories amongst the central and high-Asiatic nomads are mostly borrowed from India [1]. It is true the Chinese possess an old collection of songs, but no great poetic value can be attributed to them. In warlike qualities also the Mongolians are not especially great; but they can overrun large districts in great hordes which resemble a wandering nomad race more than an army, crushing and devastating everything by sheer numbers, without bringing either warlike skill or bravery into play. The gift of political organisation is what they most want; their kingdoms fall at the death of the conqueror or a few generations after him; even if they do last rather longer owing to the talent of single governors, as was the case in the government of the Great Mogul at Delhi, still they show no vitality. At the time of the end of the ancient world the Huns gave the impulse to that great migration which produced the Europe of the Middle Ages. In the Middle Ages and during two centuries, the Mongolians have produced three great conquerors, Tshingiskhan, Kubilai, and Timur. They conquered China, overthrew the Kaliphate of Bagdad, subjected Persia, Russia, and Asia Minor, penetrated into Germany, and yet have never taken a leading part in the world's history. They may have done so in ancient times, if it is true that the aborigines of Chaldæa, the cradle of Assyro-Babylonian culture,

[1] TH. BENFEY first suggested this connection. The fables in question were collected by B. JÜLG, Kalmükische Märchen (1866), Mongolische Märchen (1868).

belonged to the high-Asiatic race and were even related to the Chinese. But this is very difficult to decide. It is equally uncertain what part this race had in Persian civilisation. It is as certain that the Persians belong to the Indo-Germans as that civilisation in Iran developed itself in conscious opposition to the inimical Turanians, and in that sense only under their influence. Turanian is an ethnographic name which is still used occasionally to signify the high-Asiatic race.

As regards religion, the Mongolian is characterised by strong indifference. The great conquerors of the Middle Ages who had made acquaintance with various religions from the east to the west of Asia, were not only tolerant, but evinced even eclectic desires and interests for various forms of belief. God in heaven and Chakan on earth was after all their motto. In the religious foundations of the Indian emperor Akbar, this eclectic tendency reached its highest point. Therefore we cannot be surprised that almost everywhere amongst the Mongolians, foreign religions are diffused. Many high-Asiatic tribes have not yet exchanged their inherited Shamanism or disguised it by other religions. We find the following religions ruling amongst these nations, Buddhism in Thibet, China, Japan, and Farther-India, Islam amongst the Turks, whilst Magyars, Fins, and single Asiatic tribes are Christians. The great variety of branches, nomadic and settled, who people European as well as Asiatic Russia is most remarkable; amongst them we find Mohammedan Tatars, Kirghese, Buddhist Kalmuks, and others. We shall treat of Buddhism in Thibet and China, and of the national Chinese religion in our

historical section. Here we need only emphasise that the latter does not disown its relationship with Mongolian nature-religions. Amongst the Mongols, the barbaric races, and the Chinese civilised people have the most important points in common: such as, a belief in heaven as the highest God, the opposition between heaven and earth, and a highly developed family sentiment, manifested in ancestor worship and peculiar forms of magic.

The special form assumed here by animism and magic is called Shamanism. Fetishism, according to VAMBÉRY, can only be slightly traced, but we find unmistakeable signs of Totemism amongst the Turko-Tatars. As a general rule these races believe in a Supreme God, Tengere, who lives in heaven; and in a powerful, dangerous god, living in the lower world, called Erlik (Irle-khan). Moreover, man's life is influenced by all sorts of protecting spirits and ancestors. To work on these, one summons the magician, weather-prophet, medicine-man, soothsayer; Kam or Shaman, to use a name coming really from India. To shamanise is an hereditary power, and is not looked on as a traditional doctrine, but as a supernatural inheritance that a father transmits to his son and sometimes to his daughter. The principal idea involved, is that the spirit of predecessors enters the Shaman, so that he is drawn out of himself and the world, by fits, distortions, and wild ravings, and thus penetrates into the upper region of light or into the lower region of darkness. This shamanising is found amongst most high-Asiatic nations, and in Europe we find it amongst the Laps. The Shaman uses a magic drum painted

with all sorts of figures, on which he beats and with which he accompanies his wild and gloomy songs. In his ecstatic condition the Shaman mounts up to heaven to get information from the gods about what is demanded of him. There are degrees in the Shaman worship; in some the magic only goes far enough to enable them to soar up to the lower heavenly spheres; the great and famous Shamans can reach the highest heaven. But they must also descend to the lower regions. This takes place more especially when they clean a Jurte (tent) dwelling, after a death. The belief prevails that the soul of the deceased wanders about there, and would willingly draw down a living being with it. Therefore it is necessary to catch this soul and conduct it to the realm of the dead, to the other souls, which is done by the Shaman with dramatic vivacity and most impressively. Another of the Shaman's duties is to offer sacrifices, more especially the sacrifice of a horse, which is killed and distributed with all sorts of rites and magic forms. The connection between a sacrifice and an oath amongst many of these nations is most interesting, for the blood of a sacrificed animal is drunk when taking an oath as well as when making an agreement or taking a vow.

We will now turn our attention to the civilised nations of this race, but we shall not consider China at present, in order that we may say a few words about Japan (Nippon), the kingdom of the rising sun, called by Marco Polo, Zipangri. Civilisation and religion, although they are generally looked on as having come over from the mainland, are yet most peculiarly developed there, and differ considerably, like the whole national character, from that

of the Chinese. The native religion is called Kami-no-mitsi, the way of the gods or spirits, in Chinese Shin-tao; therefore generally called Shintoism. It consists of the worship of many gods and spirits, of the sun-goddess whose symbol is a mirror, and from whom the Mikado is descended, and of other nature-gods, heroes and ancestors. The forms of worship consist in the keeping up of a pure fire by the priests in the fore-courts of the temples, in sacrifices, prayers, various purifications, especially after cases of death, many festivals celebrated with processions, music, singing, dancing, dramatic representations, races, and feasts. To these last belong the days of new moon and full moon, the great yearly national feasts, the family feasts, and the anniversaries of the Kami. The holiest place of Shintoism is Ise. Thither every year, especially during the spring months, but also throughout the whole year, thousands of pilgrims undertake a pilgrimage to fetch a ticket on which the name of the godhead is written, which is kept as a talisman in their houses. Also when praying, the Kami worshipper turns his face towards the region where 'the heavenly palaces of the holiest gods of Ise' stand. Since the sixth century, Buddhism called Fu-tao, or Buttoo, has existed in Japan by the side of Shintoism. Quite lately Buddhist texts preserved in Japan, and studied by Max Müller and his pupil, the Buddhist priest Bunyiu Nanjio, have produced most remarkable historical discoveries. In Japan as in China, Buddhism is widely diffused, especially among the lower classes. Many sects, amongst others the Robiu Shinto in the ninth century, have eclectically amalgamated the original religion with the Buddhist religion. Even at present Buddhism is clung to

by the people, although the official support of the State has been withdrawn from it since 1874. The educated Japanese remains true to Shintoism, but with this he possesses a sort of moral philosophy of Chinese origin (from the school of Confucius). Yet on the whole he is a sceptic and indifferent as regards religion. This explains why, although Japan has during the last few years been so ready to receive European civilisation, Christianity makes slow progress only.

Chapter 34.—**The Fins.**

Books of Reference. A. Schiefner, Kalewala, das National-Epos der Finnen (1852); a French translation of this epic was made by L. Léouzon le Duc, an English one by W.F. Kirby (1888), and lately a German one by H. Pauls (1889); J. Grimm, Ueber das finnische Epos (Kleinere Schriften, II); A. Castren, Lectures on Finnish Mythology (German translation by Schiefner, 1853); E. Beauvois, La magie chez les Finnois (R. H. R. 1881–82).

The Finnish branch of the Mongolian race to which the Laps, Fins, Ehsts, and Livonians belong, possessed probably in past ages a large part of Northern Europe, and was driven out more and more by the immigrations of Germanic tribes or became mixed with them. Tacitus already mentions the Fins in his Germania, but he could only obtain obscure reports about their mira feritas. The nation of the Fins is the principal stem of this branch. Their mythology has amongst the high-Asiatic races about the same position as the Polynesian amongst the South Sea tribes, and although Finland is Christianised, it is there, and not amongst the rougher heathen Laps, that the old god and hero myths have been collected. We possess comparatively rich materials for studying Finland, or

Suomi as the Fins call their country. The northern literature of the Middle Ages throws so many side lights on Finland, that it is quite worth while to collect those parts referring to Finland, as BEAUVOIS has done for example in reference to witchcraft. Already at the end of the last century, men like PORTHAN, LENCQUIST, and GANANDER began to collect and explain old runes. But their work has been quite surpassed by E. LÖNNROTT, who lived for years amongst this nation, took down the songs from the mouths of the singers, and himself, as a national singer, partly completed and arranged the stories in a poetical form. From these labours he has produced three great works. The most important is the collection of epic subjects, Kalevala, of which LÖNNROTT in 1835 published an edition in thirty-two books, and in 1849 an enlarged edition in fifty books or runes. The lyric poems he collected in Kanteletar, a name borrowed from the native harp (Kantele). Finally in 1880 he published a third and not less important collection of magic formulas and songs; which BEAUVOIS used as a foundation for his excellent essay. Thus materials are not wanting, and these have been worked up in a masterly manner by CASTREN in his Finnish Mythology. It is true that Runic research has not yet spoken its last word, and men like J. KROHN and others, are actively engaged in Finland in collecting and critically sifting the materials.

The highest god amongst the Fins is called Jumala, also Num, or Jilibeambaertje, as protector of the flocks; but this last only amongst certain tribes. The word Jumala indicates rather the godhead in general than a divine individual; the God of the Christians

is also often called Jumala. Therefore in the runes another name is more prominent; namely Ukko, the old man, the grandfather, who sends thunder. Both are regarded by CASTREN as belonging to the air-gods; besides this there are gods of the elements, such as water-gods and earth-gods. The Hiisi who were dreaded as evil creatures, were possibly originally forest-devils. The conceptions of the lower world, Tuonela, are highly developed, and probably Christian ideas have got mixed with them. Mana or Tuoni, the master of the lower regions, rules there, whilst a special figure is made for the god of death. Besides the gods there are still a number of guardian spirits, Haltia, of which every Fin possesses one, who are easily influenced by the magicians. With reference to witchcraft, we find its nature and forms are identical with that occurring in other places. Since LÖNNROTT has given us a number of magic formulas, we have now the opportunity of comparing them with the magic sayings of other nations.

The great attraction in Finnish mythology lies in the fact that it receives actual shapes and forms in the epic cycle. The Kalevala begins with a cosmogony, which certainly offers interesting features for comparison, but in which there is much that may be foreign to the original heathen conceptions. Then the epic deals with the adventures of the three heroes, Wäinamöinen, Ilmarinen, and Lemminkäinen. These heroes of Kaleva go into the hostile north-country of Pohjola as suitors, to fetch a bride, who is finally won by Ilmarinen; they return later to rob the Sampo treasure. Amongst the labours which Louhi, the hostess of Pohjola, lays upon them is a journey to

Tuonela, with which a description of the lower regions is connected. The runes are important, both from a mythological point of view and as regards the history of civilisation. Mythologically it is probably certain that behind the forms of the chief heroes, ancient gods are really represented, only it is difficult to interpret them; and this has been done in so many different ways. Anyhow, the old mythic forms have been spiritualised; 'thus, Wäinamöinen represents divine wisdom as creative in word and song; Ilmarinen, artistic force producing forms with the help of fire; Lemminkäinen, brave, far-reaching courage, joy in action' (CARRIÈRE). This epic also, is full of magic; Wäinamöinen is the great rune scholar and magician, and many magic-words and means play a prominent part. It is most difficult to explain Sampo, the treasure, which Ilmarinen, the smith, worked, and on the possession of which depend welfare and blessing. Some people have looked on Sampo as an actual thing, others explain it mythically as the twilight, the sun, others symbolically as the essence of all possessions, but nothing seems to explain the various details sufficiently. But we have said enough to show the great importance of this epic cycle. In the whole domain of the Mongolian race it is the one thing of its kind. It is true the Ehsts have their hero-sagas about Kaleva heroes, which are collected under the name of Kalewipoeg. But however valuable these may be, they do not approach the Finnish Kalevala in importance.

Chapter 35. — The Semitic Family.

Books of Reference. The most important handbooks of ancient history will be mentioned later on (in the chapter on the literature of Egypt); here we shall only recommend that most carefully written book of Ed. Meyer, Geschichte des Alterthums (I. 1884), which up till now far surpasses all other summaries. In reference to the Semites we have: Th. Nöldeke, Die Semitischen Sprachen, eine Skizze (1887); F. Hommel, Die Semitischen Völker und Sprachen (I. 1883; this work, planned for 5 vols., is meant to be the first to contain an encyclopaedia of the science of Semitic language and antiquity); W. Robertson Smith, Lectures on the religion of the Semites (I. Burnett Lect. 1889); E. Renan, Histoire générale et système comparé des langues sémitiques (I. 1st ed. 1855; no more vols. have come out, but this 1st vol. has been repeatedly reprinted); Nouvelles considérations sur le caractère général des peuples sémitiques et en particulier sur leur tendance au monothéisme (J. A. 1859); Renan's theories have called forth numerous articles, of which we shall mention as being the most important those by Max Müller (Chips, I.); by L. Diestel (Jahrb. f. d. Theol. 1860); and a popular, clever, though not very original, apologetic pamphlet by R. F. Grau, Semiten und Indogermanen (1. Ausg. 1864). A far more valuable comparison of these two racial families is given by A. M. Fairbairn (in his Studies on the philosophy of religion and history). E. Schrader, Die Abstammung der Chaldaer und die Ursitze der Semiten (Z. D. M. G 1873); W. W. Graf Baudissin, Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte (2 vols., 1876–78); Fr. Baethgen, Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte, I. Der Gott Israels und die Götter der Heiden (1888). The Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology (since 1872) contain much that is of importance. A survey of later discoveries in respect to the Bible is given by A. H. Sayce, Fresh lights from the ancient monuments (lately translated into German in an enlarged form). If we turn to the individual nations then J. Selden, De diis Syris (1628) still deserves mention; D. Chwolsohn, Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus (2 vols., 1856). The later discoveries concerning the Hittites are to be found in W. Wright, The empire of the Hittites (2nd ed. 1886); A. H. Sayce, The Hittites (1888, By-paths of Bible knowledge); Perrot and Chipiez, Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité, IV. With regard to the Phoenicians the large work by F. C. Movers, Die Phönicier (4 vols., 1841–56), is not very reliable, and contains much that has caused great confusion. A good collection of material drawn from inscriptions has been made by M. A. Levy, Phönicische Studien (4. H. 1856–70); A practical survey is given by Ph. Berger (in Lichtenberger). R. Pietschmann, Geschichte der Phönicier (in Oncken). The principal work on Phoenicia is the Mission de Phénicie, in which E. Renan gives

the results of his travels. On the whole the study of ancient Semitic religions is very backward, which cannot be wondered at when one considers how much depends on the collection and deciphering of inscriptions; which is now being zealously carried on as for instance in the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum. An important source of information on these religions is the Old Testament, and scientific criticism has done much in order to use the Old Testament as a valuable source for ancient history. We shall here but occasionally mention the Israelitic religion. The works by EWALD, REUSS, KUENEN, WELLHAUSEN, ROB. SMITH, and lately by STADE, which throw light on the history of the Israelitic religion, or on parts of it, are well known. The attempt made by I. GOLDZIHER, Der Mythos bei den Hebräern (1876), to construct nature myths out of the names in the Old Testament and out of isolated facts found a certain following, but must on the whole be considered as unsuccessful.

We now come to that race which governs the history of the world, the Mediterranean, or as BLUMENBACH not very correctly terms it, Caucasian. The original connection of the various nations belonging to this race is entirely beyond our historical knowledge. We cannot go further than to distinguish two great divisions in this race, the Semitic, and the Indo-Germanic. It is quite true that all nations include in the Mediterranean race cannot be classified as Semites, or as Indo-Germans. The Basques, for instance, are the remnant of an Iberian branch more diffused in ancient times, and belonging to the Mediterranean race, but not to either of the above-mentioned families. The same applies to several tribes in the region of the Caucasus, amongst others the Georgians; probably also to the Alarodiens in the land of Ararat, between Lake Van and the Araxes in Armenia, who are probably connected with them. This may also be the case with the Hittites, who became representatives of Semitic cul-

ture, but whose proper names betray an altogether non-Semitic idiom.

The extent of the territory of the Semitic family is very variously determined, according as the Semites are considered by themselves, or the inhabitants of North Africa are included with them, thus forming an Hamito-Semitic group. The table of nations given in the tenth chapter of Genesis establishes, as we know, a special group, founded by Ham, his sons being Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan. Many people still adopt the above-mentioned classification more or less ethnographically (others geographically, or from the point of view of the history of civilisation), but they also naturally accept a closer relationship between Hamites and Semites, and form one family out of these two groups. The Hamitic branch of this family is then subdivided into three classes, the Lybian, Egyptian, and Ethiopian (by FR. MÜLLER and HOMMEL, &c.) The Hamitic branch, as a general rule, is looked on as the prehistoric element in Asia, and as being connected with the Semites in North Africa. Now it is quite true that a relationship between Egyptians (Ham is Kem, Egypt) and the Asiatic Semites is most striking, and may outweigh the points of resemblance with African races, of which we spoke before. The name of Cushite has proved fatal in ethnography, because in the tenth chapter of Genesis Cush is made the father of Nimrod and various Arab branches. This statement still exercises its influence on FR. MÜLLER, who accepts a connection between the Ethiopian branch of the Hamites and the pre-Semitic population of Babylon, as well as with the original inhabitants of Arabia.

We can prove that there has been a mistake here, at all events as regards Chaldea, since the Kassi or Kossaeans who ruled for a time in Babylon have nothing in common with the Cushites, that is the Ethiopians.

Other names have been proposed for the Semitic family in a narrower sense; thus RENAN speaks of Syro-Arabs. In this name the two divisions of this family according to their languages are correctly given; they are thus divided into a South Semitic (Arabian and Ethiopian) and a North Semitic (Assyrian, Syrian, and Canaanite) branch. Many people, amongst others SCHRADER, now look on Arabia as the native land of the Semites, from whence the Semitic emigration to Mesopotamia, and from there further west, took place. Other people, such as HOMMEL, wish to seek further for the original Semite settlements, if possible in some land where they were in contact with the original Indo-Germanic tribes, in Central Asia; but this lies as far beyond the limits of historical research as the wanderings of the Cushites from Africa to Babylon; even a Semitic home in Arabia is more or less doubtful, and by no means certain. The South Semitic division has mixed least with foreign elements, and has preserved most purely the original type of the family. The Arab of the desert is the real Semite; though here also a difference between the Arabs of the North and those of the South has crept in. At the beginning of the Christian era, Abyssinia was colonised by the latter. The Semitic Ethiopians who inhabit the high lands of Abyssinia must be distinguished from the Ethiopians (Cushites) of the old world, who possessed the Nubia

and the Soudan of to-day. In South Arabia a peculiar civilisation flourished, which we know of from inscriptions and from ruins: the Sabæan or Himyaritic, for whose discovery and investigation in the present day FRESNEL, HALÉVY, FR. LENORMANT, OSIANDER, MORDTMANN, and D. H. MÜLLER have worked so successfully.

These Sabæans were the people of Saba in Yemen, and entirely different from the Sabians in Harran, about whom CHWOLSOHN has instituted careful inquiries. These were a Syrian heathen people, who were given to star-worship, and thus gave rise to the fiction of a peculiar form of religion (Sabeism, star-worship) which occurs sometimes in old writings. At the time of the Mohammedan conquest, in the seventh century, these Syrians of Harran assumed the name of Sabians, in order to enjoy the privileges which the Koran afforded to Sabians as well as to Jews and Christians, and they could do this more readily as no one dared say what Mohammed had really understood under this name of Sabians. We must again distinguish the Babylonian Sabians from this Syrian branch. These Sabians, Mandæans, who were formerly erroneously called Christians of St. John, are a religious community still existing in the region of the Euphrates, and reaching back to the first century of our era. Their doctrine seems to have consisted of various ancient Babylonian, Persian, and gnostic elements joined together. Since the middle of our century these Mandæans have attracted the attention of scholars, and have been visited and studied by men like PETERMANN, EUTING, and NÖLDEKE. But it is only recently that A. H. W. BRANDT discovered the

actual sources, and has given us a statement of the Mandæan religion, based on the most ancient religious books. This will sufficiently explain the name of Sabæans and Sabians.

The north Semitic branch has come more in contact with other nations on the stage of history than the south Semitic. This took place first of all in Mesopotamia, where the Semitic immigrants and conquerors found an ancient population of Proto-Babylonians (perhaps belonging to the high-Asiatic race), whose civilisation they partly accepted, and where also other neighbouring nations, such as Kossaeans and Elamites repeatedly made their influence felt. This Babylonian mixture of nations cannot as yet be studied in detail. But it is certain that foreign elements preponderated in Babylon, whereas Semitic elements had the upper hand in Assyria. It is true that civilisation proceeded from the south. Towards the west we find the closely related Aramaic (Syrian) and Canaanitic tribes; along the coast are the Phoenicians and Philistines. These latter, whom the Old Testament represent as foreign immigrants from the unknown Caftor, most certainly possessed Semitic civilisation and religion, and must be regarded as belonging here. The origin of the Hittites and the part they played is as yet doubtful; they settled between the Orontes and Euphrates, and formed a power known to us from Egyptian sources as the Chetas, and from Assyrian sources as the Hattis; but the monuments and inscriptions found during the last few years at Hamath, Aleppo, and Jerabis do not give us sufficient information. It is certain that these Hittites possessed great power at the time of the eighteenth and nineteenth Egyptian dynasties, but

it has not been proved whether their kingdom extended far into Asia Minor. It is true that SAYCE, and after him WRIGHT, ED. MEYER, and others have referred numerous monuments from Asia Minor to this origin and traced them back to the Hittites; but a close study of these monuments has convinced G. HIRSCHFELD[1] that this art in Asia Minor and Cappadocia is entirely independent of Syrian art, and has nothing to do with the Hittites. In any case the ethnographic position of the Hittites remains doubtful; there seems a great deal against their relationship with the Semites, but their language is at present too slightly known to enable us to draw safe conclusions. With regard to the nations of Asia Minor, their classification is very uncertain. Most probably we must count the majority as belonging to the Indo-Germanic family; at most some Semitic inhabitants may have been settled from an early time along the south coast, which was later called Cilicia. But, as we have said, there are no reliable facts about this country. Our only source of information (besides the Egyptian, Assyrian, and later on the Greek records), for an ancient history of the Aramaic and Canaanitic nations, and the inhabitants of Asia Minor, consists of inscriptions, coins, and monumental remains. Added to this we must consider that Phoenician inscriptions now offer small difficulty, whereas the Hittite inscriptions and those found in Asia Minor are still only being deciphered. This being the case the possession of a literary monument like the Old Testament is of the greatest importance. Of course

[1] G. HIRSCHFELD, Paphlagonische Felsengräber, und: die Felsenreliefs in Klein-Asien (Abh. Preuss. Ak. 1885 and 1886).

we must treat the historical statements of the Old Testament in a critical spirit, but to throw them aside as altogether valueless, as ED. MEYER has done, is carrying scepticism a little too far, since a literary criticism of the Old Testament not only produces negative but also very positive results. Scholars such as KUENEN and WELLHAUSEN do not hesitate to maintain the old history of Israel, at least in its principal outlines.

The nations who dwelt between Assyria and Egypt, falling alternately as a prey to each, and finally disappearing under Persian influence, were for the most part dependent for their civilisation and culture on the Babylonians. An exception must be made in the case of the Israelitic religion, which although it developed on the same soil as the other Syrian religions, yet produced in its Jahvistic (Jehovistic) prophets something which raises it above all other Semitic religions. But although the same can be said of none of the other above-mentioned nations, yet they also have solved an important problem for mankind. Since their civilisation mostly depends on commerce, their importance lies in the fact that they were the carriers of civilisation in antiquity; they were the brokers who brought the mental products of Babylon to the Greeks.

Probably never has so much been written or have people fought so much about the general characteristic of an ethnic family, than since RENAN'S famous assertions about the Semites. RENAN spoke of a monotheistic instinct amongst the Semites; but this was not to be regarded as a high religious gift, but rather

as narrowness and mental poverty. The son of the desert has no feeling for the many-sidedness of life. His mind is as barren as the country which surrounds him, his monotheism is a minimum of religion. But much has been brought up against this: the word instinct, it was said, was not at all suitable here, and is a mere phrase. It was urged that many Semites are polytheists, and that the monotheism of the Israelites can only be explained as the result of a revelation to Abraham or to the prophets. With all this a special natural tendency in the Semites remains, which also appears in their religion. ED. MEYER mentions as strongly marked characteristics the following:— great poverty of thought, quick perception of single facts, a calculating and always practical reasoning, which restrains the imagination, and is opposed to the free flight of the spirit into unlimited regions. In religion also we find the same characteristics. No rich mythology has been developed here as amongst the Indo-Germans, the persons of the gods are far less individualised, and religious conceptions are more symbolical. The gods are the most high, and powerful beings, and rulers: the word Theocracy, which Josephus coined especially for the Israelites, can be applied to Semitic ideas in general. But MAX MÜLLER goes perhaps too far when he brings the difference between Semites and Indo-Germans to such a minute point, that the former recognised God in history, the latter God in nature; for natural phenomena also are sometimes very prominent among Semitic gods. Just as little can BAUDISSIN'S opinion be strictly proved, that the Semitic gods are heavenly, and never telluric beings. But it is perfectly correct that the Semitic

religion places a great distance between man and God. Man is the servant of the godhead; subjection, fear, resignation are the characteristics of piety; in Islam the phrase 'Allah is Allah' puts an end to all questions, all wondering, all inquiries, and all efforts. Finally we must draw attention to the fact that the system of prophets originated with the Semites. Certainly these general characteristics of the Semitic religion are not absolutely to be relied on, because we cannot quite forget that foreign proto-Babylonian elements have influenced the formation of that Semitic civilisation, whose final result has passed into the general development of mankind.

ROBERTSON SMITH has represented the development of the Semitic religion quite differently to any of his predecessors. He does not care for the natural explanation; but lays entire weight on the social character of the Semitic religion, which retained into later times in its social arrangements and religious conceptions, the traces of its original uncivilised state. Totemism, the fundamental idea of which consists in blood-relationship and communion between the clan and its Totem, can be traced through everything. On this foundation ROBERTSON SMITH has begun, according to his opponents, a too systematic fundamental reconstruction of the history of Semitic religion. According to him, essential principles such as sacredness, and the idea of sacrifice, &c., have an utterly different origin than is usually ascribed to them. His remarks on the importance of the Assyrian conquest in the eighth century are most valuable; this conquest destroyed the original conditions everywhere,

and forced new ideas, especially the magic element, into the foreground.

We know very little as to the Syrian and Phœnician forms of religion. Besides the facts of the Old Testament we must consider certain parts of Josephus. Strabo also gives us some information; and from Lucian we have received a small but instructive treatise about the Syrian goddess, in which he describes the cult used at the sanctuary of Hierapolis (Bambyce, Mabog). Great importance is usually attributed to the so-called fragments of Sanchoniathon. It is well known that in Eusebius there are complete extracts of a Phœnician history written by a certain Philo of Byblos who lived in the first and second century A.D. This Philo of Byblos is said to have translated his history from the Phœnician original of a certain Sanchoniathon. But now the question remains, did this ancient Phœnician document ever exist, or did Philo only wish to cover his own work by the authority of an ancient, more or less mythical, name? This last opinion was formerly maintained by MOVERS, and quite lately defended with important arguments by BAUDISSIN. This opinion is supported by the strong syncretistic and euhemeristic tendency of the fragments, which betray far too much knowledge of Egyptian, Greek, and perhaps even Persian ideas, to be regarded as reliable statements as to the original form of the Phœnician religion. The chief contents of these fragments are several cosmogonies, which one would in vain try to melt together into one; but their individual traits contain valuable materials for a comparison with other Semitic cosmogonies. For the rest, as we have already mentioned, we

must mostly depend on inscriptions. These inscriptions on steles, votive-tablets, and coins are as a rule quite short, and contain often nothing more than a few names. Of comparatively great importance are the large Sidonian inscription (in which King Eshmunazar commands that his coffin is not to be opened or his grave disturbed, and in which he enumerates his temple buildings in Sidon), and the inscription at Massilia which contains a tariff of sacrifices.

The Semitic names of gods such as El, Baal, Moloch, and Adon are rather titles than names, and designate the kind of god, rather than the individual; thus, for instance, Baal is often used with an article or in the plural. Of course they are sometimes used as proper names and not as titles; generally a special description is added, such as the Baal of this or that place, the king of the people or the town: Milkom of the Ammonites, Melkart of Tyre. By the side of the god we find the goddess Baalat (Baaltis) or Ashtoreth (Astarte), also in the plural Ashtaroth, with special names, such as Atargatis and Derketo. These gods are partly great nature-gods of the sky, the sun, the moon, and partly protectors of the nation and the town, as some show by their names, and as the castle-crown on the head of the goddesses proves. The ancient Semitic stone and tree-worship has become connected with their form of worship, and near their altars we find the stone pillars (Masseba, στήλη, cippus) and the wooden block or sacred tree (Ashera).

That the Semitic gods were closely connected with nature is proved by the myths and worship of Gebal (Byblos), in which the goddess bewails her lover, who has been killed by a wild boar, but who will return

with the new year. This return is commemorated in the festivals of mourning and rejoicing for Adonis, who is first sought for and bewailed, and then later on people rejoice at his return to life. This worship was not limited to Byblos, it is of Babylonian origin, as is shown by the name of the deceased god, Thammuz-Dumuzi (cp. Ezekiel viii. 14), who also appears in other places. Later on the Astarte-Adonis myth became blended with that of Isis and Osiris. Another widely-spread myth tells how the god was mutilated either by himself or by his son, his servants and priests following his example. This mutilation of the priests of the Syrian goddess has extended to Asia Minor also, and was still practised under the Roman dominion. The Galli (cinædi) mutilated themselves and rushed about frantically, often in female attire. This blending of male and female elements is frequently met with in Semitic myths and cults, as, for instance, in the case of the bearded Astarte at Paphos and Carthage, the warlike Amazons of Asia Minor, the male Semiramis, and on the other hand, the effeminate Sardanapalus, and Herakles, who had to perform woman's service for Omphale.

The gods of the Syrians and Phoenicians have a dual character, friendly and destructive. 'Diva Astarte, hominum deorumque vis, vita, salus, rursus eadem quae est pernicies, mors, interitus.' In Carthage these two attributes are embodied in the two sisters, Dido and Anna. Accordingly there is in their worship a severe, cruel, as well as a licentious custom. Bloody offerings, especially of their own children, often take place; the Old Testament and the Mesa

stone bear witness to this as regards the Canaanites. In Carthage also these sacrifices often occurred; the cries of the children were drowned by music, and the mothers had to watch the sacrifice of their own children without tears. Throughout the whole region of the Semites we find sacred prostitution, which was also practised in Babel, and both male and female Hierodules (Kadesh and Kedesha) vowed themselves to the service of the goddess, and offered their earnings to the temple-treasure.

The temples were originally open spaces, where the fetishes and votive-stones stood, similar to the Arabian Himas; the place of sacrifice only formed an annex, and the images of the gods seem to have been of later origin. In more historic times the temples of the gods were often centres for meetings and political gatherings; thus in the Old Testament the temple of Baal-Berith in Sichem and the temple of Dagon of the Philistines are mentioned. The culture-myths relating to the wars and distant journeys of the Tyrian Melkart and the Sidonian Astarte are peculiar to the Phoenicians; perhaps traits of nature-myths can be found in these, but they are more especially connected with sea-journeys and the founding of colonies. In treating these myths of colonies, Movers has given very free play to his imagination, and identifies Astarte with all sorts of goddesses. In Phoenician mythology there is much that is not yet understood. Thus the group of the Kabiri, who in the cosmogony of Philo are the children of Sydyk, are often connected with the medicine-god Eshmun, and in Samothracian worship they are connected with the myth of Cadmus and Harmonia. The Pygmies and the Pataiki,

who in Memphis are connected with Ptah, and yet are certainly originally of a pure Phoenician origin, are mere forms whose origin and history are still unknown. It is altogether impossible to write a history of the development of the Phoenician religion from historical reports, but one must depend on analogy in the determining of original elements. Thus PIETSCHMANN has deduced much from an original worship of the dead, but this element is, curiously enough, placed quite in the background by ROBERTSON SMITH.

CHAPTER 36.—**The Indo-Germanic Family.**

Books of Reference. On the relationship of the various members of this family and their common conceptions and customs we can consult numerous works on comparative philology and comparative mythology (especially MAX MÜLLER'S Lectures on the science of language, 2 ser.). A meritorious but rather antiquated résumé of the results of the comparison of languages was made by A. PICTET, Les origines indo-européennes ou les Aryas primitifs (new ed. in 3 vols., 1878). A most instructive book is P. ASMUS, Die indogermanische Religion in den Hauptpunkten ihrer Entwickelung (2 vols., 1875, 1877). Two short but important articles on the original religion of the Aryas were written by R. ROTH, Die höchsten Götter der arischen Völker (Z. D. M. G. 1852), and J. DARMESTETER, Le Dieu Suprême dans la mythologie indo-européenne (R. H. R. 1880, later it was included in the Essais Orientaux, 1883). We shall mention the books of reference for Indians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, and Germans in our historical summary. On the Slaves, L. LEGER wrote a summary which is quite reliable, Esquisse sommaire de la mythologie slave (R. H. R. 1881); it also contains a short bibliography. We do not mention the works which are difficult to consult, those written in Russian or Bohemian (by AFANASIEV, ERBEN, &c.), nor the more general works on Slavonic archæology and literature (by SCHAFARIK, &c.), but only a few books which are important for the history of religion and a knowledge of popular beliefs, such as W. R. S. RALSTON, The Songs of the Russian people (1872); Russian folktales (1873); A. RAMBAUD, La Russie épique (1876); W. WOLLNER, Untersuchungen über die Volksepic der Grossrussen (1879); F. S. KRAUSS, Sagen und Märchen der Südslaven (2 vols., 1883–84), Sitte und Brauch

der Südslaven (1885); the important work by G. KREK, Einleitung in die Slavische Literaturgeschichte (2nd ed. 1887), is of importance for mythology and folklore; also L. LEGER, Cyrille et Méthode, Etude historique sur la conversion des Slaves au Christianisme (1868). Gottesidee und Cultus bei den alten Preussen (1870). On the Kelts: H. GAIDOZ, Esquisse de la religion des Gaulois (Lichtenberger); H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, Introduction à l'étude de la littérature celtique (1883), Le cycle mythologique irlandais et la mythologie celtique (1884); W. K. SULLIVAN, Celtic Literature (in Enc. Br., with a complete bibliographic reference); J. RHYS, Hibbert Lectures (1886).

There is no family of people whose unity is more certainly established, and about whose primitive circumstances and ideas, the comparison of language has brought more to light, than the Indo-Germanic family. But it follows from the nature of these explanations that many questions remain unsolved. For instance, we do not know where to seek the original home of the ancient Indo-Germans. The Pamir plateau from the sources of the Oxus to the Hindu Kush, Armenia, the south of Russia, Central Europe, and even the south of Sweden, have been suggested. If the original home of these people is hidden from our investigations, then we cannot say anything for certain about the wandering of the various branches.

The whole family is named after its two extreme branches, the Indo-Germanic, or more correctly the Indo-Keltic, sometimes called the Indo-European, and also the Aryan, which is hardly as suitable, as it is a name better kept for the more eastern branch: the Indo-Persian. We cannot enumerate all the individual branches and subdivisions of the Indo-Germans, but must limit ourselves to the principal nations. The ethnography of this family is firmly established in its general outline, although in detail much is still unsettled. Beginning with the East, we first meet

with Indians and Persians, who remained together after other groups had already separated themselves from the original people. These are the Aryas, the noble, or according to others, the faithful. When the Indians turned towards the South, and in the course of centuries conquered India, they came across some ancient aborigines, belonging to another race; these they drove before them, and these aborigines therefore still form the greater part of the population in the South. We are not justified in classifying these Dravidians with any other race known to us (as MAX MÜLLER does with the Turanians); most students of ethnography make them into a race by themselves. Their influence on the formation of the Indian religion, and also their influence on the Indian people themselves, will be treated more fully in the historical division. We must still mention one more branch, which is most probably Indian, namely, the Gipsies or Romes, as they call themselves, who first made their appearance in Europe in the fourteenth century; but their origin is to a great extent still hidden in obscurity.

The ancient Persians are also an historical people in the true sense of the word. If, on the one hand, their relationship with the Indians is an established fact, on the other hand their connections with the western and northern nations (in Mesopotamia, Media, and Turan) are by no means clear. It is certain that the northern nomadic and warlike tribes, whom the Persians called Sakai and the Greeks comprised under the name of Scythians, belonged equally to the Indo-Germans.

If we turn towards the West, we come across the least known division of the Indo-Germans, which we

can call the Armeno-Phrygo-Thracian race. That these three nations belong together was known by Herodotus, who said that they all came from Thrace; whereas those who seek the home of the Indo-Germans in Asia naturally maintain an opposite direction for their wandering. In Armenia, as well as in Asia Minor, these Indo-Germans are mixed with Caucasian tribes. The ancient history of Armenia is very unsettled, because the historical works of the fourth century A.D. (Moses of Chorene) have hardly preserved more than a few grains of native traditions. The most important nations of the Indo-Germanic branch found in Asia Minor, besides the Phrygians, are the Lydians, concerning whose history Herodotus tells us much that is of importance, the Mysians, Karians, and Leleges, who spread themselves over the islands in the Aegean Sea, and the Lycians (Tramil). To the Thracians we also add the Illyrian tribes, of which the Albanians (Arnauts and Skipetars) still exist, under Turkish government.

The unity of the Graeco-Italian group, which was formerly generally recognised, has become doubtful through modern linguistic researches. The relations of the single Greek races to the Italian people have not as yet been properly explained. Amongst the races of Italy the Etruscans took a peculiar place. That they did not belong to the nations most closely connected with the other Italians (Umbrians, Samnites, &c.) is as certain as that they exercised a great influence on Roman civilisation. Their place in ethnography, which must be settled by the numerous inscriptions which have come down to us, is given very variously. Some people trace a connection with the Siberian languages of the Mon-

golian race; others look on the Etruscans (Rasenai, as they call themselves) as part of a formerly much more widely-spread family, like the Basques; others, again, maintain that their language can easily be explained as an Indo-Germanic language. Lately the discovery of an inscription on the island of Lemnos seems to render probable the identity of the Etruscans with the Pelasgian Tyrrhenians of the Mediterranean.

The Letto-Slavonic nations inhabit the eastern part of Europe, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, from the Danube to the Volga. To them belong the Lithuanians, the old Prussians, the Letts, the Russians, the Poles, the Servians, the Croatians, the Slovenians, the Bulgarians, the Tchechs in Bohemia, and the Wends or Sorbs in Lusatia. The three first mentioned, which can be classified as the Lettic branch, are more distantly connected with the others, than these others are amongst themselves. It does not seem wise to divide the actual Slavs again into an eastern and a western group. The many points of contact between the Slavonic and Persian branch of the Indo-Germans are peculiar, and this forms one of the strongest arguments for deriving the Indo-Germans from Europe.

The Germans with the Scandinavians, whose original home is eagerly sought by Scandinavian savants in the south of Sweden, drove the Slavs to the east, as well as the Kelts to the west, and peopled not only the centre but also the west of Europe. The Germans appear as a great power in the history of the world, first by their migrations and then by their conversion to Christianity; the time prior to their conversion belongs partly to their prehistoric state.

Still, we know enough about that time to draw more especial attention to it in our historical section.

The Kelts were probably the most ancient Indo-Germanic immigrants into Europe, and inhabited the whole western part, Spain, North Italy, Gaul, Switzerland, Belgium, and Britain, and everywhere their traces can be pointed out. But they were driven back and mixed with Roman and German nations, amongst whom (especially in France) there is much Keltic blood. Prehistoric archæology can no longer strictly separate their traces from those of still older original inhabitants. Almost pure Kelts can still be found in Brittany and in Wales (the Kymri), as well as in Ireland, Scotland, and in the Isle of Man (Gaels). Many popular stories and songs and a literature, chiefly epic, in old Irish give us information on the religion and customs of the Kelts.

The Indo-Germanic nations belong more to history than to ethnography. Therefore it would be useless to attempt a minute description of the natural dispositions of this family. These natural dispositions are no longer to be found unadulterated, but everywhere they are developed and modified by very complicated historical events. With most writers the characteristics of the Indo-Germans only serve as a foil to those of the Semites, and these characteristics are strongly influenced by this contrast. And it is also impossible to classify Indians, Greeks, Germans, and Romans, to mention only these, under one formula. We must not therefore attempt to deduce one common characteristic; but we will point out the eminently important part that this family has played in the history of the world.

The original religion of the Indo-Germans is partially made known to us by the results of comparative philology. We know at least, that their worship was mostly directed to the gods of heaven, and that the gods were regarded as shining beings, called Devas. But the general points of similarity are not numerous; we obtain better results from more limited comparisons, for instance between Persian and Indian, or Persian and Slavonic names and myths. The assertion which has often been made, and which DARMESTETER has lately again formulated, that the ancient Indo-Germans honoured their heaven-god as the highest god so that their religion can be called monotheistic (or henotheistic), cannot be sufficiently proved from the religions we are considering. In the same way, any attempt to point out a uniform development in Indo-Germanic religions, however suggestively ASMUS has done this, must be regarded as a failure. We shall treat of five of the Indo-Germanic religions in our historical section; but we shall here make a few remarks on the others.

The forms of worship in Asia Minor are certainly for the most part Indo-Germanic, but we can no longer separate the many Semitic elements from them. In Phrygia we find Sabazios, whom the Greeks have generally identified with Dionysos, and the moon-god, who had his temples all over Asia Minor. Here we also find the mythical story of old Gordius, who was raised from his peasant life to the dignity of a king, and that of Midas and his riches, his ass's ears and his Phrygian cap, after he had preferred Pan's flute to Apollo's cithera. We must also mention Smintheus, the god of light of the Mysians, the Zeus

Stratios or Labrandeus with the battle-axe at Mylasa amongst the Carians, and the Lycian Apollo. Of many of the gods we cannot say how far they are of Semitic and how far of Indo-Germanic origin; as for instance, the many forms taken by Artemis in Asia Minor, as the severe Taurian goddess, and as the many breasted goddess in Ephesus, whose priestesses are called Melissae. The same name may often have been given to many rather different deities. But the myths and forms of worship of Asia Minor are known to us only in such fragments, that we cannot take a general review of the whole.

With regard to the Letto-Slavs our sources of information are very limited, and many current mistakes have been accepted from doubtful authorities, whose unreliability has been proved by criticisms. As sources of information we can mention a few occasional remarks in Tacitus' Germania, many notices by Procopius in his De bello Gothico, accounts of journeys and chronicles of the Middle Ages (like those of Wulfstan in the ninth century and of Helmold in the twelfth), and both German and Russian chronicles, which often deserve but little confidence. Our information in respect to Folklore is much richer both as regards the national epic and the manners and customs, especially in Russia, but also in Servia and amongst other southern Slavs. That our knowledge of Slavonic religions from such sources must be very limited can be naturally understood. We must follow Leger's warning and keep ourselves from precipitous generalisations. We know with certainty a few facts about the gods of the Baltic nations and the Russians; those belonging to

the remaining Slavs are almost unknown to us, and we must not look on the gods of the Russians and Baltic Slavs as being generally Slavonic.

The Slavonic gods are natural phenomena or elementary powers, but only imperfectly personified; but only a few traces of myths can be found. It is even an exception to find any family ties amongst the individual gods. The name for God is Bog, lord or distributor, Sanskrit bhaga. The belief in a highest God, in a monotheistic sense, which has often been attributed to Slavs, can as little be pointed out as their so-called Dualism, which is only founded on an error. Amongst the Russian gods we shall mention the God of heaven Svarog, and his son Dajbog, the fire-god Ogonu, and above all the god of thunder, Perun. This Perun (amongst the Letts, Perkunas) had at Kief, as well as elsewhere, a large idol, in front of which a fire of oak wood was always kept up, and animal and human sacrifices were offered to it. Not till 988 did Wladimir have it destroyed, but Perun still survives amongst the Russian peasants under the form of Elijah. Amongst the Baltic Slavs the chief god was Svatovit, whose temple stood on the island of Rügen, where his festival was kept at harvest-time, and the booty of war was brought to him. Besides the gods, in Slavonic belief we find spirits playing a prominent part; for instance, forest-spirits (Lyeshy), water-spirits, such as the beautiful Rusalka (Naiads), who enticed human beings down to themselves, and above all the house-god (Domovoy), who is the ancestor as well as the spirit of the hearth, who helps in time of trouble, but sometimes also plays all sorts of tricks, and is visible at Easter. In

the Russian fairy-tales and popular myths there often appear a pair of fantastic forms, two very dangerous sprites—the immortal Kochtchei, who is said to represent the cold of winter, and the bad old witch, the Baba Jaga. The ideas concerning death and the beyond are truly animistic. As regards the old Prussians, we possess Wulfstan's account of the great ceremonies with which they celebrated their funeral feasts with rejoicings and races, whilst the dead were presented on their funeral piles with gifts and even servants. Popular tradition still preserves the memory of unmarried dead people receiving a bride or bridegroom. Burial as well as cremation was practised amongst the Slavs. The coffin was often boat-shaped for the sea-journey into the beyond; the dead were also given journey money; the rainbow or the milky way was the soul's path, or else the dead person was given a little ladder to climb out of the grave. The belief in Vampires, the souls of dead people, who suck the blood from the living, was deeply rooted amongst the Slavs.

If we have had to complain of the scarcity of Slavonic records, we shall do so much more as regards the Kelts. What Roman writers tell us, mostly refers to the connection between Roman politics and Gallic priesthood; this is valuable in itself, but very fragmentary. This much we can gather from it, that Caesar in his conquests looked to the priesthood of the Druids for support against the nobles, but that later on the circumstances were reversed and the Gallic equites took an honourable position in Rome, whilst the Druids became the centre of all the hatred against Rome. People like to ascribe to the Druids all sorts of secret knowledge,

and the belief in immortality, and similar theories; but there is certainly no foundation for this, even though the circumstances as related by Caesar were too highly organised, to allow us to place the Druids on the same footing as the fetishmen and magicians of the lower races. Carnutum was the centre of Druidic Gaul; the Romans transferred the centre to Lugdunum (Lyons). They took especial pains to exterminate the cruel human sacrifices of Druidic worship. Pliny describes the ceremonies with which the Druids in white robes, by the light of the moon, cut the mistletoe (guy) with a gold sickle from the oak tree, and gathered it in a cloth, to make a healing drink out of it. This custom has given rise to many mythological interpretations. Lucan mentions as the three principal gods of the Gauls: Teutates, Hesus, and Taranis. The name Esus or Hesus, which occurs also in Ireland, is often connected with the northern Ases and the Indian word Asu.

Modern research in Keltic religion has annihilated the fantastic theories as to the secret learning of the Druids, and now looks for its origin less in Gaul than in Ireland, where the largest remains of the old faith in gods and heroes are to be found. We cannot say that the nature of Irish gods, such as Ogma, and Anna, the mother of the gods, and others; the idea of an island of the dead in the west; the myths of the gods' and heroes' battles, as fully described by D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, are especially transparent.

Here we shall end our ethnographic survey. The later development of European nations, and their division into Romanic and Germanic, belong to

history, not to ethnography, because natural descent and relationship falls into the background. Nor need we mention here the forms which Christianity assumed amongst the nations of this family, in the Catholic, Greek, and Protestant Churches.

HISTORICAL SECTION.

THE CHINESE.

Books of Reference. A bibliography has been made by H. CORDIER, Bibliotheca Sinica. Much material is to be found in earlier collective works: Mémoires concernant l'histoire, les sciences, les arts, les mœurs, les usages des Chinois par les missionnaires de Pékin (14 vols., 1776–89); J. B. DU HALDE, Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique et physique de l'empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise (4 vols., 1735); still earlier is Confucius Sinarum philosophus, sive scientia Sinensis latine exposita (1687); it is true, however, that these works in folio and 4° now possess no value except as giving proof of the working powers of Jesuit missionaries, whose labours they contain. Many special journals are only important for sinologues; the best known are: The China Review (Hong Kong, since 1872), Revue de l'extrême Orient (since 1882). Among the numerous descriptions of the country and the people we shall only mention: J. F. DAVIS, The Chinese, a general description of the Empire of China and its inhabitants (2 vols., 1836); F. VON RICHTHOFEN, China (2 vols., 1877–82). A good Chinese history is still wanting; for the present we refer to K. GÜTZLAFF, A sketch of Chinese history, ancient and modern (2 vols., 1834); and J. E. R. KAEUFFER, Geschichte von Ost-Asien (3 vols., 1858–60); the former had access to original sources, the latter possessed a greater aptitude as an historian. As a general summary of everything referring to China we recommend the article on China in the Enc. Br. by R. K. DOUGLAS.

CHAPTER 37. — Introductory Remarks.

CHINESE origins are as much hidden in the darkness of unknown remote antiquity as all other origins. It is probably as certain that the 'hundred families' immigrated from the north-west, and first settled in the districts watered by the Yellow River, later on spreading themselves in the south, as that they belonged to

the high-Asiatic (Mongolian) race; a connection which accounts for many peculiarities in their civilisation and religion. Some people have taken great pains to trace a connection between the Chinese and the civilised nations of western Asia: formerly this link was looked for in Egypt, but lately TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE has drawn attention to Babylon, and some people think with him that the writing, language, and civilisation point to a connection or relationship between China and the countries on the Euphrates. However this may be, the beginnings of Chinese civilisation belong to prehistoric times. At the point where this nation first appeared in the light of history, it already possessed social, political, and religious institutions, which are essential to a civilised life; it also possessed agriculture, used written characters, and calculated time. Tradition ascribes all these discoveries and institutions to the old emperors of antiquity. People often represent Chinese civilisation, with its monosyllabic language, its fully-developed family sentiment, and its never-changing principles, as a type of the first patriarchal status of human society. But this involves a double error. First, there is no foundation for imagining that ancient Chinese conditions are nearer original conditions than are those of Egypt, Babylon, and India. There is just as little foundation for the widely-spread opinion that Chinese life has remained stationary. In the realm of history too there is no exception to the rule that everything living develops and alters, and it is only an imperfect knowledge clinging to mere external features, which can speak of conditions remaining really the same for hundreds of years.

The study of China dates some way back. It is true the ancient world knew very little of that distant east, and geographers like Ptolemy brought only vague reports of the land of Seres; but quite early the brisk relations with India, and in the Middle Ages the travels of European and Arabian discoverers, throw light on China—the Kataya land, as it is called in records of the Middle Ages. Of these men the most famous are Marco Polo, the Venetian, in the thirteenth century, and Ibn-Batuta, the Arabian, in the fourteenth century; round them many lesser lights congregate. The period of newer studies began earlier in China than in other oriental nations. This was the result of missionary efforts; sinology owes not only its first incentive, but also many of its best results to the activity of Catholic, and later of Protestant missionaries. Already in the sixteenth century, Jesuits had undertaken to Christianise China, but it was not till towards the end of the seventeenth century that the mission of French Jesuits acquired actual and important influence. These men conceived their work on the most liberal lines, and they have done important work in making known the products of Chinese literature. In 1842, when PAUTHIER published a translation of the Livres sacrés de l'Orient, he had to depend principally, for the Chinese books and the communications which he gave as a preface, on the works of these Fathers, PRÉMARE, GAUBIL, REGIS, DE GUIGNES, and DE MAILLA. During the present century this work has been undertaken by Protestant missionaries, who have been able to carry it on much further. We must mention amongst them, MEDHURST, GÜTZLAFF, LEGGE, EDKINS, EITEL, BEAL, and FABER.

That some of the old vigour still exists amongst the Catholics can be proved by ZOTTOLI'S important activity. Through the studies of these men and of European scholars (AB. RÉMUSAT, STANISLAUS JULIEN, L. DE ROSNY, R. K. DOUGLAS, A. PFIZMAIER, W. SCHOTT, J. H. PLATH, G. VON DER GABELENTZ, and the Dutchman, G. SCHLEGEL), much has been made known to us concerning the Chinese language, history, and literature, and an insight into the character of their religion is afforded us.

We must first give a general sketch of the political history; at least we must mention the succession of the principal dynasties. The five emperors of remote antiquity are Fohi, Shinnong, Hoangti, Yao, and Shun. Although Chinese historians seem to give us historical information about the last two or three of these kings, yet we cannot regard them other than as quite legendary characters. With the help of historical traditions, and with the calculation of eclipses which are recorded in Chinese books, we can get back to about 2000 B.C., but not much further. The two first dynasties were those of Hia and Shang. Towards the end of the twelfth century the Chow (German Tsheu, French Tchéou, and in the Sacred Books of the East, *K*au) succeeded to the throne. The first exemplary princes of this house were Wen and Wu. The conditions of the kingdom at this period can be compared with those of Europe in the Middle Ages under the feudal system. The chief authority, centred in the emperor, was often weaker than the power of the smaller princes of the land and the dukes; the chief amongst them often played a great part as regents of the

empire; but in the individual states the power of the princes was again often limited by the attitude of their barons. The third dynasty is important because of its long duration, and because it includes Kong-tse's work. In the third century B. C. a powerful prince arose from another house; he put an end to the dominion of the Chow, and undertook to establish a great central power in his own dynasty, namely that of the Tsins; his name was Shi-Hoangti. He and his successors tried to alter the fundamental principles of both state and society; they persecuted the learned men, who were the supporters of ancient civilisation, and in 213 they authorised a great burning of ancient sacred writings. But soon after this, their dominion came to an end, and the dynasty of the Han ascended the throne, and organised a restoration (206 B. C. to 265 A. D.). Amongst the dynasties which then rapidly succeeded one another we shall pass over those which only reigned a short time or contemporaneously. The most important are the Tang (620–907), Song (960–1127), the foreign Mongolian rule (1280–1368), the Ming (1368–1644), and finally the dynasty which still governs, but which also came from a foreign land, the Mandshu dynasty (since 1644). Of this dynasty the most important reigns have been those of Kang-hi (1662–1722) and of Kienlong (1736–1795).

Chinese civilisation early reached a considerable height, both materially and intellectually. It has had many impulses from outside; we must especially mention the introduction of Buddhism from India. It has spread over a large territory and civilised many savage tribes, but it has never had any im-

portant influence on the course of the world's history. It is in this sense that the proverbial exclusiveness of China from the rest of the world should be understood.

CHAPTER 38. — The Sacred or Classical Books.

Books of Reference. A résumé of the more ancient and modern translations of these books has been made by H. CORDIER in his Bulletin in R. H. R. 1880. An edition in several vols. has been brought out by J. LEGGE since 1861, The Chinese Classics, with translations, notes, and prolegomena. Of the latter without the Chinese texts he published three separate vols.: The life and teachings of Confucius; The life and works of Mencius; The She King, or book of ancient Chinese poetry. He also wrote: The Shû King, The religious portions of the Shih King, The Hsiâo King, S. B. E. iii; Yî King, S. B. E. xvi; Lî Kî, S. B. E. xxvii, xxviii. Amongst other translations we must mention: VICT. VON STRAUSS, Shi-King (1880; a translation successful in its poetical style; before this, in 1833, RÜCKERT had undertaken the same thing, but was dependent for the sense on a defective Latin translation); E. BIOT, Le Tcheou li ou rites des Tcheou (2 vols., 1851).

The classical literature consists partly of writings dating from antiquity which have been collected by Kong-tse, or finally edited by him, and partly of writings by Kong-tse himself and by his followers. These are the five King and four Shu, with which are connected others of hardly less value. We must give a short account of the individual works.

The first, probably the most venerable and most important, is the Yî King, the book of changes. At the burning of the books it was saved because of its sacred character as a book of divination. The diagrams forming the foundation of the Yî King are very old; a dragon-horse is said to have issued from the Yellow River, bearing on its back a drawing, consisting of partly dark and partly light circles. From this drawing Fû-hsî made the diagrams consisting

of various combinations of whole and divided lines. They are the following eight:

From combinations of these eight trigrams, sixty-four hexagrams are produced, which form the basis of the text of the Yî King. This text consists of nothing else than notes on these sixty-four diagrams. But these notes are different in kind. At first to every hexagram are appended short notices, which are said to originate from king Wăn and his son the duke of Chow (*K*âu), the founders of the third dynasty. The former wrote a treatise on the entire hexagram, the latter on the six lines of the hexagram severally. Besides these notes there are also longer treatises. Their connection with the diagrams and text is rather slight, and therefore LEGGE in his translation places them as appendices at the end of his work. These parts are of much later date than the diagrams and their short notes. The meanings of the whole work and its separate parts are still quite dark. People have tried to open the mysteries of the Yî by applying to it the key of comparative mythology (MCCLATCHIE) and comparative philology; according to the latter the Yî King is a vocabulary that can be understood with the help of Accadian (LACOUPERIE, DE HARLEZ, &c.). Many people saw in the Yî King a deep wisdom clothed in symbols, a philosophical cosmogony, governed by the contrast between the male and female principles, namely heaven and earth, Ying and Yang. But LEGGE, on the contrary, mentions that these words only occur in the later treatises, and even there do not possess the philosophical meaning which is attributed to

them; in the Yî King he sees rather popular ethics and many fanciful thoughts, both clever and dull. With all this we only know for certain that this book was used for prophesying, and owed its great importance to this fact. The changes of the figures were connected, even in the notes, with the changes of nature with the fates of men, and with lucky and unlucky events. What thoughts were really at the bottom of these changes will perhaps be for ever hidden from us.

The great historical work, the Shû King, was especially an object of persecution at the time of the burning of the books in the year 213. Only a few copies were saved, particularly by the teacher Fû-seng, and they reappeared under the Han dynasty, although they were certainly not in an undamaged condition. There still remain to us fifty books or chapters, which LEGGE divides into five parts of unequal length. These books treat of Yâo, Shun, Yü, and the Hsiâo, the Shang and the Chow, and embrace a period of about seventeen centuries, ending with the seventh century B. C. Many questions in connection with this work are yet unanswered. We must first inquire how far Kong-tse's editing work went; whether he only collected what he had to hand, or whether he added much himself. Then also much doubt has been thrown on the historical reliability of the Shû King. We possess parallel historical records in the so-called Bambu books, very scanty annals comprising the period from the mythical emperor Hwang-Tî till 299 B. C., but they were not discovered till 279 A. D. in the tomb of a prince of Wei. In his prolegomena to the Shû King, LEGGE has translated part of these Bambu annals, and has used them to criticise the Shû King. With regard

to the chronology, which in the annals is shorter by 211 years, he decides in favour of the Shû King; but not so with regard to some material differences. The most ancient reigns of Yâo, Shun, and Yü are very magnificently depicted in the Shû King, and there they impress us as emperors of a powerful, and thoroughly organised kingdom; in the Bambu annals this old history assumes smaller and more probable proportions. But this comparison is not the only reason against the historical value of the Shû King. A superficial reading of the book produces an impression of authenticity; everything is treated very temperately, and many parts look like official documents, government manifestoes, and the like. But if we examine the contents more closely, the moralising tendency appears very strongly; the emperor's speeches, the ministers' councils, have a distinctly didactic character; in one important point the principles of the art of governing are formulated (V. 4). The whole is rather an educational manual for princes than an historical work, and therefore we also find that history itself is systematized. The virtue of the prince makes the land and people prosperous; but if the prince leaves the straight path, then he and his race fall, and heaven and the voice of the people give the government to another, who is faithful to the principles of right and truth. From this point of view the change from the first to the second dynasty, and from the second to the third are described. As an historical source, therefore, the Shû King is unreliable; but for a knowledge of Chinese views on political life and religion, it is of great importance.

The third canonical book is the Shih King, the book of poetry. At the burning of the books, and at the

restoration under the Han dynasty, it had a similar fate to the Shû King. It consists of quite three hundred poems, which Kong-tse chose from a collection ten times as large. The form of these poems is neither rhythmical nor rhyming; they are divided into strophes. There are some which merely relate, others are metaphorical, and in many, each strophe begins with a simile. Their contents are very different; mythical matter is hardly found at all (only once or twice). The first part, which contains the largest half of the poems, gives popular pieces. From them we learn the customs of the land and the domestic and private life in various provinces; amongst them we find many pleasant lyric pieces which seem delightful, even to our modern taste. The two next parts take us to the festivals at the emperor's court; of these we should especially pick out the poems in praise of the founder of the Chow dynasty, which begin the third part. The fourth part contains sacrificial poems and poems in honour of ancestors; amongst these there are about five which date from the time of the second dynasty.

The fourth canonical book, the Lî *Kî*, is not of less importance for a knowledge of the religion than the three already described. The history of the text is in this case rather different to that of the other King, since the latest edition which has reached us was settled under the Han dynasty, which nearly coincides with the beginning of our era. By this we do not mean to imply that much does not come from ancient times. For this is really the case; many writings which treat of the Lî give us the opinions and customs at least of the centuries of the third dynasty. The word Lî has many meanings; it is translated by rite

and ceremonial, it implies the conception of everything proper, and comprehends consequently social, religious, and household duties, customs, rules about proper behaviour, and a good disposition shown by outward manners. Amongst the works on these subjects, three are more especially prominent: Ili, Chow Lî, and Lî *K*î. Ili deals with the duties of certain classes of officials, Chow Lî deals with the arrangements of government under the Chow. The belief in the antiquity and authenticity of this book, which was formerly attributed to the duke of Chow, has been almost entirely given up. In opposition to these more special collections, the Lî *K*î owes its acceptance amongst the five King to the fact, that it regulates the duties of all men and inculcates general rules of behaviour. In the forty-six divisions of this collection we must not look for dogmatic discussions, but for rules of conduct which have received the sanction of custom and tradition.

To these four books we must still add a fifth, the only one written by Kong-tse himself, and called Chunthsieu, spring and autumn. It is the annals of the dukedom of Lu, Kong-tse's native province, dating from 722–494. It is a very dry statement of facts, without detail or commentary. Still, many Chinese have prized it highly as being the means by which Kong-tse faced the degeneracy of his times.

Although not included in the five King, the Hsiâo King, or the Classic of Filial Piety, belongs indubitably to classical literature. In the edition that we possess it consists of eighteen chapters, in the form of a dialogue between Kong-tse and one of his pupils, or rather it is an instruction of the latter by the sage. Even severe criticism on this small work by Chinese

men of letters has not disproved, that part of it can be traced back to the master, even though its present form may not be older than the Han dynasty.

The classics of second importance are the four Shû, which tell us even more than the King about the actual teaching of Kong-tse. The first is Lun-yu, notices of events, short dialogues, sayings of the master or of his first pupils, loosely connected without any chronological order, and grouped together now and then according to their subject matter. These 497 short sections in twenty books are the principal source of information about the person and teaching of Kong-tse. The second and third of these works contain many shorter texts, which are incorporated also as chapters in the Lî *K*î, and known as Chung-yung, or teachings of the mean or of equilibrium and harmony, and Tahio, which means the great doctrine. Chung-yung is attributed to a grandson of Kong-tse; perhaps both treatises are by the same author. They give a classical expression to the opinions of Confucianism, and are highly thought of in China. In addition to these three, there is a fourth Shû, the collection of discourses made by the greatest teacher in the school of Kong-tse, called Meng-tse, who was born a hundred years after the master's death; he lived from 371–288. In the seven books of his discourses there is much more connection than in the loose paragraphs of the Lun-yu; the subjects are here thoroughly discussed in the form of dialogues.

Chapter 39. — **The Ancient Imperial Religion.**

Books of Reference. J. H. Plath, Die Religion und der Cultus der alten Chinesen (from the Abh. der Ak. zu München, two numbers 1862); J. Happel, Die altchinesische Reichsreligion vom Standpunkte der

vergleichenden Religionsgeschichte (1882, first written in French in R. H. R. 1881). Missionaries wrote on the Chinese belief with the practical object in view of settling what word would be the best translation for God: W. H. MEDHURST, A dissertation on the theology of the Chinese (1847); J. LEGGE, The notions of the Chinese concerning God and spirits (1852, a reply to a paper by W. J. BOONE). Amongst general surveys of the Chinese religion two small publications should be mentioned as being most useful: the four lectures by J. LEGGE, The Religions of China (1880), and R. K. DOUGLAS, Confucianism and Taouism (1879, S. P. C. K.).

It is very difficult to form one's judgment about the ancient religion of the Chinese empire. The sources from which we derive our information are given us from the hands of Kong-tse, and the question remains open, how far he has delivered them to us in a pure state, or has treated them to suit his own reform. Kong-tse always professes to wish to hand over and treat what has been handed down from ancient times; but it seems very probable to us that he only made a selection, and left out what did not please him. This becomes more probable if we notice, that at the same time with Confucianism there sprang up another religion very different to it, which also had its roots in antiquity, namely Tâoism. We have therefore no direct sources for a knowledge of the ancient imperial religion, since the Chow Lî, which claims to be taken for it is, as we have already seen, of later date. Still, the King contain various materials from ancient times, and Kong-tse must have been a reformer in a very conservative, and not in a revolutionary sense of the word. Although we must be cautious, yet a few conclusions can be drawn from the King as to the ancient religion. We shall not attempt the impossible, namely, to draw a clear line of demarcation, but we shall present the fundamental

ideas of this King as the probable substance of the ancient religion.

The religion which we find there, is presented to us as a perfectly organised religion, as part of a national life, which has outgrown the savage state. It consists in the worship of heaven (Thian), the supreme lord (Shang-Tî), and the various classes of spirits (Shan). Modern scholars judge it in quite different ways. The statements concerning Thian and Shang-Tî are often so sublime and spiritual that many people—amongst others Legge, Faber, and Happel—ascribe great value to the ancient Chinese religion; they call it monotheistic, they compare it to Jahvism, and even answer the question as to whether the Chinese knew the true God, in the affirmative. They even look on the reformation of Kong-tse as a retrogression from the original pure idea of God. With this is closely connected the question, which even in the time of the Jesuit mission was variously answered, as to whether in Christian preaching and in translating the Bible, the word God could be rendered by Shang-Tî. The great esteem in which some hold the ancient Chinese religion is opposed by the opinion of those, who only place it one grade higher than the Shamanism of the related North Asiatic races. In China the belief in spirits is said to be more formulated, the heaven-spirit has a high place appointed to him amongst the other spirits; but this religion has not outgrown the domain of spirit-worship and witchcraft (Tiele).

We can draw no distinction between Thian, heaven, Tî, lord, and Shang-Tî, the supreme lord. In some descriptions, they are identical with the material

sky; but still its mythical personification is not carried out. Sometimes, though seldom, the heaven and earth (Heu-thu) are spoken of as the father and mother of all beings, which gives rise to a belief in the myth of the cosmogonic marriage; but this conception is so slightly developed that many people, amongst others PLATH, entirely deny it. If we mention that the birth of the ancestors of the second and third dynasty is traced back to Shang-Tî, we shall have touched on almost everything mythical, connected with this conception. All the more is therefore said about the general order of the world, the destination (Ming), the way of heaven (Tâo). Heaven and the Godhead do not speak in any special way, or have any love or hatred towards individuals, but are manifested in the usual course of nature. Silently, quite simply and without break, heaven carries on its work. It is manifested in rain, sunshine, heat, cold, wind, and the seasons; if these occur at the right times and in proper proportions, then they bring blessings, but their excess or non-appearance implies harm. The rulers must pay especial attention to this, and this regulation is the foundation of the state. Disturbances in the course of nature are warnings to establish harmony in the state also. The natural, political, social, and moral orders of the world are not only closely connected one with another, but they are perfectly identical, or, more properly speaking, they have not yet become distinct. There are three fundamental beings: heaven, earth, and man, who must be in harmony one with another. The order of nature is looked on with religious reverence as the rule to be followed in all

moral actions; and political institutions are regarded as laws of nature. But people did not yet realise the antithesis which we have expressed in these words. This regulation is an essentially moral one; heaven punishes and rewards, causes sorrow to the proud, and gives blessing to the humble. The will of heaven is manifested in a peculiar way through the voice of the people. Thus it more especially happens that bad rulers receive their condemnation; their rejection by the nation is thus the voice of heaven. A remarkable sign of the continuance of these fundamental conceptions is the fact, that about thirty years ago, the emperor in resisting English demands appealed to the indignation of the people, and gave as his doctrinal reason that the tendency of the hearts of the people formed the basis of the decrees of heaven.

With the worship of heaven, Shang-Tî, or the general order of the world, is connected the worship of spirits. These two forms of worship and conceptions are not opposed to one another, but are closely connected: heaven and the spirits are mentioned side by side, and similar efficacy is attributed to each. Especially as regards morals, spirits have the same power as Shang-Tî. Spirits are omnipresent, incomprehensible, and invisible, but yet very real. They are not individualised, nor joined in groups; only the celestial, terrestrial, and human spirits (ancestors) are distinguished. The opinion which represents them as servants of heaven, or as mediators between man and Shang-Tî and subordinated to him, cannot be properly supported by the texts. Amongst spirits also, everything personal stands quite in the background of everything general. They permeate

everything, but are not visible to the outward senses. Evil spirits are not found in the classical texts; but we cannot be equally sure whether they were foreign to popular belief also.

Amongst spirits, those of the latest species, the human (Kwei), and of these more especially the ancestors (Tsu), receive the greatest worship. Belief in immortality has only developed itself in China in respect to the worship of ancestors. With regard to the soul or power of life after it has left the body, we only find occasional statements, which are not formulated as a doctrine, and which therefore cannot be used as an argument. But the worship of deceased emperors, sages, and benefactors, more especially of each man's forefathers, played a very prominent part. The question as to the continuance of his own existence is of less importance to the Chinese than the influence exercised by his ancestors on his life. Therefore all more important matters as regards the family, as well as the state, are only discussed in the presence of ancestors. They are prayed to in need or sickness; marriages are celebrated, and the successor to the throne is installed in their halls; their memorial tablets are carried by their descendants on journeys as well as in wars. It is singular how the eyes of a Chinese turn towards the past much more than towards the future. If any one is ennobled the whole series of his ancestors participate in the honour. The worship of ancestors is the fundamental principle of the Chinese religion. What exists after death is much less the individual life than family ties. In this sense, the often repeated statement must be altered, that the Chinese live in the present only. They do

not busy themselves much with speculations as to the world to come; but they look to their forefathers for power, comfort, and help. It is true they do not think of them as dwelling in a distant beyond; like spirits they are omnipresent and float invisibly round their descendants. Sometimes this presence becomes visible: not only in the above-mentioned tablets, but at sacrificial feasts in some youth, generally the grandchild of the departed, who, dressed in the deceased's clothes, and sitting in his seat, is the principal person of the feast, and is entertained as if he was the deceased himself.

The most peculiar feature of this religion, besides the lack of a mythology and code of teaching, is the total absence of a sacerdotal order. Religious ceremonies formed a part of the general, domestic, and civil life; the care of them was incumbent on government officials. The large number of officials who were entirely or partially occupied with them in no way formed a priesthood. The Chow Lî gives us a picture of the rites and numerous officials belonging to it, but it is too much spun out, and contains too many puzzling details, to be a description of original conditions; still, the fundamental principles of this widely worked out scheme probably date from ancient times. Sacrifices were offered at certain times, for instance at the four seasons, or on special occasions, such as a war, a bad harvest, or when the emperor went hunting. The great sacrifice to heaven might only be offered by the emperor; to do this was therefore a sign of dominion. The great vassal dukes offered sacrifices to the spirit of the earth, and of the hills and rivers in their district. General sacrifices, which people were allowed to

perform, were only sacrifices to ancestors. Ancestors possessed their large temples, as well as the halls in private houses. The Shih King gives many vivid descriptions of sacrifices offered to ancestors at the imperial court, with cheerful feasts, singing, and dancing. Amongst sacrificial objects, animals, fruits, and incense are mentioned; but of human sacrifices there is one isolated example. The object of these sacrifices is the maintenance of the order of nature, the averting of evil, and the obtaining of desired results or possessions. Of prayer also we may say the same, that it entirely aims at such worldly objects. A more fervent tone is only to be found in the prayer in which the duke of Chow intercedes for the life of his sick brother, and wishes to offer himself to die in his place.

Divination was especially widespread. Nothing unimportant or important, in public measures or private affairs, was undertaken, unless the sooth-sayers had provided propitious signs. These signs were derived from various circumstances, from appearances in nature, the usual as well as the unusual signs, such as darkness and earthquakes, which were harbingers of evil, and peculiar occurrences, dreams, &c. The divination drawn from the flower Shi, and from Pu, the tortoise, is most curious, for these, when burnt, showed rents which were looked on as signs. We have already mentioned the use made of the Yî King for the same objects. A passage in the Shû King is most remarkable, according to which the emperor in doubtful cases is obliged to consult his own judgment, the councils of the nobles of his kingdom, the voice of the people, and Pu and Shi.

The foundation of Chinese life as well as of religion

consists in reverence for the order of nature, of the state, and of the family. Filial piety, which consisted in first submitting oneself to parents, then to rulers, and forming one's character, is only another name for this fundamental virtue. This piety is first practised in family life. In China a number of partly ridiculous and partly most affecting stories are told of the submission of children to their parents, as, for instance, the story of the maiden who flung herself into glowing melted metal for casting a bell, since this casting, on which her father's life depended, could only succeed if a maiden sacrificed herself for it. To what extent these family duties were carried may be seen in the minute ordinances which the Lî *K*î gives for mourning for the various grades of relationship. But the reader of the Hsiâo King will realise that piety in China is not inculcated as a special virtue amongst others, but is of a thoroughly general character; it extends to all the circumstances of life, and is essential for the well-being of the individual, as well as of the state. This duty of man harmonises with the way of heaven and earth; it is only when man is subject to duty that he takes his place in harmony with heaven and earth. If a depreciatory opinion is expressed about the Chinese religion because it consists so much in outward observances we must, on the other hand, consider this central and religious conception of filial piety as virtue.

Chapter 40. — The Life and Teaching of Confucius.

Books of Reference. The older books take their information for the most part from Amyot's Biography in the twelfth vol. of his already mentioned Mémoires (1786). Among more modern writers the most complete is J. H. Plath, Confucius und seiner Schüler Leben und Lehren (four numbers: I. Historische Einleitung, II. Leben des Confucius, III. Die Schüler des Confucius, IV. Sämmtliche Aussprüche von Confucius und seinen Schülern, systematisch geordnet, from the Abh. der Ak. zu München (1867-1874). The sketch which Legge published at the beginning of his translation of the Lun-yu, Chung-yung, and Tahio is of value; also E. Faber, Quellen zu Confucius und dem Confucianismus (1873), und Lehrbegriff des Confucius (1872); and the small essay by G. v. d. Gabelentz, Confucius und seine Lehre (1888).

The sage whose name represents Chinese religion was the teacher from the race of Kong, hence Kong-tse; not Kong-fu-tse, from which Confucius has been derived. His grown-up name was Chung-ni. His life from 551-478 B.C. is fairly well known to us. We shall here only give the outer framework, which is filled in with numerous anecdotes and dialogues from various sources. Kong-tse was of respectable, perhaps of princely origin. When still a child he lost his father, and was brought up in miserable surroundings. Thus he seems not to have acquired certain abilities which belong to a careful education till he was grown up, and early in his life he had to take a subordinate place in the service of one of the noble families so as to provide for his maintenance. He lived at a time of political disorder. The government of the empire was weak and limited to a small sphere, and had no authority over the great feudal states. In these states, the same thing was repeated on a smaller scale. Thus the duke of Lu, the country of the sage in a narrower sense, was just at this

time pressed hard by the noble families, who were again much divided amongst themselves. To this we must add the quarrels between the states, thus rendering the picture of disorder quite complete. We cannot gather from our sources of information whether social dissolution and moral depravity had also played a part, as many of the complaints of Kong-tse seem to point out. It is clear that it was difficult for an honest man like Kong-tse to take part in public life under such circumstances. However, the thought of withdrawing himself from these duties was utterly opposed to Kong-tse's character; wisdom was not to be found, according to him, in avoiding the world and in asceticism, but in exercising true principles in public life. Wherever it was possible for him he took up public offices; but this was only the case, it is true, during a small part of his life. During his youth we find him in the employ of a noble family. In the suit of this patron he journeyed to the capital, the seat of the Chow. Details of this story are not recorded, only we hear of his meeting with the elder sage, Lâo-tse. Perhaps from this period dates Kong-tse's great love for the institutions of the Chow dynasty, to which he remained faithful all his life. Kong-tse was about thirty-five years old when great disorders in Lu, during which even the duke was driven away for a time, caused him to withdraw to the neighbouring Thsi. Kong-tse had formerly once spoken with the duke of this state, who now received him most kindly, listened to him with pleasure, but feared to give the sage too much influence in state affairs. Thus Kong-tse got no appointment, and returned

after one year to his native land. At first he did not even here find a suitable field for official activity; many of the great men and ministers, who were all at war with each other, tried to draw him to their side, but he does not seem always to have behaved with firmness in regard to these persuasions; and in the end he did not join any party. Finally, when the central government of the duke was re-established, the time arrived for Kong-tse to do public work in various high positions, and ultimately he became minister. But this office was of short duration; after four years the heart of the duke turned from the right way, and the conscientiousness of the sage became a burden to him. The latter turned sadly away, and now entered for fourteen years on the bitter path of banishment. He wandered about in various states, lived at courts and amongst the people, and everywhere heaven used his voice as a bell to warn the people. In some places he was honoured and flattered, but received no appointments; in other places he was persecuted, and even his life attempted. We find amongst his followers many of his faithful pupils and friends; whether they were with him continuously or occasionally only is not clear. Numerous anecdotes refer to this time. In his dialogues the sage often complains about the corruption of the times, which showed itself in the fact that he was not honoured, and he vaunts his own virtues. It is true we find many beautiful sayings concerning the sage's independence of the world, and the peace which virtue brings in its train. Finally, Kong-tse was recalled to his native land through the influence of one of his pupils, who filled a high position in Lu. He was

then almost seventy years old, and no longer took any part in politics. His last years of life he devoted to study; but he seems to have been filled with sad thoughts. As death approached, his disposition became gloomy, and he complained of the decay of the empire and the death of the sage. The man whose ideal had been the past, found in death no comforting prospect in the future.

We learn most about Kong-tse's person from the Lun-yu. Although but a few individual characteristic traits are emphasised, it is evident that this collection attempts to draw him as the ideal sage. To our idea the character of Kong-tse is rather too formal; his general benevolence never turns into heartfelt sympathy, his humanity is much too proscribed by rules and forms. One whole book of the Lun-yu describes Kong-tse's suitable behaviour in the various circumstances of life, at dinner, in bed, and in the choice of the colour of his clothes, &c.; the great value ascribed to these external details is most characteristic. But we must also notice that Kong-tse was one of those people who are able to inspire their fellow-creatures with a feeling of respect and love. His judgment of himself oscillates between humility and inordinate pride. As his object in life he mentions a striving after wisdom, and acknowledges how he is still deficient in it; but he perfectly realises his position as a preacher of wisdom, and, in some statements, he makes the relation to his own person the measure by which he judges his contemporaries. With regard to his work we must first of all look on Kong-tse as the collector of the sacred literature, as the man from whose hands

China received the King. He has himself in many sayings commended the excellence and usefulness of these works; he gave them the form in which they have ever since formed the foundations of Chinese culture. He comes forward to re-establish what was old; he does not call himself an innovator, but a preacher of the ancient wisdom; he admires and honours the traditional ordinances, the old emperors Yâo and Shun, and the founders of the third dynasty, as lasting rules for life, as models and ideals of virtue. But still, it is highly probable, as we have already pointed out, that Kong-tse not only inculcated what was old, but that he made a selection in what he has handed down, and thrust into the background certain not unimportant features.

His position with regard to religious belief is very remarkable. He observed strictly the forms of worship. Even as a child he is said to have occupied himself with sacrificial implements; when he was grown up he liked to enter temples, he enjoined a punctilious obedience to the three hundred ceremonial ordinances, not less than to the three thousand rules of behaviour, and said that offerings should be made to the spirits as if they were actually present, and was thus painfully exact in the carrying out of ritual. In his teaching also, he took his stand on the ground of ancient religion; among the principal features of his teaching he mentioned a knowledge of the rules of heaven; the thought of heaven comforted him in sorrow. On the other hand, with the exception of quotations from the King, he very seldom mentions Shang-Tî, and in many statements he declares that it is useless to occupy oneself with theological

problems; for, as long as one does not know man, how can one know spirits? as long as one does not know life, how can one fathom death? He also states once that he has not prayed for a long time. He gave evasive answers to questions concerning spirits and the dead. On the whole, his mind was averse to everything mysterious, and entirely impregnated by the importance of moral duties, which he inculcated repeatedly.

The same remark holds good here which we made before: morality with Kong-tse depends on metaphysical thoughts also; he considers man in his harmony with the general order of the world, which is the rule for morality. This morality has too often been described as hollow, and entirely governed by practical considerations. But this is most certainly not the case. Chinese morality is not determined by circumstances or advantages, but by the fixed rules of heaven and the example of long since departed sages. It was because he could not suit his schemes to existing circumstances, that Kong-tse was often put aside as unpractical. According to him, the result must not be the motive for action. He does not contemplate man as he is, but as he ought to be, the ideal man, the hero of virtue, whom he often describes and glorifies in contrast with the usual vulgar man of everyday life. This noble being is above all a sage, devoted to study, and continually occupied with it; altogether he is the model of all virtues. Full of reverence, honest, humble, kind, and upright, he practises in his surroundings the purest humanity. What he cares for is not recognition by the world, but virtue itself; even when he is alone he does

not neglect moral self-discipline, but keeps a watch on himself. He always obeys the golden rule of reciprocity, namely to do unto others as you would they should do unto you. Thus he is in perfect harmony with heaven, whose ordinances he obeys whilst keeping to the right medium, the central path. As a contrast to this the vulgar man follows his own interest and pleasure, and always seeks it in others and not in himself; he is governed by outward circumstances; his path leads downwards, whilst the path of the noble leads up. The discovery of the wickedness of many men, and the high ideals which he demands of good men, do not prevent Kong-tse from believing in the dogma of the goodness of human nature. Virtue is easy, and natural to man; one need only follow one's true instinct to keep in the straight path.

But we must not suppose that Kong-tse with his teaching and example aimed only at imbuing individuals with virtue, but what he cared for principally, was the complete renovation of the people. In the beginning of the Ta-hio the development of virtue is represented as a chain, its end is reached in the family and in the state; the peace and well-being of the kingdom is its object. Many rules refer to politics: such as that one should try to make the people wealthy and instruct them; that the rulers are responsible for the proper feeding of the people, for the maintenance of means of defence in good order, and that they must inspire confidence; that the state is properly governed if the prince is a real prince, the minister a minister, the father a father, and the son a son; that the rulers must accomplish more by their

examples than by punishments. Kong-tse believed that these ideal conditions really existed in ancient times under the old rulers, and that one had only to return to them again. The brightest point in his views is that he recognises the demands of morality in politics also; the dark side is that he considers man only in this relation to the state.

Kong-tse's pupils do not seem to have formed a separate school. They were mostly people who, standing in the very centre of active life, sometimes turned to the master for advice. We only find a few continually with him, and these three or four people are prominent in the dialogues by their distinctly emphasised characteristics. The master cannot find people in whom the right qualities appear in proper proportion, and balance each other, men of the right mean; therefore he must be satisfied with the passionate, who vigorously take up the cause of truth, and the timid, who keep away from evil. Such people he always had round him, and they clung to their master with deep affection.

Kong-tse's influence has been very great; by his collection of sacred writings, by his teaching and life, he formed a close tie between religion and scholastic education, and gave to the class of learned men the influential position which they hold in China. The great importance of Kong-tse's work may be gathered from the fact that when the Tshin dynasty wished to make innovations they saw in the King a bulwark for ancient customs, and therefore tried to root them out. Under the Han dynasty not only were these books reinstated, but the religious worship of the person of Kong-tse began, and has

increased ever since. He was first of all worshipped under the name of 'duke,' later as the 'perfect sage,' the 'throneless king,' and similar titles. He has numerous temples, sacrifices are offered to him and he is invoked. His teaching forms the foundation of the empire, and his person is the people's highest ideal.

Chapter 41. — Lâo-tse's Tâo-te-king.

Books of Reference. Among the translations of this difficult book the following are to be recommended: Stan. Julien, Le livre de la voie et de la vertu (1842); J. Chalmers, The speculations on metaphysics, polity, and morality of 'the old philosopher' Lau-tsze (1868); V. von Strauss, Lâo-tse's Tâo-te-king (1870); the two latter are in many respects dependent on Stan. Julien, and he again, on the interpretation of Chinese commentaries. Among essays on Lâo-tse we shall mention: Ab. Remusat, Mémoire sur la vie et les opinions de Lâo-tseu, philosophe chinois du vi^e^ siècle avant notre ère (1820); W. Rotermund, Die Ethik Lâo-tse's mit besonderer Bezugnahme auf die buddhistische Moral (1874); and a few essays by V. von Strauss und Torney, Essays zur allgemeinen Religionswissenschaft (1879).

Much fewer details are known about the life of Lâo-tse, the hidden sage, than about Kong-tse. He was older than Kong-tse, was born in 604, and met him when Kong-tse visited the town of the Chow where Lâo-tse held a public office. The conversations between these two men are recorded by different Chinese writers, who make us realise the differences between the two. Kong-tse always appears as the inferior; he knows a good deal, but he has not yet attained the true wisdom, and he follows worldly aims and vain things. Kong-tse himself seems to have realised Lâo-tse's superiority: he compares him to the dragon which rises to inaccessible heights with wind and clouds, and probably he referred to him, when in answer to a question, he spoke of a holy man

in the west. With the exception of this, Lâo-tse's person is hidden from us. He did not try to influence his times or to form disciples. At the termination of his life, tradition makes him disappear at the western limits of the empire. The officer who commanded there persuaded him to write down his thoughts concerning Tâo and virtue. After having done this he stepped across the boundary to finish his life in foreign lands.

The Tâo-te-king which he left behind him is one of the most difficult books in the world to understand. Even Chinese commentators confess, that they have to be satisfied with a general understanding of the meaning, and cannot fathom all the deep thoughts contained in it. The translations we possess do not inspire much confidence; they often do not seem to escape the danger of including all sorts of modern theosophical speculations, with which Lâo-tse no doubt to a certain extent agrees. Keeping this in view we will give the principal ideas of the book. It treats in eighty-one very short chapters of Tâo and Te (virtue). Without being able to form any rigid divisions the general order is as follows. The three first principal parts introduce the chief ideas; parts 4–37 treat of the principles of which the universe is formed; parts 38–52 treat of morality; 53–80 treat of politics, and 81 is a postscript.

The contrast between Lâo-tse's and Kong-tse's teaching is often presented in a very exaggerated form; but we find in both, with many differences, many very real points of contact also. Lâo-tse also appeals to antiquity; an important part of his very small book consists of quotations from ancient writings

or of ancient sayings; but of the old emperors he does not honour Yâo and Shun as Kong-tse does, but he gives high place to the Yellow emperor Hwang-Tî, whose name is probably purposely, almost entirely left out from the Confucian books. The teaching that heaven and earth have no preferences, as little as the sage, is emphatically expressed in the Tâo-te-king. People think they have found traces of a triad of fundamental beings in certain expressions of Lâo-tse. Finally the word Tâo, which he stamps as implying the fundamental principle of his views, occurs also in the classical books of Confucianism; especially in Chung-yung it is a leading word, even though it does not there comprehend the same extensive and varying conception as with Lâo-tse. V. VON STRAUSS has defended the idea that Lâo-tse originated from an ancient cycle of Tâo worshippers, to which cycle Kong-tse was opposed: this statement is as yet unproved, although L. DE ROSNY has of late supported this opinion. It is probable that Lâo-tse drew on the thoughts contained in the ancient religion and gave them further development, just as Kong-tse did, only in a different way. Several people think that the origins of the Tâo teaching must be sought for outside China. In the Tâo-te-king XIV the principle of the fundamental principle is described as colourless (I), silent (Hi), and bodiless (Wei). In this, ancient Jesuit missionaries saw the mystery of the Trinity; REMUSAT, on the contrary, recognised in I Hi Wei the Old Testament name for God, Jahve, an opinion which is still defended by VON STRAUSS. If this were so, then dispersed Jews must have introduced the knowledge of the sacred name, which

Lâo-tse embodies reverentially in a mystic cloak in his work. The improbability and groundlessness of this supposition, which is based entirely on three Chinese signs, admitting of another interpretation, strikes one most forcibly. Another view, which connects Lâo-tse with India, has met with more approval. The traditions of his western journeys seem to favour the acceptance of this idea, and the similarity between his speculations and Indian ideas, as found, for instance, in the Upanishads, is not to be denied. Formerly people even looked to Buddhism as the source of Tâoism, but this is excluded by a knowledge of dates. The old opinion held by PAUTHIER and WUTTKE, which seemed to have been placed aside, is now brought up under a new form; DOUGLAS, for instance, finds the ideas of Tâo and Brahma so alike that they cannot have arisen independently of one another. We must admit the possibility that such a borrowing really took place, but the similarity is not convincing, because speculative minds often strike similar paths; and against the possibility of a borrowing from India, we have the certain fact that Tâoism has such deep roots in Chinese antiquity itself.

The word Tâo, which expresses the fundamental principle of the Tâo-te-king, is one of those words with many meanings, which are sometimes used for such purposes. REMUSAT translates it by reason, STANISLAS JULIEN renders it better by, the way. It is impossible to give a definition which shall agree with the many meanings in which it occurs in the Tâo-te-king. It means the fundamental principle, the order of the world, the true method, and much

else of a similar kind. It has no beginning, it is older than Shang-Tî, absolute by itself, having its laws in itself, whilst Heaven must be guided by Tâo; it permeates everything, and yet undergoes no changes itself; it is the father and foster-mother of all things. The very first sentence in the book begins by drawing a distinction between the everlasting Tâo and the Tâo that can be expressed. Negative and positive statements often occur alternately with one another. On the one hand Tâo is nameless, unfathomable, empty, without any determination; thus it is that everything has come from nothing. But Tâo is also the foundation of the world, has a name when acting as a creator, supports everything without wishing to govern everything, and does everything even without activity. There is no trace in the Tâo-te-king of a systematic description of what Tâo is, and does, nor of its gradual development; the same paradoxes about Tâo are repeated for ever. The book leaves us in the dark about important questions such as immortality. From a few sayings we seem to gather that those who know Tâo do not perish in death; but one must be content, according to the sage's opinion, with mere guesses on this problem.

In morality we find the same similarity and difference between Kong-tse and Lâo-tse. Lâo-tse also recognises in virtue the development of man's real and true nature; he also admits the unity of all morality. But the knowledge of Tâo, which to him is the principle of morality, is not quite the same as the striving after wisdom, which Kong-tse demands; Kong-tse requires the study of the many books and institutions of antiquity, and Lâo-tse the intuitive

knowledge of the absolute being. Lâo-tse regards a widespread knowledge as dangerous; he draws attention away from all external circumstances towards the inner life. He does not recommend people to withdraw actually from the world and become hermits, but mentally to be quite free from the world in spirit. What the world offers, only perplexes and dims the mind; the way of heaven can be found without mixing with the world, if one is only at peace with oneself. Virtue really consists in doing nothing; one must follow Tâo, whose activity is essentially negative. Many beautiful sayings are expressed in the service of this negative morality, and that is why they do not possess the whole of that value which is sometimes attributed to them. As for instance—that worldly gain is really loss, that what is tender is stronger than what is hard, that compassion is the secret of power, and that one must return good for evil. These ideas are foreign to Kong-tse, and he has partly contradicted them. On the other hand, Lâo-tse expects very little from outward acts; he speaks even depreciatingly of propriety, which holds such a high place with Kong-tse.

In the Tâo-te-king we find curious thoughts about politics. Here also politics are only a sub-division of morality. A virtuous man who knows Tâo is the best ruler. In harmony with these prevalent conceptions no positive duties are allotted to the state. War is condemned, material advancement is despised, and the numerous institutions declared to be useless. The kingdom is to have Tâo, and everything is to go on quietly as if by itself; peace is the first duty of the citizen. The rulers must as little as possible, arouse desires amongst the people; they must not excite

their wills, so that there shall be no vain, restless, and worldly activity. Politics thus consist in not following any fixed ideal or positive object, but in producing a state of peace and stagnation, in which all hearts remain empty and occupy themselves with a knowledge of Tâo.

The hidden sage and his shapeless teaching have remained without great influence in China. There are millions who honour him and believe in Tâoism; but this belief has so few points of contact with the speculations of the Tâo-te-king that we can only very imperfectly understand their connection.

CHAPTER 42. — **The Philosophers.**

Books of Reference. A history of Chinese philosophy is still to be desired; E. J. EITEL gave a general survey in his Outlines of a history of Chinese philosophy (Oriental congress at St. Petersburg, 1876). On Meng-tse: J. LEGGE, The life and works of Mencius (1875; in the introduction he gives sketches of the teachings of other philosophers); and E. FABER, Eine Staatslehre auf ethischer Grundlage (1877; the teaching of Mencius is interesting, but too systematically arranged). On other philosophers also, such as Micius and Licius, FABER published similar essays, but these only answer the purposes of a first introduction to the subject. J. CHALMERS, F. H. BALFOUR, TH. MCCLATCHIE, H. A. GILES who translated Chuang, and other Englishmen have provided more or less good materials for a study of Chinese philosophy.

Since the time of Kong-tse a rich literature has been developed on various subjects. The times of the Han and Tang and Song dynasties were especially marked by great mental activity. As names of the first order we must mention the historian Sse-ma-thsien (second cent. B.C.) and the encyclopaedist Matuanlin (third cent. A.D.); but much was done in other branches, for instance in the dramatic line. But here we must limit ourselves to a few remarks about the most pro-

minent philosophers. In realistic China there have been great speculative systems, and not only on ethico-political problems. We cannot yet survey the whole development of the mental life of China; many thinkers are known to us merely by their names; we can therefore only mention a few of the most interesting characters. They are partly connected with Lâo-tse, they partly carry on the school of Kong-tse, and they partly follow their own ways.

To the latter belong Yang and Mih (Mak); the date of their life is very uncertain, probably about the fifth century B. C., at all events before Meng, who complains of the destructive influence and wide spreading of their teachings. But it was incorrect to include two such utterly different men in the same judgment. Yang's principle was 'every man for himself.' He preached enjoyment, and that every one should follow his heart's desires. Everything is vain, virtue is a mere word, good reputation and fame are empty, therefore one should enjoy life as much as one can, and accept death when it comes with indifference. The people who enjoy their lives, are wiser than those heroes of virtue who sacrifice all enjoyment of life to a mere fancy. Mih-tse's teaching is of much greater significance, for he maintains, that one should love all men equally. He does not think the well-being of the empire will gain anything by a study of antiquity and by the fortifying of ancient customs, but it will gain everything from the principle of love to all men. All evils arise from hatred and from the difference drawn between men; true love illumines everything, as do the sun and moon, without any exceptions. This teaching, which won many followers, must more

especially be regarded as a theory of politics. Mih-tse also made the well-being of the empire his chief object. Meng-tse accuses his teaching of denying the principle of filial piety, and therefore being dangerous. The contrast between the followers of the schools of Mih-tse and Kong-tse is very clearly marked.

Lih and Chuang are counted among Lâo-tse's disciples. Lih-tse lived probably in the fifth century and Chuang in the second half of the fourth century B.C. The former impresses us as having been an eclectic; he appeals almost as often to Kong-tse and even to Yang-tse as to Lâo-tse. But still, as regards all essentials he follows Lâo-tse's views; more especially he derives everything from nothing. His teaching is more popular and less pure than the master's; he even advocates occasionally the doctrine of pleasure, and he concedes an important place to magic. Thus we find in him a connecting link between the abstract speculations of the master and the magic arts of later disciples. Chuang had a loftier mind than Lih-tse, and some people esteem him as the most original thinker of China. He expressed himself most decidedly against the school of Kong-tse; his own system seems to be a fantastical mixture of Tâoistic speculations and mythical conceptions.

Meng-tse (371–288) is the principal teacher in Kong-tse's school. He was born a hundred years after Kong-tse's death, and his fame and authority place the names of the master's actual pupils quite in the shade. He came from the same state of Lu, in which he belonged to one of the great noble families. The same fate overtook him as Kong-tse: he wandered

through various states, and only occasionally took official positions in passing; he was famous for his influence on many men, to whom he propounded his learning. His virtue is highly honoured in China, but is not placed on a level with the master's; it has certain sharp angles; he is as little like Kong-tse as crystals are to precious stones. His personality produces a more human impression on us than the master's; it is less typical and more individually developed. His dialogues, in seven books, collected most probably by his pupils, contain more of a system than the isolated sayings of the master; still, they both inculcated the same convictions. He also cares chiefly for the well-being of the state. Filial piety, respect for authorities, and care for funeral rites are to him most important. The four cardinal virtues are Wisdom, Humanity, Justice, and Propriety: he is continually praising their blessed results. He particularly dwells on the fact that virtue is innate in man, and that human nature is good. Only through violent injuries or by withholding necessary food, does man become spoilt and like an animal. But virtue is his real being, and cannot be given to him from outside; he need only remain himself; he must not throw himself away, but must take care of his inner being. This teaching found decided opposition in Seun, who lived not long after Meng, and described human nature as evil. Everything natural must be kept under control by laws; if every one followed his natural inclinations, then general disorder would prevail; wisdom and kindness must be gained artificially and with great trouble; it is just because man desires what is good and strives to attain it, that

proves that he does not possess it naturally. The philosopher Han-yu, who lived in the eighth cent. A. D. (under the Tang dynasty), took up yet another position in regard to this problem. He declared that the dogmas of the good and bad in human nature were both one-sided, and therefore only partially true; there are good, bad, middle, and vacillating natures; the first can be made more perfect, the second can be kept under control, the third can be induced to do good, but none can be radically altered. The teacher who has had most influence on modern times is Chu-hi (eleventh cent. A. D. under the Song dynasty). He was a most learned man, and wrote a most comprehensive commentary on the classical books. Although he is the official representative of Confucianism, yet his teaching varies greatly from the master's. Its character is dualistic; the opposition between the male and female principle is the foundation stone of his system.

CHAPTER 43.—**Popular Beliefs and Customs up to the Present Day.**

Books of Reference. On Tâoism there are numerous treatises in the Sitz. Ber. der Ak. zu Wien by A. PFITZMAIER, Die Lebensverlängerungen der Männer des Wegs (1870), Die Lösung der Leichname and Schwerter (1870), Ueber einige Gegenstände des Tâoglaubens (1875), &c. STAN. JULIEN translated a very important book, Le livre des récompenses et des peines (1835). Besides this we have E. J. EITEL'S Feng-Shui, or the Rudiments of Natural Science in China (1873); J. EDKINS' Religion in China (2nd ed., 1878); J. M DE GROOT, Les fêtes des Chinois annuellement célébrées à Emoui (Amoy), Ann. M. G. xi, xii.

In the first century of our era Buddhism was added to the two native Chinese religions from India; this has in the course of time become a real national Chinese religion, and is much more a part of the national life than any other foreign religions which were introduced later on, such as Islam and

Christianity. But we shall not touch here on the religion of Fo, namely Chinese Buddhism. We shall only notice that it is closely connected with Tâoism and exercised great influence on it, more especially in regard to the worship of Lâo-tse himself.

The transformation of Tâoism into a national religion is a most striking phenomenon, but also the most difficult problem in the history of Chinese religion. The Tâoists form a community which regards an hereditary 'heavenly master' as its head; the succession of these honoured beings can be traced to the first century after Christ. In the temples of the Tâoists many gods are worshipped, such as spirits of heaven, natural phenomena of the seasons, and of the stars, and even a god of wealth. The Tâoists are distinguished by great superstition; they try to acquire immortality by various magic means. Sometimes we find the conviction, that virtue and moral purity lead to the desired protraction of life; but as a general rule they seek for the elixir of life, or plants of immortality, and such things. Thus the emperor of the Tshin dynasty, who burnt the classical books of Confucianism, sent an expedition to the eastern islands to fetch from thence the drink of immortality. Amongst the men of the way (Tâo), all sorts of superstitious conceptions as to the attainment of immortality were widely spread; people spoke of a setting free of the dead body, that is a state in which the body of the deceased became invisible, and thus the dead man joined the army of immortals; they even found in the coffin of one of these immortals a sword instead of his body. These were not the only thoughts presented by Tâoism to the nation.

Many books of popular morality have come from these circles; they are highly honoured, and are much read, and to propagate them amongst the poor is even considered as a religious duty. More than the Tâo-te-king, which is not sufficient for the general wants of the people, it is a popular book like Kan-ying-phien, which supplies the masses with moral instruction. This book of rewards and punishments consists of 212 sayings, aphorisms which inculcate the leading moral principles, but into which many superstitions have crept, and its contents, illustrated by 400 anecdotes, are thus made easy to the people. The leading idea is that the good and bad deeds of men are rewarded or punished by the spirits of heaven and earth. Man's fate is not predestined, but by his conduct he brings good or evil upon himself, just as a shadow follows the body. This is explained by a series of examples which have no connection one with another, but each, either recommends some virtue or condemns some vice. The book closes with this question: How could one not endeavour to do good? The small book of hidden blessings contains much the same, and is of not much less authority; it commends kindness and honesty, purity of heart, and faithfulness in all circumstances, as the path of blessing. In both these works we find the prohibition, probably of Buddhistic origin, to shed blood or to harm the life even of an animal.

The two signs we have given as characteristic of Tâoism are also to be found in modern Confucianism. Here also the teaching of morality is still prominent, and official religion is not averse to magic art. But as regards the latter there is a great

difference. Whereas Tâoism encourages all sorts of popular beliefs, abets fraud in the sale of secret remedies, and gives expression to a hope of immortality; in Confucianism, magic or rather mantic, is of quite a different sort. It is officially regulated, and not left to individual caprice, and relates to something quite different from the prolonging of life. We mean the system of geomancy, known under the name of Feng-shui, which plays such an important part in modern China. The most favourable spot has to be chosen for almost everything, more especially for building a house or a temple, and for the erection of a tomb. But various things must be observed, several of which seem most natural to us, and which we should also consider in choosing a suitable position, but others rest entirely on a fanciful idea of nature. From various signs one is supposed to discover the earth directions; for a favourable locality it is necessary that the one earth direction called the azure dragon should be on the left, and the other called the white tiger on the right. Feng-shui's system has been developed in Chu-hi's; it is founded on a whole philosophy of nature. We shall just, in passing, mention the opinion that a similar connection lay at the bottom of the old divination of the Yî King, and that Chu-hi therefore only systematically elaborated old ideas. Amongst the limitations against which all efforts of civilisation in China have still to fight, Feng-shui takes a prominent place. Buildings, the laying out of streets, railways, even the erection of a telegraph-post, are met by the religious scruple that it is disturbing Feng-shui.

In the China of to-day Confucianism may still be called the official religion. Towards the end of the seventeenth century the emperor Kang-hi, to check the moral decline of the people, comprised Kong-tse's teaching in sixteen short precepts, which he caused to be proclaimed everywhere. The worship of heaven is still the imperial form of worship, the worship of ancestors forms the foundation for the popular religion, and the books of Confucius are still the classics of China. But side by side with this the two other religions continue to exist; they are not only free from persecution, but are recognised and supported by the state. The three religions do not exist so much side by side as all together. The Chinese need not choose, but can take upon himself the religious ceremonies of all three, and takes from all three according to his wants. Confucianism is looked on as the religion of men of letters, and educated people look down on the superstitions of the people who follow Tâoism and Buddhism. Amongst the educated people those who are of a sceptic turn of mind, and there are not a few of them in China, hold Kong-tse in great esteem, for his name represents all sides of national culture, the height of the empire, literature, and the system of morality.

THE EGYPTIANS.

Books of Reference. H. JOLOWICZ in his Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca gives a bibliography up to 1861, and the bibliography of PRINCE IBRAHIM HILMY, The Literature of Egypt and the Soudan (2 vols.), takes us to May 1887. Amongst private catalogues the most important is that of R. LEPSIUS' library (Brockhaus, 1886). Egyptology is represented by a few special periodicals: Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Alter-

thumskunde (since 1862) and the Revue égyptologique (since 1881). The honour of having roused a wide-spread interest in Egypt by a really important work belongs to C. C. J. VON BUNSEN, Aegyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte (6 vols., 1844–1857). This work, which never satisfied the severe demands of historical critics (cp. A. VON GUTSCHMID'S Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Orients, 1857), is now quite out of date; only the English translation is of lasting value owing to the additions made by S. BIRCH (especially in vol. v). The same can be said of J. G. WILKINSON'S The Manners and Customs of the ancient Egyptians (5 vols., 1837–41), a work especially famous because of its excellent illustrations; the new edition by S. BIRCH (3 vols., 1878) offers improvements in the text. For a study of the monuments we have much to help us, but for the most part a knowledge of the Egyptian language is necessary to understand them. The principal works are the great collections of reproductions and descriptions made by CHAMPOLLION, ROSELLINI, LEPSIUS, LEEMANS, MARIETTE, DÜMICHEN, and PRISSE D'AVENNES; then also the catalogues and descriptions of Egyptian collections in the museums of London, Paris, Turin, Petersburg, Leiden, Berlin, and Bulak: special mention should be made of the five books in which the results of the Mission archéologique française au Caire are collected under MASPERO'S direction. Most descriptions of travels through Egypt afford more or less detailed disquisitions on Egyptian monuments. Of such works the following are of special importance: CHAMPOLLION, Lettres écrites d'Égypte et de Nubie en 1828 et 1829 (1833); R. LEPSIUS, Briefe aus Aegypten, Aethiopien und der Halbinsel des Sinai (1852); H. BRUGSCH, Reiseberichte aus Aegypten (1855), and the photographic reproductions by MAXIME DU CAMP. The handbook for travellers, more especially to be recommended because of its reliable information, Aegypten (I) was published by K. BÄDEKER with the help of many scholars.

We particularly recommend the following histories of antiquity and Egypt: M. DUNCKER, Geschichte des Alterthums, I (of this, one should use the newest edition and certainly none older than the fifth, which appeared in 1878); this work was the first comprehensive statement formed on the latest discoveries. FR. LENORMANT, Manuel d'histoire ancienne de l'Orient jusqu'aux guerres médiques (3 vols. with a map, 1869); this is hardly critical enough, but important for the history of monuments. G. MASPERO, Geschichte der morgenländischen Völker im Alterthum (1877); of this we, as an exception, do not mention the French original (the latest edition appeared in 1886), but the German translation, as this has been enriched by the translator, R. PIETSCHMANN. H. BRUGSCH, Geschichte Aegyptens unter den Pharaonen (1877), which is important because of the number of translated historical texts. J. DÜMICHEN, Geschichte des alten

Aegyptens (in ONCKEN'S series), the introduction being principally devoted to the geography; the history is written by ED. MEYER. F. J. LAUTH, Aus Aegyptens Vorzeit (1881), a survey up to the time of Augustus, but containing many doubtful statements. A. WIEDEMANN, Aegyptische Geschichte (2 vols., 1884, supplement 1888); an indispensable book of reference, which gives a tabulated summary of monuments and facts, more than a readable historical account; A. WIEDEMANN, Geschichte Aegyptens von Psammetich I bis auf Alexander den Grossen, nebst einer eingehenden Kritik der Quellen zur aegyptischen Geschichte (1880). The book which best fulfils the demands of this task and grasps the present state of discoveries is ED. MEYER'S Geschichte des Alterthums (I 1884). Amongst more abbreviated accounts we mention, A. MARIETTE, Aperçu de l'histoire d'Égypte, depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la conquête musulmane (1864); S. BIRCH, Egypt from the monuments (S. P. C. K.). Amongst special researches and monographs the most important for historical investigations are: R. LEPSIUS, Die Chronologie der Aegypter (1849), das Königsbuch der alten Aegypter (1858); E. DE ROUGÉ, Recherches sur les monuments qu'on peut attribuer aux six premières dynasties de Manéthon (1866); F. CHABAS, Les pasteurs en Égypte (1868).

We have still to mention the following general works on the Egyptian history of civilisation: H. BRUGSCH, Die Aegyptologie. A survey of Egyptian learning (1891); AD. ERMAN, Aegypten und ägyptisches Leben im Alterthum (I. 1885, II. 1888); G. PERROT et C. CHIPIEZ, Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité (I. Égypte, 1880), with excellent illustrations; P. PIERRET, Dictionnaire d'archéologie égyptienne (1875), a small dictionary of reference serviceable for the requirements of beginners; G. MASPERO, L'Archéologie égyptienne (1887), translated into English by AMELIA B. EDWARDS (2nd ed., 1889); G. MASPERO, Lectures historiques, most readable essays.

CHAPTER 44.—**Preliminary Remarks.**

The general results of the science of Egyptology are well known, or at all events so easily accessible that we need not repeat them in detail. Egypt was thrown open to science by the French expedition under Napoleon Bonaparte. An impetus was given to productive enquiries by the discovery of the Rosetta stone. This basaltic stone, at present in the British Museum, contains a decree of the priesthood in honour

of Ptolemy Epiphanes in hieroglyphic, demotic, and Greek text; the top and bottom are broken, but the greater part is legible. Prominent men like Sylvestre de Sacy, Akerblad, and Thomas Young, tried in vain to decipher this inscription; the key to it was first found by Fr. Champollion, who thus became the founder of Egyptology. In this, as in Persian inscriptions, it was the royal names surrounded by the cartouches (escutcheons containing names), which first gave reliable facts to start from. Champollion first recognised the mixed character of hieroglyphics, which must be understood as being partly phonetic (alphabetic as well as syllabic), and partly ideographic, although later scholars, who continued in the direction he had marked out, found that many of his statements needed correction. But the systematic opposition made against Champollion's school by Spohn and Seyffardt cannot be maintained. Seyffardt declared all hieroglyphics to be phonetic and made various other curious statements, and it is a pity that M. Uhlemann should have followed in this direction in his Egyptian Archæology. The explanation of hieroglyphics with a successive development of Champollion's method always tended to more and more certain results, and received no small confirmation by the discovery of the decree of Canopus (also in hieroglyphic, demotic, and Greek text), dating from the times of the Ptolemies and discovered by Lepsius in 1866. For nearly half a century a considerable number of Egyptologists throughout Europe have devoted themselves to these studies, which they approach from different sides, and with different objects. The discovery and explanation of monuments

and papyri; the deciphering of texts, which are given in three forms of writing, the hieroglyphic on monuments, the hieratic in most old papyri, and the demotic of the more recent literature dating about 800 B.C.; the study of the ancient Egyptian language, for which the newer Coptic language has always to be consulted; the editing of texts (critically and historically treated); these are the most important tasks, many of which have been successfully carried out by the exertions of Egyptologists, or at least they have been thoroughly taken in hand. In these spheres the more famous names are: in France after Fr. Champollion: de Rougé, Devéria, Chabas, Mariette, Pierret, Lefébure, Grébaut, Maspero; in England, Hincks, Birch, Goodwin, Le Page Renouf; in Germany, Lepsius, Brugsch, Dümichen, Eisenlohr, Lauth, Stern, Reinisch, Ebers, Erman, Wiedemann; in Holland, Leemans, Pleyte; in Norway, Lieblein; in Switzerland, Ed. Naville; in Italy, Rosellini, Salvolini, Schiaparelli, and others.

The limits of ancient Egypt are fixed both as to situation and date. The country consists of the Nile valley from the first Cataract to the Mediterranean, and is bounded on the east and west by the Libyan desert and the Red Sea. The history of the kingdom of the Pharaohs ceases with the conquest of Alexander the Great. The Ptolemies took care of the Egyptian religion, and temples to Egyptian gods were built even under Roman dominion, but the culture of this period was essentially Hellenistic. The ancients even described the land as 'the gift of the Nile' and the inhabitants of to-day call him the 'father of blessings.' The importance of this river in the culture of Egypt cannot be emphasised

sufficiently; the Egyptians are dependent on the Nile for their entire material existence, and nowhere is civilisation more dependent on the exigencies entailed by the nature of the land than in Egypt. That the Egyptians were agriculturists and became great builders, that they drained their soil and measured the land, is as much owing to the Nile as to the material tendency of their civilisation, and their feeling for what is settled and regular. The country of the Nile was from ancient times divided into many districts, Nomes. Their number varied at different periods, but usually amounted to forty-two, of which half were in the south and half in the north. The Pharaohs who governed the whole land wore therefore the double crown, the white for Upper, and the red for Lower Egypt. Some people think that the name Mizraim, which is given to this country in the Bible, is a dual form and refers to these two divisions; but this is highly improbable. All attempts to give a satisfactory explanation of this name, as also of the Greek Aigyptos, have failed as yet. The native name for the country was Kamt. The Memphitic Nome, which really belonged to Lower Egypt, formed the border line between Upper and Lower Egypt. Great attention has been paid to the geography of ancient Egypt; and a detailed survey of the ancient divisions is given by DÜMICHEN (in ONCKEN'S series).

We can follow the course of Egyptian history pretty closely. Various calculations can be made, which however do not lead to the desired agreement. These reckonings are taken from the information in MANETHO'S historical work, from royal pedigrees and monuments, and from the exact Egyptian

reckoning of time, which even in very ancient times counted the solar year as of 365 days; but a difference showed itself in the heliacal rising of the dog-star (Sirius, Sothis) coincident with the beginning of the rising of the Nile, which difference in 1460 amounted to a whole year (causing MANETHO'S Sothis period). The Egyptians regulated the calendar, but they possessed no fixed era, they counted by the years during which a king ruled, which caused many fluctuations. Also the question as to whether certain dynasties ruled successively or contemporaneously has not been solved; hence arises the uncertainty in Egyptian chronology. Opinions vary as to the date of their beginning, some by several centuries and some even by more than a thousand years. Thus it is safest, as ED. MEYER proposes, to be satisfied with minimum dates, so that they can be pushed further on, but not placed further back. By this means we get the following dates: Mena 3180 B. C., the twelfth dynasty 2130, the times of the Hyksos 1780, the beginning of the new kingdom 1530, the reign of Thotmes III 1480–1430, Ramses II 1300–1230, Sesonk (twenty-second dynasty) 930. We have thus mentioned the most important periods of ancient Egyptian history. From its commencement till the time of Alexander the Great, thirty-one dynasties ruled. One distinguishes generally between an ancient kingdom, a middle kingdom, and a new kingdom. The middle kingdom reaches from the seventh or eleventh dynasty till the eighteenth dynasty came to the throne. In this history we can distinguish more minutely the following chief divisions. The first dynasties come from Thinis, and they are very little known to us. We get a firmer footing

with the fourth and fifth dynasties (from Memphis). This is the period of the great pyramids. Then follows a time from the seventh to the eleventh dynasties which was very poor in monuments; but the twelfth, on the contrary, is in the full light of history. It is the culmination of the ancient Thebaic kingdom, the first classical period of literature, in which the Amenemhat and Userteses conquered the Upper Nile valley (Nubia) and erected vast buildings. Then again follows a time of decadence; the foreign Hyksos ruled in Lower Egypt and adopted Egyptian culture, whilst in Upper Egypt hardly a trace was left of the Thebaic rule. With the expulsion of the Hyksos, Egypt's second brilliant period, the new kingdom of Thebes, began. The warlike princes of the eighteenth (Amenhotep and Thotmes) and the nineteenth (Seti, Ramses) dynasties carried the victorious arms of Egypt into part of Asia, and immortalised their fame by large buildings. The following dynasties could not maintain this power, and the kingdom of Ramses quickly fell to pieces. The chief priest of Amon in Thebes, placed the crown on his own head; soon the sovereignty of Egypt fell into the hands of Libyan mercenaries, Ethiopian princes, and for a time to the Assyrian monarch. This gloomy period was during the twenty-second till the twenty-fifth dynasty. The twenty-sixth is the period of restoration by the Saitic house of Psamtik and his descendants. Then the Persians conquered Egypt; the twenty-seventh and thirty-first dynasties are those of the Persian kings, whilst the twenty-eighth to the thirtieth show a few passing attempts to place again a native dynasty on the throne.

Chapter 45.—A Survey of Authorities.

Books of Reference. The best survey of Greek reports on Egypt is given by A. Wiedemann, Aegyptische Geschichte, I; besides this one can consult those parts of Herodotus which deal with Egypt; A. H. Sayce, Herodotus, vols. 1–3 (1883); G. Parthey brought out a good edition of Plutarch's de Iside et Osiride with notes (1850). Translations of Egyptian texts in the Records of the Past, vols. ii, iv, vi, viii, x, xii, of the 1st series by S. Birch, and vols. i, ii, of the 2nd series by A. H. Sayce. Besides this there are Egyptian texts translated or described by G. Maspero, Les contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne (1882); Chabas, Le plus ancient livre du monde (Rev. Arch. 1858), he means the Papyrus Prisse; Ph. Virey, Études sur le Papyrus Prisse (1887); E. Grébaut, Hymne à Ammon-Ra (1874). There are up till now two complete translations of the so-called Book of the Dead; but they are both rather antiquated and must be used with great care: they are by S. Birch (in the English translation of Bunsen, V) and by P. Pierret, Le livre des morts (1882). On the Book of the Dead we possess also E. de Rougé's Étude sur le rituel funéraire (1860); E. Lefébure, Traduction comparée des hymnes au soleil composant le xv^e^ chap. du rituel funéraire égyptien (1869); W. Pleyte, Étude sur le chap. cxxv du rituel funéraire (in Et. Egypt. 1866–69); finally we possess the special introduction to Ed. Naville's splendid edition of the texts of the Book of the Dead (1880). We can study a book of ritual in the survey by O. von Lemm, Das Ritualbuch des Ammondienstes (1882).

We shall first specify the foreign sources, which are here very abundant, owing to which, even before the discovery and use of native documents, Egypt was never totally unknown, as was the case with many other centres of civilisation. Amongst Oriental sources, the information from Babylono-Assyrian annals is important as regards certain periods of Egyptian history, but it should be used with great care. With this are connected the correspondences and reports received by the Pharaohs of the eighteenth dynasty from Asia in cuneiform writing, which were discovered in Tel-el-Amarna. Persian inscriptions are not of much importance for Egyptian history. Arabian historians

are of real value for the time after Islam, and not for the time of the Pharaohs. Such a value can only be attributed to the statements in the Old Testament, to those in Genesis and Exodus about the time of the Patriarchs and the exodus, as well as to those contained in the Books of Kings, and to the prophetic writings of the later history of Egypt.

All the richer are the facts gained from the Graeco-Roman literature. WIEDEMANN enumerates over one hundred writers who have occupied themselves especially with Egypt; but of most of these writings fragments only remain [1]. We shall here mention the most important, whose works have fortunately been preserved to us. The list is headed by Herodotus (in the second and in the beginning of his third book), who had a predecessor, it is true, in Hekataeus of Miletus, whose work he made great use of. Thoroughly suited to be an historian by his great literary knowledge, by distant journeys, which led him also into Egypt, as well as by his gift of observation and love of truth, Herodotus, owing to his not knowing Egyptian, is dependent for many of his statements on the faulty or superficial communications of Eyptian interpreters, or common temple-servants. Therefore his survey contains many errors, especially in reference to those periods or places less attainable to Greeks; his knowledge is entirely based on the traditions of Lower Egypt, and his representation of religion is influenced by his desire to derive Greek gods from Egypt. Still his work is valuable, especially when he recounts his own observations, or deals with the period after Psammeticus, when the country

[1] These are mostly to be found in MÜLLER'S Fragm. Hist. Graec.

was thrown open to the Greeks. Of hardly less value than the references to Egypt in Herodotus are those in Diodorus Siculus (Bibliotheca, lib. i, and other scattered notices). Diodorus, who travelled in Egypt, and wrote his work during the first century B. C., was able to use the best authorities, especially the work, now lost, of Hekataeus of Abdera, who lived at the court of Ptolemy I. Diodorus is a leading source of information for the history of the Persian period; as regards more ancient times he is not free from the usual Greek errors; he continually explains the gods in a euhemeristic way. Half a century after Diodorus, Strabo wrote his great geographical work, of which the last book deals entirely with Egypt. In the second century A.D. we know that the Egyptian religion did not escape the attention of such a thoroughly cultivated man as Plutarch. His essay, de Iside et Osiride, is the most comprehensive statement of an Egyptian myth which we possess in classical antiquity; it is therefore most valuable, although we must distinguish between the author's philosophical explanations and the genuine materials.

None of these works approaches in value the fragments which we possess of MANETHO'S Egyptian history. MANETHO of Sebennytus was chief priest under the first and second Ptolemies, and to a Greek education he joined a knowledge of Egyptian authorities. Fragments of his history are preserved in Josephus' treatise against Apion, whilst Africanus and Eusebius give much the same extracts from the entire work. These extracts can be found in the works of the Byzantine chronographer Georgius Syncellus

(eighth cent. A.D.). This extract contains the succession of kings arranged according to their dynasties; but we must notice that these groups do not always begin with the appearance of a new family of rulers, since it often happens that one dynasty contains people belonging to different houses, and on the other hand the succession from father to son is often marked by the commencement of a new dynasty. However uncertain several isolated details still remain, more especially as regards the determining of synchronous dynasties, yet MANETHO'S scheme is in use in Egyptology up to the present day, and it has not been easy even to shake off its palpable errors (such as the identification of the Hyksos with the Jews). With reference to the explanation of hieroglyphics, Charemon of Naukratis wrote a book, fragments of which occur in Tzetzes. Horapollo's book (Ἱερογλυφικά) has been preserved entire, it is a Greek translation of an Egyptian (i. e. Coptic) work, dating towards the end of the fourth century A.D., in which the hieroglyphics are explained in a symbolic way [1]. We must still mention Josephus' Archæology, because of the facts about the times of the Ptolemies, and especially his treatise against Apion, because of his account of the Exodus; Clemens Alexandrinus, who gives us a few important details about the three kinds of Egyptian writing and the so-called hermetic books; and Jamblichus, whose book about Egyptian mysteries drags many neoplatonic ideas into the Egyptian belief.

Let us now consider native authorities; they consist of numerous inscriptions or longer texts, which

[1] The best edition is C. LEEMAN'S Horapollinis Nilòi Hieroglyphica (1835).

are preserved on monuments or in papyri, and form a pretty extensive literature. The Egyptians covered their country with large buildings and monuments of all sorts, and these are even met with outside their boundaries and far into Nubia. The most important are the Pyramids, the vast royal mausoleums of the ancient kingdom, which are found more especially in the neighbourhood of Memphis; the building of Pyramids ceased after the twelfth dynasty. The Pyramids have now lost their outside splendour, and their smooth, bright surface; we cannot therefore decide whether they were originally covered with hieroglyphics. Close to the largest Pyramids we find the great Sphinx, which also belonged to the ancient kingdom, and is now very much mutilated; Sphinxes are found in other places also, for instance in the Sphinx alley in the Serapeum at Sakkara. We must still mention the Obelisks [1], which were entirely covered with hieroglyphics; the colossal statues of the Pharaohs with sharply defined features; and the labyrinth in the lake district (Fayum), of which only doubtful remains still exist. Of the buildings we must first notice the graves, the mausoleums built with square stones (Mastaba), as well as the rock-caves; we shall especially mention the City of the Dead at Thebes, the fields of Sakkara with the tomb of Ti, and the Apis graves (Serapeum) of the new kingdom, discovered by Mariette (1851). Of course many of the graves in the burial places at Memphis, Abydus, and Thebes have not yet been examined, whilst others have been

[1] The first writer known to us to give a right explanation of an obelisk inscription was HERMAPION, who deciphered the hieroglyphics on an obelisk put up in the circus at Rome (Ammian. Marcell. xvii. 4).

carefully examined, such as the grave of Patuamenap made known to us by Dümichen, and that of Seti I by Lefébure. There are the large palaces and temples also, amongst which those of ancient Thebes are the most famous (Karnak, Luxor, Medinet-Abu, and Gurna). Finally many stelae (cippi) were built in memory of influential persons or important events. These monuments and buildings are mostly covered with inscriptions and pictures. Such pictures adorn the walls of temples, palaces, and graves, and give us a vivid representation of the public and private life of the ancient Egyptians. The inscriptions are in various styles; their contents are not very different from those of the papyri; but on the monuments they are mostly in hieroglyphics, the more ancient papyri on the contrary are written principally in hieratic, and the more modern in demotic characters. These inscriptions refer to the most varied aspects of life. Many are geographical, such as the description of the single nomoi, which occupies the lower parts of the walls. Others are historical, lists of kings (the tablets of Abydus, Sakkara, and Karnak), imperial annals, accounts of conquests; but these cannot be unconditionally trusted, as many kings used to annex to themselves the deeds of their predecessors, by erasing from an inscription the name of a former prince, and replacing it with their own. The pictures and texts on the walls of graves give us the key to the religion and the cult of the dead, as well as to the various sides of social life. In Pyramids of the ancient kingdom, complete prayers have lately been discovered, and have been made valuable use of by Maspero. Similar texts, hymns to the gods, and formulas used in the cult of the dead,

can also be found in the papyri. The preservation of written documents for many thousand years, as is the case with many of these Egyptian papyri, is an isolated example in history, and only possible in a dry climate and with the sand of the desert as in Egypt. It is a fact that we possess papyri from the ancient kingdom, though those of the twelfth, eighteenth, and nineteenth dynasties are more numerous; but the latest, even according to the minimum reckoning, are over three thousand years old. Most papyri are called after their discoverers or first possessors (the Harris papyrus, those of Prisse and Sallier); many have already been published or explained in Egyptological collections or periodicals, whilst the catalogues give a survey of those contained in museums. Amongst the most important are a few Turin papyri; one which is much damaged contains a list of kings, and another the Book of the Dead. If one tries to work up the inscriptions and texts we possess into a literary history, then we soon become convinced, how insufficient are the materials that have descended to us to fill up a period of many hundred years. It is true almost all sorts of literature are represented; we possess geographical, historical, geometrical, and medical texts, as well as novels and poems, amongst which we have the poem of Pentaur, in papyri as well as on buildings, but the historical value of this poem, which depicts Ramses II fighting the Cheta, has been much exaggerated.

The whole wisdom of the Egyptians was, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, collected in forty-two hermetic books. The contents of these books were not limited to ritual, but the most varied branches of learning were contained in them (cosmology, medi-

cine, &c.). In detail we possess but scanty information about these works; LEPSIUS suggests that they formed the nucleus only, round which the sacred writings actually in use were grouped. We shall still mention the texts on morality (Pap. Prisse); the precepts of Amenemhat I to his son and others; the magic texts (mag. Pap. Harris), the hymns, of which many are interesting on account of the philosophical opinions from the time of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties; and the books of ritual. By far the most numerous and the most important are the texts relating to the worship of the dead, and these were inscribed in almost all the graves, on walls, on sarcophagi, on the wrappings of mummies and on the amulets, and in the papyrus rolls that were laid by the body. To the same class belong numerous texts, for instance those on the sarcophagus of Seti I, the book of the lower world, the book of buryings, and the book of embalming. The principal collection is that which under the title of the Book of the Dead (many French scholars call it less well, 'Rituel funéraire,' others 'Offenbarung am Licht,' and 'Ausgang aus dem Tage,' &c.) has developed and extended for many hundred years. We can find traces of this Book of the Dead as far back as the times of the ancient kingdom, and we possess texts from almost all periods, as far back as the times of the Ptolemies and Romans. An edition of this Book of the Dead from a hieroglyphic papyrus at Turin, which contains the text of the times of the Saitic (twenty-sixth) dynasty, was arranged by LEPSIUS in 1842, and this editio princeps is the foundation of all translations and editions of the whole or of parts, up to the present day. The Oriental Congress in London in 1874 commissioned some

Egyptologists to form editions of the texts in the various periods; this plan is at present realised, in regard to the text of the eighteenth to the twentieth dynasties, which lies before us in a critical and splendid edition by ED. NAVILLE (1886). Meanwhile PLEYTE had undertaken to publish, with a translation and commentary, the texts of a later date, which are looked on as an appendix to the Book of the Dead, 'Chapitres supplémentaires du Livre des Morts,' beginning with the 162nd chapter. LEPSIUS' edition has 165 chapters, of which the last is generally regarded as an appendix. This Book of the Dead, to the contents of which we shall return later, is in some parts most difficult to understand; we do not ascribe this only to the present imperfect knowledge of the text, but also and even more to the form in which the thoughts are expressed. It is most natural that the attention of Egyptologists should principally be turned to these texts, since they inform us as to the most important part of the Egyptian religion, and also teach us much about what Egyptians thought in respect to the gods, the world, and man. It is true we can often complain with an ancient Egyptian that no word 'either good or bad' can be understood in a sacred book.

CHAPTER 46. — **Different Opinions on the Egyptian Religion.**

Books of Reference. General accounts of the Egyptian religion are to be found in the already mentioned histories. Besides these we have: R. LEPSIUS, Ueber den ersten ägyptischen Götterkreis und seine geschichtlich-mythologische Entstehung (1851); P. PIERRET, Essai sur la mythologie égyptienne (1879), Le panthéon égyptien (1881), both of these works have been minutely reviewed by G. MASPERO, R. H. R. 1880, 1882; R. PIETSCHMANN, Der ägyptische Fetischdienst und Götterglaube, Prolegomena zur ägyptischen Mythologie, (Zeitschr.

f. Ethnol. 1878); C. P. TIELE, Vergelijkende geschiedenis de aegyptische en mesopotamische godsdiensten (1869, the abridged French translation by G. COLLINS, 1882, and the complete English translation by J. BALLINGAL, 1882, serve at the same time as improved editions of this work); P. LE PAGE RENOUF, Lectures on the origin and growth of religion as illustrated by the religion of ancient Egypt (Hb. Lectures, 1879); J. LIEBLEIN, Gammelaegyptisk Religion, populaert fremstillet, I. Gudsbegrebets udvikling, II. Folkereligionen, III. Udøplighedslaeren, (1883–85); the writer's opinions, which are difficult to get at on account of the foreign language, have been shortly drawn up in an English criticism of these lectures by LE PAGE RENOUF: J. LIEBLEIN, Egyptian religion, 1884, and a lecture on ancient Egyptian religion (Act. d. Or. Congr. in Leiden, 1883); H. BRUGSCH, Religion und Mythologie der alten Aegypter (2 vols., 1884-88); VON STRAUSS UND TORNEY, Der altegyptische Götterglaube (2 vols., 1888-90); R. V. LANZONE, Dizionario di mitologia egizia (since 1881), gives a list of the sources of information; E. LEFÉBURE, L'étude de la religion égyptienne; Son état actuel et ses conditions (R. H. R. 1886); A. WIEDEMANN, Die Religion der alten Aegypter (1890).

Great difficulties stand in the way of any account of the Egyptian religion, and perhaps in the present state of enquiry it is still too soon to give an account of the whole, since so many questions as to details still remain unanswered. For the present at least there is no question of any agreement between Egyptologists as to the origin, nature, and development of Egyptian religion; therefore it seems imperative that we should, before considering this subject ourselves, state the positions of the principal representatives of these studies.

Of all preconceived opinions which have proved fatal to Egyptology, none has been more difficult to remove than the idea held by the Greeks, that the Egyptians were the oldest, most pious, and wisest people in the world. Many people, even at the present day, overvalue the intellectual life of the Egyptians, and ascribe to them a pure belief in God and deep thoughts, and eagerly seize the opportunity

offered by many hymns to the gods to explain as symbolical many coarse material conceptions (as PIERRET and others do). If one expresses a doubt as to whether the authors of these religious texts realised the spiritual meaning of their material pictures, and could 'see behind the mythological side-scenes' (PIETSCHMANN), then these panegyrists at once bring forward the sublimity of Egyptian ideas. Thus people first consider all texts from the thoughts contained in them, instead of in connection with the form of worship. And yet in Egypt theological doctrine was far behind the forms of worship, and it is only by a clear understanding of these forms that we can arrive at the understanding of their doctrines. Philosophical ideas always fail to explain a national religion. And it is equally erroneous to maintain that we can trace the origins of religion, morals, and civilisation more clearly in Egypt than in any other country. Even though Egyptian religion may date farther back than any other, yet the real origins are as much concealed from us in it, as in all other religions. The great disagreement amongst historians on these questions proves that their evidence is not very reliable. After having removed certain leading misconceptions, we shall give a more objective statement of opposed opinions.

Many enquirers treat Egyptian religion as a whole, without attributing to the difference of time and place any essential importance. Everywhere and always, in all parts of the land, and from the ancient kingdom to the time of the Ptolemies, the same general fundamental conceptions influence religious life in the Nile valley. This is the opinion held under various forms

more especially by PIERRET and BRUGSCH, and in the main points also by LE PAGE RENOUF, who however recognises transformations even in essential points, and by MASPERO, at least in the representation which he gives of Egyptian religion in his history. But MASPERO himself later (in his bulletins in the R. H. R.) defends most eagerly the theory of development which is also supported by LIEBLEIN, ED. MEYER, and others. Even a common conception in the different local cults perceived by LEPSIUS, was rejected by MASPERO as well as by PIETSCHMANN; at least MASPERO declares that this theory cannot be supported by any authorities. But these authorities are scarce, and many forms of worship are only known to us from foreign information. Thus we know about the religion of Memphis almost entirely from Theban writings. We can in no way infer any unity between the forms of worship in the various Nomes; any unity between the different periods is entirely excluded by the authorities. It is certainly true that the same gods, and partly the same texts and formulas, recur from the time of the ancient kingdom up to the time of the Ptolemies; but one interprets this fact wrongly, if one denies the theory of development on the strength of it. All religions are conservative, and allow what is old to exist alongside with what is new; this is especially the case with forms which are fixed in the ritual. We must not form to ourselves any exaggerated conceptions of what is stable or unchangeable in Egyptian life and cult. The fact that what is old in religion continues for hundreds of years, meets us almost everywhere, in China, India, and Rome, no less than in Egypt. Besides this, many civilisations only seem to

us typical, conventional, and stationary, because the individual character is hidden by the great distance and by our fragmentary knowledge of it. The younger Egyptologists (MASPERO, ERMAN, WIEDEMANN) wish to examine Egyptian religion analytically, and start from the single divine beings and cults of popular religion; whilst BRUGSCH still maintains a systematic treatment and represents abstract conceptions as the original contents of religion and mythology.

But all this is mere generalising: we must now consider more closely the various views about the form of Egyptian religion. The starting point and character are variously determined: as Monotheism (DE ROUGÉ, LAUTH, and PIERRET); Pantheism (BRUGSCH); Henotheism (LE PAGE RENOUF); Sun-worship (LEPSIUS); the worship of nature (LIEBLEIN); Animism (TIELE); and mixed conceptions (PIETSCHMANN, WIEDEMANN, MEYER, and MASPERO).

Everybody acknowledges that there are expressions on the unity of God even in the old texts. All do not deduce therefore from this that the Egyptian religion was originally monotheistic. This original monotheism is supposed to have developed into polytheism by the amalgamation of various local forms of worship, or in some other way. PIERRET has lately been the chief supporter of this theory. He supports by many texts the fact (he does not distinguish between the periods) that the god of the Egyptians was looked on as the one god, the infinite, the eternal, the hidden being, and the creator. Polytheism according to him is only apparent, it is a form of language; the many gods are not the attributes, but the various functions of the one supreme god. This god is manifested in

the sun, whose daily and nightly course forms the contents of the mythology, and whose new birth symbolises the renewing of the divine being. The supreme god is therefore spiritual, in so far as he is conceived as the hidden one; on the other hand he shows himsef in many forms, for which PIERRET finds a symbol in the worship of the sacred bulls. BRUGSCH does not differ much from this view, even though he prefers the name Pantheism and gives a more elaborated system. Egyptians seek for what is divine in the universe; the everlasting god is certainly the creator, but at the same time he permeates, as the soul of the world, all members of the cosmic body; the various gods of mythology are merely the emanations of this soul of the world. Carrying out this view, BRUGSCH lays great weight on cosmogony, which he thoroughly discusses. Essentially different is the view of LE PAGE RENOUF, who though he finds a similar Pantheism in the Egyptian religion, accepts Henotheism as original in the sense given by MAX MÜLLER. The Egyptians never developed a thorough Monotheism, though numerous monotheistic expressions occur, and curiously enough in actual connection with distinctly polytheistic expressions. LE PAGE RENOUF comprehends, under the name of Henotheism, phenomena which others describe as Monotheism. But one can maintain that Egyptian Monotheism and Pantheism have never been denied by any serious enquirer, though the majority do not look on them as general and original. They are the views of certain schools and times, or, as MASPERO says, one must not speak of a single god, but of many single gods. We add that this single god is only so far spiritual as he is a

hidden god, unknowable, and removed from the world. But he can be so strongly identified with his manifestation, the sun, that there is good reason for speaking of a solar Monotheism.

LEPSIUS agrees for the most part with this opinion, although he does not entirely accept it. He lays great importance on the local forms of worship (Osiris of Thinis, Ptah of Memphis, Amon of Thebes), but thinks that sun-worship, although Ra has its headquarters in On-Heliopolis, existed before all local forms of worship and was primitive, perhaps even pre-Egyptian, the first seed and the most general principle of Egyptian belief in gods, and remained as such until the end. Ra is therefore the actual Egyptian national god, and other gods can only assume the highest place by becoming identified with Ra. The earliest expression of this religion is the worship and myth of Osiris of Thinis. The progress of Egyptian religion is reflected in the development of this myth, from the worship of the sun and moon to the pantheistic worship of nature, and finally to a moral worship of ideas. Against this conception WIEDEMANN'S remark is very convincing, that the original solar character of certain gods, which they owe to their early connection with Ra, is really very doubtful.

A scheme of religious development has been worked out by LIEBLEIN. As a beginning, he places the worship of many gods in the disunited small states of Egypt. All these gods were gods of nature; amongst them the sun-god often occurred, and occupied a high place. But he was by no means the only god, earth, heaven, and the moon were also worshipped. This is the period of the religion of nature; but at

the same time we have the worship of the dead, which is of equal importance. A further progress was made in consequence of the unification of the country with the founding of the monarchy by Mena, the various countries came in closer contact with each other, and the acceptance of a single god, as the supreme god to each individual worshipper was recognised: this is the period of Henotheism. Then follows the period of Polytheism, when the various local forms of worship were united in one state religion; this point was reached towards the end of the sixth dynasty. The process of spiritualising the gods of nature was still more important. This opened the way for Monotheism, which arose also from another cause, namely the supremacy of the god of the capital of the kingdom. Thus the Theban god Amon, of the twelfth and eighteenth dynasties, was the only supermundane god. But this god was too far withdrawn from the world to satisfy religious needs, and therefore had to be drawn back into the world; this took place in Pantheism or by the theory of emanation, and in a coarse way in the worship of animals, in which the god was shown to the people under the visible form in which he manifested himself. The weak side of this scheme is the chronological succession in which the various forms are said to have appeared; we can clearly see that to give so late a date to animal worship cannot be maintained even by artificial argument. That Egyptian religion degenerated after having reached a great height is not only admitted by LIEBLEIN, but by others also. ED. MEYER recognises in the growing power of the priests, and the secret doctrine, even in the zenith of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties,

the elements which served to enervate national life. LE PAGE RENOUF acknowledges a materialistic reaction of pantheistic speculations.

TIELE finds the starting point of Egyptian religion in a well-organised Animism. We have here before us, he thinks, a primeval religious formation, pre-Semitic as well as pre-Aryan. The symbolical theocratic character of Semitic religions is here found joined to the mythological pantheistic character of Aryan religions. This can be seen from the two fundamental antitheses: Death and Life, Light and Darkness. Egyptian Polytheism developed itself in two directions: first of all through the multiplying of the gods by the addition of local and foreign gods, and secondly in a more monotheistic sense.

PIETSCHMANN'S essay has opened the way for a new treatment of Egyptian religion, by rendering prominent its elements of Fetishism. It is not his intention, any more than it is that of WIEDEMANN, ED. MEYER, or MASPERO, who on the whole agree with him, to deduce an entire religious development from this one fundamental idea; on the contrary they rather place many equally fundamental principles side by side. PIETSCHMANN starts with the magic character of the Egyptian religion. According to him, DE BROSSES was on the right track when he compared the Fetishism of Negritia with that of the ancient Egyptian, and the saying of Herodotus about the Africans, *γόητες πάντες*, 'they are all fetish worshippers,' applies equally to Egypt. The ideas found in animal worship, and in the worship of gods, cannot be derived from a principle common to both, but have a local or historical origin. The various Nomes had each a special development, and

it was not till later, under the influence not only of theology, but also of the history of the monarchy, that Egyptian religion became uniform. Syncretism was the result of political circumstances; and the uniformity of belief was gained with great difficulty, in fact it was really never entirely accomplished, and Polytheism was never quite overcome. ED. MEYER on the whole agrees with this argument, but he limits the magic element, because he believes that the use of amulets and magic formulas was more general in later than in ancient times. MEYER also places side by side the polydæmonism of popular belief, and the worship of the great gods of light, who stand at the head, and about whom the myths are formed. Everything philosophical, a system of gods, genealogies, cosmogonies, and the whole secret doctrines are of a later development. WIEDEMANN also gives up deriving the various sides of Egyptian religion from one another, or from one common origin. He distinguishes three circles: that of Ra, with which later all sorts of gods were identified, that of the Triads, and that of the god of the dead, Osiris. With this we still have crude ancient nature worships, such as the worship of animals and trees, and a worship of abstract ideas (such as life, eternity, and truth), which occurs even in a text of the sixth dynasty.

In a similar way MASPERO distinguished three groups besides the worship of animals and fetishism: the gods of the dead (Sokari, Osiris, Isis, &c.), the gods of the elements (earth, heaven, primitive water, and the Nile), and the sun-gods (above all Ra); no pure Monotheism has ever been developed from this polytheistic mixture.

We have often mentioned the secret doctrine; in reference to this we must also examine the opposite views. An idea dating from the ancients ascribes a hidden wisdom to the Egyptian priests, which they jealously kept away from the uninitiated. Whilst the people were satisfied with the outer shell of religion, these sensuous representations were only symbols of a purer moral and spiritual meaning in the eyes of the priests. We learn from the statue of the Memphitic chief priest Ptahmer that he fathomed the mysteries of all the temples, but that he drew a veil over what he had seen. Many modern historians have protested against this conception of Egyptian religion. LE PAGE RENOUF can find in the texts no evidence of this distinction between an esoteric and an exoteric religion. MASPERO adds that even if such a hidden religion of initiated people existed, which he doubts, still the religion of the people must have preceded it; a symbol is always a second meaning for something else, it presupposes a worshipped animal or a myth, to which it can give a different meaning. TIELE absolutely refuses to recognise a secret doctrine: the priests did not keep their wisdom hidden, even from foreign travellers like Herodotus, and they themselves were in no way exalted above the mixture of spiritual and coarse conceptions. They represented education, but were by no means separated from the people by such a wide gulf, as the great difference between an esoteric and an exoteric teaching implies.

These objections are so far well grounded, that we cannot explain Egyptian religion as the cloak of certain abstract ideas; such a system was not original, and the sacred animals and myths do not owe their

existence to symbolism, although the system developed by BRUGSCH tends towards this view. Still it is doubtful whether the reaction against the admission of a secret science does not go too far. Some people, at least, cannot quite throw it off. It cannot, however, be regarded as an original profound wisdom, but as a spurious wisdom thought out by the priests. BRUGSCH also clearly distinguishes such a priestly, mystic language from the general Egyptian system of religion. Later scholars, like ED. MEYER, still speak of a secret wisdom which was developed in the new kingdom by the Theban priesthood. It finds expression in several hymns, as well as in many texts of the Book of the Dead; it contains a solar monotheism, an identification of almost all the gods, who are really only various shapes of one eternal god; a conception which, however, does not exclude coarse material ideas. In such a definition of the secret science, opinions are not so utterly antagonistic, since the opponents, even if they do not use this name, must make some place for the above-mentioned elements of the secret science. The older conception of an esoteric priestcraft can be regarded as antiquated.

Opinions vary also as to the fundamental concept of the Divine. It is of the greatest importance in all religions to find out what the meaning of the predicate God is, which is given to the single members of the pantheon. This question is generally, perhaps not always correctly, approached by means of etymology. Thus people try to fix the meaning of Nuter, the Egyptian word for god, which is, however, always used as an appellative, and never as a proper name. Since ROUGÉ, most Egyptologists agree in the explanation

that Nuter designates the god as constantly renewing himself, as eternally young, because continually begetting himself. In this word for god, we find therefore a fundamental feature of Egyptian mythology; namely, the god who generates himself and is identical with his own son. He is therefore often called the 'husband of his mother.' BRUGSCH holds this opinion, although he takes the conception of Nuter in a more general sense. The general unity of father, mother, and son, represents the unity of the begetting with the generating power and with the generated. Nuter means 'the active power, which in periodical rotation generates and produces things, lends them new life, and gives them the freshness of youth again;' the conception of Physis, natura, is entirely analogous. The definition which LE PAGE RENOUF defends is very different. According to him the fundamental meaning of Nuter is, 'strong, powerful' (the same meaning is found in ἱερός, Brahma, El). The gods are therefore 'the Powerful,' not only amongst the Egyptians, but according to the above combinations, amongst the Indo-Germans and Semites also. This explanation is so plausible as to make us almost suspicious, and the whole etymology is quite unsettled. An explanation given by LE PAGE RENOUF of another expression of what is divine, has been more widely accepted. The gods are often said to be 'living through Maat,' to be 'masters (possessors) of Maat.' This Maat is the goddess of rule, of right, and of truth. The regularity, the fixed order of nature, as of the world of morality, what is real, pure, and true, belong thus to the characters of the gods, without separating what is natural from what is moral: Maat comprehends them both. But here again we have

probably no original idea before us. In Egyptian antiquity the gods were certainly not conceived as moral beings. And Maat also was first the goddess of truth and justice, before she had any part in the cosmic order.

CHAPTER 47.—The Gods of Popular Belief.

It is quite impossible to enumerate all the gods worshipped by the Egyptians; it would be an utterly useless task to collect all the names of divine beings. As regards many, we possess but scanty information; and only a few single myths have come down to us. We must, as much as is possible, distinguish the different periods in the material which has been transmitted to us, and wherever we can, we must separate the original form of popular belief from the later systematic and theological treatment. Without attempting to explain the Egyptian divine beings from one common thought, or to represent them as a socially organised circle, we shall mention only the most important objects of worship amongst the people, and later on we shall cast a glimpse into the theologians' workshop.

We first meet with animal worship. No feature of Egyptian religion struck a stranger more quickly than the great reverence paid to sacred animals [1]. Even a Roman citizen could not escape from the people's vengeance when he had killed a cat, and

[1] The principal references about animal worship are: Herodotus, II. 65–76, III. 28; Diod. Sic. I. 83–90; Strabo, XVII. 38–40; Plutarch, De Is. et Os. 71–77. These afford a curious variety of explanations. A list of the sacred animals is given by WILKINSON (BIRCH), iii. 258 seq. and by PARTHEY, Plut. über Is. u. Os. 261 seq.

in the eyes of Juvenal the country was contemptible on account of this animal worship. Although this worship continued into later times, yet on the other hand it dated from great antiquity; for even under rulers of the first dynasties, animal worship is recorded.

We must now examine the meaning of animal worship. Greek authorities have set up various statements about it, and more modern savants have increased the number. Of all these conjectures only two need be taken into serious consideration: the symbolic and the fetish explanations. From the symbolic point of view, which BRUGSCH strongly defends, animals are worshipped, because in them certain attributes of the gods symbolically represented, were recognised; the fetish explanation recognises in animal worship a remnant of a more ancient crude religious phase. The symbolic explanation has the advantage of being held by the Egyptian priests themselves; it is certain, as is proved by the texts, that the priests looked on the sacred animals as symbols, and representatives of the gods. Nevertheless the fetish explanation recommends itself, since crude conceptions generally precede a deep symbolism. However, it is not easy to explain how the sacred animals were connected with the individual gods, and were regarded in the form under which they appeared as their incarnation, or 'renewed life.' Why does Thot have the head of an ibis and Hathor a cow's head? Some people think that the similarity of the hieroglyphics solves the riddle, but this is refuted with many examples by PIETSCHMANN. An attempt to give a totemistic explanation of animal worship has, as far as I know,

never been made by any Egyptologist. It seems difficult to trace a totemistic clanworship in Egypt, and the cult of animals was rather a worship of individual animals than of classes of animals.

The ancient Egyptians themselves regarded the different animals in various ways. Some were universally or almost universally worshipped, such as the cat, the sparrow-hawk; others, such as the crocodile and hippopotamus, were worshipped in certain provinces only, whilst they were hated in other provinces. Some we know were worshipped from their mummies being found, for instance, rats, owls, and swallows; some are closely connected with one special god, such as the hawk with Ra, the bird Bennu with Osiris, the jackal with Anubis. Although classes of animals were regarded with religious awe, yet individual animals were more especially objects of cult, such as the sacred goat of Mendes, and the sacred bulls Apis and Mnevis. The Apis (Hapi) was the sacred bull of Memphis. There were many signs necessary for an Apis, which are described by Aelian; for instance, spots in the shape of a triangle on the forehead, and a half-moon on the breast. If such an Apis was discovered, it was led with rejoicings into Memphis, it was carefully tended, and after its death was buried with great costliness. He was zealously worshipped and gave oracles. He was looked on as the second life, or the son of Ptah, the soul or image of Osiris, born [1] of a virgin cow. After his death he became Osiris-Apis or Serapis. Similar to the Apis worship at Memphis was that of the bull Mnevis, who

[1] A. MARIETTE, Mémoire sur la mère d'Apis (1856); he added many philosophical ideas to the conceptions in question.

was regarded as the incarnation of Ra in Heliopolis. The animal which occurs most frequently is the beetle or scarab. This animal plays a great part in the system of symbols; the Egyptians imagined that it propagated itself without a female, and the sign for a scarab was expressed by the word Kheper, meaning to be, to exist; from this again the name of a god is derived which means the 'existing one,' and this has caused many speculations in regard to Egyptian monotheism. But however this may be, it is certain that the scarab occurs often in the symbols of the sun-gods as well as in those used on tombs; in many mummies, a scarab with inscription is found on the spot where the heart has been taken from the body, and buried by itself. We must still mention the fabulous bird Bennu, which is the symbol for the resurrection in the Book of the Dead; some people suppose this gave rise to the fable of the Phœnix.

As has already been said, we cannot even approximately enumerate all the Egyptian gods. The religion of Egypt was simply a deification of almost everything: heaven, earth, sun, moon, stars, the sacred river, trees, animals, the departed and the living (for instance the Pharaohs), and abstract ideas: all these elements were from ancient times closely connected, and mixed up in the worship of the people, and at an early date were explained and their reference to each other shown in the symbolical system of the theologians. Some elements, however, as for instance the ancient Egyptian worship of the stars, were forced into the background. We shall now enumerate the most important gods, but we must notice that with many the original meaning has become obscured by later explanations, because the

gods became cosmic powers, or the individual forms were combined together.

The Egyptians regarded the earth as a god called Sab (or Qeb), the heaven as a goddess called Nut. They were originally united, but were divided by Shu, in such a manner that the arms and legs of the goddess hung down to earth on both sides and therefore the heaven was never quite raised to the heights, whilst Shu had for ever to support the goddess. The goddess of the sky is also represented as Hathor, in the shape of a cow.

The god common to most Egyptians is the sun-god Ra. His person is more living than most of the other Egyptian gods; this fact we owe to the myths in which he plays the principal part. Whilst sailing over the ocean of heaven in a boat, he daily conquers the opponent snake, the demon of darkness (Apep). In a fight with Isis, Ra is betrayed by the goddess, who first heals him from the poison of a serpent, after he has revealed his hidden name to her. At the same time he has to concede his eyes, the sun and moon, to Horus. Although we here see traces of a weakening of Ra's power, yet in another myth we are told how mankind was roused against the god, and Hathor organised a fearful massacre amongst men, until Ra himself put an end to the butchery. Ra is also praised as the creator and ruler of the world, in hymns occurring in chapters fifteen and seventeen of the Book of the Dead. His identification with other gods is prehistoric: such as Tum the sun-god of Heliopolis, Anhouri the conquering sun of Thinis, Harmakhis and Horus, the two horizons. Obelisks and sphinxes are dedicated to this Ra-Harmakhis, with the sun's disc,

the Uraeus snake, and the Horus hawk; the Pharaoh is the incarnation of this godhead.

The heaven or sun-god Horus was worshipped almost as generally as Ra. He was honoured in various shapes in Egypt: as Haroeri (the older), Harpechrud (Harpokrates, the child), as the son of Isis, of Nut, or of Hathor, in many places in Upper Egypt (as at Edfu) and in Lower Egypt. His symbol is the winged sun-disc, and he flies through the air as a hawk. His chief myth is that of the fight with Set. But it is difficult to trace his original form, as he is completely absorbed in the Osiris circle to which he certainly did not originally belong.

We know the myth of Osiris from the detailed account given by Plutarch, the actual statements of which are supported from Egyptian sources. The myth, telling how his brother Set murders him treacherously, how his wife Isis wanders about lamenting, and how his son Horus revenges him, is well known [1]. People do not yet agree as to the original character of Osiris. MASPERO tried to discover the development of this god, and maintains that Osiris was originally and essentially a god of the dead, the first man, son of the heaven and earth, and as such the god of the dead. He also says that the original home of Osiris was not at Abydus, but in the Delta: at Busiris and Mendes. However this may be, Osiris was to the Egyptians above all things a god of the dead, more especially in a beneficial way as Onnoris. But he was identified, at an early date, with the sun; chapter seventeen of the Book of the Dead calls 'Ra the soul of Osiris, and Osiris the soul of Ra.'

[1] E. LEFÉBURE, Le mythe osirien: I. Les yeux d'Horus, II. Osiris (1874).

Opinions vary very much in regard to Set[1]. Set or Sutech, called by the Greeks Typhon, was looked on as the god of everything antagonistic in nature. He was the god of the Hyksos during their rule in Egypt; therefore the question arises, did these foreigners bring him with them or borrow him from the Egyptians? DE ROUGÉ, PLEYTE, and LIEBLEIN, amongst others, hold the former opinion and look on Set as an ancient Semitic godhead. But most Egyptologists regard him as an original Egyptian god, though they explain his character very differently. According to LEPSIUS, EBERS, and others, he was originally a beneficent god, but became a hated and hostile deity during the time of the Hyksos. But if Set from the very beginning was the enemy of the beneficent gods of light, Osiris and Horus, then he must always be conceived malignant, either as the fearful life-destroying heat of the sun (TIELE, PIERRET), or as the god of darkness (ED. MEYER). The battle between Osiris and Set would then be (according to LE PAGE RENOUF, who does not however consider Set to have been originally malignant) similar to the conflict between Ra and the snake Apep; Set's victory would be the swallowing of light by night, and Horus' revenge would be the appearance of a new day's light. With this explanation we must account for the passages in which Set is distinctly pointed out as a sun-god. To explain this, we can appeal to the identification of the Egyptian Set with the Baal of Semitic immigrants, or to the systematising of the deities, by which all gods were made into sun-gods. Set's wife was his sister Nefthys, whom we always

[1] ED. MEYER, Set-Typhon (1875).

find with Isis in friendly relations with her brother Osiris and bewailing him; Nefthys is even said to have been the mother of Anubis by Osiris.

Closely connected with Osiris, especially by their funereal meanings, are two other gods, Thot and Anubis. Thot[1] (Tehuti) is generally drawn with an ibis head, or as a dog-ape. We recognise in him the moon-god, but he generally appears as the god of civilisation (of intelligence and writing), or as the god who protects and revives dead bodies. He is worshipped more especially at Sesennu (Hermopolis and in the peninsula of Sinai. Anubis is the son of Osiris, the god with the jackal's head, the ruler of graves, who supervises the burial of the dead.

Amongst the oldest and most important gods of Egypt we must mention Ptah, the god of Memphis, whose worship flourished even in the ancient kingdom. Unfortunately we know hardly anything about his original meaning, since we only possess texts about him, coloured by much speculation. He is represented as a mummy or a dwarf, with a scarab on his head, and a crocodile under his feet. His name is often explained to mean 'the opener'; his most prominent function is that of the creator; he formed heaven and earth as well as mankind. He is combined with an otherwise unknown god, Sokar, also with Osiris, under the name of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris. The relation in which Herodotus places him with the Phoenician gods, the Pataekoi, has led to most confusing speculations. His wife is the lion-headed Sekhet and Imhotep is her son.

[1] R. PIETSCHMANN, Hermes Trismegistos (1875).

We know of many other gods, who were held in great reverence in smaller localities or in larger districts; and in the theological texts, cosmogonic, solar, or funeral functions were attributed to them, but little can be said as to their original signification. This is the case with gods such as Chum or Knef in Nubia, and near the cataracts, Khem or Min in Panopolis and Koptos, who increases the fruitfulness of fields and trees, the crocodile-god Sebak in Fayum, the warlike Munt in On-Hermopolis, and the great goddess of Saiş, Neith, who was probably of Libyan origin like the goddess Bast at Bubastis.

We can more easily understand the worship of the god Hapi, the Nile. We can readily realise that the Egyptians paid divine honours to the river that brought them all blessings. It is true no special temples seem to have been erected to this god, but we find that gifts were presented to him everywhere, and he was worshipped as a god in hymns and was identified with other gods.

As yet we have left one of the greatest gods unnoticed, who was destined to absorb all others, namely Amon of Thebes. Although this figure has been of great importance in the theological system, yet we know little of its origin. We see the form of this god, when it has been developed by priests and kings; but the hymns in his honour do not tell us who Amon was in the popular belief. We shall come across him again when discussing the theology. He was represented like the other gods with the signs of power and life; above his crown were two long feathers. The Greeks called him Zeus (hence Thebes was called

Diospolis), and Herodotus derives from Thebes the founding of the two oracles, at Dodona and in the Libyan desert (famous by the visit of Alexander the Great). Amon's wife was Mut and his son Khonsu.

We will not make this list of gods any longer. Every place, every period, and every great function had its own god. Foreign gods also crept in. The Semitic gods, Baal and Astarte, possessed temples in the Delta. The deformed god Bes was dedicated to averting the evil eye and to articles of toilet; most people think he came from Arabia, but PLEYTE considers that he came from the Somali coast of Africa. In much later times, under the Ptolemies, we find the introduction of the worship of an idol which was brought from Sinope to Alexandria, as is minutely related by Plutarch and Tacitus. This strange god was called Serapis; we must carefully distinguish between this Greek god Serapis and the native deceased Apis [1]. The Egyptians who in ancient times received so much that was foreign into their religion, were very cautious in regard to Greek gods and cult.

CHAPTER 48. — **Death, the Tomb, and the Lower World.**

Books of Reference. See the chapters about this in LE PAGE RENOUF and LIEBLEIN and in other general works on the subject, and also the reproductions in WILKINSON'S work. About the Book of the Dead see what has already been said. Compare also H. RHIND, Thebes, its tombs and their tenants (1862); A. MARIETTE, Sur les tombes de l'ancien empire que l'on trouve à Saqqarah (Rev. Archéol. 1869); H. BRUGSCH, Die ägyptische Gräberwelt (1868); J. DUMICHEN, Ueber die Tempel und Gräber im alten Aegypten und ihre Bildwerke und Inschriften (1872); G. MASPERO, Etude sur quelques peintures et sur quelques textes relatifs aux funérailles (J. As. 1880); many of

[1] E. PLEW, De Sarapide (1868), cp. Plut De Is. et Os. c. 28 (compare with this PARTHEY'S Excurs.), and Tacit. Hist. IV. 83 f.

MASPERO'S essays in R. H. R. 1885–1889, about the newest discoveries in the tombs.

It is well known how strongly Egyptian life was influenced by thoughts of death. Almost all we know concerning Egyptian antiquity, we owe to the tombs: and the vivid pictures we make to ourselves of domestic and social life in the valley of the Nile, are derived from pictures on the walls of the funeral chambers; the most important texts are those found on the sarcophagi or in the papyri of the dead. The Egyptians considered, as Diodorus so well says, the houses of the living as inns, and the tombs of the dead as eternal habitations. But it would be wrong to conclude from this, that they entirely sacrificed their present life to the future. The life after death is not to render this life of no value; but one may follow earthly pleasures without troubling oneself. Life in the other world is framed on the model of the earthly life. The sarcophagus is therefore called 'the lord of life,' and dead persons are called 'the living ones' (anchiu).

What was done with the body is described by Herodotus, II. 85–90, and Diodorus, I. 91–93, and also in the book of ritual for embalming; besides this we learn much from the mummies and the tombs themselves. The preparations necessary for the burial of an important person or a Pharaoh were enormous; poorer people of course did not expend so much. Armies of workers were employed for a rich man during the eighty days which had to pass between death and burial. First of all the body had to be embalmed. The cuts, the extracting of the soft parts of the body, and the embalming could be done in various ways: the

mummies from Thebes, and those from Memphis vary in many ways. The entrails were not thrown into the Nile, as is wrongly stated by Porphyrius, but were interred in special small boxes. Then the body was carefully wrapped round and its natural form was adhered to as much as possible. But the business of the Taricheutai and others, who had to do with the body, formed only a part of the work during these days. The sarcophagus, of which we possess valuable examples in granite with artistic carving, had to be made, and the vault had to be prepared. It was a duty to provide this tomb with all sorts of things, so that the deceased should want nothing. Therefore carpenters, sculptors, weavers, and workmen of all sorts were engaged to make the dwelling of the departed habitable. At last the day arrived for taking possession of his dwelling. The deceased was carried there in a solemn procession, which we often find painted on tombs. The procession consisted of the mourning relations, of hired female mourners, of slaves weighed down with luggage, of priests who either read funeral sentences aloud or carried sacrificial offerings, and of all the furniture for the tomb; the mummy itself was generally drawn on a cart by oxen. Thus they started from the deceased's house and turned towards the west, to the river where the procession was ferried over in boats. At the entrance of the tomb, the mummy was stood upright for the relations to take a last farewell, which often gave rise to most touching scenes and loud lamentations. From Greek authorities, some people gather that a sort of tribunal awaited the dead man here, which refused him the right of burial, if he was declared to be guilty; but

this is an error, as MASPERO has proved, since the judgment which awaited the dead man in the lower world would thus be represented as taking place on earth.

The bodies of the poorer people were laid in natron and then simply wrapped in a cloth and buried in the sandy soil; some mummies were kept in a special part of their private houses; but if the expenses could be borne, they erected an 'everlasting house' like the pyramids, or brick buildings of the ancient kingdom, or the rock tombs of Upper Egypt. A symbolic meaning is attached to the fact, that the large cities of the dead, like those of Memphis and Thebes, lay in the west, and also to the crossing of the Nile; the land of the dead is the land of the setting sun. In choosing and building a grave, the idea of preserving the body is always kept in mind: people are buried in sand not reached by the inundation of the Nile, and the strong buildings, the entrance to which is often carefully hidden, are made so that greed or hatred cannot enter in.

Many tombs consist of three parts: first the chapel, where the person (ka) lived, and received visits and offerings. Close to this is a walled-in space (serdab), where statues of the person were preserved, and had incense offered to them. Then there were various passages, and finally the place where the mummy rested, which was deeply hidden, walled in or else shut off by blocks of stone. It is true that these careful precautions were useless, for even in antiquity thieves and robbers knew how to find the means to gain an entrance, and most of the graves were desecrated.

When the dead man has reached his grave, he begins a new life. This is symbolically represented

by his legs being set free and the mouth and eyes opened; he lives again, and can walk, speak, and see. Then an offering is made and the funeral feast is held, at which the mummy takes part. Meanwhile songs are sung inviting people to partake freely. A certain sceptic vein can be found in fragments of some of these songs which we possess. The song of the harpist, and that in honour of Prince Antuf[1], contain an invitation to enjoy the present moment; one should enjoy life before descending to the gloomy dwelling, to the land from which there is no returning; everything is vain, therefore we should have a joyful day before death destroys happiness. But this tone is not general. We must be careful not to represent the Egyptian teaching about death as being uniform everywhere. Here also there are different shades of meaning, and there probably was a development connected with these ideas. The worship of the dead was however common throughout Egypt. We find amongst the Egyptians, as amongst many other nations, that the care of the dead was a sacred duty. This was not limited to the funeral, but prayers had to be said for the departed, and sacrifices had to be offered to them. For this purpose, therefore, the rich people formed a fund, from which priests were paid to take care of their graves and to offer sacrifices. How long such a foundation could last is shown by the fact that under the twenty-sixth dynasty, priests officiated in the service of the builders of the great pyramids of the ancient kingdom. Of course this organisation may have been renewed from time to time. The duty of caring for the dead, by regular sacrificial gifts, devolved more

[1] R. P. IV, VI.

especially on the son of the departed; therefore to possess a son is a blessing, and the want of one 'to sit on the father's seat' is a curse. The dead are so much in need of gifts and prayers that they implore them from passers by; many inscriptions actually conjure the traveller to offer a Suten-hotep-ta (a sacred prayer) for the departed.

These formulas have a magic effect: the thousands of bread, the thousands of beer, the thousands of cattle, the thousands of geese which are desired for the dead person, he is supposed actually to enjoy. The painted viands and fields form part of his actual possessions; and the little images which accompany him, work for him, if he has to till the ground in the other world. Therefore everything in the cult of the dead is really magical. The inscriptions on tombs and sarcophagi, the papyri, the amulets, the scarabs, and the Hypokephalœa, all possess magic power.

This magic cult of the dead is supposed to provide the departed one with everything he needs, to prevent his dying a second time. Numerous formulas protect him against hunger and thirst, crocodiles and snakes, and give him pure water to drink, and fresh air to breathe. Then also various ceremonies and formulas give him back his life. His mouth and eyes are opened, he is cleansed with water and incense, his shadow, heart, and name are given back to him; opportunities are afforded him to go out during the day, so that he need not dwell continuously in his tomb.

The soul having escaped from the body is divided into various parts; Ka and Ba are of especial importance. Ka is the likeness of the man, his double, εἴδωλον. Le Page Renouf has accepted genius or

image as the translation of this word. This Ka answers very well to the description given by H. SPENCER of the 'other self'; it is a more spiritual, but still a material portrait of the man, which during his life exists in him as a spirit, and after death stays around him. The statue of the departed which is erected in the tomb is meant for a dwelling-place for this Ka. It is really for this being that the worship of the dead is meant; gifts are brought to him, the spiritual essence (odour) of which he inhales; the priest of the dead is called the Ka priest. But while Ka remains in the tomb, it is quite different with Ba, the soul, and its spiritual substance, the luminous being, called Khu. These two leave the dwellings of the dead, and are subjected to many fates, changes, and wanderings in other spheres. We can clearly see that these two doctrines, that of Ka and of Ba, are derived from two very different systems of thought, and do not originally belong together, but were connected much later. One chapter of the Book of the Dead (chapter 89) describes how the soul, in the shape of a sparrow-hawk, visits the mummy to see if it is still preserved. For it is necessary for a future uniting with the soul, that the body should be made lasting; this depends greatly on the preservation of the heart, which is specially buried. If the body has decayed then this is fatal to the existence of Ka and Ba, who have thus lost their material foundation. Such a case is met by the precaution of erecting several statues of the dead, which, if necessary, that is if the mummy is destroyed, can take its place and have life put into them. But naturally the preservation of the mummy itself is much more desirable. The genii of the tomb are

entrusted with the preservation of the mummy for resurrection.

The cult of the dead does not merely deal with the departed one as resting in his tomb, but is also concerned with the fate of the soul in the other world. The Egyptians have not developed any uniform doctrine concerning the future world. They sometimes thought of a land to the west of Abydus, the entrance to which, through the mountain rocks, was only found with great trouble, and could only be passed with the help of the gods. Sometimes they thought of a land in the heights above, into which the souls had to fly up like birds, or to climb up, as by a ladder. Sometimes the islands of the blessed were portrayed like the fruitful fields of Ialu in the marshy district of the Delta. However, Duat was never an underground world. It was rather a dark space above the stars, where the sun, as a dead Pharaoh, has to undertake a dangerous journey of twelve stages, in a ship from the west to the east. Maspero has tried to examine critically the various details, in the minute descriptions of these journeys, and in the geography of Duat, as given in the texts. The picture of the life in Duat is by no means cheerful; it is a dark country, where dangers of all sorts can only be escaped by magic means. On the other hand the fields of Ialu, where there is splendid air, and where a rich harvest rejoices the heart of man, are to be looked for with joy.

The question now arises as to whether the lot of man in the future depends on moral causes. This was certainly not the case originally. Magic means and the gifts of the living procured a happy existence to the departed; and the rich and powerful

who could procure these means, had the greatest advantage. But afterwards morality entered into the cult of the dead. The 125th chapter of the Book of the Dead describes the judgment of the departed, who stand before the divine tribunal in the great judgment hall to be absolved from sins. This chapter, which is more a work by itself, is most curious, and the picture in it is well known by many reproductions. We see in this picture how the deceased is led in by the goddess of truth. His heart is weighed in the balance against the feather of truth; this is done by Horus and Anubis, whilst Thot inscribes the result on a slate. Beyond the scales sits an animal, a sort of dog of hell, and beyond still on a lotus flower sit the four spirits of the tomb, Amset, Hapi, Kebsenef, and Tiumutef, and finally comes Osiris, and above him the smaller figures of the forty-two judges of the other world. The text starts with the supposition that the deceased is vindicated, and the monster close to the scale is perhaps the only allusion to any doom or punishment. We here meet with many ideas placed side by side, which can hardly belong together. Magic plays a great part, and much importance is attributed to the knowledge of the names; the door does not admit the deceased until he has called by their proper name, the threshold, the posts, &c. Then he steps before Osiris and the forty-two judges with joyful confidence, because he knows their names. But on the other hand much depends on moral worth. The deceased stands before the tribunal with the knowledge of being free from sins which could condemn him; he makes a sort of confession of innocence, in which he enumerates the sins from which he knows

he is free. This is a wonderful fragment, which gives us at the same time a glimpse into the moral claims made by the Egyptians.

The identification of the deceased with the godhead is very ancient, more especially with Osiris, and he is therefore called the 'Osiris so and so,' and is represented with the small beard of the gods. This identification is met with as early as on the coffin of King Menkara, one of the pyramid builders of the ancient kingdom, and the most important paragraphs of the Book of the Dead attest this belief (cp. the old chapter 17, and also chapters 64 and 72; the hymn also to the sun in chapter 15 starts from the same conception). The antiquity of this idea can be gathered from the fact that the gods of Thebes do not occur in it; the religion of the dead is occupied with Osiris and his circle, and with the sun-gods of On-Heliopolis, such as Tum and Ra, who were combined with the Osiris religion. In chapter 42 we find an isolated statement of the idea that the various members of the departed are connected with some special god; generally we find the idea that the dead becomes one with Osiris. This is why Abydus is of such importance in the worship of the dead; many people are buried in the town of Osiris, or at least send a stele there. The crossing of the Nile became an emblem of the crossing into a world on the other side, and in this symbolical sense we must accept the accounts of seas of the dead, over which the funeral procession passed.

By his identification with the god, the deceased takes his place in the boat of the sun. But he also takes part in the battles of the sun-gods; the contrasts between

light and darkness, life and death are combined. The complete identification of the resurrection (the stepping out into light) of the god Osiris, with that of the departed is strongly emphasised in certain important texts, which occur also on the funeral papyri; namely, in the lamentations of Isis and Nefthys and the book of the breath of life[1]. In order to assist the departed the necessary prayers and names are enclosed in his coffin, and are written on his sarcophagus; this is the origin of funeral literature, of which we possess the largest and most important collection in the Book of the Dead.

We have only given a few of the most important ideas connected with this literature of the dead, in so far as it is known to us. There still remains much to be discovered. We are not yet clear to what extent the Egyptians believed in the migration of souls. In the Book of the Dead no less than twelve chapters treat of metamorphoses, without throwing much light on the subject. The departed takes various forms (a hawk, or a serpent, &c.), but what is meant by this is not clear. It is true Herodotus ascribes this teaching of the migration of souls to the Egyptians, but these metamorphoses do not take place on earth, and are not in the form of a punishment or purification, but are quite voluntary; therefore they have nothing in common with the Indian or Pythagorean migrations of souls. BIRCH sees a mythical meaning in these texts, and refers them to the absorption of the soul in the cosmic soul; BRUGSCH refers them to a solar birth; MASPERO considers metempsychosis as a heliopolitan dogma. Still the riddle remains unanswered.

[1] R. P. II. IV.

CHAPTER 49.—The Theological and Cosmogonic Systems.

We have repeatedly mentioned the theological work the 'secret wisdom' of the Egyptians, in our short summary of the various opinions on Egyptian religion, as well as in our enumeration of the individual gods. We considered that we had to base our enquiries on popular belief, and could not allow that the gods and their myths owed their origin to philosophical conceptions. But this error is very natural, and we cannot wonder that, after the example of the Greeks, many in the present day should fall into it.

The Egyptians themselves regarded their religion as symbolical. This opinion may not have been held originally by all people, yet we find it at quite an early date, and amongst the wide circles of people educated by the priests. These explained their religion by theological and philosophical thoughts, without surrendering therefore its material reality. In this lies the great difficulty of forming a clear opinion about the Egyptian religion. In Egypt the stage on which theological speculation takes place was reached at an early date; even the beginnings of philosophical thought can here be traced; but all this is not as yet freed from the forms of mythical thought and expression, and even in the consciousness of the priestly theologians themselves, the spiritual kernel is not free from its material shell, and cannot even be distinguished from it. We can therefore recognise in these speculations, vain, empty, meaningless symbols, or on the contrary, profound thoughts, which penetrate to the essence of things: but we have no full right to do either. What we have before us is a process

of thought which has never reached its maturity. Our sources of information are far from being sufficient for us to represent it historically, or judge it correctly. It is certainly not a uniform doctrine, but it consists of many more or less finished systems, which have been formed in the various centres of learning. We only know a few of them, namely, those which proceeded from On-Heliopolis and Thebes. Added to this we hardly possess any Egyptian texts which are not under the influence of this theological work, which do not breathe the spirit of this 'secret doctrine.' We do not deduce from this the originality of this doctrine, but it becomes impossible for us to form any clear idea of the religion which preceded it, since this doctrine colours almost all our sources of information. Of certain gods, such as Ptah, Chnum, and even Amon, we know hardly more than their meaning in theological speculation; others, such as Ra, Thot, and Osiris whom we know rather more in their character as popular gods, we regard nevertheless chiefly through the glasses of theology. We have no measure to carry out the distinction between the elements which belonged to popular faith and to theology.

Under these circumstances we must be satisfied with this. We do not attempt to explain the symbols. We do not know what was meant by making the scarab the symbol of generation, the hawk the symbol of the mother goddesses, and the cow the symbol of heaven, &c., or whether such combinations owed their origin to anything besides the accidental likeness of language or writing. Nor shall we attempt a systematic representation, since up to the present it could only rest on an arbitrary selection of materials.

We shall therefore again keep ourselves to an enumeration of those ideas which are most prominent.

We must first draw attention to the general identification of the gods with one another. We perceive at once, even with a superficial acquaintance with the texts, how impossible it is to distinguish from each other the attributes of the individual gods or the spheres of their activity. From this arises the assertion made by many Egyptologists that fundamentally the Egyptian gods all meant the same thing: the gods represented the sun, and the goddesses, mothers or something else. This was most certainly not the case. But at a very early date the gods were almost all represented as being gods of light. Hence the combined names of Amon-Ra, Ra-Osiris and others. This is the reason why it is so difficult to fathom the nature of the gods from the texts. Ptah is certainly not originally a sun-god; still he is most distinctly called the sun-disc, &c. The fact that Set appears in the boat of the sun, does not determine his original nature. All these phenomena can be explained by the fact that theology reduced the plurality of gods, which were allowed to subsist, to a substantial unity.

This can also be seen from the way in which each god, without excluding others, but actually in his unity with them, is worshipped as the highest god. And this is not the result of the exigency of piety, which states the god in question to be all powerful, and expects everything from him, but it is speculation which reaches to a highest being, permeating the whole world, the cosmic power which is revealed throughout nature, but more especially in the light of heaven. It is worth while to illustrate this conception

by the most striking examples. Thus Ra is identical with Tum, Osiris, and Horus, the highest god [1], the creator, who only proceeds from himself, and lets all creatures proceed from himself, who shines in the heavens, but also rules in Ament, the only existing one, the being, the father of the gods, the hidden and revealed being. Osiris is presented in a not more limited manner; we need only think of the long list of his names in the Book of the Dead, chapter 142, which represents him as the only one, the master of life, who is worshipped in all places, under all forms. But Chnum and also Ptah are not less the only god, the workman, creator, master of truth, and father of Ra, the god of light.

In no god can we more easily trace the transition from the popular fancy, which originates the form of worship, to the mystic theological idea, than in Thot. His functions in the popular belief are large enough, as god of measuring (we have already mentioned that he was probably originally a moon-god), of intelligence, of writing, who at the judgment in the lower world, enters on a slate, the guilt or innocence of the dead. But theology gives him cosmic functions. He becomes the divine word, who determines the victory of light over darkness, who gives back his eye to the sun, and administers truth, that is, cosmic order; for 'what flows from his mouth, is, and what he says, becomes.' Then he is 'the unborn, only god,' ruler of heaven and earth, 'originator of the types of what is, and what shall be;' in the fullest sense he is Hermes Trisme-

[1] Book of the Dead, chap. 17, in which BRUGSCH (Rel. u. Myth. p. 21) has tried to separate the older from the younger elements by different types in printing. Cp. also a 'Litany of Ra,' R. P. VIII.

gistos. The same is the case in the worship of the Nile; the popular character of this worship can easily be understood, but it has also assumed a mystical shape. Father Nile is not only praised under the many names which describe him as the broad, the full, the renewed, &c., but also worshipped as the master of the fish, and the giver of blessing, on whom all fruitfulness depends. In a well-known Nile hymn [1] theology includes this god also within its domain; he is comprised with Amon, Ra, and Ptah as an invisible, hidden god, and represented as a divine being from whom light itself emanates. Thus cosmogonically the terrestrial river is combined with the water of heaven: but the mystery of the apparition of the Nile contributed not a little to this mystic conception, as the dead on his journey to the lower world was supposed to reach its unknown sources (Book of the Dead, 146).

The goddesses also are transformed into cosmic powers. Thus we find the great goddess of Sais, called Neith, in whose temple according to Greek accounts, this inscription might be read: 'I am, what is, what shall be and what has been. No one has lifted my chiton. The sun was the fruit I bore [2].' The Egyptian texts entirely corroborate this conception of Neith as the mother of Ra, who created everything. Much the same is said in the inscriptions on the temple at Dendera about Hathor, in which she is described as the mother of god, the mistress of heaven, and the creative goddess of light.

But in this sense no god is more strongly spoken of

[1] R. P. IV.

[2] Plato, Timaeus, p. 21 E; Plutarch, De Is. et Os. c. 9, who wrongly considers Isis to be the goddess of Sais.

than Amon, who in the Theban period, that is in the classical epoch of literature, actually absorbed all other gods. Amongst the most important hymns to the gods, one in honour of Amon-Ra belongs probably to the time of the nineteenth dynasty [1]. Amon is here symbolically represented in the likeness of a bull; he is called 'his Mother's bull,' a simile of the creative renewing power, which is clear from what we have already said. In all this the thought of a general creation is prominent. Amon is the ruler of the gods and men who created both, who called forth light, who gives sustenance to animals and growth to plants, who supports everything, the only one, the creator of the whole earth. He is also the ruler of Thebes, and from him, men in their various circumstances expect life and happiness.

Thus theology represents these gods throughout as cosmic powers, which bring forth, support, and animate the whole world, and are revealed in the whole world. From this we can clearly see how close is the connection between theological and cosmological ideas; in Egypt also, cosmogony is theogony. We may at once remark that this originates with the representation of the birth of light.

The Egyptians, like many other nations, regarded water as the element from which all life takes its being. This original water is called Nun, and it includes the ocean of heaven as well as the sea that surrounds the earth and also the Nile; it contains all male and female germs of life (fathers and mothers, bull and cow, scarab and hawk), and the creative gods are probably identified with this Nun.

[1] R. P. II. This is the same hymn that GRÉBAUT has published, richly annotated.

More especially is the birth of the sun-god traced from this original water; Ra appears from Nun, but we find also the conception of a cosmic egg from which Ra steps out.

We must still consider the various cycles and systems of gods. Herodotus (II. 145) even distinguished three orders of gods: the first cycle consisting of eight, the second of twelve, and the third of the descendants of these twelve gods. Herodotus includes amongst the eight most ancient gods, Pan of Mendes and Leto of Buto; he counts Herakles amongst the twelve gods, whilst Osiris is said to belong to the youngest cycle. The various opinions held by modern scholars about the first cycle of gods can be found in a work on the subject by LEPSIUS; he himself has arrived at the following conclusions in reference to the oldest cycle of Egyptian gods. The three cycles of gods given by Herodotus correspond to the three dynasties of gods given by Manetho: but both writers only give us the traditions of lower Egypt. A cycle of the highest gods can often be met with on monuments: consisting of Mentu, Atmu (Tum), Mu and Tefnet, Seb and Nut, Osiris and Isis, Set and Nefthys, Horus and Hathor. There, as well as in Manetho, Osiris belongs to the most ancient cycle, and not, as is wrongly stated by Herodotus, to the youngest cycle. Neither the names nor number of the gods belonging to the first cycle are always the same; in Memphis, Ptah heads the list, but in Thebes we find Amon. In this highest cycle of gods, which was completed since, or even before the beginning of the Menes kingdom, the local or individual was subordinated to the general: the common national

sun-god Ra (in his two forms of Mentu and Atmu) stands at the head, without any female principle by his side, and then the pairs of gods which follow are subordinate to him. Thus far reaches LEPSIUS' opinion, to whom belongs the honour of having thrown light on the complicated conceptions in regard to the Egyptian pantheon. In recent times opinions regarding these cycles of gods are widely separated. Whereas BRUGSCH places them in an abstract philosophical conception, as a fundamental dogma of the Egyptian religious system, MASPERO regards them as proofs of the various theological schools, of which the school of On-Heliopolis is best known to us. Amongst the few points on which these two scholars agree, we find they attribute far less importance to the triads than was formerly done. Many Egyptian gods have become united into triads, by the amalgamation of myths or cults; but we have already noticed that even the triad of Osiris, Isis, and Horus was not originally connected, and the combination of the three gods is often very artificial and far less real. We do not by any means always find the relationship of father, mother, and son; the triad of Elephantine consists of the Nile-god Chnum, and the two water-goddesses Anukit and Sakit. Of far greater importance is the grouping of the nine gods, which was settled at On-Heliopolis even in prehistoric times. At the head stood Tum, the sun-god, who living in the original water Nu, produced from himself Shu and Tafnut; earth (Seb) and heaven (Nut) were divided and their children were Osiris and Isis, Set and Nefthys. This group of nine was changed in other places so that the local gods, such as Ptah, Thot, Neith, Hathor,

&c., were placed at the head, instead of Tum. A peculiar system prevailed at Hermopolis, where eight gods, or rather four gods with their female counterparts, were subordinated to Thot. This Ogdoad consisted of the gods Nun, Heh, Kek, and Nenu, each with a female companion. They were represented with frog and snake heads, also in the forms of dog-apes who saluted the rising and the setting sun. Opinions vary much as to the origin of this idea. LEPSIUS[1] saw in these four gods, the four elements, water, fire, earth, and air; but he derives the whole idea from the Greek theory of elements, and believes that it only made its way into Egypt under the Ptolemies. The correctness of this explanation has been refuted by DÜMICHEN and BRUGSCH. The latter discusses most thoroughly the cosmogonic speculations of the Egyptians. In the birth of light from water (Ra from Nun) he sees the starting-point of all the mythical conceptions of the Egyptians; LEPSIUS also looks on this as an ancient Egyptian idea. But BRUGSCH goes still further. He sees in Nun and his wife, original matter, in Heh and his wife, active power, which is looked on as time (Aion), desire (Eros), and air (Pneuma); in Kek and his wife, darkness (Erebos); and in Nenu and his wife, the cosmic sediment. He compares these conceptions with the foreign views of Hesiod or of the cosmogonies of the Phœnicians, but still he recognises them as ancient Egyptian. He sums up the contents of these original conceptions as follows: 'In the beginning there was no heaven and no earth. Surrounded by thick darkness, a limitless original water, called

[1] R. LEPSIUS, Ueber die Götter der vier Elemente bei den Aegyptern (1857).

Nun, filled everything, and this water hid in its lap male and female germs, or "the beginnings" of the future world. The divine original spirit, inseparable from the original element of the original water, felt a desire to create something, and his word woke the world to life, but the shape and image rich in forms had been reflected beforehand in his eye. Its bodily outlines and colours corresponded according to their origin to truth, that is to say to the original ideas of the divine spirit on his future work. The first act of creation began with the formation of an egg from the original waters, from which broke out the light of day (Ra), the immediate cause (ra) of life in the domain of the terrestrial world. In the rising sun, the omnipotence of the divine spirit was embodied in its most resplendent shape.' We must distinctly put away the impression that these ideas in this abstract form, were held by the Egyptians, on the contrary they have been distilled from the symbols. But even when a true conception of these symbols causes us much trouble, this fact is established, that the Egyptians at an early date occupied themselves with all sorts of theological and cosmogonic speculations, and tried to systematise their religion. We even find various explanations of myths. BRUGSCH has tried to prove from the monuments, that all modern methods of explaining myths (the ethical, physical, historical, eclectic, and linguistic methods), were represented even from the most ancient times of Egyptian history by philosophical priests. It is certainly true, that even in very old texts we find traces of theological thought far beyond the stage of naive faith. If therefore writers of a later date, such as Manetho, Plutarch,

and Jamblichus, look on the gods of Egypt euhemeristically as ancient kings of the land, or physically as elementary or cosmogonic powers, or morally as moral principles; or if they use etymological tricks to explain the names and the nature of the gods, we must be careful that we do not at once attribute all these ideas to the ancient Egyptian priests. But we must not from the outset deny the possibility of certain things dating from ancient tradition; for in ancient texts we often find similar statements. It is most remarkable, considering the great age of these speculations, that the priests who thus speculated on the essence, yet clung so fast to the word, and did not relinquish form for matter. It is quite wrong to imagine that they supported a religion for the people only, and did not believe in it themselves. It is true, they symbolised a great deal, but did not themselves despise the value of the outward figures which they explained symbolically. The deceitfulness of priests as little explains the permanent stability of a religion, as the origin of a religion.

Chapter 50. — **Worship and Morals.**

As far back as we can see into Egyptian antiquity, we find the love for great buildings strongly developed. The princes of the ancient kingdom are mentioned as great builders, and the pyramids date from them. Of the numerous temples they erected to the gods, none has lasted to our times except a great stone building which Mariette discovered in the immediate vicinity of the Sphinx of Gizeh. The temples which are either partially or entirely preserved, date from the time of the Theban dominion; for instance, those on the

ruins of ancient Thebes; or even from a later date, such as the Hathor temple at Dendera, the Horus temple at Edfu, and the Isis temple on the island of Philae, which were all built by the Ptolemies. The temple at Dendera was actually finished under the Romans only, although there were former temples on the same sites. We have only these remains by which to form any idea of the Egyptian temples, since the descriptions given by Herodotus are quite insufficient. The temples in Thebes are especially vast; the most important is the great sanctuary of Amon at Karnak, which was the head temple of the whole empire during the zenith of the Theban rule. This temple, like so many others, was not built after one design or on one uniform plan. Various dynasties had often changed and enlarged them, and the Pharaohs of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties completed what their predecessors of the twelfth had begun. The temples that we know are mostly built on the following plan. The entrance was formed by great porticoes, so-called Pylons, in front of which were erected obelisks, and sometimes colossal statues of the Pharaoh who had founded the temple. An avenue of sphinxes led from the gate to the actual temple, where one entered a great covered hall supported by pillars, a hypostyle, which assumed vast proportions, especially in the temple at Karnak. From hence an entrance led to the inner parts of the temple, and in the inmost room there was total darkness; here the boat, which was dragged round in processions, was kept. We do not yet know for certain whether the images of the gods, the sacred animals, the idols and symbols of the godhead were kept there perpetually, or were

only placed there on certain days. In Thebes, many temples and other buildings were connected together by avenues, and then surrounded by an enclosing wall. We have already mentioned the paintings on the inner and outer walls of the temples. The use of the temples is indicated by their arrangements. They were not suited as a place of meeting for a large congregation or as a dwelling-place for the priests, but only as a place for keeping the images of the gods, and the sacred vessels and treasures. The priests and king were alone admitted into the actual building; in the space between the gate and the temple, a certain number of initiated were admitted. In the temple, gifts were offered to the gods, and everything connected with their service was performed there; there the processions also were arranged which left the precincts of the temple to carry about the images of the god, sometimes to a great distance. The necessaries for the temple worship were richly provided for by donations; we still possess several lists from which we see that the temple revenues often consisted of the rents of farmed lands. The Theban imperial temple was endowed by Ramses II and III with vast treasures, numerous slaves, cattle, gold and silver, villages in Egypt and in Syria, &c.

The privileges of the priests are described to us in a rather exaggerated manner by Greek authorities, as in Herodotus II. 37 and in Diodorus I. 73. However great their influence, they formed no separate caste, and they only attained supremacy in the state from time to time. The first of these statements can be proved by the inscriptions. The priesthood was bestowed on members of the noble families by the

Pharaoh, who was also the head of the cult. On the other hand we notice that the office of priest could be easily combined with other functions. We hear of many priests who filled high public offices, and were at the head of the war or finance departments. Thus we know of the official life of a certain Bekenchons, who under Ramses II rose from being master of the horse, to be the first prophet of Amon. But there were many obstacles to their taking a leading position in the state. They were the priests of local gods, of local worship, who could not claim general recognition. Only under the Theban dynasties the worship of Amon became of general national importance, and the influence of the college of priests at Thebes could be looked on as a power in the whole state. The position of high-priest to the other chief gods at Memphis, Heliopolis, and elsewhere, was filled by members of the Theban priests' college. This centralised priestly power seems, even during the eighteenth dynasty, to have become dangerous to certain Pharaohs; and under the later Ramses when the royal power became weaker, that of the Theban high-priest increased, until he finally, for a time placed the double crown of Egypt on his head. But at all times the priests must have exercised the influence due to their education. They were the scribes and teachers; the power which in a civilised nation falls to literature was in their hands; the education of aristocratic youths, who afterwards governed the state, was entirely left to the priests. In their manner of life the priests probably did not differ very much from these aristocrats. In their dress, which was of linen, though officiating high-priests sometimes wore a panther skin, and in their food and

ablutions, they were subjected to strict rules of purity. In the most ancient times we find priestesses for the service of goddesses; but even Amon at Thebes had his Pallakides, as the Greeks called them, who were recruited from women of illustrious and even princely families. Many priestesses are represented with a sistrum, a noisy instrument which Plutarch (de Is. et Os. 63) carefully describes, and to which he gives a very philosophical significance. The duties of the various grades of priests were numerous. We find many classes mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus and enumerated in the bilingual decree of Canopus, under Ptolemy III[1]. We read of the high-priest who was the head of the temple, of the prophets who were chosen from the wisest and most important men, of the sacred writers with feathers on their heads and writing materials in their hands, of the stolists who robed and adorned the statues of the gods, of the sages, the holy fathers, singers, pastophores, hierodules, and others. Even if we do not know in detail the organisation of the Egyptian priesthood, yet we see that in many grades, from the ordinary servant to the influential noble, numerous duties were incumbent on the priests, such as the keeping up of the temple, the care of the sacrifices and other sacred duties, the explaining of signs and dreams, the cultivation of science and the education of the young, the administration

[1] Das Dekret von Canopus R. P. VIII. On the various classes of priests, see Ebers, Aeg. u. die B. M. p. 341 seq. Brugsch in his Aegyptologie gives and explains the various titles of Egyptian priests; whilst Erman in his Aegypten II tries to give a sketch of the development of the Egyptian priesthood. Of great importance is G. Maspero, Un manuel de hiérarchie égyptienne, publié in the J. A. 1888 (reviewed by Amelia B. Edwards in the Academy, Ap. 21, 1888).

of certain state affairs, and advising the Pharaohs. At the various principal temples the priests bore various titles. At the later Amon worship at Thebes, the simple title which we translate from the Greek by Prophet, was in use; but we must by no means connect it with prophesying. By the side of these, there were the priests who tested the purity of the sacrifices, and those who read the sacred texts; each class had a distinguishing title. The lay element also occurred in the cult, in the so-called hourly priests who had to carry out numerous sacred duties.

We have already said all that is necessary about the service of the dead, and we must now mention in what way the Egyptians worshipped their gods. The monuments often show us the worshipper of the god in a praying attitude, with raised hands, or with bent knees; the texts often contain the thanks of some one whose petition the god has heard, and whose wish has been fulfilled. Bread, cakes, cattle, geese, wine, and other things, more especially incense, were brought as gifts to the gods, as well as to the departed. We possess no detailed information as to the meaning which was imputed to these gifts; in fact there seems to have been no actual theory about it. Worship in Egypt was a daily service, regulated by the ritual books, and offered by the priests in honour of the gods in the temples; this service consisted of lighting fires, offering incense and invocations. Chief in importance were the great annual or monthly festivals; the various places had their own calendar of feasts. Herodotus (II. 58–64) mentions numerous great festivals, of which the most important was the festival at Bubastis, and the feast of lamps of the goddess at Sais. There

were many occasions for festivals: such as the Nile feast, the harvest feast, the solstices, those held on birthdays, at coronations, or after a victory gained by the Pharaoh, and the yearly feasts in honour of a god. Great meetings (Panegyries) were held, when the statues of the gods were carried round with dancing and music, sometimes on long journeys; as when, for instance, Hathor of Dendera visited Horus at Edfu. Many paintings show us what these processions were like; thus in one place Ramses III is depicted being carried on his throne to the temple of his father Chem, to see its glory.

A special place is given to the king in the worship; he does not only possess, as we have already seen, the highest sacerdotal rights, but he is himself an object of worship as the representative of the godhead on earth. The Pharaoh is the son of the sun, of Ra, and of Amon; and like his father, he spreads light and blessing over all the world. He sits on the throne of Horus, his authority is the authority of the god whose living image he is, and who gives him victory in war against his enemies. The divine emblems of life and power belong to the king also, and after his name we always find the formula anch, usa, seneb (life, health, power). Like the images of the gods and the dead, kings also, at their coronations, are anointed in the presence of the gods.

The magic element preponderates amongst the Egyptians. We already know how important it was for the dead to know the names of the gods. Belief in the efficacious power of magic formulas is to be found also throughout the range of medicine. Bad spells from which various evils arise are removed by in-

voking the great and powerful gods. The suppliant actually becomes identified with the good god, to whom he prays to be delivered from evil influences. By the side of the magic words we also meet with magic implements, such as small images of the gods, and amulets which are worn, and from which protection and help are expected. There is very little that is characteristic in these customs and conceptions; they are like the magic arts of other nations, but we had to mention them, since they play a great part in Egyptian life.

We must notice some other traits in religious customs: such as circumcision, to which the priests at all events had to submit; then the choice of days, which was a highly developed art. People paid great attention to the lucky and unlucky days as mentioned in the calendar. On certain days almost every meeting had some evil omen, and it was even dangerous to leave the house. Finally we must mention the significance of dreams, in which people recognised warnings and commands from the gods. Many of these dreams are mentioned in Egyptian history, as for instance the dream in which Thotmes IV was promised the crown, whilst at the same time certain duties were imposed on him.

We shall now consider religious morality amongst the Egyptians; but on this subject our authorities are peculiarly meagre. A history of the ideas of any nation on morality must be gathered from a rich literature; but we can hardly call a literature rich, which consists only of inscriptions on monuments, and of liturgical and magic texts. Still we do possess some material: we know, as a general rule, what thoughts governed the life of the ancient Egyptians, and we know in

detail the virtues and duties they more especially practised. We gather the former from the books of the dead. Although dominated by the thought of death their view of life is by no means gloomy; no fleeing from the world or askesis is recommended; on the contrary, an Egyptian clings to life, even in death. Religion celebrates the victory of light and life over darkness and death, and in this sense their disposition is a cheerful and worldly one. But this does not exclude a certain moral seriousness; on the contrary, we meet with it in the chapter on judgment, in the Book of the Dead (chapter 125), and in many of their maxims. We possess many lists of duties in proverbial forms: the sentences of Ptahhotep, Ani, and Beka, and the precepts given by Amenemhat I to his son and many others, from which we know the moral demands made by the Egyptians on themselves, and on others. Much can be gathered on this subject from narrative literature. From all this we get an impression of very pure moral ideas, and the religious motive is never absent. Beka says that he carried God in his heart, so that he quickly got to know his will. Virtue consisted essentially in that attribute which characterised the divine being, the Maat (right and truth) which was possessed by the gods. Finally, thoughts of death and the judgment in the other world were a very effective motive for moral conduct. The confession of innocence in the Book of the Dead (chapter 125), is also found in other forms on many tomb inscriptions, in which the departed prides himself on having done good and avoided evil; and although these witnesses in their own cause are rather suspicious, yet we can see from them the great value

placed on morality in the face of death, and also of what sentiments and actions it consisted.

A few examples will illustrate the purity of this morality. In the councils of King Amenemhat to his son, we see that the absolute power of the Pharaohs did not cloud their mind; the king here urges that royalty imposes heavy obligations; times of affliction and the day of death are also taken into account; and the king especially warns his son not to isolate himself on his throne, but to be accessible not only to the nobles of his kingdom, but also to his poorer subjects. Women had a very high position in Egypt; polygamy was not forbidden, but it was by no means usual. Women were respected, and unchastity (not only adultery) was emphatically counted as a sin. Another feature is the great respect paid to knowledge. A careful education for instance, at the priestly high school at Khennu (Silsilis), in Upper Egypt, was a necessary condition for an influential position, and in many texts we find a learned education highly commended above a military career. Social duties play a most prominent part. It is a capital crime to turn aside the waters of the Nile, in order to improve private fields at the cost of general irrigation. That robbery and murder should be condemned goes without saying, but the moral law is severe against all sorts of injustice, such as false measures or weights, lying, and calumnies also; and the virtues of charity and clemency are highly praised. Many a dead man boasts, not that he has been just only, but rather that he has been a support to the poor and needy, a protector to the humble, a husband to widows, and a revenger of the wrongfully persecuted. But people were not

satisfied with the outward appearance of these virtues. A tender feeling of right and truth is often seen. Vain words, boastings, untruth in stating some event are also sins. Modesty which seasons all virtue, can be traced in many of the documents. Though great, the noble man Beka behaved as if he had been small. Another man practised charity remembering how good God had been to him. People thankfully receive the blessing of God as a reward for virtue, but yet we cannot say that this thought spoils the moral feeling. As a whole these moral sayings show us one of the most beautiful sides of Egyptian life, if we may trust the translations. ERMAN, however, doubts this, especially as regards this sort of literature.

Chapter 51. — Sketch of the Development.

From what we have already said, one can easily see how scanty any sketch of the development of religion in Egypt must prove, since the material at our disposal is so meagre, and the opinions held by Egyptologists on the most important points are so very contradictory. Nevertheless, we shall try to give a short outline to gather up what has been already said, to mention certain things which have not been noticed, and to call attention to various questions with which research in the present day is occupied.

First we must turn our attention to the ancient kingdom. Our knowledge of the first dynasties has been greatly enlarged by MASPERO'S discoveries during the last years, but we have not got any nearer to the original sources of Egyptian civilisation. Our knowledge does not reach beyond the time when the kingdom was already fully organised.

The religion also of the oldest periods was quite complete, at least we find almost all the elements of religious thought; but we cannot trace their beginnings. Everything, even architecture and plastic art, is already so developed, that we must search for a more ancient antiquity, which is entirely withdrawn from our sight. From the very beginning we find in Egypt the worship of the great gods, such as Ra, Ptah, Osiris, Horus, and others. The meaning of these beings may have been developed and extended later, other gods may have been placed by their sides, and different gods may have taken the highest rank in different periods; but this fact remains, that the Pharaohs of the first dynasty and the Ptolemies also, erected temples to the same gods. We find the same thing in the worship of the dead, for its most essential elements stretch back into the greatest antiquity. The fundamental principles of the Book of the Dead of the Theban and Saitic periods date from the time of the ancient kingdom. The same can be said of the divine honours enjoyed by the Pharaohs: temples were already erected to the kings of the first dynasty, and we find the worship of some of these early kings extant in later times. Herodotus says that a king of the second dynasty introduced animal worship; at all events it belongs to the original elements of Egyptian religion, and even during the ancient kingdom it is connected with the worship of the gods. In a list of the gods dating from the time of King Pepi of the sixth dynasty, a number of abstract ideas are mentioned among the gods, such as the year, eternity, life, joy, and truth. We find also pure moral ideas in the precepts of

Ptahhotep. It is very probable that some leading ideas of a cosmogony date also from ancient times. By the side of this we find witchcraft very prominent, and after MASPERO'S texts we can no longer look on this magic side as a later phase of religion. Thus almost all that we find in the later periods can also be found in the most ancient times; the most varied conceptions being found side by side, and all in relatively complete form.

This state of things does not tempt us to deny a development in Egyptian religion, as some do. This development was the work of theology, which connected the gods with one another, identified and transformed them, systematised and perfected certain doctrines (of the future life and cosmogony), set up theories concerning religion, and introduced philosophical ideas into it. But religious development was as much influenced by political events, as by the work of theologians. Whenever one or another Nome was at the head of the government, its god at once received honour and preference. We must not, however, over-estimate this fact. On-Heliopolis and Abydus never became principal towns, yet Ra and Osiris belong to the highest gods. That political events, however, formed a powerful lever to religious development cannot be denied.

Cult and mythology likewise exercise a transforming influence. Cult offers a common worship to various gods, whose functions come in contact one with another. Mythology makes gods, originally foreign to each other, appear in the same myth; as for instance Horus, who is included in the mythic circle of Osiris.

We shall probably be most correct if we regard the

local cults and those of the single Nomes, as the most original elements in Egyptian religion. But, as far back as we can see into antiquity, the Egyptian religion was a fully developed state cult. The combination and identification of the individual gods appear already in the most ancient pyramidic texts, though not so fully developed as later on. Thus Ra is combined with Tum, and both again with Osiris; but the combination of Ptah, Sokar, and Osiris was not yet complete, and we do not find that Ptah has any connection with the worship of the dead, or the religion of the sun. But the connecting of these two last elements is prehistoric; and it is so close, that it is difficult to decide whether, as MASPERO holds, Osiris was originally only a god of the dead, or whether a solar character was from the very first connected with his person. Anyhow the solar religion gained more and more on all sides; and gods who could not be connected with it, or only with great difficulty, such as Ptah, and Chnum, &c., were driven into the background. The cult of the dead, also, was quite transformed by the solar explanations.

The third element in Egyptian religion, by the side of the magic cult of the dead, and the worship of the sun, namely theological speculation, is of great antiquity, and the chief features of the Heliopolitan Ennead theory existed at the beginning of historic times. In the historic periods the theological systems seem to have developed even more and more in the direction of a solar religion, until in the new kingdom, the priestly speculation of the worship of Amon united all systems in itself. But before discussing that period we must consider foreign influences on

Egyptian religion. Even in the old kingdom we often hear of numbers of foreigners in Egypt, known on the monuments as Menti and Sati; they are generally looked on as Semites of Arabian, Canaanite, or mixed origin. Many of them settled in Egypt, and mixed with the native population. But it was not till the middle kingdom between the thirteenth and eighteenth dynasties, that a tribe forced an entrance from Asia, and set up in Egypt a foreign rule, whose chief seats were at Avaris and Tanis in the Delta, but which reached beyond Memphis; whilst in Upper Egypt a few traces only were left of the Theban kingdom. These foreigners, who are often described on the monuments as a 'pest,' are generally known under the name of Shepherds and Hyksos, a name given them by Manetho. It is very uncertain to what race they belonged; the names of their princes, and their features, as given on the monuments seem to testify against a Semitic origin. Many scholars, such as CHABAS, leave this question undecided. These foreigners placed themselves, when once they had founded a firm kingdom, in friendly relations with Egyptian culture, and tried, as far as possible, to appropriate its benefits. We still possess a message sent by the Shepherd King Apapi to Sekenen-Ra, the prince of Thebes at that time. In it he offers an alliance, by which, amongst other things, Set and Amon-Ra were to be acknowledged as the two chief gods of Egypt. But the Egyptians could not tolerate this foreign rule, and after long wars the Shepherds were driven out of Egypt, after their stronghold Avaris had been taken. This was not the end to foreign sojourners on Egyptian soil. Before, as well as after the time of the Hyksos,

the inhabitants in the eastern Delta were strongly impregnated with Semitic elements. It would be interesting to know whether the Hyksos were connected with them, and in what degree. But we must principally consider what influence these foreigners had on Egyptian religion. As far as we can see their influence was neither deep nor lasting. We know nothing about the religion brought by the Hyksos into Egypt, since in religion also they conformed to the institutions of the Egyptians. Their chief god was Set or Sutech, to whom a large temple was built in Tanis, and who was praised as the 'Master of Avaris.' We have mentioned elsewhere that he was an ancient Egyptian god.

The zenith of Amon worship, of theological learning and speculation, was during the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, the second Theban period. Under the eighteenth dynasty a great reaction set in against the prevailing tendency: this was the reform of King Amenhotep IV, but we cannot sufficiently estimate its meaning. This prince entertained a great dislike to the systems which his predecessors had followed, and turned with great determination from the worship of Amon. He had everything chiselled out from the monuments which referred to this worship. He even left Thebes, and built an entirely new town, the ruins of which have been found close to Tell-el-Amarna, and which was dedicated entirely to the worship of the new god, who, under the name of Aten-Ra as the living disc of the sun, was to take the place of Amon. He himself changed his name into Chunaten, 'Glory of the sun's disc.' It is not clear what caused his opposition to Amon; some people say his mother was a foreign

princess and attribute this whole movement to her influence. But the reason was probably not entirely personal. Ed. Meyer seeks this reason in the endeavour to organise a pure monotheism in opposition to the 'secret wisdom' which overruled and disfigured everything. Erman seeks it in the opposition to the ever-increasing power of the priests of Amon. This movement is characterised by the fanatic hatred which Chunaten showed towards the worship of Amon. We do not find here, as in other cases, a new god placed by the side of the old one, or one god placed before another; but the king appears here as a persecutor, who destroys the governing form of worship, and puts another in its place. Chunaten himself and his court are represented as very ugly on the monuments which remain to us from this period of reformation; but the songs in which they pray to the sun are most beautiful. After the death of this prince, who lived long enough to introduce his reform into the whole land, came a time of disorder, during the short reigns of Chunaten's various sons-in-law. Finally Horemheb took possession of the crown and suppressed the whole movement of reform with a strong hand, destroyed Chunaten's town, and restored the worship of Amon in Thebes in all its former glory.

That this Amon worship was not very exclusive can be seen in the worship offered by kings of the nineteenth dynasty to other gods, as well as to their father Amon. A royal prince from Thebes, called Chamus, was a priest of Ptah and of the Apis at Memphis, and laid out large Apis graves. The worship of Set can be traced in the name Seti, which belonged to many princes of this dynasty. Set, or Sutech, is especially the god

of foreigners, as can be seen from the treaty of peace made between Ramses II and the Cheta, in which both parties appealed to their gods. Sutech in this treaty is the principal god of the Cheta. The nineteenth dynasty forms the turning-point in Egyptian history; under Ramses II the summit of external power is reached, but the decadence follows immediately. In art and literature the creative power is dried up, and form and outward show become supreme. A slavish worship of the king was carried to an extreme under Ramses II. The later Ramsesides were weak, and therefore the government of state affairs passed gradually into the hands of the Theban priesthood, till the high priest at last annexed the crown. The external decadence and the internal conflicts which mark this period, can be felt even in the religion. The power of the priestly sovereigns, being of divine origin, demanded unconditional obedience, and the religion of the people was reduced more and more to outward observances and witchcraft. During the reaction against the government of the priests of Thebes, the dynasties of Lower Egypt acquired power, and made the worship of the gods and goddesses of Lower Egypt very popular, yet they did not renounce Amon. The Theban dynasty prepared a home for Amon in Ethiopia, whither it had fled, and also in the Libyan oasis, where it founded the famous oracle of Amon [1].

We can say very little about later times. The Saitic period of the twenty-sixth dynasty was a time of restoration, but added nothing new to the Egyptian religion. We can only make conjectures as to the

[1] G. PARTHEY, Das Orakel und die Oase des Ammon (1862).

influence Persians, Greeks, and Romans may have had on the forms of the gods; but we find some traces of this influence on the later monuments. The interest of the history of Egyptian civilisation under the Ptolemies does not lie chiefly in the Egyptian rites and forms of worship which they carried out, and mixed with new forms, such as the Serapis worship, but it depends on the Hellenic civilisation, of which Alexandria was one of the head quarters. Thus the Egyptian religion lasted on nominally for centuries, but had lost its importance in mental development. Theodosius I put an end even to this shadowy existence; in 391 A.D. the glorious Serapeion of Alexandria was destroyed; though in Upper Egypt the cult of Egyptian gods lasted some time longer, as is proved by an inscription which mentions the worship of Isis on the island of Philae, in the year 453 A.D.

CHAPTER 52. — **Egypt and Israel.**

Books of Reference. Besides the general works on Egypt by BRUGSCH, MASPERO, LIEBLEIN, and others, which deal also with the question of the connection between Egypt and Israel, a number of monographs have been written on this subject which often give us premature and unreliable results. We mention more especially: W. PLEYTE, La religion des pré-Israélites, recherches sur le Dieu Set (1865, this is full of specious combinations); M. A. UHLEMANN, Israeliten und Hyksos in Aegypten (1856); J. LAUTH, Moses der Ebräer (1869); A. EISENLOHR, Der grosse Papyrus Harris, ein wichtiger Beitrag zur ägyptischen Geschichte, ein 3000 Jahr altes Zeugniss für die mosaische Religionsstiftung enthaltend (1872): V. ANCESSI, L'Egypte et Moïse, I. (1875); G. EBERS, Aegypten und die Bücher Mosis, I. (1868, which has not been continued); Durch Gosen zum Sinaï, aus dem Wanderbuch und der Bibliothek (1872); F. CHABAS, Recherches pour servir à l'histoire de la XIX^e^ Dyn. et spécialement à celle des temps de l'Exode (1873). Of all these works only the last three are really trustworthy, although all the results arrived at may not have been scientifically proved. ED. NAVILLE'S report of the excavations in 1883 is of especial importance, called The store-city of Pithom and the route of the Exodus. W. G.

BRILL'S Israel en Egypte (1857) contains striking thoughts on the mental and historical importance of the contrast between Israel and Egypt.

Of the many questions concerning the connection of Egyptian civilisation with that of other nations we shall only consider one, namely, the relations between Egypt and Israel. But before dealing with it in detail, we must at least mention a few others. We have already seen that in historical times the Egyptian religion developed itself independently, and only adopted very few foreign elements. But we must first ask whether we may not infer a prehistoric connection between the Egyptians and other nations, from the strong coincidences that exist; and secondly, what influence the Egyptians on their side exercised on other nations.

With regard to the first point, we notice that in this respect Egyptian religion produces different impressions on different scholars. The majority lay great emphasis on the similarity with Semitic religions in their general character, as well as on single points (for instance, Hathor is said to resemble the Babylonian Istar). They connect Egyptian religion in one group with the Babylono-Assyrian and other Semitic religions (TIELE, HOMMEL). Others dwell much on the coincidences between the Egyptians and the Indo-Germans (LE PAGE RENOUF); whilst others think that Egyptian antiquity gives us a glimpse into the primitive times, when these various families were still unseparated (LIEBLEIN). To answer this question it is important, amongst other things, to try and see to what extent we can point out parallels in Egypt to the cosmogonic myths and

primeval traditions of Genesis. Single traces of this have been much exaggerated, for instance by LAUTH [1], who has traced an Egyptian paradise, an Egyptian flood-myth, and a story of the tower of Babel, where no one else has been able to discover them. On the other hand, as we see from FR. LENORMANT [2], the Egyptian parallels to ancient biblical history are even much slighter than we should expect. EBERS was wise enough to put these parts quite on one side, and to begin his work with a thorough treatment of the sons of Mizraim taken from the list of nations in Genesis x.

It is especially difficult to gain an idea of the influence exercised by Egypt on Greece. No one any longer believes Herodotus, who says that by far the greater number of the gods of Greece, as well as the oracle of Dodona, were of Egyptian origin. The endeavour made by ED. RÖTH in his history of Western philosophy, to find the most ancient sources of our speculative ideas in Egyptian and Zoroastrian theories of belief, is now looked on as having utterly failed. But if we remember what we said in chapter 45, how closely the Greeks busied themselves with Egypt, and more especially that tradition and history represent almost all important Greek thinkers (to mention only a few casually chosen names, such as Homer, Thales, Solon, Pythagoras, Herodotus, Plato, and Euripides) as travelling to Egypt, and educating themselves through intercourse with Egyptian priests, we must certainly not deny the great importance of Egyptian civilisation for that of Greece.

We cannot attempt this research, nor can we here

[1] Aus Aegyptens Vorzeit.

[2] Les origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible.

enter on the question of the influence of Egyptian conceptions and forms of worship, on the Hellenistic and Roman periods. In our survey of the religion of the Roman empire, we shall treat these questions more fully. In these later periods of religious eclecticism and syncretism, Egyptian religion did not exclusively, though to a considerable extent, attract attention. Of foreign forms of worship that of Isis reached a high degree of importance for a time in Rome. But the zenith of Egyptian prosperity was already too long past, and the people too thoroughly impregnated with foreign ingredients (such as Jewish and Greek) for Egyptian religion to have been able to exercise a really lasting influence on these later times.

We shall now consider the problem that was placed before us, namely, the ancient connections between Egypt and the children of Israel, especially as regards the exodus, and the dependence of the religion of Moses on Egyptian thought. Three sources of information are open to us: the full biblical statements, in which, in spite of their fabulous embellishments, many scholars like EBERS discover a firm historical foundation; Manetho's confused accounts, which are full of internal contradictions, and which are given us by Josephus; the scanty reports, together with the much richer excavations made at the localities said to have been the scenes of these occurrences.

That the parts of the patriarchal history in question show an exact knowledge of Egyptian circumstances, and that the picture of the history of civilisation in Egypt, which we find in Genesis, can be supported by numerous native texts, has been convincingly proved by EBERS. We could only wish that historical data

could be as reliably fixed. But in this case everything is uncertain. It is probable that the Apuriu of the Egyptian texts are the Israelites, but this is not certain; and it is highly improbable that Lauth found the name of Moses in an historical record. The identification of the Israelites with the Hyksos is now almost entirely given up; but the question whether any relations existed between the two, especially whether Joseph was a co-regent of one of the Hyksos kings, is answered in various ways; in the affirmative by Maspero, Brugsch, Lauth, and others, but negatively by Ebers, who says that Jacob and Joseph came to Egypt during the eighteenth dynasty, whereas the times of the Hyksos would correspond to the period of Isaac. The most important question refers to the time of the oppression and exodus of the Israelites. On the whole, three opinions have found favour. The most prevalent opinion is that which recognises in Ramses II the Pharaoh who oppressed the Israelites, and in his successor Merneptah (Manetho's Amenophis ?), the Pharaoh of the exodus. This opinion is held by Chabas, Brugsch, Tiele, Ebers, and others. This agrees with most of the dates known to us, and receives great support from the excavations of the two towns of Ramses (Tanis) and Pithom (Exod. i. 11). The construction placed on this question by Eisenlohr, and followed by Maspero, seems to have much less foundation. It places the exodus during the time of disorder which characterised the transition from the nineteenth to the twentieth dynasty, because under the son of the great Ramses, Egypt would still have been too powerful to submit to a defeat like the

exodus of the Israelites. Finally, as the third opinion, we mention that held by ED. MEYER, who wishes to place the whole question on one side, with a 'non liquet.' He maintains that the historical elements of the whole story of the sons of Israel dwelling in Egypt cannot be found, and that therefore all questions which refer to the Pharaoh or the date of the exodus are useless. Considering the strong grounds for the general opinion, and its confirmation by the discoveries of ED. NAVILLE, this scepticism is carried too far.

If therefore the Israelites came out of Egypt, the question arises, as to how far their religion depended on the Egyptian religion. The Bible tells us that their leader and law-giver Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. and therefore it is probable that this education may have influenced his acts and laws. This has often been maintained, and is still sometimes asserted. Even the idea of God contained in the word Jahve is said to arise from an Egyptian conception. The last attempt to prove this was made by LIEBLEIN, who argues as follows. In the secret doctrine of the priests of On-Heliopolis, people had arrived at a monotheistic conception of God, which was expressed in a name, in which the god was described as Chepera, the existing one. Now Moses was a pupil of the priests of Heliopolis, and from them he borrowed this idea and this name: Jahve, the existing one. The morals which Moses codified are taken from an Egyptian model; for if one compares the laws which he gave to the Israelites, one finds nothing that cannot also be found in the laws of morality in the Book of the Dead, chapter 125, &c. ANCESSI goes still further, and has

traced Egyptian influence even in the dress of the Israelitic priests. But we must pass over these details. It is not more difficult to disprove the Jahve-Chepera hypothesis, than the earlier theories of the same sort which are now quite exploded. In fact this hypothesis is untenable from two points of view. It is not possible to prove the existence of a monotheistic god of the priests called Chepera, nor is the explanation of the name Jahve, as belonging to him, established. But the following consideration decides the question. The Israelitic history is dominated by the opposition to Egypt: the exodus is described as a struggle between Israel's God and the gods of the Egyptians; the law was given in remembrance of deliverance from the bondage of Egypt: this rupture with Egypt is always treated by the prophets as the beginning and principle of Israel's national life. Freedom is set in opposition to slavery; the life in the desert, as ordered by the hand of God, to the earthly and secure existence in the fruitful land, the 'garden of God;' the sovereignty of God is contrasted with the earthly empire. This antithesis rules the life of the people of Israel. It is therefore impossible to treat this people as of direct Egyptian origin, as is done by those who consider the religion of Jahve, as a touch of the mystic Egyptian teaching, introduced by Moses among his fellow-countrymen. There is not a single proof to compel one to adopt this opinion. On the contrary, the coincidences between the Egyptian and Israelite religions are only superficial and general, and in no way more numerous than those which connect the Egyptians with other Semitic nations.

THE BABYLONIANS AND ASSYRIANS.

Books of Reference. The following deal specially with this branch of enquiry: Transactions of the Soc. of Bibl. Archæology, with the proceedings of the same Society (since 1872, but Egyptology is also included in it); Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung, von C. BEZOLD and FR. HOMMEL (since 1883). The most important Assyrian collections are in the British Museum and the Louvre; facsimiles of the monuments are to be found in the large works of BOTTA, LAYARD, OPPERT, and PLACE. The most interesting accounts of personal discoveries are: A. H. LAYARD, Nineveh and its remains (1850); G. SMITH, Assyrian discoveries (1875). A short statement of results with a good bibliography is given by FR. KAULEN, Assyrien und Babylonien (3rd ed. 1885).

For studying the history most of the works can be used which we mentioned for Egyptian history, but we must notice that MASPERO is more an Egyptologist and LENORMANT more an Assyriologist. Both of their histories are inferior to DUNCKER'S and more especially to ED. MEYER'S. In reference to Babel and Assur we mention the following: SIR HENRY RAWLINSON, Outlines of Assyrian history (R. As. Soc. 1852: this was the first attempt to describe this history on the basis of discovered monuments); MARC. VON NIEBUHR, Geschichte Assur's und Babel's seit Phul (1857: a valuable collection of Old Testament and Greek facts without using as yet cuneiform inscriptions); GEORGE RAWLINSON (Sir Henry's brother), The five great monarchies of the ancient Eastern World (3 vols. which appeared first in 1862, 4th ed. 1879: a rich mine of archæological and historical dates, but not up to the new standard of modern studies. VALD. SCHMIDT, Assyriens og Aegyptens gamle historie (2 vols., 1872–77); G. SMITH, Early history of Babylonia (1872, in Transact. Soc. Bibl. Arch. I, and in. R. P. III, V.); A. VON GUTSCHMID, Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Orients: Die Assyriologie in Deutschland (1876), a violent attack on the methods and results of Assyriology, provoked by DUNCKER'S Gesch. des Alterth. (4th ed.), but strongly criticised by EB. SCHRADER, Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung (1878). More popular and very successful surveys have been given by: F. MÜRDTER, Kurzgefasste Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens (1882); G. SMITH, Assyria; The history of Babylonia, ed. by A. H. SAYCE (two small books published by the S. P. C. K.); E. A. W. BUDGE, Babylonian life and history (1885); A. H. SAYCE, Assyria: its princes, priests, and people (1885). At the present time two large historical works are completed: C. P. TIELE, Babylonish-assyrische Geschichte (I. 1886, II. 1888); FR. HOMMEL, Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens (in ONCKEN'S collection). We must also

mention: FR. HOMMEL, Abriss der Babylonisch-assyrischen und israelitischen Geschichte (1880, with chronological tables); a few articles in FR. LENORMANT'S Les premières civilisations, II. (1874); G. SMITH, History of Assurbanipal (1871); W. LOTZ, Die Inschriften Tiglatpilesars, I. (1880), and many other monographs.

For the history of art we must mention G. PERROT et CH. CHIPIEZ, Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité: II. Chaldée et Assyrie (1884); J. MÉNANT gives us valuable studies of the pictures on Assyrian cylinders (R. H. R. 1883, 1885; extracts from a larger work on Oriental sculpture). For geography FR. DELITZSCH, Wo lag das Paradies? (1881) is of importance because of the wealth of the authentic documents it contains, although the principal results of his work are doubtful. All these works contain more or less materials for the history of religion; this is specially treated by A. H. SAYCE, Hib. Lect. 1887.

CHAPTER 53.—**Preliminary Remarks.**

In Mesopotamia, the land of the two great rivers Euphrates and Tigris, there have flourished powerful kingdoms and ancient civilisations, the knowledge of which has been preserved by Hebrew and Greek documents, while their towns, buildings, monuments, and literature have been buried by the débris of centuries. It was reserved to our generation to uncover again this ancient history. But the excavations of the mounds of Assyria and Babylon began after the discoveries in the Nile valley; moreover, the material difficulties of the work, as well as the difficulties offered by the writing and language of the discovered monuments, are much greater in Mesopotamia than in Egypt. Therefore we must not be surprised that whereas Egyptology has long since crossed the border-line which separates the period of discovery and deciphering, from that of philological treatment and historical use of what has been discovered, Assyriology has hardly reached as yet this border-line. Still, we must by no means reject all attempts that have at

present been made, to form a collective statement of Babylono-Assyrian history and civilisation, as being premature and insufficient; bold guesses also help on science, and, after all, many doubtful points have been actually cleared up. But we must be especially careful to remember that we are here standing on uncertain ground. This can be most convincingly proved by a short sketch of the history of the discoveries and decipherings, and the questions connected with it.

The honour of excavations and discoveries in Mesopotamia belongs to the French and English, who have done astonishing work, partly by their consular agents in Mosul and Bagdad, and partly by sending out special expeditions. They began their operations in Assyria, where the French consul BOTTA examined the mounds at Mosul, owing to the encouragement given to him by the famous Orientalist, J. MOHL. In 1842 he excavated the great palace of Sargon at Khorsabad, which he examined and described; this work was carried on later by PLACE. A few years later, in 1845, that energetic man AUSTEN HENRY LAYARD began his work at Nimrud, on the site of the ancient Nineveh (Kujundshik, Nebi-Yunus), where he and his successors made valuable discoveries. The most valuable of all was the discovery of the library of baked clay tablets of King Asurbanipal. Amongst LAYARD'S successors, we must particularly mention G. SMITH, who, as a young official at the British Museum, proved himself to possess an exceptional gift for deciphering cuneiform writings, and was sent by the 'Daily Telegraph' to Nineveh, but on his third journey succumbed to a fever (1872–76). Besides the above-mentioned people, SIR HENRY RAWLINSON,

Loftus, and the Oriental Hormuzd Rassam, have rendered great services in excavations; their work was not limited to Assyria, for they worked also in Babylon. Here, above all things, the topography of the town of Babel attracted great attention. The French expedition sent out in 1851, under Fresnel and J. Oppert, to investigate Babylon, was limited to the neighbourhood of Hillah (the ancient Babel). The antiquities they collected unfortunately sank in the Tigris; but J. Oppert published the results of the expedition in a large work of classical value. The other discoverers we have mentioned worked mostly in other places in Babylon. We must also add the names of J. E. Taylor and E. de Sarzec. The last named in 1881 sent to Paris a collection of antiquities found in Tello, which is of great importance for a study of the most ancient periods of civilisation and art in Babylon. But, as a whole, this country has been far less explored than Assyria.

To be able to use the discovered materials, it was absolutely necessary to understand the difficult writing in which the inscriptions are written. This writing, which from its shape is called arrow-headed or cuneiform, was first met with in the Persian inscriptions in Persepolis, where, even in the seventeenth century, travellers had gazed at them in astonishment.

The careful observations of a few men of merit, such as Carsten, Niebuhr, Tychsen, and Münter, had brought a few facts to light; for instance, that the writing had to be read from left to right, that a certain often-recurring mark divided the single words, and that there were three sorts of cuneiform writing in the inscriptions. But this was not yet even the beginning

of the actual deciphering. GROTEFEND (1802) made the first step in this direction by recognising in Persian writing the formula, 'great king, king of kings,' and guessed the names before these titles to be those of Darius and Xerxes. With this he was able to interpret correctly a number of signs, as letters. It is true, he was wrong as regards some, but he had opened the way for others like BURNOUF and LASSEN to go still further. At first only the Persian alphabetic cuneiform writing was dealt with, whilst no direct explanation was given of the two other sorts of writing. This was only done after the discovery of the great trilingual inscription of the Behistun rock by SIR HENRY RAWLINSON in 1835, which has thrown open the way to much else. RAWLINSON was the first to undertake a scientific explanation of the third kind of cuneiform writing, the Babylono-Assyrian. And this discovery, as well as the work he has done in excavations in Mesopotamia, and his edition of the collection of 'Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia,' make him the founder of Assyriology. The first to follow in his footsteps and carry on the work of deciphering and examining this language were HINCKS and NORRIS in England, DE SAULCY and OPPERT in France, and later, as quite equal with these, FR. LENORMANT, A. H. SAYCE, and G. SMITH. In Germany these studies were organised by EB. SCHRADER, and now flourish, owing to the activity of men like FRIED. DELITZSCH, F. HOMMEL, P. HAUPT, and C. BEZOLD; whilst in England the old reputation is kept up by G. SMITH'S successor, PINCHES.

That cuneiform writing was derived from a picture-writing and that these hieroglyphics were continually

being reduced to simpler forms, is now a fact established by the comparison of older Babylonian inscriptions with the new Assyrian and new Babylonian letters. In later times this cuneiform writing has been applied by many nations to their respective languages. Thus near Lake Van, Armenian inscriptions have been found in cuneiform writing, and the kings of Persia have, as we have already mentioned, immortalised their edicts in cuneiform writings in three languages, of which the first is ancient Persian, the second probably the language of Susa (according to OPPERT and others the language of Media), and the third the Babylono-Assyrian. Though the deciphering of the Persian cuneiform writing, being of an alphabetic character, is comparatively easy, the Babylono-Assyrian signs offer many difficulties. First of all these signs are partly ideographic and partly phonetic (syllabic), and then they are often polyphonic, that is, the same sign represents various sounds. The choice between the various possible ways of reading is often made easy by determinative signs, case endings, meaning, and connection. There are also valuable means of assistance in the Assyrian syllabaries ; but often, especially as regards proper names, whose pronunciation is not fixed by foreign accounts (names of gods, &c.), much has to be guessed at. Many names which we use are for the present nothing more than a possible reading without any guarantee for their correctness. To this we must add the following fact, which renders the work much more difficult, that the Babylonians and Assyrians adopted this writing from a more ancient language totally unconnected with their own, and that therefore the signs often represent a

syllabic value borrowed from the name, which the object in question possessed in this ancient language. In the south, in the region round the mouths of these two rivers, there flourished a proto-Babylonian, pre-Semitic civilisation, from which the Semitic immigrants borrowed their civilisation, and with it also their writing. The language of the ancient inhabitants of the land is still preserved in a few texts, formulas, and names, and besides this also in the syllabic value of the Babylono-Assyrian written characters. Many questions till now only provisionally answered are closely connected with this ancient people of Chaldea [1]. At first, the acceptance of a language differing from the Semitic languages was totally denied by J. HALÉVY, who declared that this so-called language was nothing but a kind of secret writing, a hieratic allography of the Assyrian itself. This opinion was held by STAN. GUYARD, a man of great learning, who has since met with an early death, and by his pupil POGNON, and others, who partly or altogether join HALÉVY'S opinion. Amongst the followers of the opposite opinion there is no agreement. People do not even agree as to the name which is to be given to this ancient language. The kings of Babel called themselves kings of Sumer and Akkad. One of these two names or both are used for these ancient inhabitants, and people talk of their language as the Akkadian (HINCKS, LENORMANT) or the Sumerian (OPPERT, FRIEDR. DELITZSCH),

[1] The books in reference to this controverted point are mentioned by TIELE, Bab. Ass. Gesch., in chapter 7. FR. LENORMANT gave a strong impetus to enquiry into this ancient Akkadian idiom. A survey of the controversy can be found in SAYCE'S Hibbert Lectures, Appendix I.

whilst modern scholars often distinguish two dialects. This was first done by HAUPT, and DELITZSCH soon joined him in his opinion. The relationship of this language, which is counted amongst the agglutinative, has been sought for in the Turanian family, especially by LENORMANT and now also by HOMMEL, whilst TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE claims to have discovered its relationship with Chinese. This Turanian origin of the Akkadians and Sumerians has been denied by many people, for instance, by VON GUTSCHMID, HAUPT, and TIELE. Another possible relationship of this ancient population is with their warlike eastern neighbours from Mesopotamia, the Kassi (Kossäer), who with the Elamites and others, belong to a group of nations difficult to define, but certainly not Semitic. Almost total darkness reigns over all these ethnographic questions. We cannot say with certainty whether the Chaldeans were the first Semitic immigrants, or whether they belonged to another family of nations.

This Akkado-Sumerian civilisation is certainly one of the oldest in the world; it was inherited by the Semites who settled in Mesopotamia, and is of importance in the history of the world as the principal agent in the formation of Babylono-Assyrian civilisation. But this importance may be over-estimated; many Assyriologists represent this ancient people of Chaldea, of whom so little is known, as the teachers of all later civilised nations. The elements of civilisation which the Semites of Mesopotamia owed to this un-Semitic ancient people they transmitted to their ethnic relatives in Western Asia, more especially to the Israelites and Phœnicians. From these last, the

Greeks likewise received it. HOMMEL thinks that he can decide the dispute for precedence in history, between the Egyptians and Babylonians in favour of Babylon, for not only are there proofs that civilisation was older there, but in writing, in art (such as the building of pyramids), and in mythology also, Egypt shows that it is dependent on ancient Babylonian culture.

We must for the present rather distrust these ideas, for it is imprudent to attribute too much to a nation, only known to us by very scanty remains, and about which we possess so little geographic or ethnographic information. But again we cannot entirely deny the above-mentioned relations, and the greater part of the interest of the Babylono-Assyrian history of civilisation, lies in these connections with the general civilisation of the world. Thus the latest discoveries which have brought the archaic period of Greek art to light, are strong witnesses to the Babylonian origin of many forms and designs. In this domain new discoveries, which are to be expected, may perhaps open new paths; and although we must be most careful in deciding on such prehistoric relations, yet an exaggerated scepticism must not exclude all probable or possible connection. These relations must be brought to light by a study of the history of art (architecture and plastic art), of writing and material civilisation; in religion and mythology they are much more difficult to determine.

If we now cast a glance at the historic times of the Babylonian and Assyrian kingdoms, we find they can be divided into three or four periods, according as we comprise the time of Assyrian supremacy as one

period, or distinguish in it a first and second. Anyhow, a division into an ancient Babylonian, Assyrian, and new Babylonian period is quite settled.

The historical proofs of the ancient Babylonian time lead us into a distant antiquity, to the thirty-eighth century B. C., but not as far as the times in which no Semitic immigrant had as yet entered Chaldea. From early times this land stood open to either friendly or hostile invasions from western (Semites), or eastern (Elamites and Kossæan) neighbours. The most ancient times are those of smaller kings and priestly princes, whose names, temple-buildings, and wars are known by inscriptions, though we do not know how far their power extended, and still less to what nation they belonged. Thus we know from discoveries made by DE SARZEC, that there were kings called Gudea and Urea, who built temples in the earliest centres of civilisation, in Ur, Larsa, Nipur, Uruk, and Zirlaba. The Semitic princes of Agade (Akkad) were known earlier; they are Naramzin and his father Sargon, of whose childhood there is a myth which is very similar to that of the childhood of Moses, but still more to that of Cyrus. Sargon is said to have lived in the thirty-eighth century. The conquest by the Elamites, who carried their victorious arms further towards the west, is chiefly known to us by the accounts of the expedition of Kedor-Lagamar in Genesis xiv. At a date which is approximately fixed at 2300, the Kossæan Chammuragos or Hammurabi founded a powerful monarchy. We see from the inscriptions of his reign that he united the whole country under his dominion, the

centre of which from that time became the town of Babel. With the fall of these Kossæans begins the supremacy of Assyria, which brings us to the second period.

As early as the fourteenth century, Assyrian power arose in the north. Of a more unmixed Semitic origin, the Assyrians are dependent on the Babylonians in literature and civilisation, but in their own way they are rougher and more warlike. The period which we name after them, we know almost exclusively from their own numerous historical documents. Therefore we only see the history of Babel in this Assyrian light. But we must not represent the relations between the two parts of Mesopotamia in the ancient Assyrian period, as if Babylon had been a province of Assyria. The battle between these two countries was carried on with varying success; Babylon was subjected for a time only, then Assyria was deeply humbled, although on the whole the power of the Assyrian kingdom was generally superior to that of the Babylonian states, which were so often divided amongst themselves. The history of Assyria is rich in authentic documents, and since the tenth century it is chronologically fixed by the so-called canon of the Eponymoi, although some people (like OPPERT), to suit Biblical chronology, add forty-six years to the dates. The contents of this history are nothing but the monotonous repetition of wars and conquests, whilst the defeats are left out or hushed up. The greatest conquerors of this time were: Tiglat Pilesar I (about 1100). After him there occurs a gap in Assyrian history, therefore it was probably a period of subjection. In the ninth

century, there was Asurnasirpal, from whom dates the restoration of the empire; then Salmanassar II, Rammannirar III, of whose conquests we find detailed reports in almost all quarters. The second Assyrian period begins with the usurper Tiglat Pilesar II (745–728); there is no longer any doubt of his identity with the Biblical Pul. He also was a powerful warrior against Armenia as well as against Babylon and the small states in the land of the Hatti (Syria). His son, Salmanassar IV, followed in his steps; he reigned for a short time, and after him the dynasty of the usurper came to an end, and a man of royal descent, called Sargon, took possession of the throne. He and his successors gave it a splendour and fame which it had never before possessed. Amongst Sargon's wars (722–705) we must mention the subjection of Babel under Maruduk Baliddin. That he cared greatly for the throne of Babylon, which he joined to that of Assyria, is shown by the fact that he called himself Sargon II, thus carrying on the name of the former Babylonian king. Besides this he was the conqueror of Samaria, the siege of which had been begun under Salmanassar. He had also to oppose various enemies in the north and east. He followed the policy introduced by Tiglat Pilesar II, of transplanting numbers of the inhabitants of the conquered lands into other districts, and of introducing foreigners in their place, a rule which did much to absorb the various nationalities in the unity of the Assyrian empire. Sargon was not merely a great warrior but also a great builder, as is shown by the town which is named after him, Dur-Sarukin, with its numerous temples and palaces. His successor, Sanherib (705–681), fought

against Babylon and the Syrian states. During these wars he encountered the Egyptian forces, as Sargon had done. Asarhaddon (681–668) pursued them into Egypt, where for a time Assyrian sovereigns ruled. This was the zenith of Assyrian greatness. All opponents had succumbed to its military power, every insurrection had been most cruelly suppressed, all the small states of Syria (to which belonged the two kingdoms of Israel) had been conquered, or at least forced into doing homage or paying tribute. Asarhaddon's successor, Asurbanipal (668–626), no longer led the army in person; he was a voluptuous, bigoted despot, but he took especial charge of literature, and to him we owe the preservation of many documents which he ordered to be copied for his library. After him the end came quickly. A great Scythian invasion shook the power of Assyria, and hardly twenty years after Asurbanipal (606?), all the capitals of Assyria fell into the hands of the confederate Medes and Babylonians, and were so utterly destroyed that up to our times they remained perfectly unknown.

The new Babylonian kingdom now enjoyed a brilliant but short time of prosperity. The son of Nabopolassar, the prince who had conquered Assyria, was the famous Nebukadresar (604–562). From Bible history he is known as the conqueror of Egypt (battle of Karkemish, 605) and as the destroyer of Jerusalem (567). Of other warlike deeds we must mention the siege of Tyre, which lasted thirteen years under Itobaal II. In his inscriptions, he thinks much less of his wars than of his buildings for the defence of Babel and in honour of the gods. On the whole, he was one of the greatest rulers in the east before Cyrus.

But he had no successor equal to him; under the short reigns of various princes the power of Babel decreased rapidly, and Nabonedus, who reigned in peace for seventeen years and won glory by the temples he built, could not withstand the advancing power of Persia. In 538 Cyrus conquered the town of Babel, and from that time Babylon and Assyria became provinces of Persia.

Chapter 54. — Survey of Authorities.

Books of Reference. As regards outside authorities: Eb. Schrader, Die Keilinschriften und das alte Testament (1872, a second, improved, and enlarged edition appeared in 1883); several chapters in A. H. Sayce's Fresh light from the monuments (1884); O. Strauss, Nahumi de Nino Vaticinium (1853); G. Rawlinson, Herodotus (Eng. trans. with notes, 4 vols., 1858); Fr. Lenormant, Essai de commentaire des fragments cosmogoniques de Bérose (1872). Of monumental authorities we have already mentioned the large collection of inscriptions. Many of the above-mentioned works contain surveys of the literature. Besides this we must mention: A. H. Sayce, Babylonian literature: Lectures (1877); C. Bezold, Kurzgefasster Ueberblick über die babylonisch-assyrische Literatur, with a chronological excursus, two registers, and an index to 1500 clay tablets in the British Museum (1886). The already numerous translations give us at least a glimpse into the extent and form of the literary remains, but they can be but little trusted, especially if they are not accompanied by transcriptions and commentaries. This reservation is necessary, for instance, in regard to the attempts of the R. P. I, III, V, VII, IX, and XI; New Series, I, II.

Amongst the foreign authorities on Assyria and Babylon, the principal place is taken by the parts of the Old Testament which bear on this subject, such as the books of Kings and the Prophets. They are derived partly from men who judged as eye-witnesses, or at least as contemporaries; they often complete the reports contained in Assyrian texts,

which again, as a rule, confirm the correctness of Biblical witnesses, although sometimes they correct details. The number of publications which use the results of Assyriology more or less successfully from an apologetic point of view is great, but in scientific importance none approaches SCHRADER'S above-mentioned book. We shall leave a discussion on the books of the Old Testament to theologians; the fifty-seventh chapter will treat of the concordance of the Assyro-Babylonian texts with the ancient reports of Genesis. But we shall only mention here, that the reliability of the first half of the book of Daniel has found a supporter amongst Assyriologists in FR. LENORMANT, though till now he has not been able to convert many opponents, since the reasons against the historical truth of this book are of more importance than the few correct statements on Babylonian matters, which are so strongly emphasised by LENORMANT.

Amongst Greek authorities we shall first mention Herodotus. He wrote, or meant to write, an Assyrian or Babylonian (this meant the same to him) history, but we know nothing more about it. In his great history, perhaps owing to this, the information about Assyria and Babylon is very scanty (Book I), although very interesting and reliable, but here also there is no line drawn between history and myth. Herodotus faithfully records what he saw himself, and what he heard, and modern explorations have confirmed many of his remarks. It is otherwise with the statements of Ktesias, a Greek doctor at the Persian court, who is said to have drawn his facts from the state annals, but according to the fragments found in Diodorus he is utterly untrustworthy. We shall not dwell on the list of Babylonian

kings which is preserved in the royal canon of Ptolemy, nor on the fragments of Abydenus, of whom little is known, which are preserved by Eusebius. The most productive authority in the Greek language is Berosus' Chaldean history in three books, which we unfortunately only possess in fragments, and on second or third hand (from Alexander Polyhistor, in Josephus, Eusebius, and others). Berosus was a priest who lived under the first successors of Alexander the Great, and he knew and understood the original sources of the mythology and history of his country. He recorded the myths about the origins of the world, of man, and of civilisation, and about the flood, but he also described historical times; for instance, he gives an important list of the succession of the dynasties of the ancient Chaldean kingdom.

Although in the form of Babylono-Assyrian literature we only possess what is chiselled and engraved on stone, yet this by no means limits us to inscriptions only, for there exist also much longer texts. The texts that were written on paper are lost to us. Fortunately the libraries consisted mostly of clay tablets: the writing was impressed into soft clay and the tablets were afterwards baked. Thus we possess the inscriptions on monuments, as, for instance, the obelisk at Nimrud, on the walls of palaces, and also statements of buildings; inscriptions on smaller or larger cylinders, bas-reliefs, &c., and the texts on clay tablets. At an early date, in the ancient Babylonian period, the capitals were seats of culture, where libraries were founded, as by Sargon I in Agane. But we know no more of these collections than their existence; we owe our knowledge of literature to the libraries which the

Assyrian kings, particularly the Sargonides, established. More especially from the library of Asurbanipal, thousands of clay tablets, partly destroyed and broken, have been placed in the British Museum. A book consisted of several tablets, which were covered on both sides with very fine cuneiform writing, and their connection and order was shown by numbers. Great care was taken of these libraries ; the tablets forming one book were placed carefully together, whilst their use was made easier by syllabaries explaining the signs used. Unfortunately the building for this library has only been discovered in ruins, the tablets all scattered in heaps and often very much damaged, so that investigation had first to begin with the difficult work of finding the parts of the single tablets, and often larger or smaller gaps could not be filled up. However fragmentary our information may be, yet it suffices to give us a certain knowledge of Babylono-Assyrian literature. We must first notice that this literature must be looked on as a whole. The Semitic language of Babylon and Assyria is the same. In literature the Assyrians (often called the Romans of the East) were dependent on the Babylonians, for it consisted of old Babylonian texts which the Sargonides had copied for their libraries. Some of these texts are written in the Sumero-Akkadian language, especially those referring to magic, but they are usually followed by Assyrian translations. We cannot approximately guess what originals in this ancient language (Sumero-Akkadian) may still be found in Babylon; up to the present we possess numerous inscriptions and cylinders without Semitic translations.

The contents of these various inscriptions and texts throw light on many subjects. We must first mention the historical documents which give so much information about Assyrian times: such as lists of kings and eponyms (these officers were called Limmi, and gave their names to the years), imperial annals, a synchronistic survey of the history of Assur and Babel, inscriptions in which kings describe their buildings or wars, and statements of buildings, &c. With these reports, which were partly written at the time when the facts happened, we can construct a framework of Assyro-Babylonian history, with tolerable exactness. To this we must add the despatches which contain reports from the provinces to the court, or vice versâ, the fragments of laws, especially on family rights, dating from the ancient Babylonian times, the numerous contracts which show us something of civic life, &c. But as regards religion more information is given by texts of another kind. What has been already stated holds good of these likewise, that the Assyrians borrowed from the Babylonians, and that the texts, sometimes even in their form, but also in their contents, are of Sumero-Akkadian origin. This is certainly the case with the magic spells, the incantations, and also with the astronomic and astrological works, and the texts on presages, &c. Amongst the texts, an important place is held by the great work which Sargon I caused to be made for the library at Agane, under the title of 'The observations of Bel.' Fragments of the copy, made of this work for the Assyrian library, are now in London. Later on Berosus made a translation of this work into Greek.

Such works belong to mantic literature, but they

contain also scientific observations. The Babylonians were the fathers of mathematics and the calendar, but they did not separate astronomy from astrology. Besides these magic texts, we must also mention the lyric and epic texts. To the former belong several prayers and hymns, which date from the Sumero-Akkadian period ; to compare them with Vedic songs or with the Psalms, as some people do, only gives rise to erroneous conceptions. We learn more from the epic treatment of certain myths, more especially the cycle of the Izdubar legend in twelve parts. We shall speak of its subject matter later on.

The religious literature gives us a general conception of various important traits of the religion of this remarkable people; but it does not give us even an approximate survey of the religious development during these many centuries, which separate the pre-Semitic culture of Chaldea from the new Babylonian period. We shall arrange our material according to subject.

Here and there we can try to distinguish between the part taken by the Semites, and that of the original inhabitants, and we shall find it easier to do this, if we make a comparison with other branches of the Semitic race.

CHAPTER 55. — **Magic and Divination.**

Books of Reference. FR. LENORMANT, La magie chez les Chaldéens et les origines Accadiennes (1874, an interesting book, with plentiful material, but the combinations are too hazardous, especially those respecting 'Akkadian origins;' the English translation, 1877, is largely increased); La divination et la science des présages chez les Chaldéens (1875).

Magic and divination are the most prominent features in Assyro-Babylonian religion. In classic antiquity,

the name Chaldean was synonymous with magician and soothsayer; even in imperial Rome, when the Assyro-Babylonian gods had long since passed away, these Chaldeans found a large audience, and one of the poets gave this warning: *Chaldaeos ne consulito.* This magic element belongs to the oldest times of Babylono-Assyrian religion; it is part of what the Semites borrowed from the original inhabitants of Chaldea, as is proved by the language of the magic incantations.

The ruling ideas of magic are here the same as everywhere else. These are a belief in spirits which one wishes to propitiate, or whose evil influences one wishes to avert by spells and magic means. But the texts which we possess point to a developed state of magic, far beyond that which prevails amongst savages. The spirits (Utukki, Sidi, and others) are properly organised. There seems to exist a certain hierarchy amongst them, they often appear in groups of seven; fixed spheres of nature are appointed to each, there are gods of heaven, of earth and water, and they dwell on mountain tops and especially in the desert. But what is of more importance is that good and bad spirits are distinguished; people appeal to the good spirits to avoid being taken possession of by evil spirits, or they place themselves under the protection of the highest gods against the adverse, anti-divine power of spirits. The forms of conjuration are systematically arranged in numerous lengthy texts, and others are given in a work on magic in three parts[1]: the first part contains the formulas against

[1] The fragments of this book in Cun. Inscr., W. As. IV, have been thoroughly examined by Lenormant.

the evil spirits; the second, against sickness; the third, the songs addressed to special gods. The recitation of these songs has a magic influence. The evil spirits work mischief everywhere, in the air and on the earth, in fields and in towns; on the highways they lie in wait for travellers, and are dangerous to man and beast, large and small; 'reverence and kindness is unknown to them, prayers and supplications they do not hear,' and magic spells alone can protect men from their secret power. These spells were so arranged that first of all the demon who was to be exorcised was mentioned, and his influence was described, and then the 'spirit of heaven' and the 'spirit of earth,' and sometimes a whole number of other gods, were appealed to against him. In the same way people protected themselves by exorcisms against the evil eye, the unlucky word, the evil magic of enemies who could bewitch people in various ways, for instance by the malevolent making of a likeness. Illness was also attributed to evil influences, and a cure was expected through magic spells. The spells mostly occur against pest, fever, and headache. Amongst the influential words which could avert or expel evil, the most prominent were the names of the great gods, but these names were considered to be secret, and therefore people appealed to the god himself to pronounce them. Besides these magic spells, various magic means were used: such as talismans and amulets, and magic curative drinks, &c. Vivifying force was attributed to sprinkling with water, and the magic knots which were spread far and wide came from Chaldea. The images of the great beneficent gods were taken to the bedside of

sick people to heal them. And there is no doubt that the huge colossal figures (winged bulls, lions with human heads), were erected at the entrance of temples and palaces, to keep away evil spirits. But people cannot agree as to whether they represented good spirits, or whether they were likenesses of the most powerful of the evil spirits, which were put up there to frighten away other evil powers.

The Chaldeans, before all other nations, interested themselves thoroughly in observing appearances in the sky, as they believed in their influence on earthly fates. The great work of Sargon I on astrology, which we have already mentioned, is by no means an isolated example. The Chaldeans made astronomical observations from the towers of their temples which were built in circular rising terraces. They recognised the five planets, calculated eclipses, and fixed the twelve months according to the course of the sun through the zodiac. With this observation of heaven, they joined the science of presages; they settled nativities, and were really the first to develop the belief in sidereal influences into a systematic mantic art. It is difficult to settle exactly the part taken in the cultivation of this astrology by the two divisions of the inhabitants. It certainly dates from the original people; but it is equally certain that star-worship was not unknown to the Semites. From this we may gather that the aborigines and the immigrants met each other half way on this question. We can see that the worship of stars was aboriginal in Babylon, since the word god has a star for its symbol. Still, it would be probably wrong to explain all individual gods by their planets (Nebo-Mercury, Istar-Venus, Nergal-

Mars, Maruduk-Jupiter, and Adar-Saturn) since these combinations were probably original for some, but not for all.

Besides this most popular form of mantic based on the position and course of the sun, moon, and stars, the Chaldeans practised many others. In Ezekiel xxi. 26 we see the king of Babel questioning various signs, amongst which is the oracle by arrows, which often occurs in pictures. It is most extraordinary that this form of mantic has a parallel amongst the Semites, even amongst those who were least under Babylonian influence, and amongst the ancient Arabians who practised belomantic in front of the picture of the god Hobal. The other acts of soothsaying are similar to those which occur in other places; such as the flight of birds, the entrails of animals, and prodigies, &c. Dreams play a very prominent part. Even in the historical texts, dreams are recounted, by which kings like Asurbanipal let themselves be influenced. In the epic poem of Izdubar, dreams are repeatedly mentioned; on this point certainly, the book of Daniel does not go against historical probability. It is not necessary to mention here all the forms of magic; and it is enough to state that almost all the forms may be found in Chaldean divination. Soothsaying was even used in connection with the worship of the gods, for we find the mantic arrow in the hand of Maruduk and Istar; the latter of whom gave oracles at Arbela.

Chapter 56. — Gods and Myths.

Books of Reference. Religion is treated by C. P. Tiele (Vergel. Gesch. der eg. en mesop. godsd.); Fr. Hommel (Die sem. Völker, I), in works we have already mentioned. A short survey is given by Fr.

LENORMANT, Les dieux de Babylone et de l'Assyrie (Rev. de France, 1877). Single myths are given by FR. LENORMANT, La légende de Sémiramis (1872); EB. SCHRADER, Die Höllenfahrt der Istar (1874); A. JEREMIAS, Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode (1887). An important work is that by P. JENSEN, Die Kosmologie der Babylonier (1890).

Many people have stated much more about the Babylono-Assyrian gods than can with authority be deduced from our sources of information. Thus LENORMANT bases this religion on an original monotheism. He claims to have discovered a reliable trace of this in the word Ilu (El, in the name of the tower Bab-el), which is said originally to mean the only god. As a fact, this word is nothing else than the name for the conception of god, just like the Indian Deva and other epithets of the same sort. Many statements concerning the symbolic character of the gods of Mesopotamia are just as unfounded, at least they cannot be properly supported. We must be satisfied with a few slightly connected notices, since the origin, name, and character of these gods are often very uncertain. In many cases we do not know whether a deity is of Sumero-Akkadian, or Semitic origin, or how the fusion took place between a form from one pantheon with one from another. Of all signs in Assyrian writing, the names of the gods offer the greatest difficulties. Many readings are still undecided; it is not clear for instance whether a certain god should be called Adar or Ninip. Another name was formerly, quite wrongly, transcribed as Vul, now it is Raman, and it is often very doubtful whether a name is Akkadian or Semitic. Added to this, some names are half title, half name, for instance Bel, which gives rise to a doubt whether this word implies the god Bel or another god called Bel (master).

It is also not easy to say much positively about the character of the Babylono-Assyrian gods. We come across a number of deities, but they vary very much. First of all there are the numerous spirits of the ancient religion, who are not only mentioned according to their functions, or in nameless groups, but many of them stand out strongly individualised, as for instance Gibil, the spirit of fire, who is worshipped in numerous texts. These texts can be classed half way between magic forms and hymns. Many gods can be clearly recognised as gods of nature; such as the moon god and the sun god (Samas). Finally, with some gods (Sin) this nature meaning has disappeared or has never existed; we see them chiefly as rulers of the people, according to their political or moral meaning: such as Assur, Maruduk, and Nebo. Our knowledge is therefore too limited for us to be able to give a general characterization of these gods. The sphere of one god is often hardly divided from that of another; this applies still more to the goddesses, who are really only one and the same being under different names, and these must again be looked on partly as titles.

In spite of this, certain points can be regarded as settled. To begin with, the gods of Assyria and Babylon were the same; only Assur, whom the Assyrians worshipped as the highest god, was not worshipped in Babel. Here, as in Egypt, the ancient local forms of worship are easily recognised: Sin was the god of Ur, Anu of Erech, Mullil (Bel) of Eridu, Ea belonged to Eridu, and Samas to Sippara and Larsa; and even in later times local gods, such as Maruduk, existed in Babel. The same god some-

times occurred in various places, with rather different attributes, such as Istar in Arbela and Nineveh. The amalgamation of the local forms of worship, as well as that of the religion of the aborigines with the religion of the Semites, probably brought about a certain systematic treatment, but we cannot say with any certainty when this began. Some people have suggested that Sargon I was its originator. At quite an early date the highest gods were placed in groups. The two highest triads were: Anu (god lx), Bel (l), Hea (xl), and Sin (xxx), Samas (xx), Raman (vi). In Babylon we find the sexagesimal system; but we cannot now explain the meaning of the numbers by which the individual gods were distinguished. This much only is clear, that we have before us a systematised work, to which we must not however hastily attribute cosmogonic or philosophic ideas, as LENORMANT does. We also possess many lists of the principal gods, quite apart from the lists of the many spirits and the invocations of many gods in the magic formulas. Some royal inscriptions mention the principal gods; for instance, Tiglat Pilesar mentions seven, Salmanassar and Asurnasirpal mention thirteen, but in different orders. These thirteen are: Assur, the two triads, Adar, Nergal, Maruduk, Nebo, Beltis, and Istar. We shall discuss each individually.

Assur was the chief ruler, the king amongst gods, to whom the Assyrian rulers owed their sceptre and crown. We know of no nature explanation of this god; he is the protecting ruler of the Assyrian kingdom. He is more especially active in war; he protects the king and gives him victory. The enemies of the Assyrians are also enemies of the god, thus all

wars became sacred wars. The horrible cruelty with which the conquered were treated is practised by the kings in obedience to Assur.

The chief amongst the Babylono-Assyrian gods is Anu, who is generally looked on as a god of heaven. He is called the father and king of gods, the lord of countries, he leads the host of spirits, or sends them out as his servants. The fire god, Gibil, and the god of the air, Raman, are mentioned as his sons. His wife Anat is but seldom mentioned in the texts.

Amongst the highest gods, Bel is always mentioned as master of the gods, as creator, &c. In the first triad this Semitic god has taken the place of a Sumero-Akkadian god, whose name is read as Mullil. He was the god of Hades.

Ea is the ruler of the waters, of the ocean of heaven, as well as of earth. He is an especially beneficent god, who is invoked in magic forms to give healing and safety. In the epic of Izdubar he occurs as the helper. As a god of water he is thought of in the shape of half a fish; he is the fish-man Oannes mentioned by Berosus, as rising out of the Persian sea and teaching man the first beginnings of civilisation, whence he becomes the culture god. Ea's wife was called Davkina.

Sin, or Nannar, the moon-god, is the king of crowns with sublime splendour. His worship was carried on into the latest times. When Nabonedus realised the danger threatening his dominion, he tried to gain the help of the god Sin, by erecting temples in Ur. Moreover, many hymns celebrate Sin as the highest god, to whose command heaven and earth bow. We must notice that the deity of the moon is not female, as amongst the Arabians, but male. The moon-god also

seems to have received higher honours than the sun-god, although the latter has an important place in the ancient local forms of worship in Sippara and Larsa, and has a prominent place in the pantheon. He is called Samas, the judge of heaven and earth, the ruler of all, the servant of Anu and Bel, and when he steps forth he opens the gates of heaven and brings light and justice. The prominent part played by sun-gods in the mythical accounts of the battle between light and darkness, and between the beneficent warmth and the deadly heat in the cosmogony and the storm myths, is not here attributed to Samas, but to other gods. He seems to have been looked on, not as the fighter, but as the beneficent giver of light; at all events he is only occasionally mentioned in the myths.

The last god of the second triad is Raman, who is generally explained as the god of the air. He is violent, the ruler of the canals, the god of clouds, of rain storms, of whirlwinds, of thunder and lightning (as such he is called Barku) whose flame lights up the heavens, and whose power shakes the earth. Adar (Ninip) and Nergal are both war gods, sons or servants of Bel, rulers of fights and the chase, and therefore eagerly worshipped by the Assyrian kings.

Maruduk, the son of Ea and Davkina, originally a sun-god, is the chief god of Babel; he is also a war hero, but not in the same sense as Adar and Nergal, who rejoice in blood and destruction, but he is the conqueror of dangerous monsters. He is the god who gives protection against hostile demons, he is therefore invoked with magic formulas, and his likeness appears on amulets. His great

sanctuary, Esagila, was in Babel; it dated from ancient times (from the time of Hammurabi), and Nebukadrezar spared no expense in rebuilding it. Maruduk and his wife Zarpanit were worshipped there. TIELE has lately proved that Esagila was the only principal temple of Babel, but that it included various small sanctuaries within its precincts[1]. In Borsippa there stood also another large temple, Ezida, which was similar both in age and fate to Esagila in Babel. It was sacred to Nebo (Nabu), the son of Maruduk, who also had a sanctuary in the temple in Babel, but he was more especially worshipped in Borsippa with his wife Nana. He is the son of Maruduk, not however warlike like his father, but a god, of light and civilisation, of writing and revelation. Joined with him is a deity whose worship was introduced by Hammurabi; this god was called Tasmitu, the god of listening, sometimes represented as a man, sometimes as a woman (as such she is the wife of Nebo).

The goddesses are far less individualised, and as we have already mentioned, they are really only various forms of one and the same goddess. This multiplication may have arisen from the fact that, in the system of gods, every god had a wife by his side; the unsettled state of many names may have had something to do with it. This principal goddess is called Belit (Beltis), Semiramis, and Istar. Belit, Bel's wife, is the same as the Mylitta of Herodotus, in whose service Babylonian women offered themselves once during their lives for money to a stranger. Semiramis,

[1] C. P. TIELE, Die hoofdtempel van Babel en die van Borsippa (Versl. en meded. k. Ak. v. Wet. Amsterdam, 1886).

whom Diodorus changes into a queen, the daughter of the Phœnician Derketo, of whose adventures he tells wonderful tales (she must not be confounded with the Semiramis of history, Herod. i. 184), is, as can be clearly seen from her myths and symbols, only a form of the goddess of Asia Minor, both warlike and voluptuous in her double nature, as we have already described her in chapter 35. In Babylon and Assyria this goddess is especially called Istar, with whom the ancient Nana is identical or at least united. We know many myths and fragments of myths about her. Izdubar scorns her love, and overwhelms her with reproaches, because she has proved fatal to all her former lovers, kings as well as slaves. These are references to myths that are unknown to us. The myth of Istar's love for the youth Dumuzi is easier to understand; Dumuzi succumbs to his enemies, and the goddess bewails his death. The most complete myth is the story of Istar's journey into Hades, which has till now been treated as part of the Izdubar-cycle, but quite lately A. Jeremias raised an objection to this and argued that this myth stands by itself. Istar looks in the lower world, not for her dead lover, but for the waters of life, whose source rises there. The description of the land from whence there is no returning, and where darkness and destruction reign and dust is eaten, is very vivid. But still we cannot give the conception of the lower world in detail, and the question as to whether there is any idea of recompense remains undecided. At the seven doors which Istar has to pass, she is made to lay aside her ornaments and garments. Thus she appears before the dark goddess of the earth who receives her with words of scorn, and makes her a

prisoner. But, owing to the disappearance of Istar, all fruitfulness has ceased on earth, therefore, the high gods of heaven take pity on the earth and send a messenger to the lower world, who sprinkles Istar with the water of life and leads her up again. It is very difficult to come to any conclusion about the natural meaning of Istar. The fact of her being called the daughter of Ea, or of Sin, proves that she is a goddess of heaven; she is the planet Venus; but the myth of her journey into Hades is explained by some people thus, that Istar is the opposite to the goddess of the lower world, and represents the fruitful earth. But it is a fact, that in her we see very clearly the twofold nature of the Asiatic goddess. As Istar of Arbela she is warlike, granting courage and victory to the Assyrian kings; but as Istar of Nineveh she is also the goddess of love. These thoughts are expressed in art by the lion on which Istar stands, armed, and wearing a tiara. She is also represented as naked, or a mother with her child.

Now let us turn from the gods to the heroes. The Izdubar epic consists of many parts, whose unity and connection was first discovered by G. SMITH. Owing to his great gift of combination, he was able to combine the twelve tablets, each consisting of about 300 lines in six columns, which were in the library of Asurbanipal, and belong to this history in such a manner, that he was at least able to trace a thread of thought in them. Unluckily, not one of the tablets is quite perfect, and some of them are so broken, that only fragments of lines still exist. It can easily be understood that this greatly impedes all explanations;

we ought rather to wonder that it has been possible to decipher so much. The beginning of the history carries us to the ancient town of Erech (Uruk), and tells us of the origin and deeds of the hero Izdubar. Izdubar goes to Eabani, a creature with ox's feet, a tail, and horns, to enquire the meaning of a curious dream. It is only with great difficulty that this soothsayer is persuaded to go to Erech; but once there he forms a close friendship with Izdubar, and helps him to slay the tyrant Humbaba. Then follows Istar's courting of Izdubar; but when he scorns her the goddess appeals to her father Anu for revenge, and sends a powerful bull against Izdubar, but he kills him with the help of Eabani. It is at this point that G. Smith inserts Istar's descent into Hades. Then Izdubar is overcome with a severe illness, and with sorrow at the death of Eabani; he starts off to seek recovery from Hasisadra, who lives as immortal at the mouth of the rivers. The epic gives details of Izdubar's wanderings, and his adventures on the way. At last he arrives at Hasisadra's dwelling, who imparts to him the secret of life and recovery. This Hasisadra gives his visitor detailed accounts of the deluge. The last tablet shows us Izdubar when he is cured and back again in Erech, but still lamenting Eabani, whose spirit has not found rest in the depths, and he implores Ea and Maruduk to receive him into the dwellings of the blest.

Many questions connected with this epic-cycle are for the most part as yet unanswered. First of all, there is the question whether this history in its entirety, and not considering each single story, dates from the original inhabitants, or from the Semites.

The reading of the names is very uncertain; they are at present transcribed as Izdubar, Eabani, Hasisadra, &c., but this is certainly not correct. Of late PINCHES has discovered that the true rendering of Izdubar should be Gilgames. The identification of Izdubar with Nimrod, which is accepted by many people, is thought by HAUPT to be justified by the mere reading of Namrutu. No less important is the contrast which is found here also, between the conception of these stories as legends with an historical basis, or as nature-myths. The first opinion is defended in a strong euhemeristic spirit by G. SMITH, and with more moderation by FRIEDR. DELITZSCH. The former recognises in Istar a queen of Erech, and tries to find historical connections in the accounts of Izdubar's battles. It may perhaps be the case that these are interwoven; thus perhaps the fall of the tyrant Humbaba may be connected with the fall of the foreign Elamite rule in Chaldea. It would certainly be labour lost to try and find historical points of connection for the whole story. But we do not either wish to accept all that the followers of the mythic explanations (SIR HENRY RAWLINSON, LENORMANT, SAYCE, and, in the main points, also TIELE) have said about Izdubar as a sun-god or ancient Akkadian fire-god. Izdubar's battles and wanderings are by them explained as referring to the sun, the twelve parts of the epic refer to the course of the sun and the zodiac, the illness of the hero is the sun becoming weaker, the discord between him and Istar is the heat of summer, which destroys all fruitfulness, and the deluge is the rainy season. Some people have also recognised in the story of Izdubar the original of the Heracles myths, and have tried to point out the

similarities of the features of these two stories. The fight with the lion, in the representations in plastic art, offers a striking point of similarity; but the comparison between Eabani and Cheiron is less evident.

Chapter 57.—The Chaldean Genesis.

Books of Reference. G. Smith, Chaldäische Genesis (1876, the German translation is important because of the additions made by Friedr. Delitzsch); Fr. Lenormant, Les origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions des peuples orientaux (3 vols., 1880–1884, which we have spoken of in chapter 4); Le déluge et l'épopée babylonienne (in Les prem. civilisations, II); P. Haupt, Der keilinschriftliche Sintfluthbericht (Vorl. 1881, he also wrote an important excursus in the second edition of Schrader's Keilinschr. u. A. Test.). Besides this, the question has been treated in many essays and has been discussed in connection with the study of the Old Testament. We must also consult those parts of the following works referring to this subject; K. Budde, Die biblische Urgeschichte (1883), and W. H. Koster's careful treatise, De bijbelsche zontvloedverhalen met de babylonische vergeleken (Theol. Tijdschr. 1885).

The peculiar fascination of Assyriology for many people is mostly owing to its connection with the study of the Old Testament. But at the same time, there is a danger of seeking too minute Biblical parallels, and thus carrying on a sort of sensational science. We cannot deny that since the year 1872, when first of all in England, G. Smith pointed out the striking similarity between the cuneiform and Biblical accounts of the flood, this danger has not always been avoided. We shall here give a simple statement of facts.

The accounts which are compared one with another are taken, on the one hand, from what is said in Genesis i–xi, and, on the other hand, from what is

said in Babylono-Assyrian texts (both those in cuneiform, and those of Berosus), on primeval times. We can easily see that this question divides itself into several questions of detail.

Thus FRIEDR. DELITZSCH fancied he had arrived at a reliable statement of the situation of paradise, by the geography of Babylon, but LENORMANT and others have disputed this. G. SMITH, with much less reason, claims to have found a description of the fall in cuneiform writings. Of this combination nothing remains but the still very uncertain conjecture, that a certain tree found in Babylonian cylinder pictures represents one of the trees of paradise. But on the other hand, we can rely on the connection between the Cherubim in Genesis iii, and in Ezekiel, and the Kirubu of the Babylonians and Assyrians, a sort of spirit which unites in itself the four creatures, bull, lion, eagle, and man. But although their Assyrian origin has been proved, yet their essence has not been sufficiently explained. Another important point of comparison is offered by the numerous ethnographic notices of the Assyrian inscriptions, with the list of nations in Genesis x. LENORMANT has made a thorough collection of these materials. The parallel to the story of the building of a tower, which G. SMITH thought he had found in a cuneiform inscription is, on the other hand, very weak, as is also the linguistic foundation for the statement that the tower at Borsippa (now Birs Nimrod, and probably the terrace-shaped temple of Belus mentioned by Herodotus) was the same, the building of which is recounted in Genesis xi.

We shall leave all these questions on one side, to

consider more closely the two most important parallels which refer to the cosmogony and the flood. With regard to the cosmogony, we are almost entirely dependent on authorities of a later date; fortunately we know that Berosus gives us genuine ancient material. It is true that a few statements about cosmogony are to be found in cuneiform texts, but they are in such a bad condition, that one cannot give a satisfactory summary of the whole.

Only certain facts are quite clear, for instance, that chaos was the beginning of all things, which is called Tiamat in the text. Fragments of these texts, and paintings on cylinders, tell us of a battle between Tiamat and Maruduk, of which the well-known story of the fight between Bel and the Dragon is a reproduction. Tiamat is represented as a female, as the sea a chaos, which hid everything within itself, whilst the god (Maruduk, Bel) created from this, the world in order. Tiamat, under the name of Tauthe, is one of the two cosmogonic principles (the other is called Apason) found in Damascius, an author whose writing on Babylonian cosmogony contains various names in a Greek form, in which we can without difficulty recognise the gods Anu, Ea, Davkina, and Bel. But we can learn most from the fragments of Berosus. The fish-man, Oannes, who taught the rough original men the beginnings of morality and science, and at night sank back into the sea (for he was an amphibious creature, as Berosus cleverly remarks), left behind a writing on cosmogony. In the beginning there was only darkness and water, in which all sorts of monsters spontaneously arose. This creation was governed by a woman called Omoroca, or Thauatt,

which means sea (Tiamat). Bel put an end to this state of things by cutting the woman into two parts, from which he created the earth and the heaven. Then Bel cut off his own head, and from his blood mixed with earth, the gods kneaded mankind, who therefore possess a divine intelligence. In comparing these cosmogonic thoughts with those in Genesis, we must take into account what we know of the Phœnician cosmogony from the fragments of Philo of Byblos (Sanchoniathon). If we then, as LENORMANT has done, place the various parallels of the Biblical story of the creation side by side, we see clearly that they give us no reliable ground for forming any fixed conclusions about the origin and development of these conceptions. The mutilated condition of cuneiform inscriptions produces a painful gap. The thoughts which more particularly attract our attention are the following. To begin with, the cosmogony is also a theogony in the writings of Damascius, as well as in one of the fragments of Philo of Byblos, but it is not so in Genesis, where the whole cosmogony is written in a severely monotheistic spirit. We find on the other hand an original chaotic existence, and an original water in Genesis as well as in the Babylonian accounts. Similarly, we find an essential agreement in the conception of the creation, as the arranging of already existing matter, in the idea of a separation between heaven and earth, and in the thought of the uniting of divine life with earthly dust at the creation of man. But in the Babylonian as well as in the Phœnician accounts, the connection of the cosmogony with the origin of civilisation is much more pro-

minent than in Genesis, where it is quite uncertain, if it can be traced at all.

We are better informed with regard to the flood than with regard to the creation, for we possess not only Berosus, but also a minute well-preserved cuneiform inscription, in the eleventh tablet of the Izdubar epic, on this subject. This account tallies as a whole, as well as in detail, with the two accounts which the editor of Genesis has combined, and more especially with the most ancient commonly called the Jahvist. The Izdubar epic also, tells us of a great flood, from which the pious Hasisadra was saved, by building a ship according to divine commands, to protect himself and all seeds of life. The drying of the land is here also discovered by the sending out of birds (dove, swallow, and crow). After he was saved, Hasisadra also made a sacrifice, and when the gods perceived it they collected like flies round it. The list of points of similarity and difference between the Babylonian and the Biblical account has already often been made. With regard to the diversities, we must more especially mention the different spirit of both accounts. In Genesis the flood is a judgment sent by God to sinful man. But this character is by no means given to this event in the Chaldean account. It indeed was the cause of a serious split amongst the gods. On the one hand, the flood is caused by divine wilfulness, the gods wished to send a flood, and Bel was especially active in doing so. On the other hand, it was a sort of fate, for Istar had prophesied some great evil without knowing how it should take place. The preservation of Hasisadra is entirely Ea's doing, without the knowledge of Bel, who actually was angry that even

one man was saved. Istar laments the destruction of mankind, which she had not borne in order merely to fill the sea. After the end of the catastrophe there was a great fight between Ea and Bel. Ea reproaches Bel that he destroys the good with the bad, and announces his decision that the earth shall never again be destroyed by a flood. It is only after great difficulty that Bel agrees to Hasisadra's being saved. This dramatic introduction of the gods forms the great difference between the Biblical account, and the account in cuneiform writing. Berosus contains a few other features. He lays great stress on the fact that Xisuthrus (Hasisadra) must bury the sacred writings in the town of Sippara, where they can be found again after the flood. When the flood is over Xisuthrus does not live for ever on earth as Hasisadra does, but he is taken up to the gods in heaven, like Enoch in the Bible.

From these and similar observations, the question arises, what are we to think of the relations between the Babylonian and Israelite accounts? That in spite of many differences, both in the spirit in which they are treated and in details (for instance, the building of the ark, the duration of the flood, &c.), they are still one and the same story, can be doubted as little as that the originality belongs to the Chaldean account. But nothing can as yet be said for certain about the manner and the time in which this story was borrowed. It is most improbable that there was any prehistoric connection, and that, for instance, Abraham brought this tradition with him from Ur of the Chaldees, or that it developed itself separately amongst the two nations. This idea is not tenable because a knowledge of the

flood can only be traced quite late in the Old Testament; but besides this, if we place a list of the parallel expressions before us, it is difficult to imagine such a distant connection as that between two branches of the same tradition, developed independently in two nations, separated since a prehistoric period. But it is equally doubtful, whether we must therefore place the borrowing of this story as far down as the time of the exile. At that time the Israelites would hardly have been willing to take over religious traditions from their oppressors. It is more probable that this borrowing took place during the time of the kings, when the relations between the kingdoms of Israel, Assyria, and Babylon were by no means always of a friendly character.

Much remains to be discovered about this and similar questions. When the excitement caused by the first discoveries had subsided, the Chaldean genesis was a disappointment to some people because they did not find in it the brilliant results they expected, but only difficult problems. Now people recognise that these problems also have their interest, and that the labour bestowed on them is by no means without results.

THE HINDUS.

Books of Reference. CHR. LASSEN, Indische Alterthumskunde (4 vols., 1847–1861; 2nd ed. of vols. i and ii, 1867–1874); J. MUIR, Original Sanskrit Texts on the origin and history of the people of India, their religion and institutions, 5 vols.: I. The origin of caste; II. The trans-Himalayan origin of the Hindus; III. The Vedas: opinions of their authors and of later Indian writers on their origin, inspiration, and authority; IV. Comparison of the Vedic with the later representations of the principal Indian deities; V. Contributions to a knowledge of the cosmogony, mythology, religious ideas, life and manners of the Indians in the Vedic ages (1858–1872, 2nd ed. con-

siderably enlarged of vols. i–iv, 1868–1873, 3rd ed. of vol. i, 1890). These two great classical works by LASSEN and MUIR are indispensable to everyone working at Indian history or religion. H. T. COLEBROOKE, Miscellaneous Essays, ed. by E. B. COWELL (2 vols., 1873); this is a collection of articles which appeared first in As. Researches, Transact. of the R. As. Soc., and in other periodicals; they date from the beginning of this century and first founded Indian studies, and they have not yet lost their value; this work is enriched with notes by COWELL and others. H. H. WILSON, Works ed. by Dr. R. ROST (5 vols., 1861–1865): I, II. Essays on the religion of the Hindus; III, IV, V. Essays on Sanskrit Literature. The same can be said of the work of this veteran of Indology as of COLEBROOKE, his studies on Indian sects are especially valuable. A. WEBER, Akademische Vorlesungen über indische Literaturgeschichte (1852, 2nd ed. 1875); Indische Skizzen (4 articles, 1857); Indische Streifen (3 vols., 1868–1879, vols. ii. and iii contain a critical bibliography of Indian researches during the years 1849–1879); since 1849 WEBER has been bringing out his Indische Studien, a periodical which has for its object the publishing and editing of original material; 17 vols. have appeared. F. MAX MÜLLER, A History of ancient Sanskrit Literature so far as it illustrates the primitive religion of the Brahmans (1859, 2nd ed. 1860): this treats only the Vedic literature. Also his Chips from a German Workshop (trans. into German, essays in 4 vols.), more especially vol. i, and his Lectures on the Science of Language (2 vols.) give us much that is important about India; and lastly his Hibbert Lectures, 1878, On the origin and growth of religion as illustrated by the religions of India. MONIER WILLIAMS, Indian Wisdom (3rd ed. 1876), useful gleanings from the various forms of Indian writing; his book written after several journeys to India is more valuable: Religious thought and life in India—I. Vedism, Brahmanism, and Hinduism, 2nd ed. 1885. He gave a short general survey under the title: Hinduism (S. P. C. K. 1878). II. Buddhism. P. WURM, Geschichte der indischen Religion (1874) is a brief survey collected for missionary teaching. A. BARTH'S Les religions de l'Inde can be thoroughly recommended (it appeared first of all in 1879 and then as a separate reprint; an English translation in Tr. Or. S. 1882 is improved and enlarged). J. DAWSON, A Classical dictionary of Hindu mythology and religion, geography, history, and literature (Tr. Or. S. 1879) can be recommended as a useful book of reference.

CHAPTER 58.—**Preliminary Remarks.**

The Hindu religion has its origin in the oldest prehistoric times, which we cannot fix even approxi-

mately. At the present time many of its formations bear witness to its vitality, and it meets the needs of millions of people. The history of this religion touches the most difficult questions of archæology, as well as the practical problems of the present. The most remarkable feature in this religion is, that during its development which lasted thousands of years, and under disturbing influences from within as well as from without, and in spite of the variety of its forms, it has still preserved a uniformly developed character. In all its phases, an aversion to the reality of the outer world forms an essential element. A tendency towards the mysterious and the abstruse is manifested in its rough symbols, its subtle distinctions and its often apparently deep speculations. At the same time the Hindus tried hard to grasp the essence, and to give up the outer seeming, but they never conceived this essence as supernatural. The belief in the unity of the world may be said to be the fundamental dogma of all Hindu conceptions.

With this fundamental character one of the greatest defects of Hindu life is connected: namely, the total want of what may be called the historical sense. However important the civilisation may be which we find amongst the Hindus, yet we can hardly count them with the historical nations, for they are distinguished neither by noteworthy political formations, nor by the endeavour to assert and defend themselves against other nations. That is why the history of the world, which especially judges from these points of view, as far as it includes single nations within the limits of its survey, has so little to do with the Hindus. For the development of mankind, the history of the

small Greek states is of far greater importance than that of the vast country of India, whose inhabitants were not intent on playing a part on the world's stage. This indifference is more especially seen in the absence of historical writings. Of all the numerous works which compose their literature only a few, and those of late date, are of an historical character. No annals tell us of the fates of princes and states; for here there was no desire to preserve the memory of the past. These facts are by no means prejudicial to an enquiry into the history of Hindu religion, but they make the work much more difficult. Although the history of religion as a whole treats of the inner phases of national life, yet the firm construction of external history with its clearly defined periods is necessary, as it forms the framework surrounding the growth of the history of religion. But this framework is utterly wanting here. The history of India has no fixed data; a few chronological determinations are possible only with the help of scanty foreign witnesses. The Hindus, however, had but little contact with the historical nations of antiquity. The first established fact which we possess is the embassy of Megasthenes, who stayed at the court of *K*andragupta in the service of Seleukus Nikator, and collected valuable information about India, of which unfortunately fragments only remain to us. From this first more lasting contact with Greek civilisation one can, with the help of native traditions, count back, and thus we arrive at fixing Buddha's death in the year 477 B.C., a date which, although not yet generally received, possesses nevertheless a fair amount of probability.

At least we can thus establish a reliable limit in

Indian history, and can distinguish a time both before and after Buddha. But a minute knowledge of historical circumstances and social institutions cannot be attained of the pre-Buddhistic, and but very imperfectly of later times. A rich literature affords us an insight into the history of the forms of worship, and into religious thought. As regards the fate of the people we must be satisfied with meagre accounts, if we do not distil history from the hero sagas as worked up in the epics, which is a daring undertaking. That the Âryas (masters), as they called themselves in opposition to the hostile aborigines (Dasyu)[1], forced their way into India from the north-west, and first of all settled in the river district of the Indus, then conquered the country of the Ganges, and not till later times established themselves in the Deccan to the south of the Vindhya mountains: that these foreigners only after terrible fights with the aborigines (who remained numerous in many parts of the country, especially in the Deccan, and exercised great influence on the ruling race), and amongst themselves, attained a safe hold on the land: all this is certain, but we cannot fix these facts chronologically. This causes the uncertainty in the history of Indian literature, which always depends on internal evidence. But to determine the age of these documents from their contents and mutual relation, is so difficult that we can often not even fix the century to which a book belongs. In addition to this the more ancient products of literature were for hundreds of years not preserved

[1] On the use of the word Dasyu, even for evil spirits, MUIR, II. ch. iii.

in writing, but merely by memory. Some scholars, though they meet with opposition, maintain a Semitic origin of Hindu writing, and that it was only used much later for literary objects [1].

Thus during the single periods, especially in more ancient times, the chronological order is uncertain, and we can only subdivide the whole very broadly. LASSEN has mentioned as the two great events which form a means of division, Buddhism, and the conquests by Mohammedan princes (from about 1000 A.D.). WEBER distinguishes in literature the Vedic, the Sanskrit, and the new Hindu productions. He only treated the first two in his academic lectures. MAX MÜLLER, who only speaks of Vedic literature, and in fact, rather despises everything after Buddha in India, has distinguished four periods in the Vedic time: the *Kh*andas period, during which the ancient hymns were originated; the Mantra period, in which they were put together into an arranged collection; the Brâhma*n*a period, and the Sûtra period, during which the writings known by these names were composed. The last period he places from the year 600 to 200 B.C. This division, more especially the distinction between the two oldest periods, has aroused much controversy. The most acceptable is perhaps the division by BARTH, who in five chapters treats of Vedism, Brâhmanism, Buddhism, *G*ainism, and Hinduism. The boundary line between the first two sections is, however, very wavering. The same Vedic literature embraces both periods, and the signs by which one distinguishes Brâhmanism from Vedism depend not so much on quality as on quantity. We

[1] On this question cp. LASSEN, I. 1009 seq.

shall therefore class Vedism and Brâhmanism together. We cannot deal with them strictly chronologically, and in our first sub-division we shall have even to deal with much of what is post-Buddhistic.

I. VEDIC AND BRÂHMANIC TIMES.

CHAPTER 59. — Survey of the Vedic Literature.

Books of Reference. H. T. COLEBROOKE, On the Vedas, or sacred writings of the Hindus (1805, in Misc. Ess. I, with notes by Whitney); R. ROTH, Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda (1846); F. MAX MÜLLER, History of ancient Sanskrit Literature (1859), Lecture on the Vedas (1865, Chips, I).

The name Veda, knowledge, does not designate a book or a complete collection, but a whole literature. We cannot define closely the terminus a quo and the terminus ad quem of this literature. The oldest sayings and songs perhaps reach back into Indo-Germanic, or at least into Indo-Persian antiquity; whilst on the other hand the later writings, as also the later revisions of the older writings, date from Buddhist times. Much diligence and acumen have been devoted to the publishing and translating of the numerous writings belonging to this period, as well as to the history of their origin, their oral transmission, and transference to writing, the various forms of texts and later history, during the last decades by men like BENFEY, ROTH, WEBER, MAX MÜLLER, WHITNEY, AUFRECHT, RÖER, BÜHLER, STENZLER, RAJENDRALALA MITRA, and others. We shall not attempt to give a complete list of the various Vedic writings, and shall only introduce the reader to the principal works composing this literature.

Through the whole of the Vedic literature we find a distinction drawn between Mantra, songs (this part is

also called Saṁhitâ, collection); Brâhmaṇa, tracts on ritual; and Sûtra, which Sûtra, under the name of Vedânga, i. e. members of the Veda, are joined to the actual Veda. Therefore this third part is also sometimes called Smṛiti (memory, tradition), and the two former are called Śruti (what has been heard, divine teaching). This division refers equally to all Vedas, of which there are either three (to know them was the 'threefold wisdom') or four: Rig-veda, Sâma-veda, Yaǵur-veda, and Atharva-veda. The last is generally represented as belonging to a later period, or to another class of worship. These Vedas are transmitted in various schools, often in very different forms; several of the various recensions (Śâkhâs) have been lost.

We must now consider these collections more closely, and shall begin with the Saṁhitâs. If we describe the Rig-veda as the hymns, the Sâma-veda as the songs, and Yaǵur-veda as the formulas, this does not yet give us sufficient insight into the real state of the case. As a fact, the body of the hymns in these three Saṁhitâs, although with strong variations in the readings, is almost exactly the same. The hymns of the Sâma-veda are, with a few exceptions altogether, and those in the white Yaǵur-veda for the larger part, the same as those which occur in the Rig-veda. The difference is, that the Rig-veda contains the hymns arranged according to the family of poets to whom they are ascribed, whilst the collection of the two other Vedas is meant for liturgical purposes. The Sâma-veda contains those hymns which were sung at the Soma sacrifices in the order required for this ceremony. The Yaǵur-veda, on the contrary, embraces the whole sacrificial ceremonial. In this Veda a great

division into schools is noticeable. The two principal divisions are distinguished as the black and white Ya*g*ur-veda. In the black (Taittirîya) the liturgical part (formulas and songs) is mixed up with the ritual part (the description and explanation of the ceremonial). In the white (Vâ*g*asaneya) these two parts, just as in the other Vedas, are separated as Sa*m*hitâ and Brâhma*n*a. A collection of quite a different kind is formed by the hymns and formulas of the Atharva-veda. It is true that this fourth Veda also, has about half its hymns in common with the Rig-veda; but the whole collection does not owe its unity like the Sâma-veda and the Ya*g*ur-veda to one fixed ritual. We find numerous magic formulas for protection from or keeping off of dangerous influences, for love potions, curses, and blessings of various forms.

The Brâhma*n*as, which differ very much in language from the hymns, contain all sorts of explanations, stories, and observations. These are often very disconnectedly strung together, but they are all somehow made to relate to the sacrificial ceremonies. They do not give us, like the Kalpa-Sûtras, a connected survey of this ceremonial, but they presuppose a knowledge of it, and discuss single, controversial, or otherwise important questions. MAX MÜLLER has called the Brâhma*n*a 'theological rubbish,' but at the same time he has pointed out their importance for a history of the sacrifice. The most important Brâhma*n*as are the following: to the Rig-veda belong the Aitareya and Kaushîtaki; to the Sâma-veda belong the *Kh*ândogya and Talavakâra; to the black Ya*g*ur-veda belongs the Taittirîya, and to the white belongs the *S*atapatha; to the Atharva-veda

belongs the Gopatha-Brâhmana. These Brâhmanas are followed by a class of writings which belong equally to the Śruti, but do not touch on the sacrificial ceremonial. These are the Âranyakas, belonging to the wood-hermits, ὑλόβιοι, as Megasthenes calls them. They also contain some of the Upanishads, which were speculative treatises of varied origin and different ages, numbering between 150 and 200. Of the extensive Sûtra literature which forms a complement to the Veda, and treats of all sorts of questions, even grammatical and metrical, only those writings are of importance to the history of religion, which treat of Śruti and Smṛiti (the Śrauta-Sûtras and the Smârta-Sûtras): these are the Kalpa-Sûtras, which treat of ceremonial, and the Gṛihya-Sûtras and the Dharma-Sûtras, which treat of customs and law.

CHAPTER 60. — The Hymns of the Rig-veda.

Books of Reference. Translations: French by A. LANGLOIS (1848–1851), quite useless; English by H. H. WILSON and E. B. COWELL (1850–63); German by H. GRASSMANN (1876–77, in verse) and by A. LUDWIG (1876–79, with a commentary). MAX MÜLLER has published one volume, 'Hymns to the Maruts' (1869), and has now announced a translation in his S. B. E. K. GELDNER and A. KAEGI, helped by R. ROTH, published in a pleasing metrical form, Seventy hymns of the Rig-veda (1875). For works on the contents and meaning of these hymns we recommend: A. KAEGI, Der Rig-veda, die älteste Literatur der Inder (2nd ed. 1881), which gives a clear and useful survey for beginners; A. LUDWIG, Die Mantralitteratur und das alte Indien (1878, constitutes the 3rd vol. of his translation of the Rig-veda); J. MUIR, Original Sanskrit Texts, V; H. ZIMMER, Altindisches Leben (1879); A. BERGAIGNE, La religion védique (3 vols., 1878–83), a work which in spite of many daring combinations opens new views. R. PISCHEL and K. F. GELDNER, Vedische Studien I (1889).

The collection of hymns in the Rig-veda contains in 10 Mandalas (books) 1028 Sûktas (hymns). Books 2–8 are assigned to the several old Rishis

(singers) in whose family they had been transmitted, amongst whom Vasish*tha*, and Visvâmitra, appear as rivals. In this struggle, which is often mentioned in later writings also, there is preserved, according to Roth, an historical reminiscence. It is supposed that in Vasish*tha* the future position of the Brâhmans was foreshadowed. He is the priestly hero of the new order of things. In his opponent, the old order of the warlike shepherd life in the Punjab is for ever driven back. These family books, in which the same thoughts and forms often recur, are as a rule so arranged, that the hymns to Agni come first, then those to Indra, and then follow those addressed to the other gods. The three remaining books are rather different. The ninth consists entirely of hymns to Soma. The first and tenth contain various collections, of which much is ascribed to later times. The last book contains many examples of non-religious lyrics. How careful one must be in fixing the date of a hymn can clearly be seen by a study of the well-known Purusha-Sûkta (X. 90). This is regarded by some people as belonging to the very latest writings, because of its abstruse fantastic tone, and especially because it refers to the three (or four) Vedas and the four castes. This hymn, however, describes how the world was formed out of the limbs of an original man, which conception is proved by comparative philology to be very ancient (the giant Ymir of the Edda). If therefore we find an original Indo-Germanic idea in a hymn supposed to be of late date, this warns us always to distinguish between the contents and the composition of the hymns, and to analyse the material most carefully.

It is not only on questions of detail that we desire more information, for there is no agreement about the whole, in spite of the diligent study of many savants. One can convince oneself of this, by comparing the translations, which vary so much from each other. People do not agree even about the meaning of words. Up till now the lexicographers like BÖHTLING and ROTH (in the so-called Petersburg dictionary) and GRASSMANN, in order to help the explanation of single words, have attributed to each word various meanings. BERGAIGNE, however, protests against this, calling his work an 'index rerum' to the hymns of the Rig-veda. He starts from the simple meaning of the words, but in consequence, the thoughts contained in the hymns appear very intricate. Thus not only is there discord between the various students, but the principles from which they start are quite different.

Opposite opinions are advanced not only in the exegesis, but also in the historical appreciation of these hymns. In discussions on the Rig-veda much has been said about the originality and naiveté of these hymns. People saw in them, after eliminating later elements, the mental legacy from the most ancient times, which had been preserved more intact by the Hindus than by any of their relations. A direct perception and pure intuition of the divine, as revealed in nature, is said to have been preserved unclouded by the sacred singers in these ancient times. Now it is quite true that we find in these hymns a good deal of what the Hindus possess in common with all Indo-Germans, or at least with Persians, which therefore dates from Indo-Germanic or Indo-Persian times. But similar

material can also be found in much later productions, and therefore proves nothing concerning the age of the hymns in which it occurs. And there exist valid reasons against the opinion that the hymns themselves point to such a remote antiquity Even Muir could not shut out the impression that the state of things represented by the Rig-veda is by no means primitive, but that it presupposes an already advanced stage of civilisation. Thus at the present time attention is being called to the many subtleties, to the deliberate ambiguities, the clever or fantastic tricks, which sufficiently prove that we here have products, not of a rude though pure period, but rather of an already more or less refined civilisation. The religion that we here meet with already possessed a tolerably developed moral character. Wicked gods were either not at all or but slightly known, exorcisms and magic arts occurred but rarely. This condition is not an original one, but is produced by reaction. The singers and their families are supposed to have discarded certain mythical, religious, and magic ideas which prevailed around them. We must not therefore look on anything which does not occur in the Rig-veda as being necessarily of later origin; on the contrary, as a whole, the contents of the Atharva-veda are probably not much younger than those of the Rig-veda. We must not look on the Rig-veda as an encyclopædia of the most ancient conceptions of the Indo-Germanic family, but as a collection of all that had assumed a settled form in certain religious communities. Finally, great weight must be laid on the fact that many of these hymns, although they betray no liturgical purpose in their collection, can yet only be

understood in connection with the ceremonial to which they belong. This has been too much forgotten, and although the ever-recurring mention of sacrifices could not be denied, yet an almost exclusive attention was paid to the religious conception of nature found in the hymns. Natural mythologists found such a rich harvest in this, that they only recognised half of the task which lay before them, which consists in showing the connection between the twofold character of the Vedic gods, as gods of nature and gods of sacrifice. This connection between a mystic sacramental and a pantheistic polytheistic conception was distinctly recognised by MUIR. We shall, whilst treating the single gods, keep this well before our eyes.

The number of the gods is sometimes given as thirty-three, but this is not a definite number. Sometimes 'all the gods' together are appealed to, and sometimes only groups or pairs of gods. They do not form an organised system of gods, and the family connections existing between them are very lax, which can be seen from the infinitesimally small number of goddesses. In general the gods are described as Deva (creatures of light) and Asura (lords). This last word, in the literature of a later date, received an opposite application, being applied to the demoniacal powers antagonistic to the gods. The question how this change was produced, and whether from the fact that the Devas became evil powers with the Persians, and the Asuras with the Indians, we must admit a religious schism between these two people, has been answered in different ways[1]. The idea which occurs

[1] J. DARMESTETER, Ormazd et Ahriman, §§ 214, 218; on the other side we have P. V. BRADKE, Dyaus Asura, Ahura Mazda und die Asuras (1885).

amongst many nations, that heaven and earth (Dyaus and Prithivî) are the father and mother of all things is also to be found in the Rig-veda, but the position of these two is a very subordinate one. The most prominent of the gods are: Agni, Soma, Indra, Varuna, with the Âdityas.

Agni is the fire in the three worlds (heaven, air, and earth) under the forms of sun, lightning, and sacrificial fire. The god descends from heaven, where he was hidden in the rain-cloud (hence 'the son of waters'), but he can be produced on earth by the rubbing of the two pieces of wood, by which the priest lights the sacrificial fire. Thus the god is created in the sacrifice, as the sacrifice also summons all the gods. Hence the identification of Agni with all the gods, and the idea that the sacrifice actually creates the gods. But the general meaning of Agni reaches still further. The idea contained in a later work, that 'food produces living beings; rain produces food; sacrifice produces rain[1],' is not foreign to the Rig-veda. The omnipotence of sacrifice, although not so firmly established as it was later on, is yet already pre-supposed. The possession of divine gifts, such as light and water, depends on sacrifice. The kindling of the light in the heavens is represented as a divine sacrifice. This god Agni therefore possesses the seed of life in general. Sacrifice is the condition for the regular course of the world, as well as for the preserving of life. In analogous ways, man is of heavenly divine origin, as also many old sages and priests are identified with Agni, and the same

[1] Bhagavad Gîtâ, III. 14; this is not the whole sentence, but the continuation of this list, in which also the Vedas occur, does not belong here.

Agni escorts the souls of the departed into the upper world. Agni is often praised and invoked as a priest, as a helper, as a wise teacher, as the guest of the house who lives with men, and blesses them (Vaisvânara).

Soma in the same manner is an element of sacrifice as well as a cosmic force. His character as a moon-god is probably not original. He is the life-awaking intoxicating sap of the soma-plant, offered as a sacrifice, and worshipped itself as a god. The question of the original home of this soma-plant (Persian: Haoma), although of such importance for the determining of the ancestral seat of the Indo-Persian aboriginal people, remains hidden in darkness in spite of many efforts. It is important to notice that like Agni, Soma also was not deified as an element of the sacrifice only; he also descended from heaven and belonged to the three worlds, and contained universal germs of life. KUHN described him as the rain, but BERGAIGNE identifies him simply with Agni, by describing and representing him as the liquid fire, because the seed of fire descends with the rain, and Agni and Soma have their functions and attributes in common.

The third element in the sacrificial rite, the formula or prayer (brahman), is not as yet deified. Theology of a later date will use this conception as the starting point of a whole series of ideas. It is true that Bṛihaspati, 'the lord of prayer,' occurs sometimes as the title of single gods, of Agni and others, and sometimes as a name by itself.

Indra is often considered the chief god of the Rig-veda. He is the war-god about whom mythical

accounts also, are most frequent in the hymns. His fight with the evil powers, more especially with V*ri*tra, is described in detail. Together with his allies the Maruts he encounters the terrible battle, and annihilates his enemies with the weapons which Tvash*tri* the able smith of the gods made for him. No doubt the drama of the thunderstorm lies at the bottom of this; but we must notice that Indra not only liberates the celestial waters, but light also, from the bondage in which they were kept by the demoniacal powers. Here we have not merely nature myths before us. Worship, also, plays an important part in this conflict, since it is sacrifice that gives Indra the power necessary for victory. Not till the god has drunk the Soma, to which his worshippers invite him by sacrifice, is he a match for the enemy. The food for the gods (or gods' beverage) is in this case still identical with the sacrificial food, and is identified (as we see from our description of Soma) with the element which contains the universal power of life.

To none amongst the principal gods are higher epithets attributed than to Varu*n*a. In some hymns (for instance IV. 42) he is placed in opposition to Indra, in several others (VII. 82 seq.) he is placed at his side. This relationship has been conceived in such a way by some people, that we are really witnesses of a revolution in the ranks of the gods which took place during Vedic times. The most ancient and principal god of the Indo-Germans, Varu*n*a, must give place to the younger and peculiarly Hindu deity Indra. But against this several things are to be considered. Varu*n*a often appears by the side of Indra, but he never impresses us as a god who is gradually dis-

appearing. On the contrary, the highest honours are everywhere paid him. Besides this, the Indra myth is certainly not younger, or peculiarly Hindu, for comparative mythology proves it to be a universal Indo-Germanic possession. On the other hand, we must acknowledge that BERGAIGNE'S explanation of the antagonism of these two gods, which occurs now and then, is not quite satisfactory, although it contains a certain amount of truth. He points out that in Indra and Varuṇa, two opposite views of the world are placed together, namely a dualistic and a monistic. Indra is himself always the beneficent god, the enemy of demons. Varuṇa is sometimes friendly, sometimes angry, and unites in himself in a certain measure the divine and the demoniacal character. Varuṇa's physical meaning is also not clear. People have seen in him the all-embracing heaven (to which the connection with Οὐρανός tempts us), or they follow Hindu commentators, who, in Mitra and Varuṇa recognize day and night. Great weight is also laid on his connection with the waters. But however this may be, it is certain that Varuṇa is often worshipped as the universal ruler, who sees everything, even what is most secret. To him more especially are dedicated the hymns which some people compare with the Psalms, in which his omnipresence is described, and mankind humbly confesses its sins to him, who knows all that is hidden. Varuṇa possesses his own especial character in the hymns, in which the pious address him in a different form of language than when appealing to other gods. Man fears the chains of Varuṇa formed by darkness, illness, and death, which overtake the sinner. Still more does he

beseech the god for mercy, and places himself under his protection. In this the moral element is very prominent. Sin is not considered as a breach in the form of worship, but is sought for in mind and deed; more especially are untruth and faithlessness regarded as sins.

Varu*n*a and Mitra, whom we have already mentioned, and a few other subordinate gods, belong to a group generally consisting of six, and sometimes of more Âdityas, to whom, whenever they occur, the highest virtues are attributed. Opinions differ as much about their original character as about their mother's, the goddess Aditi, in whom people recognise sometimes the visible infinity of heaven (ROTH, MAX MÜLLER), and sometimes the imperishable light (A. HILLEBRANDT), or again the twilight (KERN). People are more especially undecided whether Aditi is to be regarded as a very ancient goddess, or as a later form abstracted from the Âdityas.

We shall not attempt to give the various opinions held about the gods or groups of gods, which are more or less in the background: such as the A*s*vins, two knights who appear especially in the morning; the three *Ri*bhus, who attained immortality by their works of art, and who are thought of daily at the evening sacrifice; the sun-gods Sûrya, Savit*ri*, Pûshan, Vish*n*u; the goddess Ushas (Aurora); Rudra, the father of the Maruts, who in the Rig-veda shows as little as Vish*n*u, that he was destined to play a great part in the later Hindu religion; Par*g*anya, the god of the storm-rain, who is compared with the Lithuanian Perkunas, and also Vâta (or Vâyu),

the wind-god, who it would seem has been wrongly identified with the Germanic Wodan.

The worship of ancestors is one of the original elements of religion amongst the Hindus. But in the family books of the Rig-veda this worship hardly appears. We have to gain information about the Pitris, the divine ancestors, mostly from the two last Mandalas. It was Yama who first opened the path and now rules as king, not in a lower world of the dead, but in an upper world of light. Here he leads a happy life with the pious Rishis of ancient times, and receives the devout people who are worthy to be added to the people of eternity. This took place under the escort of Agni, that is, whilst the body was being burnt. But burial in the lap of mother earth also occurs (for instance X. 18). This hymn is remarkable because in it the widow does not follow her husband into death. It does not follow, however, from this, that this Brâhmanic custom is of later date, but rather that it was not a general custom. Punishment of the wicked is clearly indicated in other Vedas, but whether in the Rig-veda has been doubted. There are references to it, for instance, in the dogs of Yama, which are not feared by the good, thus implying that they are dreaded by the wicked.

It is hardly possible to give a characteristic of the religion of the Rig-veda which shall bring out all its features. We here find various things side by side, but nothing popular or spontaneous. It is merely a religion which has been worked at by priests, who have eliminated much that was old, and have added something of their own. We can say of the gods that they are but

slightly individualised; that is why they are so easily invoked in pairs, in groups, or all together. The opinion is even stated that the many names of the gods are only different ways of denoting a single being (I. 164). The thought here prevails that the world forms one whole. This belief exists also in the word *Rita*, which is used for order and law, that is to say, order in nature, in the sacrificial rites, and in the moral world. The gods are the masters of this *Rita*, the bearers of the general order of the world. And where belief in the gods fails, that in the unity of the world is maintained. We see this belief in the abstract beings, by which people tried to supplant the gods (even in the Rig-veda we find Pra*g*âpati, the lord of created beings, Visvakarman, the maker of all things; in the Atharva-veda, Svayambhu, who existed by himself, Parameshthin, the highest), as well as in the remarkable cosmogonic speculations (X. 121, 129). Thus the road to abstraction and speculation is already pointed out, but the ritualistic side is the most developed. We find here the still lower points of view not quite overcome, in which the sacrificer desires and expects certain benefits as the reward for his acts of worship (do ut des), but on the whole a higher meaning is attributed to the sacrificial rite, as was explained above. With this we find high moral thoughts expressed. What is here required is not only, though sometimes, liberality to the priest who demands sacrificial gifts, but also truth towards the god, who being good himself, demands goodness from his servants.

What we can say about the religion in the Rig-veda suits admirably for a first stage in the history of

Hindu religion: the seed of many later thoughts can be traced in it. Still, we cannot look on the Rig-veda as a witness of a supposed great antiquity of the Indo-Germans.

Chapter 61.—The Authority of the Vedas.

Books of Reference. J. Muir, Or. Sanskrit Texts, III.

The first thing to be noticed is that the Vedas during hundreds of years were transmitted by word, and not in writing. The doctrine of that word as a cosmic principle, as the force that supports and causes everything, as being divine and eternal, has passed through many phases in Hindu speculation. We shall here mention the most important.

Even in the hymns of the Rig-veda we find a beginning of this doctrine. It is true that the natural conception predominated, that these hymns are composed by poets, who even acknowledge their faults and weaknesses; but at the same time the apotheosis of the old *Ri*shis is already in full swing. They are identified with the Pit*ri*s, and even with the gods (more especially with Agni); they were gifted with divine judgment, they were the table companions of the gods, they produced Ushas, the Dawn, by their hymns and sayings, and their sacrifices gave light to the sun. The power of the hymns is equal to that of the sacrifices, of which they originally formed a part. A statement as to the origin of the three Vedas is only found in the already mentioned Purusha-Sûkta X. 90, in which the three Vedas proceed from the sacrifice of the first man. Magic songs are mentioned as well, though not by the name of Atharva-veda.

In the remaining Vedic, as well as in the post-Vedic

literature this theory is very fully developed. Thus in the Satapatha-Brâhmana we learn that Pragâpati, who first existed alone, produced from himself by devotion the three worlds (earth, air, and heaven); hence again Agni, Vâyu, and Sûrya; and hence the three Vedas; and hence again the three sacred words (bhû, bhuvas, and svar, which designate the three worlds). The three Vedas themselves were represented as created for the sake of the sacrifices, for which they are indispensable. On these and similar passages rests both the divine origin and the cosmic meaning of the Vedas. The worlds are comprised in the three Vedas and rest on them, and the Vedas are thus the essence as well as the basis of the world. The three Vedas are comprised in the three letters of the syllable om (A U M) and in the Gâyatri (three verses addressed to Savitri in R.V. III. 62), a formula which is looked on as 'Mother of the Vedas,' and concerning which much that was fantastic was taught. The thought that the Vedas themselves, as eternal, are also the sources of everything, and that all qualities proceeded from them, is repeatedly brought forward.

We need hardly dwell further on the incomparable value of the threefold knowledge of the Vedas. This knowledge embraces everything, and produces the richest results. The study of the Veda belongs to the five daily duties: these are gifts to animals (more especially the feeding of birds), to men (hospitality, even to the gift of a glass of water), to ancestors, to gods (even to a bundle of wood), and the study of the Vedas. He who pursues this last, offers by this means a sacrifice to the gods. The hymns of the Rig-

veda are a gift of milk, those of the Yagur-veda a gift of butter, those of the Sâma-veda a gift of Soma, and those of the Atharva-veda a gift of fat. The benefit derived from this is that one gains an eternal world, and a union with Brahma. Even ascetic discipline is represented as inferior to a study of the Vedas, which not only leads to true knowledge, but absorbs all sins in the threefold Veda.

Opposed to this high praise of the Vedas, we find more or less depreciatory judgments on some parts, or even on the whole. This was caused by the split of the Veda, which, as was argued in later times, was originally one. The various schools looked on each other as heretical and impure. There was a bitter conflict between the teachers of the Rig-veda and those of the Sâma-veda, between the two schools of the Yagur-veda, and between those of the Atharva-veda and the three others. But the Vedas were also placed in a subordinate position as compared to later writings. The Itihâsas and the Purâṇas sometimes attribute to themselves equal, or even higher value. These writings are also sometimes added as a fifth to the four Vedas. Finally even in the Vedic literature itself (in the Upanishads), the opinion is expressed that the knowledge of the Vedas is lower, and opposed to the true knowledge which is gained by mystic contemplation. The highest insight into the true being is only reached by man when every clear distinction has vanished from his spirit. Then the Veda possesses no longer any value to him.

The teaching of the Veda is developed systematically in the various philosophical schools and by the commentator Sâyaṇa-Mâdhava (fourteenth cent. A.D.). The

philosophical schools have taken up various positions with regard to the Veda, often much opposed to one another; but all have felt the necessity of coming to an understanding with this sacred word, and founding their teaching upon it. It was necessary also to remove all sorts of doubts and scruples, and further to settle the position of tradition (Smṛiti) in regard to the Veda. The latter took place mostly by representing Smṛiti (to which besides the Sûtra were added the law-books, the philosophical aphorisms, the Itihâsas, and the Purâṇas) as being founded on the Veda, or that this later writing was meant for women and Śûdras, &c., so that they might learn the way of salvation from it, whilst the study of the Veda was a privilege belonging to men of the three pure castes.

In the discussions held by the teachers on this subject, the abstruse character of Hindu thought is clearly shown. As, for instance, when Sâyaṇa first reduces every definition of the Veda 'ad absurdum,' and comes to the conclusion that no proof can be given even of the existence of the Veda, and then from the witness of the Veda about itself, deduces its authority from its own character. No one, he admits, can stand on his own shoulders, and yet the sun shines by its own light and illumines everything else. The authority of the Vedas is proved by the Smṛiti, which is founded on it; by the general opinion, especially by that of great men; by the truth and efficacy of its contents, which can often be controlled, and should therefore be accepted even where it cannot be controlled. The Vedas reveal to us much that we could not obtain by other means of knowledge (empirical or inductive). But if it is pointed out, on the contrary, that many

passages contradict each other, that they are absurd or perverse, and that the promised results do not always follow the sacrifice, then the teachers point first to the work of exegesis, which cleverly smoothe away such unevennesses. Secondly, they point to the multiplicity of schools, which naturally leads to difference of opinion; and lastly, to mistakes committed in the ceremonial, which deprive the sacrifice of its inherent power.

The question as to the eternity of the Veda is one of the principal points of controversy. This eternity is conceived in reference to the world only, and does not exclude their origin from God. It is chiefly the Vedânta school which supports this theory of eternity, whilst Nyâya and Sâṅkhya declare themselves against it. In connection with this there is much discussion in respect to the eternity of words and of sounds, from which that of the Veda would follow by itself. But if, on the other hand, one replies that the occurrence of various proper names, of poets, and other persons and things, cannot be reconciled with this theory, then these names are explained etymologically as referring to something else, or as signifying the species and not individuals, while the *Ṛ*ishis also are taken to be recipients, transmitters of hymns not poets. The origin of the Veda is sometimes traced to a supreme god (Îsvara, Brahma), sometimes to an impersonal original principle. One school (Nyâya) bases the authority of the scripture on the fides humana of its competent authors. People also disagreed in determining the advantage which could be drawn from the Veda. This difference is most clearly marked in the two divisions of the Mîmâ*m*sâ. The first

mentions the practical precepts for dutiful action, and the second the knowledge of the highest being, as the object of the Veda. But all these opinions are based on a common ground, namely the authority of the Veda, however differently this may be conceived. A rejection of the Veda on principle occurs in isolated places only, as in the Bhâgavata doctrine, which inculcates piety (bhakti), with which the study of the Veda is of no importance.

CHAPTER 62. — Ritual.

Books of Reference. We must make special mention of A. WEBER, Zur Kenntniss des Vedischen Opferrituals (Ind. Stud. X, XIII); he keeps to the Śrauta-Sûtra of the learned Y.-V. M. HAUG, Introduction and notes to his edition of the Aitareya-Brâhmaṇa. What can be gathered from later writings on the religious practices of the Brahmans is also important; thus, for instance, in COLEBROOKE'S Misc. Ess. I, and the translation of the Brahmakarma and the Dharmasindhu (two ritual tracts of the last century) by A. BOURQUIN (Ann. M. G. VII). For ceremonials at births: J. S. SPEYER, Ceremonia apud Indos, quae vocatur Gâtakarma (1872); at weddings: E. HAAS (Ind. Stud. V); at funerals: MAX MÜLLER (Z. D. M. G. IX, with pictures of the sacrificial implements used). We mention moreover: A. HILLEBRANDT, Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer (1879); J. SCHWAB, Das altindische Thieropfer (1886).

The materials for a history of the Brâhmanical sacrificial ritual, have not as yet been completely collected and arranged. It is true that parts have been studied, but even the monographs which give us the principal facts only treat of a more or less limited sphere. This fact is to be explained by the great difficulties of this subject, which are not merely caused by the vast number of minute precepts going into the smallest details. What we mostly want is a living representation of the whole procedure. Such a representation is given us neither by the Brâhmaṇas

which only emphasize single points to add numerous digressions to them, nor by the Kalpa-Sûtras, which, although proceeding according to a stricter order, yet to a certain degree presuppose a knowledge of the ritual. Therefore it is of the greatest importance when those, who have actually seen some of the sacrificial practices of the Brâhmans of the present day, explain parts of the ancient ceremonial to us. Although there is much that is ancient in the present ritual of the Brâhmans, yet much has been lost, and only parts of the ancient ritual are still in use. There is yet another difficulty in gaining a clear understanding of these rites, besides those mentioned above. There was not a uniform official cult which was the same everywhere, but in the different divisions of the Veda, corresponding to the different Brâhmanic schools, the cult varied in details. Therefore a history of the ritual has to start from these particular forms, before it can attain to a general survey.

The interest of the study of this ritual does not entirely depend on the predominating importance which was given to sacrifice in the Hindu religion. It is wrong to emphasize this side only, and to say that the original simple natural religion had been made into a sacerdotal religion by the priests. It is true, the elaborate ritual must have arisen in priestly circles, but we have already noticed this sacerdotal character in the ancient hymns, and we must more especially bear in mind, that most of the single rules of which the ritual consists, occur also in the worship of nations racially connected, and therefore date from primitive Indo-Germanic times. However great may be the difficulty of finding one's

way in the labyrinth of precepts on Hindu ritual, yet it is this very wealth, which makes a knowledge of Hindu sacrifices so essential for comparative studies.

In Hindu sacrifices, the gods to whom they are offered disappear more and more in the background. Agni, Soma, and other gods are mentioned, and are invited to the sacrifice. Gifts are also offered to ancestors, but the result of the sacrifice is not looked for from the favour of the gods, but from the actual offering itself, the omnipotent power of which gradually obliterates the gods. The sacrifice assures all blessings, happiness and riches, heirs, and entrance into heaven, but it is important to obey all precepts without committing a mistake. People therefore retain a priest to carry out the ceremony without a blemish. One is not tied down to fixed places for the sacrifice. No temples or sacred precincts are essential; for the whole earth is an altar if the sacred word sanctifies it. One has only to choose (but with numerous ceremonies) a place for the sacrifice, and to erect an altar there. This takes place at fixed times or on special occasions. There is no difference between public and private worship. The priests attend to the sacrifices for themselves, or for individual heads of families who take part in it, and also for kings (as at the anointing of a king), but without larger numbers forming themselves into a community for worship. Occasions for sacrifices are given by the stated divisions of time, evening and morning, the three seasons of the year, the two solstices, and more especially at full moon or new moon. But all great events in family life also, such as births, marriages, and deaths, are here, as everywhere, accompanied with many ceremonials.

Especially at weddings, the woman is received into the new home with all sorts of customs, the general meaning of which is, that she henceforth takes her place in family worship beside her husband, since at sacrifices not only the master of the house but his wife also, plays an active part.

The Hindus distinguish three sorts of sacrifice according to the nature of the offering: Ishṭi (or haviryaǵña), at which butter, milk, rice, corn, either mashed or in flat cakes, are offered; Paśu, animal sacrifices; and Soma sacrifices. In ancient times, the forms of worship were most bloody, and huge animal sacrifices occurred regularly. The five living creatures which were by preference offered were men (Purushamedha), horses (Aśvamedha), oxen, rams, and goats. They had all to be of the male species. Human sacrifice, of which the story of Śunaḥśepa (in Aitar. Brâhm.) preserves a recollection, was in time offered symbolically only or by an effigy, and the other bloody sacrifices gradually gave way to less bloody ones. The Śatapatha-Brâhmaṇa says, that the fruit of the earth contained the power which formerly dwelt in sacrificial animals. Gradually animal sacrifices were quite displaced, and Ahiṃsâ (reverential fear of all living things) was introduced, not only amongst Buddhists but also amongst all Hindus.

To show how complicated all the rules of ritual were, we will mention the principal ceremonies for which they were intended. Many preparations were necessary before the actual sacrifice. The place of sacrifice had to be chosen and purified, the stones for the altar had to be collected, which then had to be built. He who offered the sacrifice had to go through

a sort of consecration (dikshâ), which often lasted many days, and consisted of salves and baths, fasting and putting on new robes, and a girdle, &c. The rubbing of fire, and the arrangement of the hearth were of special importance. The various utensils also which were used for the sacrifice had to be cleansed. The preparation of Soma was accompanied with many ceremonies; amongst which were the buying, the carrying about and the pressing of the Soma. The preparation of the flat cakes and balls of the ground corn, a sacrifice which was afterwards partaken of by the sacrificer and the priest, required careful observances. The material preparations were made by the Adhvaryu, whilst the Udgâtṛi sang the hymns, and the Hotṛi said the prayers. These three classes of priests were assigned to the Yaǧur-veda, the Sâma-veda, and the Rig-veda. The supervision of the whole belonged to the Brâhman. This priestly character predominates in all rituals, and becomes in the course of time of greater importance, so that later on the gift to the priests is regarded as the principal part of sacrifices, and the Dâna (charity) is inculcated as the highest duty and the most blessed act.

CHAPTER 63. — **Brâhmanism.**

Books of Reference. J. MUIR, Or. Sanskr. Texts, I; A. WEBER, Collectanea über die Kastenverhältnisse in den Brâhmaṇa und Sûtra (Ind. Stud. X).

'On the word Brahma the development of the religion of India depends, during the course of three thousand years [1].' As early as the Rig-veda, Brahma (neuter) means prayer, meditation, sacred acts, therefore

[1] R. ROTH, Brahma und die Brahmanen (Z. D. M. G., I).

he who performs the same is called Brahma (masc.), the Brâhman, whilst the same word signifies also the god Brahma. This god was never of great importance in popular belief and in worship, but in abstract thought he represented the highest principle and the foundation of all existing things. So the point from which the conception starts is not in theology, but in worship. The Brâhmana is he who possesses the necessary knowledge and capabilities to perform the ceremonial.

Numerous passages inform us about the history of the various castes in India, but they do not give us the desired historical certainty as to the origin and development of this system. In the hymns of the Rig-veda these social grades hardly appear. It is true that a priestly class exists there, and the Purohita, and also the Brâhmana, is a respected man, but strictly limited castes did not exist. These are first mentioned in the Purusha-Sûkta (X. 90), where one finds the idea which often recurs later, that the highest god (here called Pragâpati) produced the Brâhmana from his mouth, Kshatriya (knights and warriors) from his breast and arms, Vaisya (agricultural labourers) from his body, and Sûdras (servants) from his feet. By the side of this idea, which attributes different origins to the four castes, we find another, by which all men are descended from Manu. Again, we find that originally all men were Brâhmanic, but the difference in their characters and minds caused some to sink into warriors, others into labourers, and others into the lowest Sûdras. Thus the individual accounts of the castes differ much from one another. Manu's law-book contains a social system, which

is throughout dominated by the strictest observance of the orders of castes. The mixed castes arise from mixed intermarriages. In the epic poetry, on the contrary, Brâhmans are allowed to intermarry at least with the two pure castes, and the children belong to the father's caste.

With regard to the question as to the origin of castes, and especially as to the elevated position of the Brâhmans, opinions are divided. The majority trace this origin to the later Vedic and post-Vedic times. In ancient times the kings availed themselves, in sacris, of the counsel and support of the priests, but they reserved the position of rulers for themselves. The Brâhmans, however, understood how to gradually appropriate an ever-preponderating influence. During the spread of the Âryas over the river district of the Ganges, south towards the Vindhya mountains, the warlike families fought among themselves in great battles, the memory of which is preserved in the sagas of the Mahâbhârata. During that time the Brâhmans always acquired more power according to the help which they gave to this or that ruler, till at the end of this period they took the highest place without opposition. There is another theory opposed to this, which is supported by a comparison with the division of social grades amongst the Persians. HAUG, and later on KERN[1] have urged this analogy. Amongst the Indo-Germans in general such hereditary castes occur with certain rules about connubium, &c. More especially amongst the Persians the same four Hindu castes are mentioned (Yasna XIX. 46). From this we

[1] H. KERN, Indische theorieën over de standenverdeeling (Versl. en Meded. d. Kon. Ak. Wet. Amsterdam, 1871).

can naturally see that this division cannot be the product of any specially Hindu development, but existed already in the oldest, at least Indo-Persian, times. But then the *Sûdras* also are not, as is often imagined, the aborigines of India, who were conquered and subjugated by the Aryan immigrants, but they were a grade of workmen and servants dating from pre-Vedic times, and must be distinguished from the aborigines of India (Nishâdas). It is true only that the three upper castes (as in Persia) were pure, Aryan, and twice-born, provided with the sacred girdle, and taking a part in the Veda and sacrifice, from which sacred things the *Sûdras* were entirely cut off.

Amongst the legendary material which can be found scattered through the Vedic literature, and is worked out in detail in the epics, the stories which magnify the Brâhmans play a prominent part. Princes who do not pay them due honour are in a bad plight (Vena, Nahusha, &c.), whilst riches and luck are the rewards of obedient monarchs. The most famous character is that of Visvâmitra, who by the strictest ascetic practices raised himself out of the grade of warriors, to which he by birth belonged, into the grade of Brâhmans.

The position of the Brâhman is not only a deeply respected one, but it is really superhuman. He represents the gods; the latter dwell in him, and by sacrifice and the Veda he has the gods in his power. He is even looked on as an incorporated god, as the god of gods. The tribute which is due to him from the world, as taught by him, corresponds to this exalted rank[1]. It consists in homage, gifts (sacrificial

[1] From WEBER'S *Satap. Brâhm.* XI. 5. 7. 1.

gifts), inviolability of property and of person; his house is a place of safety, his property cannot be touched, and in reality only the murder of a Brâhman can really be called murder. In return for this the Brâhman has to fulfil the following conditions. He must be of pure Brâhmanic origin, although sometimes descent is considered of less importance than the true knowledge, and the teacher can transmit his Brâhmanic descent to his pupils. A pure course of life is also a Brâhmanic duty. This comprises sometimes the world-renouncing life of a beggar and an insight into existence, or absolute knowledge, but of course this is not a general demand. A third duty belonging to the Brâhmans is to be of famous report; the splendour of his good works and of his learning must shine in the world. Finally, he must prepare the people as a teacher, as a sacrificial priest, and as a Purohita (family priest of a prince).

We shall close this survey with two remarks. Firstly, we must point out that the position of the Brâhmans, as also the special precepts for ritual were not everywhere the same. Some people have regarded the picture which the law-book of Manu traces, as applying to all parts of India and to all, even post-Vedic times. But this was not so. The powerful position of the Brâhmans varied according to place and time. The second remark concerns the character of Brâhmanism, as being a sacerdotal and not a popular religion. We have already pointed out this trait in the chapter on ritual. Brâhmanism did not found a religious popular community, but it is a religious ceremonial accompanied by a certain social order not essentially determined by the influence

of a common nationality. Hence it follows, firstly, that the people had to look for satisfaction of their religious needs outside the actual Brâhmanic worship. We shall therefore have to discuss the great development of various popular forms of worship. Secondly, these facts lead to the supposition that Brâhmanism opened its doors for aliens also. Wherever the Brâhman may be, he takes his ritual with him, the blessings of which he can impart to the pious who desire them, although they may be of foreign origin. And this really took place. The non-Aryan population of the Deccan were, and still are, admitted to take part in the Brâhmanic worship, and are divided into castes. The same holds good in Farther India and on the islands of Java and Bali. This process mostly falls in the post-Buddhistic times; but we mention it now as it forms one of the essential traits of Brâhmanism. The statement that this religion should be counted among the non-missionary religions is not quite correct, if we thereby mean to deny its powers of spreading outside national limits. This question is of equally great importance for an historical study as for a right judgment of the present religious state of India[1].

CHAPTER 64.—Justice and Morals. The Law-books.

Books of Reference. A survey of the whole is given us in a short communication from A. F. STENZLER, Zur Litteratur der indischen Gesetzbücher (Ind. Stud. I), in which he mentions the various lists. Translations exist of the most important law-books: Yâgñavalkya, by STENZLER (1849); Âpastamba, Gautama, Vasishtha, and Baudhâyana, by G. BÜHLER (S. B. E. II, XIV); Vishnu, by J. JOLLY (S. B. E. VII).

[1] On this subject A. C. LYALL, Asiatic Studies, chap. v.

Manu's law-book (Mânava Dharmaśâstra) was first translated by WILL. JONES (1794); later it was often done again, and finally by G. BÜHLER, The Laws of Manu (S. B. E. XXV).

Legal literature is a part of the Vedic literature, or, at all events, it has its roots in it. It is true the Dharma-Sûtras did not belong to Śruti but to Smṛiti, but nevertheless they contained sacred laws. In the various Vedic schools, law was most diligently studied. To this fact we owe a number of law-books, partly in their more ancient original form (thus, for instance, according to BÜHLER the laws of Gautama and Baudhâyana which we possess are pre-Buddhistic) and partly in their later metrical versions of the old Dharma-Sûtras. The best known belong to the Yaǵurveda, namely, Âpastamba, Baudhâyana, Hiraṇyakeśin, Vishṇu, and Manu to different schools of the black Yaǵur-veda, and Yâǵñavalkya to the white Yaǵurveda. Criticism is still occupied in trying to find firm ground in these different codifications, which have a great deal of material in common. But this is difficult, since we often know but little about the individual Vedic schools, and hardly anything of the historical surroundings of these books. The school of Âpastamba seems to have belonged to the south, where the study of Vedic law was as eagerly pursued as in the purely Aryan districts. Many law-books date probably from the last centuries B.C., others in their present form are much younger. The various dates given to the Mânava Dharmaśâstra are curious. This law-book, which was first and best known, was placed by SIR WILLIAM JONES, who almost believed in the mythical Manu and even combined him with Minos and Menes, in the thirteenth century B.C.

MONIER WILLIAMS, although acknowledging later additions, places the greater part of it in the fifth century B.C. BURNELL places it in the fourth century A.D.

In a survey of the contents of the law-books we need not consider the cosmogonic and metaphysical speculations which are largely developed in Manu, but do not occur in other law-books. The system of Yâgñavalkya gives the best division: first, Âkâara the customs, in which social distinctions, especially the question of castes, are treated; secondly, Vyavahâra, containing the administration of the law which belongs to the king, and civil and criminal law; thirdly, Prâyaskitta the laws of penance and purification. Of course these subjects are very much mixed up in the individual writings, and nothing is often more without method than many of these law-books, in which, for instance, civil and criminal law are not separated. The penalties for misdeeds are often severe and very unequal; they often strike us by their reference to future existences, as shown by the doctrine of transmigration. Not only are dwellings in heaven or hell placed before the sight of the good and bad, but for special sins there are special tortures in future existences. Thus wicked people are born again in form of animals, such as worms or insects, and certain afflictions, for instance leprosy, point to sin in a former life. This belief is common to all India; but it is characteristic that it is codified with the laws. Penances and purifications mostly consist of fasts, washings, and the repetition of certain Vedic formulas.

We cannot here attempt to give a complete account

of the injunctions contained in these law-books; but we must be satisfied with a general account of them. Thus the laws about caste often take the first, and always the most important place. The law-books are essentially Brâhmanical. The worst sins are those against Brâhmans. The life of the Brâhman is the principal object of the precepts. This life is described in its four periods, the four Âsramas or stages of life through which the Brâhman passes, the conditions and requirements of which are strictly regulated. First of all he is a pupil, Brahmakârin, and must prepare himself with severe studies, while a close tie of respect and gratitude binds him to his spiritual father, his teacher, or Guru. Then he marries and becomes the father of a family, or Grihastha. During these first two stages the Brâhman lives in the world and discharges the three debts with which he was born: to the *Ri*shis, whose hymns he transmits; to the Pitris, by begetting offspring to offer sacrifices; and to the gods, whom he has to provide with sacrifices. But after he has paid these debts, he can leave the world and withdraw as a hermit, Vânaprastha, to carry out renunciation, even to the life of a beggar, Bhikshu, Sannyâsin. Detailed precepts are given for each of these stages.

The great importance of this legal literature is more and more recognised, but the problems which it contains are certainly some of the most difficult. As a source of law, Manu, besides the Veda, mentions also the customs dating from ancient times (II. 6). And as a fact we must in the law-books distinguish between the rules which point to later Hindu development (for instance, the important place of the

Brâhmans), and those in which ancient customs from Indo-Germanic times survive. A comparative study, for instance, of family rights, and the law of inheritance in connection with the sacrifices to the dead (*Srâddha*), show us how much of this original material may be found even in the latest codifications. But another distinction becomes necessary. In studying ancient laws one must present to oneself the social conditions which produced such laws, and to which they referred. In our case this is not only difficult, but we have a reason for only following this course to a certain extent. In existing customs and social order there was, in reality, much which answered to these laws; but at the same time the Dharmaśâstras contain many merely abstract doctrines of law, which were only taught and developed in the schools, but remained purely theoretical. However, even if it were impossible to separate such elements in detail, it is still important to point them out.

CHAPTER 65.—Speculation. The Upanishads.

Books of Reference. A translation of the classical Upanishads was made by MAX MÜLLER (S. B. E. I, XV); in the introduction he gives a list of the literature on this subject. As an introduction to these writings the following are to be recommended: P. REGNAUD, Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie de l'Inde (2 vols., 1876-78); and especially A. E. GOUGH, The Philosophy of the Upanishads and ancient Indian Metaphysics (Tr. Or. S. 1882).

Of the numerous writings which bear the title of Upanishad and are partly of very late origin, we can only look on about a dozen as being ancient and authentic witnesses of Hindu speculation. The most important are: *Bṛihadâraṇyaka*-Upanishad, *Khâ*ndogya-Upanishad, Ka*ṭha*-Upanishad, *Śvetâśva*-

tara-Upanishad, and Mu*n*daka-Upanishad. They occupy a position within the limits of Vedic literature, and belong to the *S*ruti. But their object is quite different to that of the Brâhma*n*as of which they form an appendix. They have nothing to do with the ritual, but are intended to lead to true knowledge and form the speculative part, the *G*ñânakânda, as different from the practical Karmakâ*n*da, a distinction which influences the whole of the development of Hindu religion. These Upanishads are not generally antagonistic to sacrifice, but wherever it is mentioned in them, it is declared to be symbolical, and as a rule they pass it by to point out another road to salvation. There also exist clear traces from which we see that this speculation was not only practised in the Brâhmanic circles, but that many of the knightly caste occupied themselves with it.

We do not by any means give a detailed survey of the teaching of these treatises. The thoughts are mostly abstruse, and the manner of presenting them in metaphors and comparisons makes them still more complicated. We can hardly realise them properly, not only because they are foreign to us, but rather because our language gives them a finish and precision which they do not possess in themselves. There can also be no question of a uniform teaching, because of the great difference in the various Upanishads. We shall deal with many cosmological and psychological speculations, but only point out the direction in which they moved, and the object towards which they struggled.

The object here is the attainment of true knowledge, which is not satisfied with the multiplicity of

phenomena, but which grasps at real being, which is identical in everything, the same in the whole world, in small and great things, from a blade of grass to the highest godhead. In order to attain true unity, not only must the plurality of the objects of our experience be dissolved, but the duality between subject and object, which appears to be the sine quâ non of all knowledge, must vanish. The true being is really identical with the personal ego. The inner light of one's own being coincides with the knowledge of all things. For such a knowledge therefore, all limited and separate existence has passed away. In it, we can as little talk of the consciousness of the subject as of the signs and attributes of the object, for subject and object are melted into one. The state of the perceptive soul is that of a sleep without dreams, in which hearing, thinking, and knowledge go on, but yet one cannot say that this or that is known. The true being is without attributes, a bare existence without any character. To designate this true being which vivifies all things and all phenomena, with which the initiated man reunites himself by giving up his individual existence, the words Âtman and Brahman (neuter) are used, but their meaning, as is natural, bears many shades. Âtman is one's own ego (as opposed to the outward world), the soul (as opposed to the body), and the spirit (as opposed to matter). It is the only real thing; the world of phenomena, the individual existences, are only a dream. At the foundation of this whole world there lies a second principle besides Âtman. This is the unreality, illusion, or Mâyâ. From these two original principles there first emanated Îsvara, the soul of the world, and then

the whole world. Since the days of COLEBROOKE people have mostly looked on the Mâyâ theory as a later addition to Hindu speculation; but GOUGH has convincingly proved that it belongs to the fundamental thoughts of the Upanishads.

We shall here mention some of the best known works, in which these ideas are expressed in various sayings and pictures. First of all comes the *Kh*ândogya-Upanishad VIII. 7–12, where Pra*g*âpati instructs Indra as to the true Âtman, after one of the Asura had been dismissed with an entirely deficient information. *Kh*ândogya-Upanishad VI is still more important. In it Âru*n*i imparts a thorough instruction to his son *S*vetaketu, who had returned home after a Brâhmanical education with a knowledge of the Vedas and with great conceit, but without the true knowledge. In this dialogue, the unity of Âtman in the world with the personal ego stands out strongly, and this general unity with Âtman is shown by numerous images. In the bee's honey one can no longer recognise the taste of the single flowers; the rivers which emanate from the one sea and again return to it, lose meanwhile their separate existences; a lump of salt dissolved in water salts the whole water, and cannot be grasped again: thus the true being can nowhere be grasped. It is a subtle essence which lies at the foundation of all phenomena, which are merely illusions, and is again identical with the ego. Therefore what one loves in anything is not the thing itself, but the essence in it; one loves husband, wife, sons, possessions, not for their own sakes, but one loves the essence in them. This is the contents of a dialogue in the B*r*ihadâra*n*yaka-Upanishad IV. 5. Here the

*Ri*shi Yâg*ñ*avalkya, who is going to leave the worldly life to become a hermit in the forest, shows to his wife Maitreyî the road to immortality, which cannot be attained even by gaining the whole world. The story of Na*k*iketas in the Ka*th*a-Upanishad treats of the incomparable value of this knowledge of immortality, which is included in the true knowledge of the ego. Na*k*iketas, the Brâhman's son, had been delivered into the hands of death by his father, but he delayed three nights in the house of Yama without partaking of anything, and thus gained the right to three wishes. His first wish is, that when he has returned to his father he may find him contented and happy; then he begs for information about fire sacrifices; but for the third, he wishes to be freed from the doubt, whether man continues to live after death or not. This last request is only acceded to after great trouble and repeated demands, but finally Yama imparts to him the knowledge of the true essence, which is sought for by so few.

We should be wrong, if we concluded from this last example, that the true knowledge can only be attained through death. Even during life this insight is gained, and the very Upanishads are meant to lead up to it, by showing the way to attain Âtman. This way is not that of logical speculations or moral exertions; on the contrary, moral perfection, according to this conception, belongs to the lower acts, which do not lead to the highest end. Again, success is achieved by impassibility, apathy, and abstraction by means of the soul, which does not only withdraw itself from the outer world, but suppresses the clear consciousness which always separates the subject and

object, and sinks into a state of deep sleep till finally the absorption of the individual self into the general self is attained and consciousness is quite extinguished. This Âtman or Brâhman also possesses consciousness, but is not therefore consciousness itself. A methodical statement of the various practices and meditations which lead to this union with the Âtman is not given in the more ancient Upanishads; but the way itself is clearly pointed out. Meditations on the sacred syllable Om play a great part.

This philosophy of the Upanishads was really a religion, and one which, as new, took its place by the side of the old. The sacrificial rites and the knowledge of the Vedas were presented as satisfying the lower demands, as being fit for the masses, but they did not satisfy the higher demands. A new way was pointed out because a new object was desired. Worldly possessions in this life, and after death happiness in the dwellings of Yama or any of the gods are no longer the highest objects which have now completely absorbed the individual self. This union with the Âtman is a release, especially from transmigration, by which life is always renewed. This theory of transmigration, which forms the foundations of this whole speculation is, it is true, foreign to the Vedic hymns, but not necessarily therefore of later or foreign origin. It is impossible to say with certainty how it has become united with Hindu conceptions, and it is sufficient for us to point out its great importance. That the wheel of life in its higher and highest as well as in its lower forms is an evil, is already presupposed in the Upanishads. The object is therefore deliverance from a

repetition of existence, be it even in the paradisiacal dwellings of the gods.

Although we do not possess a knowledge of the nearer surroundings and historical circumstances in which the Upanishads originated, yet we can on the whole give this speculation its place in the Hindu history of religion. Germs of it are even found in some hymns of the Rig-veda, more especially in X. 90 and 129. In this last hymn, the origin of the world is treated in a way that reminds us of the Upanishads. More especially, scholastic philosophy as well as the Buddhistic conceptions have their deepest roots in these writings. Thus we can look on the Vedânta theory, which is based on the Upanishads, simply as a systematising of all that we here find mixed up together. But the Sâṅkhya school also, which had broken with the theory of identity, and recognised the plurality of individuals as well as the reality of the world, and is therefore strictly opposed to the fundamental theories of the Upanishads, possesses nevertheless so many points of connection with them that some people have (but quite erroneously) been able to regard the Śvetâśvatara-Upanishad as a product of the Sâṅkhya system. Every careful reader whilst studying the Upanishads must at once feel that he is in the spiritual atmosphere of Buddhism. But the Buddhist has renounced his belief in any being, as a real background of phenomena; with him there are various states, conceptions and sensations of the soul, but an actual soul does not exist. This theory, that everything is based on nothing, is here and there refuted in the Upanishads (*Kh*ând-Up. VI), and more systematically so by the great Vedânta theory; but it is

clear that it is not so very different from the conceptions of the Upanishads. There is only a step between a real foundation of the world (which can only be negatively conceived, which has no attributes, and lies beyond all known knowledge), and a simple negation.

Having pointed out the position which this speculation fills in history, we need not dwell long on the various criticisms which have been made on it. European philosophers like SCHOPENHAUER, who knew a number of these writings from the unintelligible translation made by ANQUETIL DU PERRON, and through Hindu reformers like RAMMOHUN ROY, have discovered in these treatises genuine wisdom or the true religion. People still often write about the Upanishads as if in them were to be found the deepest and most heartfelt things which have ever been thought or imagined. As opposed to this, GOUGH sees in these highest creations of Hindu thought, nothing more than the unfruitful products of a barbaric age and of a low race. He thinks that what we here find cannot be traced back to Aryan blood, but to a mixture of lower populations, which have remained the foundations of the Hindu people. This question is also of importance as regards our judgment of the religious movement of our century in India.

CHAPTER 66.—**The Schools of Philosophy.**

Books of Reference. The best survey is still that given by COLEBROOKE, On the Philosophy of the Hindus (Misc. Ess. I, in which COWELL has mentioned the later works in the notes). A thorough representation of one of the most important schools was given by P. DEUSSEN, Das System des Vedânta (1883); A. BRUINING gave a short but excellent monograph, Bijdrage tot de kennis van den Vedânta (1871). The so-called Aphorisms of the various schools have been mostly translated by J. R. BALLANTYNE: and lately the Sûtras of the Vedânta by P. DEUSSEN (1887).

A survey of the philosophical systems is best placed directly after a statement of the teaching contained in the Upanishads, with which they are in many points connected. But this order must not be conceived in a strictly chronological sense. The principal systems go far back into antiquity, but some of them reached their fuller development and perfection later. In the various systems, the fundamental doctrines are laid down in short aphorisms, called Sûtras, which Sûtras have furnished the text for later enlargements and commentaries.

There are six schools especially which must here be considered. These schools, which are more closely connected in pairs, and their teachers (more or less mythical) to which they are traced, are as follows: the Sâṅkhya of Kapila and the Yoga of Patañgali; the Nyâya of Gotama and the Vaiseshika of Kanâda; the Mîmâmsâ (or Pûrva Mîmâmsâ) of Gaimini and the Vedânta (or Uttara Mîmâmsâ) of Vyâsa. All these six schools are based, though in various degrees, on a Vedic foundation, and are thus distinguished from other philosophies, which deny the authority of the Vedas. Of course there is a great difference in these schools; for whereas Mîmâmsâ and Vedânta are more theological than philosophical, and thoroughly maintain the contents of the Vedas, the connection with the Vedas is much slighter in the case of the Sâṅkhya. But there is another reason, besides this dependence on authority, why we cannot recognise in these schools a pure and genuine philosophical character. The knowledge of truth was throughout, not an object, but a means. The object was deliverance from the evils of the world and of life.

However high or low the philosophical value of these systems may be placed, we must first of all regard them from their religious point of view, as methods of salvation by means of true knowledge. There are two fundamental presuppositions: namely, that mortal existence is above all things an evil, and that a redeeming insight must be gained. Therefore a man without this insight, that is under his usual natural conditions, has fallen into ignorance and error. The Sâṅkhya school derives its name from the exact calculation and summing up of its fundamental principles, of which it accepts no less than twenty-five. Perception, syllogism, and a right affirmation (by Vedic tradition), are the three means by which to attain a knowledge of truth. This knowledge is said to put an end to the various forms of suffering, and is attained by being able to distinguish between the twenty-three principles which belong to the dominion of the senses, and the two others, the invisible and the soul. One of these, the invisible principle, which can be known through its works, was never begotten but is the origin of all: it is nature (Prakṛiti, Pradhâna), the condition of all real existence, the whole world, as developed in the twenty-three principles which follow one another. As an ultimate fundamental being, Purusha the soul, neither begotten nor begetting, stands face to face with this Prakṛiti. Proofs are produced both for the existence of this material unqualified ground of all things, as well as for that of the soul. This soul merely implies the individual soul (a plurality of souls is admitted), without there being any question of a supreme or universal soul. That is why people have often accused the Sâṅkhya

of atheism. The school explains psychologically how these souls are mixed with, or tied to matter. The highest object, however, is the breaking of this band, a true release. It is true, one cannot actually say that the soul is in need of release, for in its very nature it is free; its bondage is merely imaginary. It is not the soul, but nature which is the actual subject of transmigration. But the connection must by all means be broken through. This is not achieved by virtue, by means of which the transition to a higher world, as by sins to a lower existence, is attained, but by the discriminating knowledge by which the soul recognises itself in its true being, and nature as opposed to itself. This look of recognition is decisive; for Prakṛiti, once recognised by Purusha, withdraws itself without exposing itself for a second time to the danger of this glance. Then transmigration ceases, and man can remain a short time in this existence, as long as the causality of former works continues, but he is no longer subjected to a new birth. Prakṛiti has no longer any hold on Purusha.

The fundamental lines of the system of the Yoga coincide with those of the Sâṅkhya. It differs from it, first by the recognition of one god (Îsvara), or a supreme soul, as being distinguished from the individual souls. This is not controlled by nature, and rules everything, a supposition which the Sâṅkhya disputes on logical grounds. The other characteristic, to which even the name Yoga alludes, is the pre-eminence assigned to meditation and askesis, and the prescription of discipline to be carried out systematically. The object of this is not only deliverance,

conceived as a union with God, but the attainment of superhuman faculties, the dominion over nature.

We need not consider the Nyâya and Vaiseshika, because their systems mostly treat of logic, the formal side of philosophy. Kaṇâda accepts an atomistic view of the origin of the natural world. This philosophy also, although mostly concerned with logical questions, is entirely dominated by the belief in transmigration and the struggle for freedom, though without producing anything original on the subject.

The older (Pûrvâ) or practical Mîmâṃsâ, which deals with works (karma), can hardly be regarded as a philosophical school. Although this school also is carried on in a systematic form, yet it is mostly concerned with the inculcation of the Vedas and even with their practical contents. It points the way to the performance of duties, and shows the blessed results which follow. Acts of virtue and happiness as a reward, which other schools consider of less value, are here most highly prized. Of course this school is more especially occupied with objects which the others more or less neglect, with the defence of the Vedas and the results of properly performed sacrificial rites. Amongst the teachers of the Mîmâṃsâ, the most prominent is Kumârila Bhaṭṭa, who about the seventh cent. A.D. worked in opposition to the Buddhists.

The principal school besides the Sâṅkhya is the Vedânta, whose Sûtras are traced back to Bâdarâyaṇa (or to Vyâsa). Its teaching is fully developed in the commentaries of the great teacher Śaṅkara (900 A.D.). The Vedânta is on the one hand opposed to the older Mîmâṃsâ as Uttarâ (last) or Brahma-Mîmâṃsâ (not

practical, but speculative), and on the other hand, to the pluralistic Sâṅkhya, as being monistic. As Vedânta (i.e. end or object of the Veda) it is most closely connected with the Upanishads, whose teaching it systematises. Prof. Deussen has very fully treated theology, cosmology, psychology, the teaching of metempsychosis (Saṁsâra) and of deliverance (Moksha), according to the teaching of Śaṅkara.

We can here only mention the most important points. The fundamental thought of the Vedânta is the identity of the Brahman and the soul (according to certain texts from the Upanishads, *Kh*ând. Up. VI. 8, 7, 'that art thou,' and B*ṛ*hadâr. Up. I. 4, 10, 'I am Brahman'). The soul is not to be considered as a part of the (indivisible) Brahman, but as the whole unchangeable Brahman, comprising everything in himself. The freedom of the soul consists of the true cognizance (Vidyâ) of its own being as identical with Brahman. This knowledge is traced back to the *Gñ*ânakâ*nd*a of the Vedic literature, whilst the Karmakâ*nd*a can only produce happiness, but not final freedom, through universal knowledge. Meanwhile there are grades in this knowledge, an exoteric and an esoteric, a lower and a higher knowledge. The exoteric knowledge has reference to the lower Brahman, which is worshipped by the soul, and therefore still different from it. It can be conceived as soul of the world, as individual soul, or as highest deity, but in all these cases it is affected with Upadhis (conditions, relations). The highest Brahman, on the contrary, is without any conditions and qualities, and it is only by knowing its own identity with that Brahman, that the soul frees itself from its Upadhis, from the

body, from the world, from the causality of works, and becomes absorbed in Brahman. Hence all predicates of that Brahman can be negative only, nothing definite can be ascribed to it. It is really unknowable, though this does not deny that the soul becomes conscious of its identity with it. The reality of the world is therefore an illusion only, which affects the soul in its state of ignorance, but vanishes through the knowledge of its essence. The questions how the soul becomes free of its Upadhis, and what they consist in, supply the material for psychological discussions. The stages are accurately described through which the not yet liberated soul must travel in its journey to other forms of existence, which, according to its previous works, are higher or lower. Even if these works are not sufficient for achieving complete deliverance they can nevertheless, together with meditation, have their value as discipline and assistance for obtaining knowledge. However they also must finally cease, because both good and evil deeds become the causes of new existences, while all existence ceases in true knowledge. For those who are truly free there is no return, they have found rest from the whirlpool of life and constantly renewed existences. If it is asked whether there remains for them after their absorption in Brahman, a sentiment of bliss, the system answers in the negative; for the universal being without attributes can have no consciousness, still less can individual consciousness endure after its absorption.

Besides these schools, which all rest on Vedic authority, there were others opposed to the Veda, the followers of which were called heretics or Nâstikas.

These were the Buddhists and *G*ainas, of whom we shall treat hereafter, and the materialists (Lokâyatika or *K*ârvâka). Among the worshippers of *Ś*iva the Mahesvaras and the Pâsupatas reject the authority of the Veda.

Chapter 67.—Witchcraft.

Books of Reference. There is no translation of the entire Atharva-veda; single parts are to be found in Weber's Ind. Stud. I, IV, XIII; much may be found in Ludwig, Rig-veda III, die Mantralitteratur und das alte Indien; Grill translated one hundred hymns of the A.-V. (1879, 2e verb. Aufl. 1888). Weber gave pieces from a Brâhmaṇa of the S.-V. and from a Sûtra of the A.-V. in Zwei vedische Texte uber Omina und Portenta (Abh. d. Kön. Ak. Berlin, 1858).

It would be quite wrong, if we argued from the fact that because nowhere in the Rig-veda do we meet with witchcraft, it was therefore foreign to ancient times and real Aryan races, and that it dates from a later deterioration under the influence of the aborigines of India. On the contrary, comparative studies prove to us with certainty, that the magic formulas and magic means which we meet with in the Atharva-veda and elsewhere, belong to the oldest elements of life and faith. In India, as almost everywhere, they occupy a prominent position. The net of magic was drawn over the whole of a man's life, and that magic was recognised by the Brâhmans is proved by the connection of these practices with sacrificial rites, and by the position of the Atharva-veda in Vedic literature. We cannot even assign magic as a special element belonging exclusively to the surroundings of the Atharva-veda; for the whole ritual is impregnated with it. In fixing the place for a sacrifice, and at the various lustrations at sacrifices as well as at the

ceremonials attending births, marriages, and deaths, magic was received into the ritual. In legal literature we find sections concerning various kinds of ordeals, and in judicial proceedings such ordeals have their recognised place as tests of innocence. There is also hardly any difference between the magic and the liturgical sayings which accompany the sacrifice, and a belief in the efficacy of certain words and sayings is at the bottom of the use of both.

In the Atharva-veda a number of these sayings are preserved to us. In general they deal partly with curing, health, victory, and blessing; but for the most part they serve to procure certain possessions, or to keep off certain evils, wounds, and illnesses (leprosy, fever, and madness), miscarriages, snakes, worms in cattle, monsters, witchcraft, and evil spells, whilst people endeavour to hurt their enemies by means of spells. On the other hand, there are many sayings which bring blessings at births, weddings, and consecrations of houses, also long life, riches in cattle and in the granary, victory in battle and luck in gambling. We must not forget the numerous love-charms and those used to exorcise jealousy and anger. These formulas often accompany certain acts of magic, for instance, the consecration of amulets. A belief in the healing powers of water and certain plants, which is widely spread amongst other nations, is attested in many hymns.

Good and evil omens were eagerly watched. Anyone undertaking anything important, more especially the king when he went to war, did not neglect to cast a horoscope, to investigate the planets, and to consult chiromancy and other forms of mantic. In unusual

events, people saw evil forebodings. Therefore it was necessary to lay these evil portents, for which various formulas suitable to the event were used.

These events were such as earthquakes, eclipses of the sun or moon, meteors, also ominous circumstances, the birth of twins, either amongst human beings, or animals with which it was not usual, clefts in the earth or cracks in a rafter, or when two ploughs in a field, or two threads in spinning, got entangled. To turn aside the evil threatened by such signs certain gods are often appealed to in the magic formulas, and the evil demoniacal beings of death and destruction, such as Mṛityu and Nirṛiti, are banished. The sayings used at these exorcisms are generally accompanied with a sacrifice.

CHAPTER 68. — **The Hero Legends.**

Books of Reference. On these subjects great merit belongs to LASSEN (Ind. A. K.) and the two AD. HOLTZMANNS; the elder published Indische Sagen, and the younger many important essays, of which we mention AD. HOLTZMANN'S Arjuna, Ein Beitrag zur Reconstruction des Mahâbhârata (1879). A good translation of the whole does not exist; extracts were given by PH. ED. FOUCAUX, Le Mahâbhârata: Onze Episodes (1862). An analysis of the subject-matter and the parts of the Mahâbhârata was attempted by S. SOERENSEN, Om Mahâbhârata's stilling in den Indiske Literatur (1883). A complete translation, under the auspices of Pratapa Chandra Ray, is now being published at Calcutta. On the Râmâyaṇa one should consult CH. SCHOEBEL, Le Râmâyaṇa au point de vue religieux, philosophique et moral (A. M. G. XIII).

The two great heroic epics (Itihâsa) of India, the Mahâbhârata and the Râmâyaṇa, which have come down to us, belong in their present form to a later period. Much of the epic material treated in them no doubt dates from earlier times, even though the attempt to represent them as identical with the hero

myths of other Indo-Germanic nations cannot be carried out. Almost all the periods of Hindu history have contributed to these hero myths. What was old has often been worked up again and rearranged, according to modern ideas. A critical sifting and historical valuation of these various elements is one of the most difficult tasks belonging to Hindu studies.

The first of the great epics, the Mahâbhârata, dealing with the fates of the descendants of Bharata has no unity of action, but is an encyclopædia of epic materials, in which most heterogeneous elements are often placed side by side. It is attributed to the mythic collector Vyâsa, who is also said to have arranged the Vedas, and who at the same time is the father of the two princes. The quarrels of their descendants are sung in the poem. Numerous episodes interrupt the story. The most famous are the philosophical Bhagavadgîtâ, the first Sanskrit work known in Europe by means of a translation, and the touching story of Nala and Damayantî, which is known to everyone by Rückert's famous rendering. But the poem is also rich in sentences and meditations of all sorts. In short the epic is, and means to be, a thorough collection of tradition; its dimensions are given as 100,000 *sloka* (distichs), but the present editions are hardly one-fifth of this length, given in eighteen divisions.

The principal action consists in the quarrel between the sons of the two brothers Dh*ri*tarâsh*tra* and Pâ*ndu*. The former, called Kurus, numbering one hundred, the eldest of whom is Duryodhana, rule in Hastinapura on the Ganges, whilst the five sons of Pâ*ndu* have

their kingdom in Indra-prastha on the Jumna. The genealogy and education of these princes; the account of how the five sons of Pân*d*u together court the princess Draupadî; how the eldest, Yudhish*th*ira, gambles with his cousin, and loses his kingdom and possessions, his brothers, wife, and freedom, and how the sons of Pân*d*u, as a result of this, have to pass twelve years in retreat in the forest, and the thirteenth year have to wander about unrecognised in various disguises: all this forms the contents of the first books. The story reaches its climax in the great battle which lasts eighteen days. The course of the battle is most vividly depicted. Amongst the sons of Pân*d*u, the most prominent are the strong and wild Bhîma and especially the victorious Ar*g*una, who, under the direction and by the council of his cunning chariot driver Kr*i*shn*a*, kills with his arrows the chief heroes of his adversaries, and amongst them his grandfather Bhîshma and his brother Karn*a*. In these battles generosity is more on the side of the opponents than on that of the unscrupulous heroes of the Pân*d*us. Duryodhana also falls, but the heroes of the Kurus who remain organise a fearful butchery in the enemy's camp by falling upon them whilst they were asleep. With the fall of a whole race the epic cycle probably originally ended, although the present poem adds more songs concerning the supremacy which was gained by the sons of Pân*d*u.

The second great epic, Valmîki's Râmâyan*a*, is of quite a different character; it is of more limited extent (but still twice as large as the Iliad), and the subject is more continuous. The poem describes the kingdom of Dasaratha, king of Ayodhyâ (now called

Oudh), in the north of India. He chose Râma, one of his three sons by different wives, as his successor, and general consent confirmed this choice. But one of the king's wives, Kaikeyî, desired the throne for her own son and laid snares for Râma. She managed to use an incautious promise of the king in such a way that Râma was banished. For fourteen years this hero, with his faithful wife Sîtâ, and his brother Lakshmana, lived in a hermitage. After the death of his father, Bharata, the son of Kaikeyî, wished to bring him from his quiet happy life, and place him on the throne, but he still remained faithful to the father's order until the fourteen years were over, and then he entered on the government. First of all he had to undergo a fight against the giant Râvana, who had robbed him of Sîtâ, and carried her off to Laṅkâ. In league with the king of apes, Hanuman, who made him a bridge across the sea to Ceylon, Râma conquered the giant, and thus regained his pure and faithful wife.

We have already refused to deduce history from these epics, although we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that many historical data are interwoven with them; but here, as in all similar cases, it is impossible to trace them exactly. No one denies that real events and facts lie at the bottom of many epic stories. Thus in the Mahâbhârata some people find a reminiscence of the battles, in which princely families fought amongst themselves in the valley of the Ganges. In the Râmâyana they find certain traces of the spread of Aryan culture in the south, where the aborigines are depicted as giants and apes. WEBER has even started the idea that Sîtâ meant the furrow,

Râma the plough, and that the poem narrates the advance of agriculture into the Deccan. But it would be risky to answer the question as to whether such fierce conflicts really took place in the valley of the Ganges in the affirmative, merely by reason of such epic hero myths. It is more important to notice that in both epics the idea of general sovereignty is pre-eminent; the ideal is not that of small princes, but of one powerful king. If in this and many other features we find ourselves on the ground of historical facts, the hero myth is nevertheless mixed up throughout with god myths, and it is most difficult to separate them. The principal heroes are the sons of the gods; Arguna the son of Indra, in whose heaven he dwells for five years, and Karna the son of Sûrya. The gods, divided between the two parties, watch the battles with great interest, and they do not even restrain themselves from determining the victory by interfering. Arguna throughout the battle enjoys the direction and advice of the god Krishna, and Râma is an incarnation of Vishnu. Although this is most prominent in both epics, we still see the old idea appearing, that Krishna is only the cunning charioteer, and Râma the noble king's son, whilst later on the Vishnu and Krishna worship were grafted on this idea. As a general rule, various conceptions about the gods are found side by side in these epics. Of the older forms, those of Indra, Agni, Varuna (as a sea-god), and Yama are retained. With them we find Brahman as the supreme god, the creator of worlds, and the disposer of fates (also Pragâpati). Other parts are purely Vishnuitic, and place Vishnu or Krishna over all; others again are inserted in the interest of

Siva. Although numerous philosophical views point to later times, yet in moral ideas the character of the ancient hero myths is generally retained. Power and reason, high-spirited courage and cunning advice, are the two elements which are mostly embodied in the ancient epic heroic characters. The glorification of married fidelity is not wanting, and the minute descriptions of life in the woods interest us as being more especially Indian.

II. GAINISM.

Books of Reference. The honour of having first of all stated reliable facts about the Gainas is again due to COLEBROOKE, in whose Misc. Ess. there are several notices treating of them, which were added to by COWELL, according to Mâdhava's report on the Gainas. The following have treated the Gaina literature: A. WEBER, Ueber die heiligen Schriften der Gaina (Ind. Stud. XVI, XVIII); E. LEUMANN, Beziehungen der Gainaliteratur zu anderen Literaturzweigen Indiens (Act. d. Or. Congr. Leiden, 1883). A translation of some of the writings with an instructive introduction was made by H. JACOBI, Gaina-Sûtras (S. B. E. XXII). Also S. J. WARREN, Over de godsdienstige en wijsgeerige begrippen der Gainas (1875).

CHAPTER 69.

Until a few years ago Gainism was almost entirely unknown. Numerous notices of this sect had been collected from Hindu literature, and single writings of the Gainas had even been translated or examined. It is only since a number of Gaina texts were brought by BÜHLER and JACOBI from India and have become accessible at the Berlin Library, and also in India itself an edition of the sacred writings of the Gainas has been organised, that the history of this religion lies open to students. Of course opinions on

this subject are still very much divided. The canon of the *Gainas* (Siddhânta, the writings called Âgama, consisting of eleven Aṅgas and twelve Upâṅgas) was only collected during the fifth century A.D., and therefore offers but an unsound foundation to go on, since *Gainism* is said to reach as far back as the fourth or fifth century B.C. But JACOBI has derived an argument for their great age, both from the language, as well as from the contents of these books, and he thinks that by referring to another literature (called Pûrvâ the former), preceding that which now exists, he can answer for the authenticity of the fixed traditions found in the latter at the present day.

The *Gaina* literature, canonical as well as secular, is thoroughly insipid and unimportant. Legends concerning the life of the *Ginas* (for instance, the Kalpa-Sûtra), rules for monastic life, morals (for instance, the later Yoga-Sûtra), all produce the impression of a dull echo of Buddhistic thoughts and rules. Herein then lies the great problem of this history. If the *Gaina* tradition deserves belief, then in India about the fifth century B.C. two religions sprang up, which were strikingly like one another, but yet antagonistic to each other, and later on had very different fates. In the other case, the whole *Gaina* legend, and the organisation of its community, would be copied from the Buddhistic sect from which it had separated. This opinion, that the *Gainas* are merely an apostate sect of Buddhism, was and still is asserted by many (WILSON, LASSEN, WEBER, and BARTH), but they vary as to the date of this separation. COLEBROOKE, and STEVENSON who followed him, recognised priority in the *Gainas*, and amongst modern

scholars of Gainism Bühler, Jacobi, and de Milloué maintain its independent character.

Let us first more closely consider the conformity between Buddhism and Gainism. Both religions are essentially monastic orders, founded by the sons of kings. These princes, Siddhârtha and Vardhamâna (*Gñâtriputra*), lived in similar circumstances, at the same date and under the same surroundings. Many characters, such as King B mbisâra of Magadha, play a part in both histories. They have many titles in common; if the former is generally called Buddha (the awakened) and the latter Gina (the conqueror) or Mahâvîra, still these epithets are not peculiar to either, for Buddha also is often called Gina, and Mahâvîra is often called Arhat, a common title in Buddhism. It is only in the title Tîrthakara, which amongst the Gainas distinguishes a prophet, and amongst the Buddhists the organiser of an heretic sect, that any difference appears. Both religions agree in dividing the course of the world into enormous periods, and in accepting a line of prophets who appeared during the course of time. The Gainas count twenty-four Tîrthakaras, who are parallel with the twenty-five Buddhas. But the similarity is much greater in the precepts for the monks, and as regards moral conceptions in general. Thus there appears to be some reason for deducing one religion from the other, and in that case much can be said for the priority of Buddhism, which is supported by older and more numerous witnesses, than its rival. The observation also that the Buddhistic legend is thoroughly opposed to the Nirgranthas (naked Gaina monks) does not interfere with this opinion, as this

can easily be explained by their dislike to the apostates.

There are, however, important differences between *G*ainas and Buddhists, which can hardly be explained if we accept this relation of dependence. The fundamental character of Buddhism is a denial of Âtman; there is no immortal substance, no real being, no soul. *G*ainism, on the contrary, agrees much more with the common Brâhmanical conception, and based on this belief in real being, it developes its theory of the division of all things into those with souls (*g*îva, gifted with an immortal soul) and those without souls (a*g*îva). This agrees with the fact that the Nirvâ*n*a of the *G*ainas, is the setting free of the soul. The method by which this is attained is different from the Buddhist method. The three precious stones (Triratna) are: a perfect belief in *G*ina, a knowledge of his teaching, and a life according to his precepts. In a certain measure this reminds us of the Buddhist triad, but the five stages of knowledge (whose highest stage, Kevala, is omniscience) are peculiar to the *G*ainas. The two religions differ also in important points of morality. Thus the Buddha legend represents the road of askesis as unsatisfactory and rather as leading away from the goal, whilst the *G*ainas recommend this road. Therefore religious suicide in order to attain freedom is strictly forbidden to Buddhists, whereas *G*ainas often practise it. The character of these differences, especially the deviation in the fundamental principle in which the *G*ainas agree with the other Hindus, makes it improbable that *G*ainism arose from an heretical form of Buddhism. It is more likely that both religions, partly under similar circumstances,

grew on a common soil of Hindu belief. This would sufficiently explain their great similarity. The five chief commandments are alike, except for a small difference in the fifth, for both Buddhists and Gainas. Amongst the Gainas they run as follows: not to destroy any life (Ahimsâ), not to lie, not to steal, to be chaste, and to renounce everything worldly, especially possessions. But it would be useless to examine whether in this respect Buddhists or Gainas are more original, as they both borrowed these commandments as well as their whole method of life from the Brâhmanic monks. In the law-books, similar ordinances are continually occurring; the Buddhist Bhikshu did not serve as a model to the Gaina Nirgrantha, or vice versa, but they both followed in the footsteps of the venerable Brâhmanic Sannyâsin. If this is so, then the question arises, in what way do these two monastic orders differ essentially from the Brâhmanic, whose type they so plainly show? In answer to this we must first of all point to the denial of the authority of the Vedas as the most important difference. But another point, especially amongst the Gainas, seems to have been in the caste from which they were recruited. As we have already seen, the model of monastic life is the fourth, or highest grade of Brâhmanic life. This fourth grade, Âsrama, was considered the especial privilege of the caste of Brâhmans. But then the above-mentioned princes founded orders, in which they laid claim to a similar life with all its desired fruits, for others also. This did not entail any democratic struggle; for the Buddhists did not oppose the Brâhmans, and both religions at first drew most of their followers from the families of the Kshatriyas.

They were orders of monks drawn from the ranks of knights, non-Brâhmanic ascetics. From the legend, it has been inferred that Mahâvîra, like Buddha, strenuously availed himself of his princely connections for the spreading of his doctrines. Also the events in Northern India seem to have benefited these new religions. During the first centuries of both religions a political movement was going on, by which the smaller princes were making place for the formation of a dynasty of mighty kings (the Nandas). But on this point we have no ground for hazarding conjectures. The history of Buddhism has to fight with many difficulties; the history of *Gainism* lies almost entirely in the dark. Is Mahâvîra, who was said to be a contemporary of Buddha, the founder of *Gainism*, or only (as JACOBI thinks) a reformer of a religion founded already by an earlier Tîrthakara? The external events, as well as the internal history of the *Gainas*, are almost unknown for several centuries. We know that in the *Gaina* church several sects are strongly opposed to one another. The two best known are first, the Digambaras, who at an early date emigrated towards the south, and followed severer rules—for instance, they went quite naked, and did not tolerate an order of nuns; and secondly, the *Svetâmbaras* in the north, who followed a milder régime. When the Greeks mention Gymnosophists they probably do not always refer to the naked *Gaina* monks, but to the scantily clothed ascetics in general. The spread of the *Gainas* was very large in India, in the fatherland of Magadha as well as in the Deccan and in Ceylon, where they existed earlier than the Buddhists. Huge

rock temples bear witness to their power. Whereas Buddhism has vanished from Hindu soil, the *Gainas* exist up to the present day. Their number at present is about half a million. They are agriculturists, and some of them are rich merchants in the towns, but their life is very different from that of the old *Gaina* monks.

III. BUDDHISM.

Books of Reference. Of classical value and still authoritative are the two great works by E. BURNOUF, Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme Indien (1844, reprinted 1876), and Le Lotus de la bonne loi (1852), the translation of a Sanskrit text enriched by twenty-one Mémoires relatifs au Bouddhisme, with constant reference to Pâli literature. From more modern southern sources, the Wesleyan missionary in Ceylon, SPENCE HARDY, has drawn up a Manual of Buddhism (first in 1853). He also published Eastern Monachism (1860), a most interesting description of the monastic life, and the legends and theories of the Buddhists compared with history and science (1866); C. F. KOPPEN, Die Religion des Buddha (2 vols., 1857–59, the first volume is rather antiquated, and contains the general history, the second volume contains the Lamaic Church); L. FEER, Études bouddhiques (since 1866 in the J. As., but it has also been published separately in different collections); E. SENART, Essai sur la légende de Buddha (also in the J. As. of 1873, 1875); W. WASSILJEW, Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Litteratur, I (trans. from Russian into German 1860), is of importance for the history of dogma in the Northern Church; T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, Buddhism (1877, S. P. C. K.), a clever, short sketch which can be recommended as the best compendium for an introduction to the study of Buddhism. He wrote the Hibbert Lectures in 1881, in which the objective historical representation is almost lost behind the defence of Buddhism. H. OLDENBERG, Buddha: His life, teaching, and congregation (1881) is based on Pâli sources; H. KERN, Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme in Indie (2 vols., 1882–1884, also trans. into German). These two last works, both of first-class merit, give us by their agreement and by their considerable difference, the present state of enquiry. The numerous popular writings on Buddhism, lectures &c., with which the book-market is overstocked, cannot be mentioned here; O. KISTNER gives a bibliography till 1869, called 'Buddha and his doctrines.'

CHAPTER 70.—**Introductory Remarks and Books of Reference.**

'Buddhism in its origin is one of the greatest and most radical reactions in favour of the universal rights of man, as belonging to the individual, as opposed to the crushing tyranny of the so-called divine privileges of birth and rank. It is the work of an individual man, who at the beginning of the sixth century B.C. rose up in Eastern India against the Brâhmanical hierarchy, and by the simplicity and the ethic power of his teaching, brought about a complete split between the people of India and their past.'

Thus wrote WEBER in 1857, and at that time he could count on a general agreement with this description. But now, many Hindu scholars will find fault with these views, quot verba tot errores; some of the statements brought forward are renounced by almost everyone, and others are severely attacked. The facts of Buddhism suffice to prove that this religion did not advocate the universal rights of mankind in general. The opinion also, that a fight against Brâhmanism was the starting-point and principal object in Buddhism, and that what was intended was a breaking with all that existed before in India, is quite wrong. The legends in no way represent Buddha as the enemy of the Brâhmans, who, on the contrary, are often mentioned with honour in many parts of this story, as well as in Buddhist writings. The difference of caste is not done away with by Buddhism, but was even introduced here and there by the spread of Buddhism. OLDENBERG has shown how erroneously people often think about the yoke of Brâhmanism, and especially with regard to the original home of Buddhism. The

Buddha legend is mostly built up of old materials, which also serve for the images of other saints, such as *Krishna*, as may be seen from the works of Senart and Kern. In teaching and monastic rules, the Buddhist community is arranged after the pattern of Brâhmanic ideas and ordinances. The best tales and most widespread sayings were borrowed from an already existing source. Still there is much that is original in this religion. The utility of sacrifices, and the authority of the Vedas, which are recognised by the Brâhmanic monks and sages although sometimes discarded, are here altogether denied. In the teaching of Karma, as in that of Nirvâna, Buddha had made an important step in advance of his Brâhmanic model; but, as we shall see later on, it was after all but a mere step. We must finally emphasise the fact that Buddha, like *Gina*, proceeded from the caste of nobles, and not from the Brâhman caste. But this certainly did not cause a democratic tendency; and if people appeal to the fact that Buddhism is based on common human motives, they must also remember that the speculation and askesis in Brâhmanism had their origin in similar motives. It is true that Buddhism did much towards spreading these Brâhmanic motives and ideals amongst other ranks, even amongst the lowest. We cannot therefore recognise in this religion any radical overthrow of Hindu customs; in India, also, it was not considered as such, as is proved by the tolerance with which Buddhism and Brâhmanism flourished for centuries side by side.

Another question, about which people now speak with less certainty than thirty years ago, refers to the historical basis of this whole story. The doubt of

an historical foundation in the story of the life of Buddha was only at that time expressed by single people (for instance, WILSON), but it has now been thoroughly proved. The many myths which are contained in the biography of Buddha, are not recognised by KERN and SENART as additions, but as the essential portion of the story. The tradition of the northern, as well as of the southern church, contains so much that is impossible, that it cannot be relied on. We know nothing of an historical Buddha, or of his religion during the first centuries. We only get firm ground under our feet when we come to King Asoka, in whose reign the monastic orders already existed, but their origins are wrapped in darkness. As opposed to this, RHYS DAVIDS and OLDENBERG maintain that there is an historical kernel in the Buddha legend. Without distilling history from the myths, they still maintain that after these mythic elements are laid on one side, there still remains historic material, which is not only probable in itself, but which, by giving us the history of the origin of this religion, fully explains its later development. BARTH also considers that however great may be the connection between the legend of Buddha and that of Krishna, yet the former always remains a man, and the second a god. Although the general character of the history of Buddha still remains an open question, yet there is an almost general agreement as to the date of his death. In the great uncertainty of all Hindu chronology, it is a real gain if one can receive information as regards any date in Hindu history from the history of the world, and thus obtain one fixed point. This is the case in respect to

the rule of Asoka. This third prince of the Maurya dynasty was the grandson of *K*andragupta, of whom we know from Justinus and through the embassy of Megasthenes, that he ascended the throne directly after the death of Alexander the Great. Since we know the number of years he and his son reigned, and, on the other hand, hear of a treaty made by Asoka with Antiochus Theos 256 B.C., the calculation can only differ by a very few years. We possess the following helps towards determining the Nirvâ*n*a of Buddha from this one fixed point. To begin with, we have the edicts of King Asoka himself, found in some parts of his kingdom, which mostly give us authentic reports of his reign, and of his relationship to Buddhism[1]. Then there also exists a vast ecclesiastical tradition, both in the southern (Ceylon) as well as in the northern church. If one follows the southern tradition, represented by the Singhalese annals of the fifth century A.D., then one arrives at the year 543 B.C. as the date of the Nirvâ*n*a, and this was established by numerous savants (TURNOUR, LASSEN). This southern chronology recommends itself by its simplicity, whilst in the north there are various dates for the Nirvâ*n*a in circulation. In China and Japan a date is given corresponding to 949 B.C., and in Tibet various others. As opposed to this, KERN some time ago called attention to the fact that the Singhalese chronicle, which is 800 years later than the events which are to be dated from it, possesses none of the internal evidences of historical reliability. He considers more especially that the three councils

[1] These edicts were first worked at by JAMES PRINSEP, and later by BURNOUF, KERN, SENART (J. As. since 1880); the three last were discovered by CUNNINGHAM in 1877 and worked at by BÜHLER.

which reach down to Asoka and the doubling of Asoka (thus the second council would have been held under a Kâlasoka, who lived one century before Dharmâsoka), cannot be regarded as historical. Accordingly he dated Nirvâ*n*a as 388 B.C., and it is curious that this is the same year in which the Gainas place the death of their Mahâvîra[1]. When KERN maintained this, the last edicts of Asoka had not been discovered, and these have forced him to change his opinion and to receive 480 as the date of Nirvâ*n*a, a date which nearly corresponds with that already given by MAX MÜLLER (477 B.C.), and which OLDENBERG also accepts. RHYS DAVIDS opposes this and places the Nirvâ*n*a somewhere about the year 410.

We have already mentioned the split of Buddhism into a northern and southern division. The difference is shown by the language in which the sacred writings are transmitted. For southern Buddhism, Pâli is used, and for the northern, Sanskrit. To the southern church, besides the Buddhists of Ceylon, belong those in Burma, Siam and Pegu; to the northern, whose literature was first discovered in Nepal, belong Tibet, China, Japan, Annam, Cambodja, Java, and Sumatra. But this must not be taken in an absolute sense, since many Chinese texts for instance, can be traced back to Pâli originals. In the sacred literature, as well as in their historical traditions, the two churches have certain things in

[1] H. KERN, Over de jaartelling der zuidelijke Buddhisten en de gedenkstukken van Açoka den Buddhist (1873); his later opinion is given in Gesch. van het B. I. p. 249. It is quite clear that KERN did not mean to fix an historical date, which would entirely overthrow his whole theory, but he only sees in it the date which Asoka recognised himself, and to which he gave an astronomical meaning.

common, but on the other hand there are prominent differences. The division of the canon into three parts (Tripiṭaka, three baskets) and many writings (often in various editions), are common to both. Others belong to one of these divisions only. A comparative study of these two collections was undertaken by BURNOUF; but he was only able to complete one half of his work (concerning the Sanskrit works), and has only produced single though most valuable contributions on the other part. Since then most scholars have kept themselves to one of the two sides; KERN only has based his history on both traditions, although he considers that a comparison of both forms of the canon cannot as yet be carried out [1]. On the whole the credit of greatest age and greater reliability is in favour of the southern church, which possesses a more clearly defined canon, and a richer historical tradition. On the other hand, in certain of the poetical works (Gâthâs), which are comprised in the northern writings and are written in a popular dialect (Prakrit), more ancient and original elements have been discovered. The southern literature has been especially studied by BURNOUF, LASSEN, TURNOUR, CHILDERS, SPENCE HARDY, GRIMBLOT, GOGERLY, FAUSBÖLL, MINAYEFF, TRENCKNER, DE ALWIS, MORRIS, RHYS DAVIDS, OLDENBERG and others, whose labours received a common centre for some years by the foundation of the Pâli Text Society. Though neither Pâli nor Sanskrit was the native language of Buddhism, as established in Magadha, yet certain scholars claimed a great age for the southern literature, and traced in it the

[1] KERN's Survey of the two forms of Canonical Literature is as yet the most critical; cf. ii. 339 seq., 362 seq., 406 seq.

most ancient ordinances of the Buddhist communities, and in all essentials a true remembrance of the teaching of the master himself. The statement that after the first council immediately after the Nirvâṇa, the sacred texts were collected by Buddha's three principal pupils (Upâli, Ânanda, Kasyapa), cannot be regarded as historical. Even in the Kullavagga there is a description not only of this first council, but also of a second council one hundred years later, and the edicts of Asoka recognise Buddhist books, but not yet a canon. Nevertheless, RHYS DAVIDS, OLDENBERG, and MAX MÜLLER maintain that the southern canon, at least in its essential parts, belongs to the first century after the Nirvâṇa, and can be traced back to the tradition of the first pupils. Even in this form, the same question always returns as to the possibility of an historical confirmation of the origin of Buddhism, even in its main outlines.

We shall now give a survey of the Pâli canonical books. As opposed to the exaggerated representations of the size of this literature, RHYS DAVIDS has calculated that all these works together would hardly be twice the size of our Bible, and if the various repetitions were deducted it would even be shorter than our Bible. The three collections are: Vinaya-Piṭaka, the discipline; Sutta-Piṭaka, the speeches; Abhidhamma-Piṭaka, containing metaphysic. We will enumerate the books belonging to each collection.

I. Vinaya-Piṭaka.

1. Sutta-Vibhaṅga, the details of the formulas used at the Pâtimokkha ceremony, which in two parts dealt with sins: *a.* Pârâǧika, concerning the sins for which people were expelled from the community; *b.*

Pâkittiya, concerning those for which penance was performed.

2. Khandakas, *a.* Mahâvagga; *b.* Kullavagga [1].

3. Parivârapâtha, appendix and recapitulation.

II. Sutta-Pitaka.

A number of shorter and longer tracts, divided into five collections (Nikâyas) and partly claiming to be sayings of the master.

The most important are: Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta, the book of the great decease, in which the last words, and the death of Buddha are given; Dhammakakkappavattana-Sutta contains the four principal truths and other principal outlines of the doctrine; Tevigga-Sutta, concerning the unfruitfulness of Vedic knowledge [2]. The last of the five collections (Khuddaka-Nikâya) is counted by some as belonging to the Abhidhamma. It contains fifteen works, amongst which are the following: Dhammapada, the path of the law or religious sayings, 423 short sentences in 26 sections, one of the most popular works, containing interesting moral maxims, which Buddhism has probably adopted rather than produced. KERN calls the Dhammapada an anthology of pre-Buddhistic Hindu sayings. Sutta-Nipâta is a collection of important and partially very ancient speeches and dialogues on the fundamental principles of the teaching [3]. Both works are in verse.

The collection of the Gâtakas is of great interest;

[1] RHYS DAVIDS and OLDENBERG, Vinaya Texts, S. B. E. XIII, XVII, XX.

[2] Seven of these chief Suttas are translated by RHYS DAVIDS, S. B. E. XI.

[3] MAX MÜLLER, Dhammapada; FAUSBÖLL, Sutta-Nipâta, both in the S. B. E. X.

their number is given as 550 [1]. In its present form it professes to give moral teaching by means of stories about the former existence of Buddha; but it is quite clear that this is only the outward form, in which Buddhism has adopted these fables. The antiquity of many of these *Gâtakas* is proved by the bas-reliefs of a stûpa at Bharhut from the time of King Asoka, which represent many scenes from these stories.

III. Abhidhamma-Pi*ṭ*aka.

This section contains seven sub-divisions treating of the conditions of life, of the elements, and causes. It does not seem to be as important as the two others, and is not rendered accessible by means of translations.

Besides these canonical books there are a number of other important works belonging to the southern church. To these belong the two chronicles of Dîpava*ṃ*sa and Mahâva*ṃ*sa from the fifth cent. A.D., which record the events between the Nirvâ*ṇ*a, till 300 A.D. Their historical value has sometimes been exaggerated, but still they contain an interesting form of tradition. In the same century lived the famous teacher Buddhaghosha, who wrote a series of commentaries and illustrated the Dhammapada by parables [2]. There are also certain Singhalese works of later date which have been utilised by SPENCE HARDY in his works, amongst which is the important discourse between the Greek king Milinda and the teacher Nâgasena (Milinda Prasna). From Farther

[1] RHYS DAVIDS' Buddhist Birth Stories or *Gâtaka* Tales (I. 1880) has been translated into English, and later on he added Nidânakathâ as an introduction. It is a history of the early part of Buddha's life and works up to the founding of the first monastery.

[2] T. ROGERS, Buddhaghosha's Parables, translated from the Burmese, with introduction by MAX MÜLLER (1870).

India we possess a Burmese and Siamese biography of Buddha, but the latter goes only as far as the story of the temptation [1].

If we now turn our attention towards the northern sources of information, we must first notice the collection of Sanskrit works which BRIAN HOUGHTON HODGSON found in Nepal in 1828, and which BURNOUF used in his chief work [2]. This literature has the same principal divisions as the southern, but differs from it in essential points. The canon is not as defined and decided, which can be explained by the fact that whereas the southern church has only one single tradition, or at least has reached us only in the form of that tradition, the northern is divided into numerous sects, whose various opinions are shown in the literature. Still more extraordinary is the fact that real Vinaya texts are not found in the Nepal collection; their place is taken by detailed legends (Avadânas). The Abhidharma writings are here of especial value. To these belong the so-called nine Dharmas of Nepal, which are specially honoured. They consist of the Pragñâpâramitâ, Gaṇḍavyûha, Dasabhûmîśvara, Samâdhirâja, Laṅkâvatâra, Saddharmapuṇḍarîka, Tathâgataguhyaka, Lalitavistara, and Suvarṇaprabhâsa. Of these the following are more especially interesting, Pragñâpâramitâ, in three

[1] P. BIGANDET, The Life or Legend of Gaudama, the Buddha of the Burmese (first pub. in 1858); H. ALABASTER, Wheel of the Law (1871), a free translation, to which the author adds many of his own remarks on Buddhism in Siam.

[2] B. H. HODGSON, Essays on the Languages, Literature, and Religion of Nepal and Tibet (1874). His Miscellaneous Essays (2 vols., Tr. Or. S.) are interesting owing to his knowledge of the non-Aryan aborigines of the country round the Himalayas.

editions, the shortest in 8000 articles, a survey of Buddhistic metaphysics; Saddharmapu*nd*arîka treats of one point of doctrine from the standpoint of the Mahâyâna[1]; Lalitavistara contains part of Buddha's biography, although, of course, it has not even the semblance of historical facts[2]. Of the other works we must mention the Mahâvastu, one of the principal works of an heretic sect, with numerous legends concerning the monastic life of Buddha. Another sort of Buddhist writings, which, counting as fourth by the side of the Tripi*ṭ*aka, have an important position (like Atharva by the side of the three Vedas), are the Tantras (magic books) and the Dhara*ṇ*îs (magic sayings).

The northern literature is wider spread than the southern. First of all, we must notice the vast literature found in Tibet, which contains a number of canonical and non-canonical writings, and has been translated since the seventh century A. D. from Sanskrit and Pâli originals. It was an Hungarian, ALEXANDER CSOMA, from Körös, who, fancying he would find the original home of his nation in Upper Asia, in the year 1820 undertook the journey on foot, and without means, and carried it out with heroic endurance and sacrifice. To him we owe the first knowledge of the two gigantic Tibetan collections; the Kahgyur, consisting of 100 folio volumes, and the Tangyur, consisting of 225[3].

[1] This has been twice excellently translated by BURNOUF, Le lotus de la bonne loi; and by KERN, S. B. E. XXI.

[2] Translated by PH. ED. FOUCAUX, Ann. M. G. VI.

[3] He gave a minute analysis of it in the As. Researches 1836, which was translated in 1881 by L. FEER, Ann. M. G. II. We mention the following translations and works: PH. ED. FOUCAUX, Lalitavistara (1847, as we have already seen; he later on translated the same work

The Kahgyur has seven principal divisions, of which Dulva corresponds to Vinaya, Sherchin to Pragñâpâramitâ, Mdo to Sûtra, and Rgyud to Tantra. Many important parts have been translated or studied, and later Tibetan literature has also received attention. Contemporaneously with HODGSON and CSOMA, J. J. SCHMIDT undertook to open another province of Buddhistic literature, and to make known the Mongol translations of Sanskrit originals.

Still more important are the Chinese sources. A catalogue published a few years ago of the translations from the Tripitaka mentions 1662 works. Although the Chinese works are translations of southern as well as of northern canonical and non-canonical works, yet they differ much from the Sanskrit and Pâli books known to us, since they almost all without exception are derived from originals unknown to us, or from other editions of them[1]. Perhaps of greater im-

from the Sanskrit original); L. FEER, Fragments extraits du Kandjour (Ann. M. G. V); W. W. ROCKHILL, Udânavarga (Tr. Or. S. is the Tibetan version of the Dhammapada). The life of the Buddha and the early history of his order (Tr. Or. S. a collection of historical materials from Tibetan sources), Le traité d'émancipation (R.-H.-R. 1884, the Pratimoksha forms). No less interesting is the collection of fables and stories from the Kahgyur, arranged by SCHIEFNER and provided with a beautiful introduction. It has been translated into English by RALSTON, Tibetan tales (Tr. Or. S.). Of later works we must mention the following: A. SCHIEFNER, Eine tibetische Lebensbeschreibung Çâkjamuni's aus einem Werk des 17. Jahrhunderts im Auszug mitgetheilt (1849); Târânâtha, also translated by SCHIEFNER (1869), Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien, a book which ends in 1608 and contains the historical transmissions of the northern church.

[1] S. BEAL, Texts from the Buddhist canon commonly known as Dhammapada (Tr. Or. S.). A catena of Buddhist scriptures from the Chinese (1871). The romantic legend of Śâkya Buddha (1875, a translation of a Chinese translation from the sixth cent. A.D.), Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king, a life of Buddha by Asvaghosha Bodhisattva translated

portance than all these translations, are the records of the journeys of the Chinese pilgrims, who visited India to strengthen their belief in the home of Buddhism, and to carry away relics, pictures, and more especially, copies of the sacred books. The most prominent of these were Fahian (about 400), and Sungyun (518), and more especially Hiuentsang, whose journey took place from 629–645. His book is most valuable, first of all because of the high impression which the man himself makes by his endurance, but not less by the reports of the geography of the lands through which he travelled and the description of the state of religion as he found it in India, where he settled as a citizen during a stay of some years [1].

Although translations only of Buddhist works have been found in China, and no copies of Sanskrit originals brought from India, yet during the last few years (since 1881) Sanskrit works of this kind have been discovered in Japan, and have thus opened quite a new path to the study of Buddhist writings. To MAX MÜLLER, helped by a hardworking young Buddhist from Japan, BUNYIU NANJIO, who was his pupil for some years in England, belongs the honour of having first cultivated this field [2].

from Sanskrit into Chinese by Dharmaraksha 420 A.D. (S. B. E. XIX). In the introduction BEAL gives a survey of the various biographies of Buddha contained in the Chinese canon.

[1] STAN. JULIEN, Voyages des pèlerins bouddhistes (3 vols., 1853-58, vol. I contains a translation of Hiuentsang's Biography, vols. II and III, a translation of his book Si-yu-ki); S. BEAL, Buddhist records of the Western World (2 vols., Tr. Or. S.).

[2] The result of this work is presented in 3 vols. of the Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series, under the title Buddhist Texts from Japan. The Musée Guimet claims to have first drawn attention to the existence of Buddhist texts in Japan.

The study of all these branches of Buddhist literature has given us much original material. But a comparative study of the various traditions is not as yet far enough advanced to throw a thorough light on the origin of this religion. We must not trust the appearance of historical reliability which is roused by the Buddhist tradition; for a closer inspection shows us beyond doubt the unhistorical character of this tradition. Here also we by no means stand on a firm historical basis, and in the course of this work we shall have to point out many contradictory views.

CHAPTER 71.—The Buddha Legend.

We must now examine the chief points of the Buddha legend. Amongst the northern Buddhists it is usually divided into twelve periods, and the accounts taken from the southern sources can be fitted into these twelve periods without much trouble. These twelve periods are:—1. the decision to appear on earth (for which the word Avatâra is used); 2. the conception; 3. birth and first years; 4. marks of special gifts; 5. marriage; 6. flight from his family and the world; 7. monastic life; 8. struggles with the tempter; 9. victory, by which he attains to supreme wisdom; 10. preaching and the spread of the teaching of the redemption; 11. death; 12. cremation of the body, and division of the relics.

1. After the proclamation had gone forth which foretold the birth of a Buddha, and the gods had made up their minds what being was destined to be the future Buddha, they all came to him to implore him to appear on earth. Then the future Buddha thought of the

five following points, which he settled: he chose as the time of his appearance the actual period of the world then going on; as the part of the world, he chose Gambudvîpa (India); as the country, the central kingdom and its chief town Kapilavastu; as the race, the Kshatriya, because they were then the most esteemed caste; and as his mother, the virtuous Mâyâ.

2. Glorious dreams announced the conception to his mother, which was to take place at the time of the festival at midsummer. The four divine rulers and their wives transported Mâyâ into the Himâlayas, where she was bathed, anointed, clothed, decorated with flowers, and placed in a golden grotto. There she conceived the future Buddha, in the form of a white elephant. Brâhmans explained this dream to the overjoyed king Suddhodana, by telling him to expect a son, who, if he remained in the world, would become a powerful king; but if on the other hand he chose a religious life, would become a world-enlightening Buddha. The conception was accompanied by thirty-two signs in nature.

3. In the grove of Lumbinî under a tree, expected by the whole world and adored by the highest gods, the Bodhisatva was born. Soon after his birth he was welcomed by the old ascetic Devala, who recognised in him the unmistakable signs of the future Buddha; as also did the eight Brâhmans, who were present on the eighth day when the young prince received the name of Siddhârtha.

4. Numerous events in the child's life showed his special dignity. At the feast of ploughing he was once left by his nurses under the Gambu tree, and

when they returned, they noticed that whereas all the other trees already threw their shadows on the opposite side, the foliage of the Gambu tree still shaded the child, who was deep in contemplation. Once when he was carried into the temple all the images of the gods bowed before him. In school he astonished the masters by his mature knowledge.

5. From his sixteenth year the prince passed the three seasons in three magnificent palaces, surrounded by the most beautiful maidens, and with great splendour and rejoicings, by which means his father hoped to bind him to the world. His wife was the beautiful Yaśodharâ (or Gopâ), whom he had won according to the knights' custom in trials of strength, in which he had shown his superiority in all ways. She bore him a son called Râhula.

6. As the gods saw that the time had come for the prince to forsake the world, they brought about that during one of his pleasure trips he should meet the four signs, which would awake in him a feeling of his destiny, namely, a man bent with old age, a sick man, a corpse, and a monk. The god Indra, at that hour, felt his throne, from which the future Buddha was to cast him down, becoming warm. Other experiences also brought about the prince's determination to renounce his home and the world. A maiden called Kisâ Gautamî, carried away at sight of the prince, in a song declared the father, mother, and wife of such a beautiful man to be blessed; but the prince at once thought that real, lasting blessedness was only to be attained by the extinction (Nirvâṇa) of desires, of fancies, and the restlessness of the heart. On another occasion, after beautiful dancing girls had exhibited

all their charms before him, after the feast was over he saw them all sleeping, and was filled with disgust on seeing that their fascinations had vanished, and they were really ugly to look on; the world seemed to him like a burning house from which he must fly as soon as possible. One more look at his wife and child, and then on his horse Kan*th*aka, and with his faithful servant *Kh*anda, he leaves the town in midsummer. He sends back his horse and servant. It is in vain that the tempter Mâra tries to turn him from his resolve. An angel brings him the eight things needful for a mendicant friar, namely, three bits of raiment, a bowl, a knife, a needle, a girdle, and a sieve.

7. The Bodhisatva begs his way through Râ*g*ag*r*iha, the chief town of Magadha, where King Bimbisâra makes him promise that after he has attained the dignity of Buddha, he will first of all come to him. At the house of the teacher Ârâla Kâlâma, he becomes aware that the knowledge imparted to him by such masters, in which he soon attained to perfection, did not lead to the real goal. In company with five other penitents he goes to Uruvilva, and subjects himself to the severest ascetic exercises and the deepest meditation. When after six years his vitality is almost exhausted, he perceives that these practices do not lead to the goal in view, and therefore takes better food, on which his five companions despise him as a renegade. At last the day has come on which the prince is to attain to the dignity of a Buddha. It was announced to him by significant events (one of which was the gift of a golden bowl from the hands of a maiden called Su*g*âtâ). Again, as at his birth, accompanied by the gods and genii, the Bodhisatva wanders

into the wood and sits down under the tree, under which he is to attain the highest insight.

8. When the wicked Mâra saw that the lord had seated himself under the tree, he collected a numberless army of evil spirits to drive him away from thence, and called forth all the terrors of nature to annihilate him. But since the Bodhisatva represented to himself the ten perfections, he remained untouched. As little also could the three daughters of Mâra, desire, sorrow, and pleasure, affect him. When finally the demon saw that he could not prevent his attaining the honour of Buddha, he urged him at once to enter Nirvâ*n*a, without spreading his teaching; but this suggestion was also refused by the Bodhisatva. The gods and genii glorified the victory over the tempter by singing his praise.

9. The attainment of perfect knowledge, by which the Bodhisatva became a Buddha, consisted in the threefold insight which he attained in three night watches. He reviewed everything which had happened in former existences, all present conditions, and the chain of causes. Then he uttered the famous words in which he declared that now, after many existences and painful regenerations, he had recognised the master builder of the house; but that he would not erect another house since Nirvâ*n*a was already attained [1]. For seven weeks Buddha dwelt under the Bodhi tree, or near it. Then he received nourishment from two travelling merchants, who became his first

[1] The words are to be found in Dharmap. 153, 154. Several translations are given by Spence Hardy, Manual, 2nd. ed (1880), p. 185. The words remind us of the teaching of the Sâṅkhya, when Prak*ri*ti, having been seen by Purusha, withdraws and loses all power.

disciples. As he doubted whether he would spread the truth which he had attained with such difficulty, the highest gods came to him, and implored him humbly not to let the word go to destruction; on which he promised to preach as Buddha.

10. At midsummer Buddha gave his first sermon at Benares, where he recommended the five ascetics, whose system he had formerly left, and who now looked on him with distrust, to take the middle road as far removed from the world in sensual desires, as from useless ascetic practices. To the earliest scholars besides these five, belonged the following: Yasas, a wealthy youth of Benares, and the three brothers Kâsyapa, famous Brâhmans, who had collected a thousand pupils round themselves at Uruvilva. For them Buddha gave a sermon on the heat of fire which devours everything, so that one ought to free oneself from the world. King Bimbisâra was rejoiced to receive a visit from Buddha, and accepted his teaching. The following are also prominent disciples: the two Brâhmans, *Sâ*riputra and Maudgalyâyana; the barber Upâli; Ânanda, who was with difficulty cured of earthly love; and the rich Anâthapi*nd*ika from *Sr*âvastî, in whose garden tradition places many speeches of Buddha, and who built in his park *Ge*tavana the first monastery for his master. On a visit to his native town Kapilavastu, the master, reveals his glory to his relations, and many of his family accepted his teaching. At *Sr*âvastî there lived a rich lady called Visâkhâ, who was distinguished as a benefactress of Buddha and the monks who followed him. The famous doctor *Gî*vaka at Râ*j*ag*r*iha, of whose marvellous cures much is told, is known also

as a disciple of Buddha. An important determination, the evil results of which Buddha at once prophesied, was that he yielded to the entreaties of his aunt Gautamî, who had cared for him in his childhood after his mother's early death, in admitting women as nuns to the religious life. Not always, however, were respect and obedience offered to Buddha, he also experienced much contradiction and enmity. Thus he had to measure himself in magic arts against six Tîrthakas or false teachers, amongst whom was *Gñâtriputra* the Nirgrantha (the founder of Gainism). Amongst the monks, there were also some who opposed him. The centre of the opposition was always his cousin Devadatta, who under pretext of wishing to introduce stricter ascetic rules produced a schism in the order, and did much else that was harmful; he also befooled the mind of the crown prince of Magadha, Agâtasatru, and induced him to murder his father Bimbisâra. The legend also illustrates the forty years of Buddha's activity, with many facts and stories which must be omitted in this survey.

11. In the last months of his eighty years of life, Buddha summed up his teaching once again, and gave his pupils, especially Ânanda, his last suggestions and warnings. He withstood an attempt of the evil one to make him vanish before he had imparted these last instructions. But now he could depart in peace, being convinced that the truth would live on in his pupils, independent of his person. He died at Kusinârâ, the result of having tasted roast pork, which was offered him by the smith Kunda. He had first of all given instructions that he desired to be buried like a mighty king. In his last warnings he again re-

minded his pupils of the destruction to which all compound things are subject, and besought them to be indefatigable in their spiritual strivings. After he had passed through all the grades of meditation, he entered into Nirvâ*n*a.

12. The Mallas of Kusinârâ took care that his body was honoured. It was cremated with great pomp and the relics were collected, and many people, even kings, tried to procure some. They were divided, and in various places chapels were erected to receive them.

This legendary biography, of which we have given a short extract, has been understood and discussed in very different forms. We shall best characterise these opposite views, which all have some grain of truth, if we consider the historical, mythical, and symbolical (or ideal) sides of the legend. The followers of the mythical theory do not deny that the existence of the Buddhist community presupposes a real founder; but in the legendary biography they can find no atom of historical fact. These legends, according to them, consist purely of divine myths, and if the Buddhist ever possessed any recollection of an historical founder, this being has now been entirely extinguished by the god. The legend throughout ascribes to the Buddha superlative predicates, which it would be absurd to think are suitable to an historical character. Nor is this really accepted by any one, for the students who think that we can trace a few historical facts in Buddha's life, merely state that in the legend divine myths and traditions stand side by side. It is more especially the Pâli scholars, Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, who represent Buddha's life in an historical light. They take their stand on

Pâli texts, which chiefly contain λόγια κυριακά, and amongst them also several biographical elements. The northern literature is placed by them completely in the background. These careful scholars refuse to give a detailed biography, and to vindicate the single facts of the legend as being historical; but they consider the outlines and general circumstances of Buddha's life as sufficiently reliable. For although no historical proof can be brought forward for these fundamental facts, yet they have a certain amount of probability, and it would be too daring to explain all historical features in the legend as referring mythically to the sun and its course. Thus Siddhârtha was born at Kapilavastu of the Śâkya race. His father was probably not the mighty king which the legend represents him to be, but rather one of the small rulers from Northern India. There is no reason for doubting the Aryan origin of this Śâkya race, and making Buddha to be descended from the aborigines, or from Mongols, or even from Negro blood. The history of his youth, and of his resolution to lead a religious life, his inward struggles which preceded the complete entrance of knowledge into his soul, may in its chief points be founded on history. The tradition of the public activity of Buddha may be right in its fundamental facts. The division of the year into a time for travelling and a time for resting (the rainy months from June till September), the places where he sojourned in the kingdoms of Magadha and Kosala, and in the chief towns of which he received, as a gift, gardens with the buildings necessary for the order, the leading thoughts of his sermons, and the principal pupils whom he gained; in all these points we find

ourselves on historical ground. We have already emphasised the fact that he preached no revolutionary social theories, nor opposed himself to the caste of Brâhmans. The fundamental truths of Buddhism, many striking remarks and sayings which we come across in the otherwise dreary Sûtras, especially the conversations from the last months, the most important precepts for monks, even the differences which existed between the actual monks and the lay brethren, and the admission of women to the order; all these may originate from Buddha. The canonical writings, which often begin with 'Thus have I heard; the master was once,' &c., are probably often right in tracing back what they recount to Buddha himself. Thus the southern tradition gives us, on the whole, a picture of his life, which is probable in itself, and forms the necessary foundation for an explanation of Buddhism.

But this is entirely opposed by the mythic view. Buddha's biography is said to be true, but it does not give the reality of historical facts, but of eternal events in nature; it is an important piece of Aryan mythology. Buddha is only the sun-god, an Avatâra of the time-measurer Vish*n*u, and his history often runs parallel with that of K*r*ish*n*a. These thoughts have been very ingeniously developed by SENART with reference to certain parts, but in the rather diffuse style affected by mythologists. The seven treasures of *K*akravartin, and the characteristics of the Mahâpurusha, have been traced by him to the sun-god; the trees which play such a prominent part in the history of Buddha are the cloud trees, and the fight with Mâra is the storm-myth. KERN has treated

it quite differently: he does not spin out single thoughts, but represents all the traits of Buddha's life objectively; and then explains them in short notices, with mathematical terseness and decision, as follows. Buddha is the sun; the Śâkya from whom he is descended are identical with the Scythians, the Huns, the Niebelungen of the German myth; the law he preaches is the light; the places where he dwells are stations of the sun; the people he comes in contact with are the planets and stars; his Nirvâna is the setting of the sun. What strikes us in Kern's explanation, is how naturally everything fits into this mythical explanation. Buddha, as well as the sun-gods, is commended as a hero and a leader; the precise dating of the chief events of his life (at midsummer, &c.) seems really to demand such an explanation. Whenever the legend mentions certain towns, they must not be taken in a geographical sense, but they are meant to be astronomical points. Although Kern's work is greatly admired, yet most people think he has tried to prove too much. He has even drawn the logical but hazardous conclusion (which is avoided by Senart), that the Buddhists recognised this character of the legend, and intentionally elaborated these astronomical riddles. However much or little we accept of this mythical explanation, the acknowledged result of these discoveries, namely that Buddha's biography is mingled with numerous sun-myths, is not denied even by the opponents of the mythical theory (Oldenberg, Barth, &c.).

The followers of these two opposite views recognise the symbolical (or ideal) meaning of the legend. All

prominent figures in the story are not merely historical individuals, but also typical personalities: even the advocates of the historical character of the Buddha legend do not deny this. And just as little does the mythologist overlook the fact that this sun-god has become an ideal of morality, that his life has become that of a .Yati or a Mukta, as described by Manu, and his history a great monastic epic. In this symbolical character, by which the founder becomes the representative form for his community, lies the starting point of the formation of the Buddhist dogmas.

Chapter 72.—Buddha according to Dogma.

The names of Buddha are, for the most part, to be regarded as titles which he shares in common with others. From the race from which he was descended, he was called *Ś*âkya-si*m*ha (*Ś*âkya-lion), or *Ś*âkyamuni (*Ś*âkya-monk), or Gautama, names to which mythologists have given solar explanations. He is also often called Bhagavat (the blessed one), *G*ina (the conqueror), Tathâgata and Sugata (the infallible), &c. We must dwell rather more on the names Mahâpurusha, *K*akravartin (Pâli, *K*akkavatti), and Buddha. The Mahâpurusha or Purushottama is not 'The great man,' but the highest being, and as such is well-known in Brâhmanic literature. He is to be recognised by thirty-two chief, and eighty minor signs (Laksha*n*as), which were perceived on the boy Siddhârtha [1]. *K*akravartin, originally the chief of a district, has received the meaning of ruler of the world. In so far as

[1] Burnouf has written an article dealing thoroughly with these characteristic signs; Lotus, App. viii; Senart gives their mythical explanation.

Buddha is *K*akravartin, he is described as 'King of kings, who rules with equity, lord of the four parts of the world, unconquerable,' &c. To him belong the seven treasures (ratna) and the four gifts (*ri*ddhi), the glory of which is minutely described in the Mahâsudassana-Sutta [1]. The reason that the word *K*akravartin and not Samrâ*g* is used for this ideal of the ruler of the world, lies in the expression used for the preaching of Buddha, namely, to spread the Dharma*k*akra; that is, to spread the kingdom of the law (this has often been translated by, to turn the wheel of law, and mythically this wheel has been referred to the sun). RHYS DAVIDS has compared this title in its political ideal with the name Messiah. Nevertheless we must observe that the name *K*akravartin at all events describes a dignity, which Buddha in order to become Buddha had renounced. From his childhood up, we are told that he would either be a *K*akravartin on earth, or he would renounce the world and become a Buddha. On the other hand, the attributes of a magnificent king are also given to him, and he gave his pupils orders to bury him as a ruler of the world.

The most important title is Buddha (the enlightened). We must agree with KERN that this theory of enlightenment is essentially connected with mythical ideas. The Mahâvagga begins with a description of Bodhi, which Buddha attained under the tree at Uruvilva, and which consisted in an insight into the chain of causes. This chain, which begins with Avidyâ (ignorance), describes the conditions of an awakening man. As a

[1] In S. B. E. XI. The mythical explanation is again given by SENART.

state of consciousness is preceded by a state of unconsciousness, light is preceded by darkness, and the cosmos by chaos. That all this is based on a conception of the rising of the sun, was still in the recollection of the author of the Mahâvagga, for he ends his description with this comparison; 'as the sun illumines the heaven.' The idea that the predicates of Buddha are the same as those of the solar deities, is not entirely based on an ingenious explanation of the above-named passage, but it is strongly supported by the fact that many of Buddha's attributes are applied to other gods also. These attributes are arranged in three sets. As Dasabala he possesses the ten powers, lists of which are found, with small variations in detail, in the northern and the southern church, specifying the various attainments of Buddha. The eighteen signs of independence likewise originate in a knowledge of the past, present, and future, which Buddha proves in deed, word, and thought. In these originate the power of his will, of his preaching of the law, of his energy, of his meditation, of his wisdom, and of his deliverance. The latter is described in the six final signs, as freedom from superficiality, noise, unclearness, sentimentality, thoughtlessness, and haste. The third set consists of four signs, namely those of assurance and trust in himself (Vaiśâradya), which declare that he has attained to the perfect dignity of a Buddha, has conquered all evil desires, has recognised everything which stands in the way of the attainment of Nirvâ*n*a, and knows everything good. Taken collectively these dogmatic definitions describe Buddha as omniscient and omnipotent, which shows, what becomes more clear in the later schools of the north, that the con-

ception of the Buddha often takes in this religion the place of the idea of God. It is different in the descriptions of Buddha as a monk and a seer, in which the Brâhmanical ideals of leaving the world and obtaining freedom through knowledge are copied, though not without certain points of difference. The insight of Buddha is that of a seer, who knows the truth intuitively, without the help of the philosophical discussions and schemes of logic of the schools. Such knowledge is by no means dependent on revelation.

The position of Buddha is the highest grade, which can be attained by long preparation only, in a succession of existences. Even for this career of the Bodhisatva a definite outline is given. Three epochs are decisive for a future Buddha, the awakening thought, firm determination, and the call. The circumstances of this call are more especially dwelt on. The Bodhisatva must meet a living Buddha and offer him a gift, which the latter receives with a smile, and at the same time announces to the pious giver his future dignity as Buddha. Of not less importance than this gift is the fact that the Bodhisatva must have practised the ten (according to another list six) Pâramitâs in his many anterior births. These Pâramitâs are charity, morality, renunciation of the world, wisdom, energy, patience, love of truth, firmness in resolutions, friendliness, and equanimity. Of the last Buddha more than five hundred anterior existences are given; they form the contents of the *Gâtaka*, in which Buddhism has appropriated much of the then existing narrative material. In it, the Bodhisatva mostly appears as a hermit, king, tree-god, and teacher, but also in various other

forms, as a noble or merchant, a lion, an eagle or elephant, and even as a hare and a frog. He is not subjected to births in hell, or to be a woman on earth, or to be any kind of vermin. It is most touchingly told how the Bodhisatva in these existences does marvels in charity and self-sacrifice, for he gives up everything; he gives his flesh to feed wild animals, and lets his own children be dragged into misery (as is told in the popular *Gâtaka* of the king's son Vessantara), so as to attain the dignity of Buddha. The difference drawn between the attributes of the Bodhisatva and those of Buddha is very important. The practice of virtues in which the Bodhisatva excels, is no longer necessary for Buddha, for he has grown out of this lower grade. The highest Bodhi, in which one attains Nirvâ*n*a, is opposed to these practices, as amongst the Brâhmans the *Gñ*ânakâ*nd*a is opposed to the lower Karmakâ*nd*a. This relation, which is so distinctly stamped on the dogma of the Bodhisatva and that of Buddha, pervades the whole of Buddhist morality. The practice of virtue is only of use so long as the higher grade has not yet been reached.

Not only had Buddha to pass through many existences, but he does not even stand alone in his dignity of Buddha, for in the different worlds and ages of the world, Buddhas follow one another. Twenty-four preceded the present Buddha, but in the present Kalpa (age of the world) he is the fourth, and the present Bodhisatva Maitreya will succeed him. No period is therefore without true enlightenment, for the teaching of all these Buddhas is identical. In later times the worship of the future Buddhas, at present waiting in heaven as Bodhisatvas, becomes more

prominent. In the north more especially they are actually appealed to as gods, more particularly Mañgusrî, who represents wisdom, and Avalokitesvara, who represents power.

Further development has been given to the doctrine concerning the Buddha, especially in the northern schools. We must here mention that a Buddha is not only distinguished by the possession of Bodhi, which leads him into Nirvâṇa. The Arhat also, the highest among the disciples of Buddha, ceases to be, and is exempt from being born again. He does not possess this power of himself, but owes it to the insight given him by Buddha. In this, the Pratyeka Buddha is above the Arhat, for he possesses this insight in himself, and has not received it from someone else; but the Pratyeka Buddha has it for himself only, whereas the Buddha radiates it from himself, in order that the world may be enlightened and mankind may be set free.

OLDENBERG has drawn attention to the fact that the importance of the person and of the dogma of Buddha hardly occupies a central position in Buddhism. In the four capital truths there is no mention of Buddha. He is not really the redeemer, but the preacher only of the redeeming truth; he himself therefore is not indispensable to his community. On the other hand, we must notice that in the formula of refuge in which the three treasures of Buddhism are mentioned (Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha), Buddha takes the first place. Many Buddhist texts mention the blessing connected with a meditation on Buddha, with the pronouncing of his name and even with the gift of a handful of rice, when given in his name.

It is difficult to decide what is original in this teaching, and what is of later date. Much is found in both sects of the church. Scenes from the *Gâtaka*, as well as from the history of former Buddhas, have been discovered on the stûpa at Bharhut, which speaks for its high antiquity. We receive an impression as if this teaching and the legend are only outwardly connected. In the legend itself, the mythical and historical elements are held together by very slender ties. Even though the mythologists have been successful in their great synthesis, the historian nevertheless finds himself constrained to ask, whether the conversion of so much old material into a new edifice does not presuppose an historical personality, such as from the southern sources of information we should imagine Gautama Buddha to have been.

CHAPTER 73. — **Dharma.**

The highest and most ancient objects of veneration which we find in the Buddhist community are the three treasures (Triratna), Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha. KERN has most cleverly combined this triad with the three divisions of the Buddhist canon and the three Vedas, &c., and has explained it mythically as referring to the past, present, and future; to the sun in its rising, zenith, and setting. However this may be, we need not here consider the possible mythical origin, but only the ecclesiastical meaning of this triad. In it, Dharma represents the law or doctrine which forms the contents of Buddha's preaching. This teaching comprises everything, the cosmic as well as the ethic order of the world.

According to an old saying, Tathâgata has taught the cause and the end of Dharma. To this subject belongs also the cosmology which has been most fantastically developed in Buddhism. In endless chronological succession (Asaṅkhya) the ages of the world (Kalpas) follow one another, and numberless systems of worlds (*S*akvalas) lie in unmeasured space. Each of these *S*akvalas has its own earth, sun, and moon. The centre of each earth is a mountain of light, Meru, round which the four parts of the world group themselves. Besides this, each system has its dwellings of the gods, its heaven, its hells; while in the gaps between the *S*akvalas lies the Lokântarika hell. The worlds are subject to a series of destructions and renewals. They are peopled with classes of beings (these again can be divided into five categories, gods, men, monsters, animals, and dwellers in hell). These beings may be said to be so far related to one another, because they change their existences with one another from the highest to the lowest grade, and only those beings who are on the road to Nirvâ*n*a are exempt from it.

If we do not dwell longer on this subject, it is not merely because Buddhism has not produced much that is peculiar to it; for the same might be said of the doctrine of salvation also, which is in no small degree borrowed from the Yoga. But one would misjudge the character of Buddhism if much weight was laid on the cosmologic speculations. Properly speaking the Buddhist ought not to occupy himself with such things, for philosophical dogmas are hurtful rather than useful to him; they do not further salvation, but are rather one of the chains which bind people to the

world. It is true that this whole cosmology belongs to the Dharma, which was known to Buddha, although he did not preach it; for he does not wish his disciples to enquire into the questions of the finite or infinite character of the world, but they are only to consider what encourages sanctity, and brings about peace and enlightenment. Therefore his teaching is permeated throughout by a flavour of salvation. It is comprehended in the four precepts of suffering, the origin of suffering, the ceasing of suffering, and the way leading to that cessation. It is true that this teaching, which does not mean to be philosophical, is certainly not popular. Its development consists in abstract series of conceptions arranged dialectically, which in practice lead to a complicated methodism as regards the way to salvation. These precepts differ from the philosophical schools, whose dogma also tends to salvation, by the way in which they are obtained, namely, by the enlightenment of Buddha who communicates them. Let us now consider their meaning more minutely.

The first of the four truths proclaims the universality of suffering. The source of this suffering is transitoriness; since everything is subject to change, therefore suffering is common to all, as birth, age, and death are common to all. This tenet of suffering has often been wrongly represented. Thus some have traced in it the theory that everything is vain, empty, and a mere appearance. This idea of nothingness was developed in later theological schools, but it is foreign to ancient Buddhism. It is also a mistake to seek the origin of this doctrine of suffering in some peculiar evils, either political or social. Because Buddha himself was not driven by personal misfor-

tunes to renounce the world, and since it was just in his happiest days that the feeling of despair about existence came over him, he nowhere offers comfort for any special or individual sufferings. It is most characteristic how cold the much-praised sympathy of Buddha is. He can only comfort the mother who bewails her dead child, by sending her to all other houses, to discover that every house has its own sorrow, and that there are many more dead than living. The suffering that Buddha wishes to heal is always the general one, never a purely individual one. Finally we must notice that the conception of Buddhism is quite misunderstood, if it is briefly described as pessimistic. There is no universal suffering (Weltschmerz), no despair, even no resignation. The true Buddhist who knows he is on the way to Nirvâṇa has the victorious joy of the redeemed. It is true the conception of the world, which the Buddhist does not consider desirable, is a very sad one, but in this world of decay and suffering he lives as a healthy person amongst sick, and enjoys inward peace and joy.

In the second truth, which treats of the cause of suffering, Buddhism raises a question (as Oldenberg expresses it) as daring as the answer is confused. On the whole, however, this answer seems simple and clear: the cause of suffering is desire, which tends towards enjoyment, a new birth, and pleasure; the cause consists also in an ignorance of the four truths. But the older Pâli sources give a more complicated answer, by making the various causes into a chain, and this formula of the Nidânas, in which the causes of existence (hence of suffering) are deduced from one

another, is most difficult to understand [1]. It runs as follows: 1, 2. From ignorance (Avi*ggâ*) arise conditions (Saṅkhâra; these are the dispositions which determine a future existence). 3. From these conditions arises consciousness (Viññâ*na*, belonging to the as yet unborn being). 4. From consciousness arises name and form (Nâmarûpa, that is individuality; this idea is common to Buddhism and the Vedânta school). 5. From name and form arise the six senses (Sa*ḷâ*yatana; to our five senses Manas is added as the inner sense). 6. From the six senses arises contact (Phassa, between the senses and the outer world). 7. From contact arises sensation (Vedanâ, pleasing and unpleasing). 8. From sensation arises desire or thirst (Ta*ṇhâ*). 9. From thirst arises strivings (Upâdâna; this clinging to existence is fourfold, by sensuality, error, ritualism, and egoism). 10. From striving arises becoming (Bhava). 11. From becoming arises birth (*G*âti). 12. From birth arises decay and death (*G*arâmara*ṇa*). Vice-versa, the abolition of ignorance, &c., is described as the freeing from the suffering of existence. In detail the succession is more or less arbitrary: thus, for instance, thirst, which really fills the eighth place, is sometimes said to be the root of all evil in Buddhist writings. If it is asked, what is the subject described in these successive stages, the simplest answer is that the chain of the Nidânas extends over three births, the second beginning at No. 3, and the third at No. 11. The individual who is developed from the third to the tenth, from the first con-

[1] This is fully treated by BURNOUF, OLDENBERG, and others; a short notice by R. C. CHILDERS is of importance; it can be found as an appendix to COLEBROOKE'S Misc. Ess. I, pp. 453-455.

sciousness to the beginning of a new becoming, has its predecessor in that being whose ignorance (1) is the cause of consciousness, and its successor in the being of whose birth (11) it is the cause. Thus the chain does not really close with No. 12; for every existence entails another after it, if Nirvâ*n*a is not attained, and this is continued ad infinitum.

This theory of causality includes two questions: that of human individuality and that of the condition of regeneration. Concerning the first the attributes and conditions of man are divided into five groups (Skandhas). They are: Rûpa (the twenty-eight bodily attributes), Vedanâ (the feelings, arranged according to the six senses, being either pleasing, unpleasing, or indifferent, or sometimes being divided into a list of 108 members), Saññâ (abstract thoughts, grouped according to the six senses, by which attributes are perceived), Saṅkhâra (conceptions, impressions, moods, of which fifty-two are enumerated), Viññâ*n*a (reason, eighty-nine members). In all these Skandhas there is nothing lasting; they are like foam, bubbles, mirages. We have here long series of transitory conditions, functions, &c., but there is nothing permanent. Individuality is the passing combination of the five Skandhas, but there is no substantial soul in it. This thought has been classically expressed in a dialogue in the Milinda Prasna, in which the teacher Nâgasena leads King Milinda to understand, that as the parts of the carriage in which he drives are not the carriage itself, and the word carriage is merely a word, thus the human person also can never be seen in the five Skandhas. Buddhism (as Oldenberg has well shown) does not

care for being, but recognises becoming only, which is here, as elsewhere, commonly represented by the similes of floods of water and flames of fire. We have here before us, not as in many Brâhmanical philosophies, the substance without a cause, but the cause without a substance. It is for this very denial of the substance of the soul that RHYS DAVIDS has praised Buddhism so highly. He looks upon the belief in a soul as a form of animism, which still shows itself in highly developed religions; and he considers that to have radically broken with it, constitutes the chief merits of Buddhist teaching. However this may be, it is quite clear that Buddhism can find a place for the teaching of transmigration under great limitations only. Properly speaking, there is no transmigration in Buddhism, because in the dissolution of the Skandhas all individuality is entirely destroyed. It is therefore only as a concession to popular views that transmigration is recognised, or that, as in the *Gâtakas*, the actual living individuals are identified with former beings. In reality there can be no migration of souls, as there is no such thing as a soul. What outlives man is a moral causality, the sum and result of his life, through which a new personality arises. This power which absolutely governs individual life is called Karma. The task set is to annihilate this Karma, so that it may not cause a new birth.

The third truth is that of the abolition of suffering, or deliverance. The usual word used for it is Nirvâ*n*a, the going out, which KERN again explains mythically as the going down of the sun. But this theory is by no means so purely Buddhistic as it is often represented. Indian speculation often mentions a

deliverance under various names (it is sometimes called Moksha). We have already seen that this deliverance consists in the extinction of consciousness, and likewise that it is believed to exist during life, as well as after death. For a saint, called *Gîvanmukta*, may still dwell in the body, and yet in principle be freed from further transmigration. All this is the same in Buddhism. Nirvâ*n*a is twofold: Upâdisesha, the state of a saint who still possesses the five Skandhas, but in whom the desires which chain him to life are extinguished and in whom Karma is annihilated, and secondly Anupâdisesha, the end of all life at death. Probably in this difference partly lies the answer to the much controverted question, whether Nirvâ*n*a means utter annihilation or a state of blessedness. Most people agree with BURNOUF, who, taking into account numerous texts of the northern literature, and the negation of the soul and of any everlasting being in Buddhism, describes Nirvâ*n*a as utter annihilation. But then others, like MAX MÜLLER and RHYS DAVIDS, have opposed this, and have brought forward numerous texts from the Dhammapada and other ancient sources, in which Nirvâ*n*a is described as a blessed state of inward peace, the happiness of the soul, which feels itself free from the bonds of suffering. It is true that this last state is often extolled, and that Nirvâ*n*a means the blessed peace of an Arhat's soul. The former opinion is likewise true, which represents annihilation in death as the real meaning of Nirvâ*n*a (la mort sans phrase, as KERN says). But official dogma did not wish to make a choice between these two principal views. This was first thoroughly and finally proved by OLDENBERG, who brings out the spirit of

abstention shewn by Buddhism in this as in other points. The questions of the 'ego,' and whether the perfect saint lives on after death or not, remain unanswered: for the sublime Buddha has not revealed the answer. Thus the matter remains in suspense, and it is interesting to see in one of the northern canonical writings that, in the later time of scholastic teaching in the northern church, opposite views are maintained [1].

The fourth truth concerning the way of salvation forms a supplement to the third, as the second did to the first. It describes the numerous practices which lead to the goal. Theory and practice are here closely united as in medical science and art (from which, according to KERN, many of these schemes are derived), and as in Indian philosophy in general, where speculation and askesis go together. The various meditations, practices, and qualities which constitute a pious life are given in long lists. Thus the Lalitavistara recognises 108 of these essential elements of Dharma. One of the most important Pâli-Suttas (Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta) enumerates the so-called seven treasures of the Dharma, the four severe contemplations, the fourfold battle against sin, the four ways to holiness, the five moral powers, the five spiritual organs, the seven kinds of wisdom, and the supreme eightfold path. Of these seven lists, the last only is of great importance. Another Pâli-Sutta is entirely devoted to this eightfold path, which opens the eyes, gives insight and leads to peace of soul, to the higher knowledge, to complete enlightenment, and to Nirvâṇa. The eight branches are, right faith, right determination,

[1] From Saddharma Laṅkâvatâra, in BURNOUF's Introd. p. 459.

right word, right deed, right life, right endeavour, right reflection, and a right self-absorption. But we find other practices also, minutely described. Of these, the most important are the speculations by which the spirit, by suppressing all sinful inclinations (Klesa), becomes absorbed in itself, meditates, abstracts, and concentrates itself. These practices, which Buddhism has in common with the Yoga, are called after their various kinds and grades, Vimoksha, Samâdhi, Samâpatti; the most general name being Dhyâna. These various grades are given with the most subtle differences. That Dhyâna lifts the self-absorbed mortal into higher spheres was understood at first in a spiritual sense, and was later applied materially to higher worlds.

We can see that an idea of magic plays a part in this. We must therefore say a few words on it, and take care not to consider everything magic as a degeneration, foreign to the character of Buddhism. The highest grade on the road of sanctity is distinguished by the fact that the Arhat who has attained it, who is freed in this life, shares in Nirvâ*n*a, but at the same time disposes of magic powers. In many practices this side is very prominent. Some of these practices may be especially helpful to meditation: such as the very complicated art of stopping the breath for a long time, and of regulating the breathing, and the dwelling on the repulsive form of a corpse, &c. In other exercises, the attainment of superhuman power is the stated and sole object, as in the curious exercise with the ten cosmic circles, or circles of the universe. This practice consists in keeping the eyes fixed on a circle of earth, water, or fire, and at the same time meditating on

the cosmic meaning of this element, till one passes into a magnetic state, and can see the circles equally well with closed as with open eyes. Whoever exercises these meditations is on the road to attaining superhuman powers. The cosmic circles have been lost to the northern church, in which, on the other hand, magic formulas (Dharaṁî) are much used.

We have already often mentioned the grades in the road to sanctity. The more ancient texts do not make this theory very prominent, but still it is not altogether wanting. Four classes are mentioned, and they are briefly characterised as follows. First come the Sotapannas, who have entered the road of sanctity, since they have destroyed the three bonds. They are certain of future salvation, but they still have to pass through several existences, though they will never again enter lower worlds (hells, the world of demons, and the animal world). Then follow the Sakadâgâmis, in whom all desires, hatred, and delusions are reduced to a minimum; they only return once more to the world before attaining the end of suffering. The next grade is that of the Anâgâmis, who are not born again into this world, but once again into the world of gods, and there attain Nirvâṇa. At the head stand those who are set free in this life, those who possess Nirvâṇa, and the Arhats to whom belong various superhuman powers and attainments (namely, the five Abhiǵñâs). The three lower grades are attainable by the lay brethren also, but the Arhatship is only attainable by monks, and it is not necessary first of all to have passed through the lower grades.

Our representation of Dharma would be imperfect without a glance at the morality of Buddhism. We see

it partly in all kinds of scholastic precepts, which are so elaborate, that people have good reason for speaking of the methodism and casuistry of Buddhism; partly also in beautiful maxims and attractive stories. One must not expect to find a uniform character in this morality, and here also much that is common property to all India has passed into Buddhism.

We will now consider particular precepts. The most important are contained in a decalogue (Dasasîla), which, however, does not contain much that is new. The first five prohibitions are, to kill no living thing, not to steal, not to commit adultery (monks especially were to have nothing to do with women), not to tell lies, and not to drink intoxicating liquors. The five following rules concerned monks only; namely to forego meals at unusual times, participation in worldly amusements, adornment and perfumes, a soft bed, and the accepting of money. In a slightly varying decalogue, sins are divided into sins of the body, of words, and of thoughts. These precepts are worked out in detail very casuistically[1]. As regards the relations also between parents and children, masters and pupils, man and wife, friends, masters and servants, monks and the laity, there are given twice five, or twice six rules. That the Buddhist morality has different sides can be clearly seen among other things, from the repeated exhortations attributed to Buddha, to connect Samâdhi (absorption), Paññâ (wisdom), and Sîla (righteousness), a triad, which RHYS DAVIDS compares with faith, reason, and works, in Christianity. The antithesis between the active and passive side of moral life

[1] SPENCE HARDY has written most thoroughly on this subject, Manual, chap. x.

in Buddhism is of the greatest importance. The stories of the earlier existences of Buddha, as of other Buddhist saints (Pûrṇa, Kuṇâla, &c.), contain touching examples of benevolence, sympathy, kindness, interest, gentleness, charity, and love. The Dhammapada and other writings praise such virtues, as for instance love which overcomes hatred, &c. But on the other hand, the value of these acts is depreciated. They may be useful, but only at a lower preparatory stage; the Bodhisatva practises them, not the Buddha. Nay, to consider this active morality as the highest, is actually heretical. As Buddhism almost always gives prohibitions and not commands, morality for a real saint or a monk is purely negative; all doing is a bondage from which he is free; the more he resembles a dead being, the higher he has risen. Though it is quite true that Buddhist morality has many beautiful sides, owing to the seriousness with which personal salvation is regarded, and to the battle with the tempter Mâra, as well as to the teaching of virtue, which is preached in word and example, yet it also has its dark side in the low value set on virtue, on all social conditions, and all practical morality. A necessary result of this is the absence of all positive sense of duty, a contempt of work, of women, and all conditions of a life on earth. The object is not to take one's place in the world, but to fly from it. This negative morality so entirely forms the essence of Buddhism that it is inconsistent to think with Ed. von Hartmann that this peculiarity can be done away with, and that we may expect from the Buddhism of the future any real assistance in the positive aims of mankind.

Chapter 74. — Saṅgha.

Buddha's community is an order of mendicant friars. The true Buddhist has renounced the world, not to live as a hermit in complete seclusion, but to join some monastic congregation. The usual name he bears is Bhikshu, which is better translated by monk, member of the order, than by priest. In the existence and rules of this order there is nothing foreign to Indian life. The circle of the sons of Śâkya was like a school, which was collected round some famous Brâhman. We have already often referred to the pious hermits (Śramaṇas, Sannyâsins, or whatever name they had) in a pre-Buddhistic age. It was especially peculiar to Buddhism that the circle outlived the founders, and that the pupils, even after the death of their teacher, still kept together without any visible centre. For the Buddha has no successor, the community has no head. The mental representation of the person of the founder may work as a motive to individual piety, but Buddha really only lives in the teaching preached by him. By clinging to this teaching the monks free themselves, and have their light in themselves. Therefore in the monastic order there is no centralisation. No one is responsible for the government of the whole; but the monks who happen to be in the same town congregate together. Those from the same neighbourhood form a diocese, but they never establish any wider connection. The word of Buddha remains the highest authority in the order, and, by a common fiction, later rules also were ascribed to him. Amongst the many conditions for the success

of the order the Mahâparinibbâna-Sutta mentions the firm hold on what is handed down from antiquity, and the perseverance in the institutions fixed by Buddha.

It is not difficult to be received into the order. In the seventh or eighth year one can be admitted as a pupil (*Sramanera*), but one can only be consecrated at the age of twenty. The ceremony of ordination (Upasampadâ) is very simple. At a meeting of at least ten members, the candidate is asked the settled questions, and after they are satisfactorily answered, and no one present makes any opposition, he is introduced by an older monk and received by the meeting. The only hierarchy amongst the brethren is owing to seniority in the possession of Arhatship. Amongst the questions, the novice is asked as to any existing impediments. These last are numerous: a murderer of father, mother, or of an Arhat; those who have wounded Buddha or have introduced schism into the community; those who suffer from certain diseases; but principally those who are not sui juris (slaves, debtors, soldiers, and those who could not gain permission from their parents) are not admitted. These ordinances are illustrated in detail by all sorts of stories. On the other hand, it is quite easy to leave the order. A monk in whom sensual desires, desire for his relations, or other worldly ties, become too strong, or who is troubled by any doubts, is free at all times to return to the world. There is so little wrong in this, that even as a lay brother he can be on friendly relations with the order.

The equipment of a monk is most simple. He has three articles of raiment, an under and outer

garment, and a cowl; the colour of which is yellow in the south and reddish in the north. He ought really to make these garments out of dirty rags which he has collected, but this rule it seems was not generally carried out. Other garments, shoes and sunshades are forbidden luxuries; but Buddhism protested against the custom, common amongst other monks, of going about naked. A Bhikshu possesses also a razor, a needle, girdle, and sieve so that he may not swallow insects in water, and often also a toothpick, a rosary, and always a beggar's cup; since, whilst wandering from house to house amongst rich and poor, he must beg for the necessary food. Under no circumstances may he accept money, and on his circuit for collecting food he must avoid all importunity; nay, he must not beg, but only show himself. Whilst as a general rule great moderation in food is prescribed, in illness he may take much as medicine which is otherwise forbidden. The enumeration of these remedies affords us an insight into Indian pharmacy.

With regard to their dwellings, the command which makes it a duty for monks to live under the open sky, in a wilderness, or in churchyards under the shadow of a tree, gives us no idea of the reality. For now we really find monks living together in huts or houses, in fine weather as well as during the rainy season, and also in monasteries founded by rich patrons and provided with great meeting-rooms, store cupboards, dining halls, and bath-rooms (Vihâra, Saṅghârâma). The wandering monks found a reception in these monasteries. In later times at least, the flourishing state of these monasteries, which were often centres of learning, is proved by the reports of Chinese pilgrims. We

need not emphasize the fact that the monks were not occupied with any labour: besides their daily walk in search of alms, they occupied themselves with spiritual practices, especially in that of the Dhyâna, and in reading and copying the sacred books.

Twice a month, at full moon and new moon, there was a meeting of the monks dwelling in the neighbourhood. The order of these meetings is given in the Pratimoksha formulas. This word is of uncertain meaning, and it is explained either as a formula of unburdening (especially from the weight of sins by confession and absolution), or as a formula of defence (armour against the attacks of sin), or more generally as an order of the community. At all events the rules contained in them date from ancient times, as they are almost the same in both divisions of the church. At this service the eldest asks questions to which the others answer. It consists of ten parts:—(1) preliminary questionings as to whether the legal conditions are present for holding a meeting; (2) an introduction; (3) treats of sins which must be punished by expulsion from the order; (4) treats of sins which entail a temporary expulsion, but later on a readmission; (5) doubtful cases; (6) offences for which some possession is confiscated; (7) those which involve penance; (8) those which have to be confessed; (9) things that are suitable; (10) on the means of settling quarrels. As can be seen from the above, the object of these meetings is confession; later it became customary to confess beforehand, so that one should not come to the meeting with an unatoned guilt. Even then, the recitation of the Pratimoksha was useful to remind the monks of their duties, and to

arouse mutual control in the community. We shall not mention the orders in detail. Only monks were admitted to the meeting; but not lay-brothers, novices, or nuns. The four chief sins for which one was ipso facto and for ever expelled from the order are unchastity, theft, murder, and falsely claiming to possess the superhuman power and insight of an Arhat. Long lists are given of other sins and suitable and unsuitable things, amongst which are numerous precepts as to how one must eat, spit, &c. In spite of Oldenberg's protest, we cannot but consider 'this earnest and anxious obedience of the law in the smallest things, as shallow and trivial.' Once a year, at the end of the quiet season, another meeting is held, which is called Pavâraṇâ, at which everyone invites the brothers who are present to make known to him his as yet unatoned sins, so that he may do penance for them.

Although the community is essentially a congregation of monks, yet a twofold concession was made by the admission of nuns and lay-brothers. We have already seen what a low opinion Buddhism holds of women, and this is clearly shown by the manner and way in which orders of nuns were governed. The monks and nuns do not form one, but two communities; in all important acts the nuns are subject to the monks, and the eight high ordinances which refer to them, inculcate above all things the deference which they owe to the monks. Their life resembled that of the monks; but their number and importance were always small as compared with that of the monks.

If the highest object can only be attained by a

monastic life, and this is really enjoined for all, we can see that it is inconsistent to give the laity a part in spiritual possessions. But still this was probably so from the very beginning. It stands to reason that a congregation of mendicant friars owes its support to the kindness of the pious laity; therefore the Buddha legend often praises the charity of wealthy householders and princes. But these lay friends of the monks formed no actual community. There is no ceremony by which the Upâsaka (lay-brother) and Upâsikâ (lay-sister) are received as such. They may have pronounced the formula of refuge in the Triad in the presence of a monk, but this is not received as a recognised act in the laws of the community. The five principal commandments are imposed on, or rather recommended to them; for there is no law which watches over their obedience or disobedience. Every patron of the monks who gives them gifts, or invites them to meals, is ipso facto a lay-brother. Many warnings in the texts show us that it was necessary to protect the lay-brothers against greediness and abuse from the monks. But after all, the monks could do nothing to them; the only punishment they could inflict was not to receive any alms from them, but to turn their pot upside down. It is curious that this was not done because of moral offences, but only because of insults offered to the monks or of harm done to the community. If the excommunicated person made peace with the community, then his gifts were at once received. The relationship between the monks and the laity is one of the most beautiful sides of Buddhism. The begging circuit leads a monk, who has really renounced the

world, into the houses of men of the world at regular intervals, and to them his appearance is a living sermon and a summons to a higher life. On the other hand, the ideal of lay piety is by no means a high one, being measured exclusively according to generosity shown to the congregation.

Actual acts of worship were foreign to original Buddhism. The Bhikshu never dreams of worshipping the gods; he rather thinks that the gods worship him when he is Arhat. Thus the meetings for confession are not acts of religious worship. They can also only be attended by monks. But Buddhism has adopted several festivals from the customs of other sects, such as the celebration of a day of rest four times a month (Uposatha), therefore a kind of Sabbath. On these days monks preached to the laity, and explained the scriptures. Other festivals also, for instance those at the beginning of the three seasons, were held by the Buddhist in common with other Hindus, whilst the chief events in the master's life were commemorated every year. But with all this the need of objects of worship peculiar to themselves was not satisfied, and these became a vital question for Buddhism. The worship of such objects is certainly of later date, and is looked on as belonging to a lower sphere and intended for the laity. The usual liturgic fiction ascribes the principal regulations concerning this to Buddha himself. Thus Buddha is said to have ordered as the four holy places of pilgrimage, the localities where he was born, where he attained the highest knowledge, where he first preached, and where he entered Nirvâṇa. We must at the same time remark that Kapilavastu, Gaya, Benares, and

Kusinagara were already considered as sacred amongst the Hindus. Buddha is also said to have arranged the relics which were to be worshipped into three classes: personal relics (*Sarîrika*); anything that has been raised or made in honour of a saint (Uddesaka); objects which have been used by a saint (Paribhogika). During the period of Chinese pilgrims the worship of relics was at its height, and the Singhalese chroniclers also tell us much about it. We saw in the account of his funeral what great value was laid on the personal relics of Buddha. Chapels containing one of these relics, or the relics of other saints, are called stûpas, and were erected in great numbers in Buddhist countries, and we also find sanctuaries of different kinds, their general name being *K*aitya. The gifts consisted mostly of flowers and incense. The foot-prints, the shadow, the pot for begging, and the tooth belonging to Buddha, are more especially worshipped; and as late as the year 1858 a great festival was held in Ceylon in honour of this tooth. The images of Buddha represent him sitting on a lotus, with a very peaceful expression. But all this belongs more to the later history of Buddhism. We have only mentioned the principal facts to show that in the long run this religion also could not exist without a popular cult.

Chapter 75. — **Buddhism in India.**

In our survey of the literature it has already been noticed how rich, but at the same time how unhistorical, are the sources from which a knowledge of Buddhist church history must be gathered. The

southern tradition is only known to us through the monks of Mahâvihâra in Ceylon, whilst the northern comes from various sources. But they are both almost entirely the opposite of real history. They also vary on the most important points. Thus the southern sources tell us of three councils; the first is said to have taken place directly after Buddha's death; the second, one hundred years later under King Kâla-Asoka; and the third, one hundred and eighteen years later under Asoka, the Maurya. The northern history tells only of one Asoka, and mentions therefore only two councils during this period. The account of these church meetings, however, is very fabulous. The first council was held immediately after the master's death at Râgagriha. Under the direction of Kâsyapa five hundred monks were present, amongst whom, besides the president, Upâli and Ânanda distinguished themselves, because Upâli communicated the orders of the master as regards Vinaya, and Ânanda as regards Dharma. Ânanda, although one of the most learned, was only admitted with difficulty, because he was not yet an Arhat, and also because he had neglected to ask the master to delay his Nirvâna, because he had not asked for closer instruction on the primary and secondary points of discipline, had recommended the institution of an order of nuns, and in his intimate relations with Buddha, had been guilty of various offences of which he could not properly justify himself. KERN has given a very ingenious mythical explanation of the whole history of this first council. After the setting of the sun (Nirvâna), twilight (Kâsyapa) prevails, and its natural enemy is the moon

(Ânanda). In this twilight the stars (Arhat) appear, and amongst them the moon shines with a superior, although borrowed light, and thus there is light in the sky even after sunset. So also the teaching of Buddha lives on in the congregation.

The second council was of greater dogmatic importance. The *Vrigi* sons, monks at Vaisâlî, had allowed greater laxity in ten points than was compatible with Buddha's discipline. After much discussion to and fro with numerous famous doctors, they were condemned at the council of seven hundred elders at Vaisâlî. Although this can hardly be an historical event, and the ten points of controversy are utterly unimportant, yet the account of this second council is of importance, because these *Vrigi* monks who were condemned by the Sthavira continued in a later sect, or rather because, to explain the schism of these later Mahâsaṅghikas, the dogmatic fable of this second council was invented.

The history of the church is really that of many teachers and patriarchs of the church, who in continual succession transmit and support the true teaching. The accounts given by the northern and southern churches are as unlike as possible. The magical power of these teachers is chiefly dwelt on, and often in the most absurd stories. We feel ourselves on more historical ground, from the reign of King Asoka of the Maurya dynasty. The council held under him, at which under the direction of Tishya Maudgalîputra various abuses at the monastery of Pâtaliputra were censured, may be put aside as unhistorical. We are more interested in the position of the king with regard to Buddhism, of which the above-mentioned

edicts are proofs. These edicts of King Devanampriya Piyadassi, as he there calls himself, do not afford us much information of the condition of Buddhism in his kingdom. They show us the king not only as patron of Buddhism but also of other monastic orders. He preaches the greatest toleration in his kingdom and protects all religions, although he personally acknowledges the Buddhistic Dharma, and assures the congregation of his sympathy, and presents them with treatises on their faith. What induced him thus to favour Buddhism, whether political motives or not, can hardly be guessed; anyhow he did more for the Buddhist church than Constantine did for the Christian. The records tell us that he passed through a wild youth, but that after his conversion the spread of this faith became very dear to him, and he is even said to have erected 84,000 stûpas. Some people say that towards the end of his reign a reaction set in because his extravagant gifts to the congregation were ruining the state treasury. The mission to Ceylon attributed to him is most important; he sent his son Mahendra thither to plant a twig of the sacred Bodhi tree, and later, his daughter to found an order of nuns. Mahendra became the apostle of the island; as if by magic he converted King Tishya and many thousand people. Here also the order became powerful and rich, owing to the protection and gifts of the princes. Many monasteries were built, amongst which later on dissensions arose, especially between the oldest monastery, Mahâvihâra, and that of Abhayagiri. The southern canon, which we possess, is that which was settled at a council of the first-mentioned party.

The period after the death of Asoka (about 230

B.C.) is that of the spread of Buddhism in Ceylon, in Afghanistan, in Baktria, and even as far as China. The Mauryas ruled till about 180 B.C. They were followed by the *Suṅga* dynasty, whose founder, Pushyamitra, is said to have been opposed to the Buddhists. At the same time as the *Suṅgas* (180–70 B.C.) there reigned in the north-west of India, as well as in Cabul and Baktria, Greek princes, amongst whom was Menander (about 150 B.C.). He is mentioned as Milinda in the Buddhist texts with great honour, especially on account of his conversations with the teacher Nâgasena (who is without any reason identified with the famous Nâgârǵuna). Thus Buddhism, even in the last centuries before our era, was widely spread in these regions as well as in Baktria. Towards the middle of the last century B.C. Scythian princes established their kingdom in the north-west of India. Amongst them, Kanishka (78 A.D.) was a follower of Buddhism. Towards 100 A.D. he summoned a large council under the presidency of the teachers Pârśva and Vasumitra to fix the canon, which was now definitely settled for the northern church. This canon, however, was not always recognised by all parties. The school of Mahâyâna, for instance, which we shall now consider, felt the need of a canon of its own, which though containing several old writings included an entirely new version of the teaching, for which even the threefold division of the Tripiṭaka no longer suited.

The rising of this Mahâyâna school is the most important event in Buddhist church history during the centuries after Kanishka. From the very beginning there had existed sects in the church, the number of

which is given, more conventionally than rightly, as eighteen. We have, for instance, already mentioned the split which was said to be the cause of the second council. But the importance of these sects becomes nothing as compared with the great split amongst the followers of the Hîna- (small) and the Mahâ- (great) yâna which took place in the northern church. The Hînayânists or Srâvakas (pupils) were the orthodox people whose ideal was that of a monastic life. The Mahâyânists, on the other hand, were absorbed in deep speculations concerning Buddha's three bodies, concerning voidness and a supreme god (Âdibuddha), &c. This school was often in direct opposition to genuine Buddhist conceptions. It often explains the master's Nirvâna as an illusion only, and makes Buddha the god of gods. It is not satisfied with the passive monastic ideal, but extols the active Pâramitâs (above all, charity), and prefers therefore once more activity to non-activity. It obliterates the sharp line between monks and the laity, and thus works its way from monastic orders towards a real community. It distinguishes three paths to salvation (yâna, vehicles), that of the hearer (piety), that of the Pratyekabuddha (philosophy and askesis), and that of the Bodhisatva (kindness towards all beings). Finally (this is at least the teaching of the Saddharma Pundarîka) it makes these three paths run into the one path of the Bodhisatva, which all are destined to enter. It gives elevated religious meanings to all sorts of acts, for instance, to bathing in the Ganges and to magic arts. In both of these two principal divisions, two schools can be distinguished. To the Hînayâna belong the Vaibhâshikas and the Sautrântikas; the latter cling to

the Sûtras, the former lay most stress on the Abhidharma writings. They also differ in several questions concerning the theory of knowledge, in subtle speculations on the ego, the non-ego, &c. The Mahâyânists are divided into Yogâ*k*âryas and Mâdhyamikas, which again fall into various sub-divisions. The doctrine of the Mâdhyamikas, who deny being and substance, and maintain the nothingness of things, is extreme idealism [1] (to be compared with the Vedânta). This system is attributed to the great teacher Nâgâr*g*una, who was born about 100 A.D. in Southern India, and whose fame surpasses that of all other Buddhist teachers, although the names of other fathers of the church, such as Âryasaṅga, Âryadeva, Dignâga, Vasubandhu, and Dharmâkr*i*ti, of whom much can be found in Târânâtha, though very little is really historical, are highly honoured.

We owe authentic reports of the state of Buddhism to the Chinese pilgrims, Fahian (400 A.D), Sungyun (518 A.D.), and Hiuentsang (629 A.D.), who travelled over India to strengthen their faith in the fatherland of their religion, and to bring away from thence books and relics. The general importance of these travels, especially those of Hiuentsang, has been pointed out in our survey of literature. For the most part, these pilgrims visited the same districts; but Southern India and Ceylon, where Fahian remained for some time, and from whence he returned to China by sea, was never entered by Hiuentsang. With regard to the countries between China and India, and to Northern India, a comparison of both reports gives us

[1] The best and most complete treatment of these schools, as well as the difference between Hînayâna and Mahâyâna, can be found in WASSILJEW'S book.

an insight into the development of Buddhism. During the two centuries which separate Hiuentsang from Fahian, Buddhism had on the whole increased. We can trace a falling off in a few isolated districts only. The Mahâyânists who in the time of Fahian were in the minority, were found by Hiuentsang, who joined himself to them with enthusiasm, to be in the majority. These books of travel tell us almost too much as regards monastic life, the pious practices of the monks, and likewise on the cult of the people, the great religious festivals, the valuable images, and the wonder-working relics. But on the development of the teaching they tell us far too little. It is true these Chinese never neglect to record the legends which they hear about Buddha and the saints on the spot, nor do they allow themselves to doubt them. Hiuentsang, who was praised as a great scholar, may have been a heroic and noble character, but certainly not a clear thinker. He was, on the contrary, most superstitious, though not fanatical. He found the Buddhists everywhere on a good footing with the Brâhmanic Hindus, and the worship of Buddhist saints mixed up with that of Hindu gods. The philanthropic institutions mentioned by Fahian are most curious. At Pâṭaliputra there were hospitals for the sick and poor, especially for strangers who came together there for religious festivals. That curious Buddhist institution, the animal hospital, was also well known.

It seems that at the time of these Chinese pilgrims Buddhism was at its zenith in India. The history of its decline is almost entirely concealed in darkness. Buddhism had been richly endowed by princes and powerful people, both in India and Ceylon, and owed much to

their protection. This lasted till far into the Middle Ages; the Pâla and Sena dynasties in Eastern India (800-1200) still protected this faith. No battle with Hinduism swept away the powers of the sons of *S*âkya. Persecutions occurred only in isolated cases; for instance, in Ceylon, when Tamil princes from Southern India (where Buddhism never took deep root) sometimes invaded it, and also in the north, where, according to Târânâtha, the unbelieving Tîrthakas three times fell on the monks, and destroyed their monasteries. But as a rule friendly relations existed. The kings of Magadha, for instance, where the Nâlanda seminary flourished, were for the most part keen Buddhists, although they afforded equal protection to their subjects who believed otherwise. This was done by King *S*îlâditya (or *S*rî-Harsha), whom Hiuentsang found on the throne there. But even Hindu rulers were not hostile to the order, and Târânâtha mentions many Brâhmans as its friends. But the Buddhist and Brâhmanic Hindus did not only exercise an outward toleration with regard to their faith and life, they were also conscious of a real internal relationship. We have often remarked before, how Buddhism from its very beginning retained common Hindu ideas and forms of life, and the same may be said of the later development of that religion. The general movement of Hindu life was shared by Buddhism during the course of centuries: its piety is much like that in Vish*n*uitic and particularly in *S*ivaitic circles. Tantrism (magic) is common to Buddhist and Hindu communities during these centuries. KERN has drawn attention to the most important points of contact between the Saddharma Pu*nd*arîka, and the Bhagavad

Gîtâ. One can look on the Mahâyâna school as the Buddhist form of Sivaism; and the Hînayânists taunted their opponents, saying that they differed in no way from the Sivaitic monks. Therefore Buddhism suffered more from internal splits than from external enemies. The various monasteries in Ceylon and the various schools in the north were always quarrelling. Their enmity and contempt found vent not only in words, but often in open quarrels. Another cause of the decline of Buddhism seems to have lain in the fact that after the series of its great teachers, ending with Dharmâkriti, Buddhism was no longer a match for the superior polemic of the great teachers Kumârila and Sankara (both from the Deccan). The decisive blow was struck by the Arabs, and the Buddhists had indeed to suffer many persecutions from the hands of Islam. As early as 644 Balkh fell, where only a few years before Hiuentsang had admired the glories of a famous monastery. In 712 the Arabs appeared in Western India (Sindh), and with the fall of Magadha (1200) Buddhism, according to the opinion of Târânâtha, came to an end in India; for the light of the true faith only appeared afterwards in these districts in isolated cases. Thus we can state as a fact, that it was the advance of Islam which put an end to Buddhism in India. It is impossible, however, to answer the question why Buddhism disappeared at this time, whilst Hinduism and Gainism weathered the storm.

Buddhism continued to exist in Nepal and Ceylon[1], and spread itself over many countries (from Mongolia

[1] Spence Hardy's Eastern Monachism, which we have already mentioned, gives an interesting summary of the more modern history of Buddhism in Ceylon.

to the islands of Java, Bali, and Sumatra). We do not here touch on the history of these churches and missions; but we must more closely consider two peculiar forms which northern Buddhism has assumed in Tibet and China.

CHAPTER 76. — **Buddhism in Tibet (Lamaism).**

Books of Reference. Besides the second vol. of KÖPPEN, the literature quoted by him, the original writings translated from the Kahgyur and Tangyur, we have still to mention E. SCHLAGINTWEIT'S Buddhism in Tibet (1863, French translation in the Annales du Musée Guimet, III).

We put aside the fabulous reports of a divine origin. The introduction of Buddhism into Tibet dates from the seventh century. At that time King Srongtsan-Gampo was ruling. He cared much for the mental culture of his people, and owing to the influence of his two wives, of whom one came from Nepal and the other from China, he introduced Buddhism, on account of which these two princesses still enjoy divine honours. During a few succeeding centuries, Buddhism did not attain great success and was even persecuted. It was not till the beginning of the fifteenth century that the famous Tsonkhapa, who founded the monastery of Galdan near Lhassa, established the present hierarchy.

The reason that this so-called Lamaism is very different from original Buddhism can easily be given. To begin with, the religion which was introduced into Tibet during the seventh century was no longer the old teaching of the monastic order, but the Mahâyânistic ideas and practices impregnated through and through by Sivaism and Tantrism. But the soil on which it here fell was quite different to that in India.

The people belonged to another (Mongolian) race and stood on a very low stage of civilisation, which up to the present day, in the rough hill countries where polyandry still exists, is not quite obliterated. The power of Buddhism to adapt itself to different requirements, and its civilising powers amongst the Mongolians, has often been compared with the history of Christianity and its spread amongst the Germans. Lamaism is paralleled with the Roman church. There are radical differences, however, which make the value of such a comparison most doubtful.

A dogma which prevails in the northern church, and which lies at the bottom of Lamaism, is that of the Dhyâni-Buddhas or the Buddhas of contemplation (Dhyâna). As opposed to the Buddhas, who appear on earth as men (Mânushi-Buddha), these Dhyâni-Buddhas are their types dwelling in heavenly spheres. Every Buddha who appears in the lower material world is only the apparition of a Dhyâni-Buddha, living in mystic sublimity and pure glory. The five Buddhas of the present age of the world (the fourth of whom is Gautama and the fifth the Bodhisatva Maitreya) correspond to five Dhyâni-Buddhas, and these again must have their own Bodhisatvas. These Dhyâni-Bodhisatvas must be distinguished from the real Bodhisatvas (future human Buddhas), because they remain in the abstract world of contemplation and never become incarnate. It is their function, during the time between the appearance of human Buddhas, to carry on the work of the former Buddha, and to prepare the work of the future one. Of course in these series the fourth Buddha, corresponding to the present time, is the most important:

he is the Dhyâni-Buddha Amitâbha, who is often worshipped as the supreme god (although an atheistical conception of the five Dhyâni-Buddhas as the five elements, or as the five senses also occurs), and the Dhyâni-Bodhisatva Padmapâṇi or Avalokitesvara (Tibetan Chenrisi), who is especially invoked as the patron of the country.

The most characteristic feature in Lamaism is the hierarchy, which is based on the idea that the highest officials in the church are incarnations of these divine beings. Thus the two chief priests, the Grand Lama in Farther Tibet (Panchen Rinpoche) and the Dalai-Lama at Lhassa, are said to be incarnations of Amitâbha and Avalokitesvara, the latter also of Tsonkhapa, whilst other members of the higher clergy also are incarnated or born again. The so-called Chubilghanic succession, after the death of the Dalai-Lama, always points out some child born after nine months as a new incarnation. This choice, which was formerly made with mantic means by the priests themselves, has during the last century come under the immediate influence of the Chinese government.

With regard to the form of worship, those few European travellers who have passed through that almost inaccessible country, and were permitted to dwell in Lhassa, have received the impression of its great similarity with Roman Catholic ritual. The numerous monasteries, with their enormous number of monks, church bells, rosaries, images of saints, relics, fastings, church music, processions, and baptism, have given rise to the idea amongst good Catholics that the devil, as a joke, has here furnished a caricature of Christianity. Besides the already-named

objects and practices, we must, in order to describe the religious practices of Lamaism, still mention the amulets, which, carried in small boxes, belong to the wardrobe, and the prayer wheels, which, if set in motion by a slight touch or even by water or wind, turn a small cylinder containing forms of prayer. This produces the same blessed results as if all the prayers had been repeated. These prayer machines exist by thousands in the simpler form of rods also, on which flags with prayers flap in the wind. Generally the short sacred form 'Om mani padme hum' (usually translated, 'O jewel in the Lotus, Amen') is inscribed on them, and this possesses peculiar magic powers.

The history of the Dalai-Lamas begins in the fifteenth century, and we not only know the names of these dignitaries who succeeded each other, but can also trace the growth of their temporal power, until China put a limit to it. The Dalai-Lama is recognised as the head of the church by the Mongolians of Upper Asia who were converted to Buddhism, and by a part of the Chinese government. Therefore it is important for the Chinese government to maintain the seat of that spiritual power in dependence. But zealous Lamaists expect a deliverer, who is to shake off the foreign yoke.

Chapter 77. — **Buddhism in China.**

Books of Reference. Besides the translations of Chinese documents already mentioned, the following must be added: S. Beal, Buddhism in China (S.P.C.K. 1884, a concise summary); J. Edkins, Chinese Buddhism (Tr. Or. S. 1880); E. J. Eitel, Handbook for the Student of Chinese Buddhism (an alphabetical list of Buddhist names and expressions).

Although tradition tells us that Buddhism reached China several centuries B. C., yet the first reliable

date in the history of Chinese Buddhism is 61 A. D. However, it is probable that even in the second century B. C. there was a certain amount of traffic between Northern India, where Mongolian tribes had settled down, and China. At that time a gold idol appeared to the emperor Mingti in a dream, and this vision, strengthened by reports which had reached him, moved him to send an embassy to India to fetch from thence books and teachers. This succeeded, and the costly treasure, carried on a white charger, reached the chief town Loyang. Some of these books were translated, and during the following centuries fresh supplies were brought from India to strengthen Buddhism in China. Many Indian teachers came thither, fired with the desire to convert, and amongst them famous men like Kumâragîva (± 400), who translated a number of the most important Buddhist works. At that time temples and monasteries were not wanting to the foreign religion, and since 335 the Chinese themselves had been allowed to enter the order as monks. It is true that Buddhism did not always enjoy the protection of the emperors, but had to pass through severe persecutions. More especially under the Tang dynasty (620-907), the fate of the monks was subject to great changes. Some of the rulers of this house were friendly to them, others again were so strongly opposed, that there were three great persecutions, during which monasteries were destroyed, and thousands of monks were forced to re-enter secular life. The reasons of this proceeding are not far to seek. The monks were occasionally accused of misdemeanours or of practising magical arts. One minister persuaded his master

that the useless lives of so many monks, who withheld their powers from the community and the state, were dangerous to the state. The monks did not work, but lived on gifts; they formed no families, and thus ignored the fundamental duty of piety, and their convictions also were not in accordance with sound principles. No sense of duty, but fear of hell punishments or a hope of heavenly salvation, formed their motives. It seemed illogical to emphasize this desire, whilst on the other hand the obliteration of all desires was striven after. To this was added the irresistible argument, that Buddhism was a foreign religion and unsuitable to China, whilst the gross superstition and worship of relics, &c., which fascinated the people, made this religion contemptible to the educated, even up to the present day.

These are the most important weapons used in China against Buddhism, and from which the antithesis between the Indian and Chinese mind can be clearly seen. It is not necessary to mention the princes who either persecuted or protected Buddhism. The great ruler of the Mandshu dynasty, Kanghi (seventeenth century), made known his dislike to it. Still Buddhism flourishes in China, and the country is covered with sanctuaries, monasteries, pagodas with relics, temples, and images.

Amongst the causes which made Buddhism spread and maintain itself in China, we have already mentioned the active intercourse with India. From thence for centuries, teachers and monks, during the decline of Buddhism in India, came in ever-increasing numbers to China. But Chinese pilgrims also, whose greatness of soul one must admire, brought new food

for the faith from India, and aroused new enthusiasm. Thus the interest in Buddhist literature was very real in China, and there were numerous literary productions, mostly translations. It would be wrong to trust too much in the depreciatory judgment of Confucianists, that Buddhism only met the needs of the people for superstitious ceremonies and beliefs. On the contrary, Buddhist learning as well as mysticism flourished in China also, and several schools (their number is usually said to be five) gave their own peculiar expression to the most abstract philosophical thoughts, and the esoteric doctrine was clearly distinguished from the popular belief. This last mystic form was introduced by Bodhidharma, who came from Southern India to China in 526, and was there regarded as the first of the Buddhist patriarchs. In these contemplative schools, of which the Lintsi school is the most widely spread, abstraction has been carried just as far as in Indian Buddhism, namely, to the utter negation of another world, and to the statement that everything, even Buddha and Dharma, exist in the human mind only. The Wu-wei sect can be regarded as a branch of this negative tendency: it exists up to the present day in Eastern China, and does not develop the old dogma of withdrawal from the world, emptiness, and peace of mind in a speculative form, though it carries it out in real life, and rejects all positive activity. It is from this that they derive their name, since Wu-wei means doing nothing. In this negation Buddhism agrees with the native Tâoism.

We can deal briefly with the form of worship. In China also, Buddhism is chiefly the worship of images and relics. Crowds of people go for pil-

grimages to the great sanctuaries. Such sacred places, monasteries, and temples are numerous, for example at Tientai, and on the island of Futo, &c. Amongst the lower classes, Buddhism and Tâoism vie in magic arts to keep off evil spirits, or to attain salvation in this world or on the other side of the tomb. It is of greater importance to turn for a moment to the objects of this cult. In religious worship, Buddha is almost hidden by Mito (Amitâbha) and by Fousa Kwanyin (Bodhisatva Avalokitesvara). Mito is represented in a widely spread school (that of Tsing-tu, or the pure land) as lord of the western paradise, where the good are born again. For that purpose it is necessary to repeat the name of Mito very often, and to count it off on a rosary, as then he will conduct the faithful over the sea of suffering to the shores of the blessed, into the western paradise, the glories of which are painted in glowing colours. Kwanyin is, if possible, still more popular; he is the god of charity (sometimes male, sometimes female), and people are persuaded that he hears the petitions of mankind, and is glad to help them in all need.

At the present day Buddhism is very widely spread amongst the Chinese. The three religions, Confucianism, Tâoism, and Buddhism, are not however opposed to each other; they not only live peaceably side by side, but do not exclude one another in any way. A Chinese, if not a priest or a monk of one of these three religions, visits their temples without any distinction, and takes part in all the ceremonies. This fact has been more fully explained in our section on China. Here we need only mention that the aristocracy and the government, although holding

Buddhism in small esteem, yet often take part in its ceremonies. For the government this is sound policy, because the many Mongolian and Tibetan subjects make it necessary to be on a good footing with Lamaism. In Pekin a large number of Lamas are supported at the expense of the state. The religious tolerance and indifference of the educated, as well as a desire for miracles and for salvation amongst the people, benefits the non-Lamaistic Buddhists also.

IV. HINDUISM.

CHAPTER 78. — **Summary of its History and Literature.**

Books of Reference. As a summary of the history, besides LASSEN'S work, the following can be highly recommended: W. W. HUNTER, The Indian Empire, its history, people, and products (Tr. Or. S. 1882). For a study of the history of religion we shall mention MONIER WILLIAMS, Religious Thought and Life in India, I; and R. N. CUST, Linguistic and Oriental Essays (Tr. Or. S. 1880). F. NÈVE in his Époques littéraires de l'Inde (1883) gives a well-written and popular résumé of Sanskrit poetry. For the last period of the history of literature, so often neglected by Indian scholars, in which the popular dialects have driven out Sanskrit, the principal work is GARCIN DE TASSY, Histoire de la littérature Hindouie et Hindoustanie (3 vols. 2nd ed. 1871).

It is not possible to draw a sharp line between the Brâhmanic and the Hinduistic periods; Buddhism does not clearly separate the two. We saw how much that was post-Buddhistic had to be incorporated into our first chief part, while on the other hand, the Brâhmanic cult still exists. We can mention various marks which form the special characteristics of Hinduism. We must first of all consider extraneous influences. Greeks, Scythians, Arabians, Afghans,

and Mongolians entered India mostly from the north-west, and established their dominion there, for a longer or shorter period. Perhaps the part which fell during these centuries to the aborigines was still more decisive. It may be that the older Brâhmanic civilisation also, was not so purely Aryan as is often said, at least it is difficult to point out what belonged in it to the aborigines. But in the times of Hinduism their influence is much clearer. The south of India, which was but slightly Brâhmanised, gains a formerly unknown importance in the development of civilisation, and in the north also the lower strata assert their influence. Therefore the history of the religion of this period is very unlike that of the former periods, and really treats of something totally dissimilar. The religion which was treated in the description of Brâhmanism consisted of sacrificial ritual, speculation, meditation, and the practices of individual circles and spheres. In Hinduism we have to deal more with general wants and popular manifestations: instead of the history of a priestly cult and monastic forms of life, we have to deal with a many-sided popular religion. An important conclusion can be drawn from this antithesis. As Brâhmanism continued into Hinduistic times, much that was Hinduistic existed also in Brâhmanic times of yore. The Vedic literature gives us no picture of popular ideas and customs, but what it ignored, existed nevertheless, and the Hinduism of later times was probably nothing else than the development of these old popular religions. The old myths are often only transmitted in works of a late date, and therefore much in the new forms of Hinduism

may be ancient material. Of course this is not always the case, and time involves also radical changes. Thus during the Hinduistic period a great breaking up took place. What is peculiar to this period is the formation of sects; and it is in these that the religious power of the people is concentrated. With this great variety of forms it is difficult to determine the limits of Hinduism. The recognition of the authority of the Veda can hardly be looked on as such, because, as a matter of fact, in most of these religious formations it is ignored. A stronger bond is formed by custom (Âkâra), which follows not only the scriptures but chiefly traditional usage. The most important part of custom is the institution of caste. There are, as we shall see, various currents in these religious sects which are opposed to these castes, but as a whole the life of a Hindu is governed by this difference in caste. During the course of development their number is greatly increased. At present there are many hundreds of them, whose members cannot intermarry, and cannot eat together, &c. Even though at certain great religious festivals these barriers are done away with, yet in every-day life they are so firmly established, that they form a great impediment to any sound social and religious development. The Hindu holds firm to his caste, and looks proudly down on those unhappy mortals who are outside the bonds of caste. These people are again divided into various classes, all known to us under the general name of Pariahs.

Before we proceed to give the broad outlines of the history of the religion, it may be best to give a slight sketch of the political history, since up till now we

have only in passing touched on historical events. This history really depends on the foreign rulers who succeeded one another. First of all come the Greeks, who were on a friendly footing with the Maurya princes (the embassy of Megasthenes to *K*andragupta, and the treaty between Asoka and Antiochus Theos), who during the second century B.C. formed a kingdom in the north of India (also in Baktria), which under King Menander extended from Cabul to the Jumna. They had to withdraw before Scythian invasions, and these Tatartic or Mongolian races (Scyths, Sakes, in Chinese, Yuetchi) established themselves in India during the first century B. C. and maintained themselves there till 544 A.D., in spite of strong and continual opposition. The most important dynasties which ruled during these six centuries in Northern India are the Sah, Gupta, and Valabhi dynasties. It can easily be understood that the repeated inroads and the lasting settlement of these Scythians, who also accepted Indian culture and religion (Kanishka was a protector of Buddhism), must have strongly influenced the population. Therefore many people think they can trace the descendants of the Scythians in the Jats of the Punjab, as well as in many Rajput tribes. At all events these foreign invasions, as well as the ever-increasing importance of the non-Aryan aborigines during these centuries, gave the people a very mixed character.

In the eighth century the Arabs appeared in Sindh, but could not establish a lasting dominion, since the brave Rajputs drove them away. On the whole, the idea that India fell an easy prey into the hands of the Mussulmans is quite wrong. It was not till

1000 A.D. that Islam established a firm footing in the north of India through Mahmud of Ghazna. In the Deccan it only assumed the upper hand in the sixteenth century, and could barely exist during one hundred years. Islam was never able to break the power of Hinduism during any length of time; it ruled through the Afghan sway in the Punjab and the Mongolian dynasty at Delhi, but the latter knew how to propitiate native Hinduism with a clever policy. To Mahmud of Ghazna there succeeded several Turkish and Afghan dynasties, until about 1400 the great Mongolian deluge under Tamerlane devastated India also. The ancient kingdom had hardly been re-established when in 1526, Baber, a descendant of Tamerlane, again visited India with the power of the Mongols, but this time not only to destroy, but also to found a kingdom, that of the so-called great Mogul at Delhi. The most famous emperor was the well-known Akbar (1556–1605), whose importance as regards the history of religion will be dealt with later on. His successors were Jahangir, Shah-Jahan, and Aurangzeb (until 1707). After him the decline of the empire commences, and the last titular emperor of a once so powerful house died in 1862. In the south of India meanwhile (since 1634), a great power had arisen, that of the Marathas, which spread with great rapidity, even as far as Bengal and the Punjab, and was only destroyed by the English in 1818 after repeated wars. On the whole it was not the Mohammedans, but the Hindus who offered the greatest resistance to the advance of the power of the English, for the Sikhs were only conquered in 1848. We shall assume a knowledge of

the history of European settlements and the English dominion in India.

We are still far from possessing fixed dates for the history of literature, even in this more historical period. When a few years ago, MAX MÜLLER assumed a renaissance of literature in the sixth century A. D. during which great classical writers (amongst others Kâlidâsa) flourished, he had to support this assertion by minute critical research[1]. But we can deal shortly with this subject, because this literature in most of its branches belongs indirectly only to the history of religion. There are many scientific books, but what Indians wrote on grammar, astronomy, medicine, &c., does not come under our consideration. We must also leave the history of drama and lyric poetry out of the question. The different collections of fairy stories, fables, proverbs, and the importance of this Hindu folk-lore for the literature of the world would more nearly concern us. But we shall keep strictly within our own limits. We have mentioned several classes of literature of particular importance to ourselves in the first section: for instance, the law-books, the philosophical aphorisms, and the Itihâsas (epics). But we must still mention the no less important Purâṇas. These writings, which together with the Itihâsas are sometimes included under the name of a fifth Veda, were intended to point out the road of salvation to people incapable of studying the Vedas, and derive their materials from great antiquity. The ancient Purâṇas are said to have dealt, according to an old definition, with five objects: creation, anni-

[1] This formed the most important part of a series of lectures with long excurses called, 'India, What can it teach us?' (1883).

hilation, the renewal of the worlds, god and hero races, and the rule of Manu and his successors. But this description in no way suits the Purâṇas which we still possess, for their contents are quite different. Although they (as well as the Vedas and the Mahâbhârata) are ascribed to Vyâsa, they have a rather modern origin. According to the most reliable scholars the Bhâgavata-Purâṇa must have been written in the thirteenth century by Vopadeva. There are eighteen of these Purâṇas, to which the Upapurâṇas are added; they are dedicated to the individual gods like Agni and Brahma[1]. These writings are interesting for two reasons. They are a mine of information as regards mythology, since they contain rich remnants of ancient mythic materials. But they are equally important on account of their theological speculations. In the form in which we possess them they give us an insight into the spiritual life of the sects. The two Purâṇas best known to us (Vishṇu-Purâṇa and Bhâgavata-Purâṇa) are sources of information for a knowledge of Vishṇuism.

Many other works which originate in the sectarian circles are not yet translated, especially the Tantras (books of magic) of the Śivaits. Their number is given as sixty-four.

Of southern Indian languages, the most important works are in Tamil[2]. In Tamil we mostly possess

[1] A short analysis of six of these Purâṇas is given by WILSON, Works, vol. iii. He also translated the Vishṇu-Purâṇa (1840) with an introduction; the new edition (1864–77) has been considerably enriched by F. E. HALL'S additions. We possess another important Purâṇa (at least, most of it) in a masterly edition, with translation and introduction, by E. BURNOUF, Le Bhâgavata Purâṇa (1840–47).

[2] Translations by the missionary, C. GRAUL, Bibliotheca Tamulica (3 vols., 1854–56).

philosophical works belonging to the Vedânta school, and a well-known and highly thought of gnomic poem with moral sentiments, which cannot be placed later than 800 A.D. This is the Kural of the Tirrevalluver, containing sayings arranged in chapters, and counsels for various people, such as married people, ascetics, and princes.

Chapter 79. — The Great Sectarian Religions.

Books of Reference. For the authorities on the great gods of the sects, see Muir, Or. S. T. IV. H. H. Wilson's Sketch on the Religious Sects of the Hindus is also classical (Works, vol. i).

Although five chief sects are generally mentioned, there are in reality only two, which are again numerously subdivided: that of the Vaish*n*avas (servants of Vish*n*u), and of the *Ś*aivas (servants of *Ś*iva). Vish*n*uism and *Ś*ivaism are the two great religions which determine the history of Hinduism. Their origin is hidden from us, but is probably to be sought for (as Lassen thought) in the popular religion of ancient times, which is concealed by Brâhmanism having pushed itself to the fore. Megasthenes found the worship of Dionysos and Herakles widely spread in the north of India; in the former we recognise *Ś*iva and in the later K*ri*sh*n*a, whose worship became united with that of Vish*n*u. With regard to the question as to how these popular cults arose, and in what relation they stood to Buddhism, which borrowed so much from them, we can only make guesses. We really find ourselves on a firm historical foundation much later; as regards Vish*n*uism in about the twelfth century, and as regards *Ś*ivaism a few centuries earlier.

From this later date originated the writings that we can put a date to, and the great teachers of whom we know anything in detail.

The general character of these sects is one of great disintegration and mutability. We find their followers divided into many groups, from which again new ones are developed, and also in all grades of religious development, from the most repulsive forms of rough immoral superstition up to the heights of pure speculation, nay almost of monotheistic piety. If we designate these religions with the usual name of sects, we do not mean that they were expelled from a great church or separated themselves from it, because they diverged from a certain rule of orthodoxy. It is true one need not seek far for important points of difference between Brâhmanism and these sectarian religions; but they can all be explained by the popular character of the worship of Vishṇu and Śiva. Various local forms of worship, together with the worship of trees and animals, which Brâhmanism ignored, find a home here. The great gods here possess a developed personality, and the cult does not supersede the gods as in Brâhmanism. But this opposition has never degenerated into open hostility. The most famous Brâhmanic teachers took part also in the rites of Vishṇu and Śiva, and although the philosophy of the sectarian teachers now and then follows its own way, yet it always remains under the influence of the Brâhmanic schools. Brâhmanism has both maintained and strengthened itself by receiving sectarian religions within its pale. This union manifests itself in the doctrine of the Trimûrti, the Triad, in which the one absolute being is revealed: namely, as Brahman

the creator, Vishnu the supporter, and Śiva the destroyer and renewer. This doctrine, which no serious enquirer would any longer compare with the Christian dogma of the Trinity, as was formerly often done, was never of such importance as was attributed to it. It is often referred to, and is of importance as a proof of the eagerness for a bond of union embracing the different religions; but practically Brahma was always in the background as an object of worship. The Vaishnavas regarded Vishnu, and the Śaivas, Śiva, as the highest being, whose rivals were in each case represented as subordinate. But we find also that both are appealed to as equal, as for instance in a famous hymn in the Harivaṁsa. Vishnu-Śiva combined in this way is called Hari-hara, and this worship is still very popular in certain districts.

Vishnu, in the Rig-veda is a sun-god, who, less important than others, owes his high place in Indian religion to the fact that he came in contact with Kṛishna, and became assimilated with him. The rich mythology and the religious value of the worship of Vishnu is almost entirely the result of this meeting; we might therefore almost as correctly talk of Kṛishnaism as of Vishnuism. The two most sacred books of the Vaishnava, the Bhâgavata-Purâṇa and the Bhagavad-Gîtâ [1] (the title Bhagavat belongs to Vishnu

[1] We shall only mention one of the many translations of this important piece of the Mahâbhârata, namely, that made by a Hindu, KASHINATH TRIMBAK TELANG in the S. B. E. VIII. In the introduction he tries to prove that the poem dates from the time of the Upanishads, several centuries B.C., which but a few will agree to. We have already mentioned the translation of the Bhâgavata-Purâṇa by BURNOUF. A Hindu treatment of the history of Kṛishna was translated by TH. PAVIE, Krichna et sa doctrine (1852).

as well as to Buddha), are more especially in praise of Kṛishṇa. The way in which these two are thought of as one, can be seen by presenting to our minds the doctrine of the Avatâras, or embodiments (the word means Descensio, not Incarnatio) of Vishṇu. In these Avatâras we learn to know Vishṇu as the friend and helper, a doctrine which gives the Vaishṇavas the opportunity not only to prove their tolerance of various other divine beings, but also of recognising them cheerfully, and of incorporating them into their religion, so that even Buddha is considered an Avatâra of Vishṇu. The number of these Avatâras is not limited: even the teachers, who are considered as incarnations of the deity, are included, and the series is not yet concluded. As a rule their number is given as ten. In the four first, Vishṇu assumed the form of an animal, first of all of a fish. As such he saved Manu's ship in the great deluge. As a tortoise, he helped the gods to lift numerous valuable treasures out of the sea. As a boar, he conquered an evil demon, and made the earth appear again out of the water. As a man-lion, he freed the world from the yoke of a cruel tyrant. In the following age of the world he overcame another tyrant in the shape of a dwarf. The sixth embodiment was as Paraśu-Râma (Râma with an axe), the valiant son of a Brâhman, who destroyed the supremacy of the caste of warriors. The other Râma (Râmaḳandra, the beautiful moonlike Râma), the husband of Sîtâ, the enemy of Râvaṇa, the hero of the Râmâyaṇa, whose name is celebrated throughout India, was the next incarnation. The eighth was Kṛishṇa, the ninth Buddha. The tenth is still expected: for when the wickedness of the world will have reached its height,

then Vishṇu will appear as Kalki, on the clouds, to punish the wicked and save the good. Whilst we here have the idea common under various forms to so many religions, of a future saviour, different ideas are expressed in the other appearances of Vishṇu. In the first the cosmogonic flood myth, in the following the battle with monsters (demons or men), and in that as Buddha, the syncretism of religions is the principal factor. The appearance as Kṛishṇa is regarded as the highest; not only a part of Vishṇu's being is passed over to him, but the god himself is fully manifested in him. Many of the myths concerning Kṛishṇa the son of Vâsudeva and Devakî have, as we have already mentioned as a result of the studies of SENART, passed over into the Buddha legend. Those which narrate the childhood of the god, how he was brought up by peasants and gave himself over to the pleasures of sensual love with the Gopîs, the wives and daughters of the cowherds, are much spun out. Râdhâ is especially mentioned as his favourite. The story of Kṛishṇa's youth spent with the daughters of the herdsmen forms the subject of many erotic poems, whose low sensuality can scarcely be concealed by an allegorical or mythical explanation of spiritual love, of a desire of the human soul for a union with the godhead, as for instance in Gayadeva's Gîtagovinda (twelfth century).

In representing the philosophy [1] of Vishṇuism, there is always the danger of treating it too systematically. Much has been said about the monotheism of the

[1] A native source of information in regard to the history of philosophy under the influence of the sects, is the work of MÂDHAVA. The Sarva-darsana-saṅgraha, translated by E. B. COWELL and A. E. GOUGH (Tr. Or. S.), represents the systems current in the fourteenth century.

Vaishnavas, and certainly many of their doctrines agree with Saṅkara's Vedânta doctrines. But, on the other hand, dualism is so deeply rooted in Vishnuism, that the opposition to the doctrine of identity (the Advaita doctrine) has been represented as the common fund of all its schools. All these remarks, and many others also, are only correct when they are taken with their mutual limitations. Here, as is often the case in religious writings, which are rather the outpourings of the heart than the products of well-schooled thought, the doctrine is not rounded off, and yes, and no, stand closely side by side. The Bhagavad-Gîtâ is one of the oldest and most beautiful works of this sort of poetical religious philosophy. In it Krishna, the highest godhead, reveals the secret of his being, and indicates his exclusive right to the pious submission and worship of his servants. This poem has had the greatest influence not only on sectarian circles, but on the whole Hindu development. We shall only mention a few of the many teachers of the Vaishnavas or Bhâgavatas (the latter name signifies both the worshippers of Vishnu in general, and a special sect also). During the twelfth century there lived in the neighbourhood of Madras, a man called Râmânuja, who developed his teaching in opposition to the Vedântic theology of Saṅkara. He distinguished three principles: the highest god or Îsvara (this is of course Vishnu), the individual souls, and the material soulless world. As unworthy of the idea of the godhead, he rejected the dogma which represents the absolute as without qualities, and unknowable, and also the dogma of illusion (Mâyâ). To him, on the contrary, the godhead is actually present in its images, its embodiments

(Râma), and its full manifestation (K*ri*shn*a*), and also in its all-pervading spirit and its indwelling in the human soul. His followers, who are numerous in the south, split up into various parties on other controverted points. In the fourteenth century, Râmânanda introduced this doctrine into Bengal, where it likewise exercised great influence on popular religion. In this school Râma was especially worshipped, and the Hindu treatment of the Râmây*a*n*a* (by Tulasidâsa in the sixteenth century) also emanated from it. Ânandatîrtha (Madhva) went still further than Râmânu*g*a in his opposition to the theory of identity. He was a contemporary and compatriot of Râmânu*g*a's and founded the sect of the Mâdhvas, which was widely spread amongst the Brâhmans of the south. Quite a different spirit pervaded the doctrine preached by Vallabha in the neighbourhood of Benares. He maintained the essential unity of the human soul with the highest deity. From which he concluded that the body which contains this divine soul must be carefully tended, and one ought not therefore to imagine that God can be served by ascetic practices, but one should humour all desires. This teaching was eagerly followed by the Mahârâ*g*as, who, as representatives of the godhead, laid claim to the right of acting the part of K*ri*shn*a* with the Gopîs, with women in the sanctuary. These immoralities, which as late as 1862 led to a famous law-suit in Bombay, roused great opposition in India also. At the beginning of this century a highly respected Brâhman, Svâmi Nârâyan*a* preached, with good results, a worship of Vishn*u* by moral solidity and purity of life.

These founders of sects are most important.

Amongst their followers these Gurus, as the great teachers and leaders of sects in Hinduism are called, are looked on as far more than mere teachers or even mediators between God and man. They are the incarnations, the living representatives of the godhead, and are overwhelmed with honours. Thus the personality of God, as well as man, forms a prominent feature of these religions. The people live on the stories of saints; those of the Vaishnavas, are set forth in the widely diffused Book of Bhakta Mâlâ (about 1600). This word Bhakti is the new road to salvation, recommended by the sects, and is more minutely described in the Bhakti-Sûtra of Sândilya and in other Vishnuitic writings. The word Bhakti can be translated by faith, love and devotion. The conception has several shades of meaning. But Bhakti must be thoroughly distinguished from the two opposite roads of salvation, which we mentioned before, namely Gñâna and Karma. Bhakti is neither knowledge nor works (ritual or spiritual), but a surrender to the godhead, a piety whose essential condition is a living representation of its object, and a loving understanding between god and his servant. Therefore Râma and Krishna are more thoroughly objects of Bhakti than Vishnu himself. Bhakti is more occupied with the attractive Avatâras of Vishnu than with the forms of Siva, although the word is also used in the worship of Siva. There are five forms of this loving devotion to the godhead: these are the peaceful contemplation of the godhead, slavish obedience, friendship, childlike love, and fiery love as between man and woman. Thus the whole scale of human feelings is transferred to relationship with the godhead. But in

this relationship the god took the initiative. It is he, more especially Vishnu as Râma and Krishna, who reveals himself to man as helping, blessing, and saving. Therefore everything is owed to the preventing grace of God; but here we are met by the question, how does man participate in this grace? The school of Râmânuja split on this very question, for some of them thought that man himself grasps the grace, as a young monkey clings to his mother; whilst the rest declared that man is a passive recipient, and that the godhead has to do everything, just as a cat places its kittens in safety. This controversy has often been compared to the dispute between Gomarists and Arminians.

Vishnuism could not have become a popular religion if it had remained in these higher spheres of speculation. But it also satisfies very fully the requirements of a cult. Vishnu, or one of these two principal Avataras, is present in all sorts of images and symbols. Sects have appropriated the worship of sacred trees and stones. A certain Ammonite (Sâlagrâma), and the Tulasi plant, are especially sacred among the Vaishnavas. Images representing Râma, Krishna, or Vishnu himself with four arms, are worshipped. Certain marks on the forehead indicate the Vaishnava (a vertical line in a bright colour) or the Saiva (three horizontal lines drawn in ashes), whilst the symbols of the god are often burnt into the breast and arms: such as the discus, the club or the shell of Vishnu, the trident or the phallus of Siva. Besides this, the service of the god consists in the repetition of short formulas, or of one only of the many names which he possesses (Vishnu has 1000 names, and Siva 1008). This last act, even if done without thought or with a bad

motive, possesses miraculous power; the name of the god on the lips of a dying person saves his soul. But we have already mentioned that virtue in word, deed, and thought also is required. Initiatory ceremonies, at which the Guru hangs the rosary on the child, are performed at the age of six, but complete admission into the community is attained at the age of twelve.

As we observed before, many of these remarks refer equally well to the worship of Śiva, as to that of Vishṇu. But in many ways the gloomy Śiva stands in opposition to the friendly Vishṇu. The two religions, however different, yet on the whole agree together, and are not as sharply opposed to one another as many of the Vaishṇava sects are among themselves. Śivaism is more deeply rooted in Vedic literature than Vishṇuism. Śiva has become the heir of Rudra, whom we find in connection with the Maruts. This Rudra, for instance, is celebrated in a curious hymn in the Yagur-veda (Śatarudriya). In it he appears as the being who lives on the mountains with his followers, and whose protection is implored for house and farm, and for all sorts of business (even begging and theft). The popular, nay, even crude character of this hymn has been especially emphasised. Rudra is here not the god of a sacerdotal religion, but a lord who reveals himself to herdsmen and water-bearers. His two sides are here already clearly marked: a saviour and redeemer, who gives pleasure and turns away sorrow, and a terrible destroyer, who is justly feared. This Rudra lives on, under the names of Mahâdeva and Śiva, as a much honoured god. Although in modern times the worship of Vishṇu has become very prominent, yet there

are centuries of Hindu history which ought rather to be called Śivaitic. Their literature is impregnated with Śivaitic ideas, although no classical book contains the thoughts of this religion, as the Bhagavad-Gîtâ does for the Vaishṇava. Hiuentsang during the years of his stay in India, only knew Śiva worshippers amongst the Brâhmans. But Vishṇuism and Śivaism did not exclude one another formerly, any more than they do at the present day. This is proved by the Mahâbhârata, for, though thoroughly impregnated with a Vishṇuitic spirit, it yet most distinctly advocates Śivaism also.

The teaching of the Śaivas is in many points like that of the Vaishṇavas. Śiva is the highest god, and personally conceived of as an object of piety, and if he does not reveal himself in such Avatâras as Vishṇu, yet he is livingly present to his worshippers in various forms. Therefore one can here speak of Theism with as much, and as little, right as in the worship of Vishṇu. Besides this the well-known Indian philosophical speculations can be seen in a Śivaitic dress also. The pluralism of the Sâṅkhya philosophy is found also amongst the Pâśupatas (in the south, during the tenth or eleventh century), and the idealistic monism of the Vedânta in the Śivaitic schools in Cashmere (from the ninth till the eleventh century).

Let us now consider Śiva as a popular god. His form is terrible, not loveable. He dwells on the Kailâsa in the Himâlayas with his wife Pârvatî, and numerous trains of servants (gaṇas) whom he keeps under his control, and whose power threatens people with various dangers. He has three eyes, serpents round his body, and skulls round his neck,

said to be symbols of the course of time and of the ever disappearing races of men. But his character is many-sided. He represents the dissolving, annihilating power of nature; the fire of his eye devours, his revenge is fearful, and he lives in burial-places. Although as such he is dreaded, yet he is blessed also, as he who always brings forth what is new, as the renewing power of nature. His widest spread symbol is the phallus (Liṅga), of which millions exist in India, as erected stones, and sanctuaries, or also as amulets for private use. However much this symbol, with which the female organ (Yoni) often occurs, may disgust educated Europeans, yet as a whole it does not seem connected with obscene ideas, but rather to symbolise the productive and receptive power of nature. It has often been maintained that the worship of Liṅga, which was at a later time joined to the worship of Śiva, dates from a Dravidian people, but KITTEL has denied this. Śiva has yet other sides. He is the great Yogi or ascetic, sometimes quite naked, covered with ashes, and with plaited hair. The great Yogis, who perform incredible things in the suppression of nature, and remain standing for years motionless on a pillar, &c., worship Śiva as their divine model. This same god is likewise full of learning; he communicated, for instance, his wisdom to the grammarian Pâṇini; he is a Veda-knowing Brâhman, invested with the sacred girdle, so that most Brâhmans up to the present day are devoted to him. Finally Śiva has also a totally different character: he is the joyous companion, who travels hunting across the hills, accompanied by wild tipsy hordes, himself given to wine and dancing with women. Therefore he satisfies

all demands and has followers amongst all grades of society. Strict ascetics as well as dissipated hordes appeal to his example. Amongst his followers there are learned Brâhmans and despised popular masses, such as the Liṅgaites in Southern India, founded in the twelfth century by Basaba, taking their name from their custom of carrying a small phallus as a means of protection.

We have not yet mentioned one of the most important sides of Śivaism, namely, the worship of Śakti or the female element. This worship is certainly not exclusively Śivaitic. Various kinds of female beings (the mothers of gods, &c.), are worshipped: thus Vishṇu has Lakshmî or Śrî, and Brahma has Sarasvatî, as wives by their sides; but the worship of a Mahâdevî is nowhere so widespread as amongst the Śaivas. This Śâktism has also a philosophical background in the idea of the power of nature, which produces everything, the Prakṛiti of the Sâṅkhya philosophy; but its greatest importance is shown in the popular belief and worship, and it expresses the worst side of this religion. The worship of the great goddess who under various names (Pârvatî, Ambikâ, Umâ, Durgâ, and Kâlî) is associated with Śiva, often superseded the worship of the god himself. The Tantra literature more especially yields the highest place to this female divinity. Her worship is on the whole gloomy, and the sacrifice of animals, which is so hated by the Vaishṇavas, is common here. Kâlî is a terrible goddess who drinks blood and devours corpses. But by several secret performances also (those who perform them are called the servants of the left hand), people tried to secure the favour of that great goddess.

Her worship has two sides: sexual excesses and magic arts. With regard to the former, it is not the erotic mysticism of the worship of Krishna, but the worshippers of the goddess do her service in wild orgies, men and women, in all sensuality, in the enjoyment of spirituous liquors, of meat, and promiscuous sensuality. The attainment of superhuman powers, to which the Hindu aspires under so many forms, is the object of the worship of the goddess. All sorts of magic spells and forms, words and figures, even alchemistic experiments, belong to Śâktism. We have already mentioned the magic books (Tantras) as being the sacred books of the Śâktas.

There is one thing more to notice before concluding. The sectarian religions bear their part in reducing or dissolving the strict distinction of caste. We must be careful in discussing this, as the subject is very complicated. It is true that in Hinduism, which is so strongly influenced by sectarian religions, caste has remained the foundation of all society, and that many circles of Vaishnavas consist for the greater part of Brâhmans, and that Śiva is altogether the god of the Brâhmans. But at the same time, the popular aspects of these gods are so strongly developed, these religions derive so much from popular customs of the original inhabitants also, and piety in these sects depends so little on a learned or ritual basis on which the privileges of a special caste are founded, that we can rightly attribute to them a tendency to neglect the castes. At the great Krishna festivals people of all grades meet together, and in the orgies of the goddess there is no distinction of classes. Having now given a general survey of the

character of these sects, and their principal gods, we shall hereafter mention all that is essential concerning their sanctuaries and acts of worship.

CHAPTER 80. — Foreign Influences.

Books of Reference. We shall only enumerate a few of the numerous essays and works relating to this subject: LASSEN pays great attention to it in his principal work, in the chapters in which he gives a detailed account of the history of commerce. Of WEBER'S treatises, we mention the following: Die Verbindungen Indiens mit den Ländern im Westen (Ind. Skizzen), and that on *Krishna*'s Geburtsfest (Abh. Kön. Ak. Berlin 1867). R. SEYDEL treats of the connection between Buddhism and Christianity, in Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zur Buddhasage und Buddhalehre (1882) and Die Buddhalegende und das Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien (1884).

Our discussion has often touched on a question which we have till now left on one side, in order to treat it as a whole. It refers, namely, to the relations which existed between the Hindus and other nations, and to the influence they exercised on one another. With regard to the history of religion, this question resolves itself into a series of controverted points, about which we desire to hear the most important answers. We shall see what great care this subject requires. There are certain firmly established data. It follows from the common origin of the Indo-Germanic, and more particularly of the Indo-Persian race, that these related people must have much in common both in life and faith. Historical relations of India with the Greeks can be proved with positive witnesses from 300 B. C., with the Chinese from about the beginning of our era, and with the Arabs from the first century of Islam. Contact with Farther India and the islands of the Archipelago (Java, Sumatra, Bali, and Madura) can be historically

proved by reports, as well as by inscriptions found there, by monuments and by the influence on language. It is also most curious that we can exactly trace the spreading of Indian fables and fairy stories towards the west [1].

On the other hand, many points of contact, about which much has been and is still said, can at once be put on one side as utterly untenable: for instance, when WILFORD, in a mythical report of a journey of the sage Nârada to the blessed island of Śveta-dvîpa, discovers a journey to England; or when a few years ago Buddhism was said to have been found in Norway (Buddha-Wodan), as well as in Mexico. Between these two extremes, between what is historically proved, and what is absurd, there lies the wide field of what is possible, of what is more or less probable. Here there is a great danger of being deceived by false analogies and attractive parallels; but it is equally wrong to regard all points of contact as merely founded in the fancy of students, as it would be to accept their truth with too hasty confidence. This is the case as regards the intercourse which is said to have taken place between Hindus and Semites, Babylonians and Phœnicians. Palæographic studies have convinced WEBER and others, that the Indian alphabet is of Semitic origin. Whatever astronomy was known to the Hindus they are said to have learnt from the Chaldæans, and they are said to have borrowed the story of the deluge (Śatap. Brâhm. I. 8)

[1] There is valuable information on this subject in BENFEY'S three vols., Orient und Occident; in the introductory essay to RHYS DAVID'S English translation of the Gâtakas; in an essay by A. WAGENER (discussed by Weber, Ind. Studien, III) and in many other publications which treat of Folklore.

from the same source. With regard to the latter, the story of Manu and the fish and of the begetting of his daughter by a sacrifice are so different from the Babylonian flood myth, that one can hardly connect the two. It is another question, whether Solomon's voyages to Ophir had not the west coast of India for their goal. In Ophir, LASSEN has found the land of the Abhîras at the mouths of the Indus; and in the treasures which Solomon fetched from thence, he recognises Hindu products. The Hebrew word for ape is said to point to a Hindu word (Koph, Kapi). But this combination is not even probable; for most people place Ophir on the coast of Arabia or Africa. The connection which is said to have taken place between India and Pythagoras is of much greater importance. It is well known that much has been invented about Pythagoras' eastern journeys, and therefore the doctrine of the migration of souls, the fear of killing an animal, and the prohibition of the eating of beans in Pythagorean circles, seemed clearly to point to a Hindu origin. On the one hand, however, historical proofs of this connection are much too weak, and on the other hand the system of Pythagoras by no means requires such an explanation from extraneous spheres of thought. The last attempt also, made to connect Pythagoras with the Hindus (by L. VON SCHRÖDER) is by no means convincing.

The most interesting questions relate to Christian influence on India, or to Hindu influence on Christianity. Here the points of comparison are numerous; but it has still to be proved that they rest on an historical foundation. Such a contact is a priori probable, at least during later centuries, in which

intercourse between India and the west, both by central Asia and by the sea, was never interrupted. In Alexandria, in Syria, Persia, and in India itself, the sons of western culture and religion came in contact with Hindus. Is it not probable that they exchanged ideas? but what light would these relations throw on the history of religion? These questions are answered in very different ways. Some people think they have found Buddhist monks in the Therapeutæ of Egypt of whom Philo tells us, and who were connected with the Essenes of Palestine. These monks are supposed to have formed the channel by which various Buddhist elements came into Judaism and Christianity. But since LUCIUS' decisive criticism of the said treatise by Philo, we know that the Therapeutæ never existed, but were a fiction of much later times. But this does not deny that IS. TAYLOR'S thesis (in his Ancient Christianity), namely, that Christian monastic life is of Hindu origin, may contain a certain amount of truth, at least with this limitation, that possibly the life of Hindu hermits may have helped towards the development of monastic ideas in Christianity. But real proofs are wanting to enable us to speak with more certainty on this subject.

SEYDEL does not agree with this, for he claims to have proved that ancient Christian literature, more especially evangelical history, is dependent on Buddhist sources. To him, without doubt, belongs the credit of having defended an opinion with scientific seriousness, which up till then had only been defended with whimsical fantastic assertions. A series of parallels, taken from the biographies of Jesus and Buddha, are made to support the theory, that the former made very extensive use of the latter.

Although SEYDEL'S work has been approved of by some people, yet his whole work is based on opinions of Buddhist sources, and on a criticism of the gospels which remain very uncertain.

Very different from this are LASSEN'S careful statements concerning the influence exercised by Buddhism on Gnosticism, Neoplatonism and Manichæism. At all events one cannot deny, that at the times when these religious systems arose, the knowledge of what had taken place in India was to a certain extent widely spread. Nor does LASSEN recognise in Buddhist and other Hindu philosophical speculations the only source of these systems. But according to him the Hindu share is of sufficient importance. To it more particularly belongs the leading idea, namely, the contrast between mind and matter. But in this, as in other statements which he brings forward, LASSEN has not conceived Hindu thought rightly, and attributes too much philosophy to Buddhism. He also often considers things as having been borrowed, which might quite as well have arisen independently. What happened in the case of Manichæism warns us to be careful. BAUR, and many after him, made Mani a disciple of Buddhism ; a more exact knowledge of this religious system reduced the share of Buddhism very much, and the newest leading works on Mani (by KESSLER and by HARNACK) agree in declaring the Buddhist element in Manichæism, if it exist at all, as quite subordinate and unimportant.

But the opposite opinion also, namely that Christian influences have definitely affected many Hindu ideas, has been eagerly defended. BEAL, in his Buddhism in China, traced much to the influence of Christian missionaries,

more especially in the worship of the Bodhisatva-Kwanyin. LORINSER claims to have found in the Bhagavad-Gîtâ, not merely New Testament conceptions, but sentences and expressions exactly copied from the New Testament. However, WEBER'S discovery was the most important; for he produced numerous Christian parallels to the history and celebration of *Krishna*'s birth, and recognised the madonna and child in the pictures of *Krishna* on his mother's lap. The strong point in WEBER'S theory, however, consists in his believing that the sectarian piety, especially in Vish*n*uism, proves its foreign origin by its character. He says that Bhakti and *Sraddhâ* are not Hindu, but are taken from Christianity; and that from these arose in Hinduism also the intimate relation between the personally conceived god and his servant. If this be so, then it is of decisive importance, because then the deepest thoughts in Hinduism would be of Christian origin. But many objections have been raised, and not without good reason. BARTH has proved that *Sraddhâ* was required even in the older literature, and more especially that a religion of faith and love, and a prominence of Bhakti must necessarily be the outcome of the more monotheistic tendency of the sects.

CHAPTER 81. — **Religious Development under the Influence of Islam.**

Books of Reference. The sacred book of the Sikhs has been translated into English with introductory essays by E. TRUMPP, The Adi-Granth or the Holy Scriptures of the Sikhs (1877). The best account of the history of this religion is also given by E. TRUMPP, Die Religion der Sikhs (1881). With regard to religious conditions in the kingdom

of the Mogol, we must mention: F. A. VON NOER, Kaiser Akbar, Ein Versuch über die Geschichte Indien's im 16 Jahrhundert (2 vols. 1880–1885); and D. SHEA and A. TROYER, the Dabistan or School of Manners (3 vols. 1843, translated from the Persian).

During the period after the Mohammedan settlement in India, several sects arose, in which Islam and Hinduism are more or less blended. These religions had more points of contact than one would at first suppose. We have already seen that a monotheistic belief was not foreign to the Hindu sects; and the Islam of India, which was influenced by the mysticism of sufism, contained a strong trait of pantheism. Therefore in some sects it is impossible to state exactly what part each of these two sides played. The origins of some are also rather indistinct, as is the case with the Kabirpanthis, which exist at the present time in Bengal. They followed the example of a certain Kabir, who probably lived towards the end of the fifteenth century, and seems to have been one of the most powerful minds amongst the founders of sects. He is said to have been born a Mussulman, but later on to have joined Vishṇuism. But in his belief in the unity of god and in his worship, without difference of caste and without images, the followers of various religions could, according to his teaching, meet one another as brothers. His name and his theories are highly praised by the Sikhs also, a sect founded in the Punjaub by a contemporary of Kabir. This was Nanak, born in 1469. He taught the unity of God, who must be honoured by a pure life, and he considered the differences of caste as unessential, although he did not directly attack their existence. The Sikhs owe their importance not to their teaching, but to the part which

has fallen to them in history. Their theology as expressed in their sacred book (Âdi-Granth), contains the most incompatible ideas. The most preponderating are those of Hindu origin. No paradise or heaven is the object in view, but freedom from transmigration, and a dissolution of individual existence. A man acting under the influence of one of the three Gunas (the qualities of kindness, emotion, and darkness known from the Sâṅkhya and other Hindu systems) is subject to new births. These are abolished by the entire absorption in the godhead (this object is called Nirban = Nirvâna). The result of this teaching, which both in and out of Buddhism led to a monastic life, is denied by the Sikhs, since they will have nothing to do with an ascetic life; but with their minds clearly set on the object, yet still taking part in worldly affairs, they wish to be in the world, though not of the world. Their conception of god is likewise not uniform and complete in itself. The highest being, called Hari, Govind, &c., is described sometimes as the absolute being, in language and with the imagery of pantheism, and sometimes as a conscious personality. The Sikhs have the worship of their teachers and leaders in common with many religious sects, but nowhere else, practically and theoretically, is higher authority conceded to the Guru, or more complete obedience offered, than to Nanak and his descendants. These descendants are not merely incarnations of Nanak, for they are absolutely deified, and their word suffices to bring about a union with Hari. The first Gurus were rather unimportant people, who, it is true, collected pupils around themselves, but did not give to the community of the Sikhs a recognised position. It was the fourth

Guru who gave to the sects a centre in the temple whose golden domes, at the present day, still gleam in the sacred pond at Amritsar. The fifth Guru, Arjun (1581–1616), was a cultivated man, who collected the Âdi-Granth, to which he himself made numerous poetical additions. Under him the Sikhs first became of political importance and came in conflict with Mohammedan power. Tradition lays the blame of Arjun's death on the Mogol. Under his sons the Sikhs took up arms, and since then they have lived in continual warfare with the Mohammedans. During these wars, which lasted over one century, they developed a fanaticism and an exclusiveness which are quite foreign to all other Hindu sects. This warfare reached its climax under the tenth Guru, Govind-Singh, the contemporary of the Emperor Aurangzeb. He added an appendix of war-songs to the sacred writings, to fire the courage of the Sikhs. This work, 'the Granth of the tenth King,' has not however maintained its position as a sacred book. Govind-Singh gave his subjects a firmer political and military organisation. When he died in 1708, he had not appointed a successor, so that with him the succession of the Gurus came to an end. He was the true founder of the nationality of the Sikhs. He united them by a simple ceremony of consecration (Pahul), into a closely joined community (Khalsa), and thus brought about their complete severance from the Mohammedans, as well as from the Hindus. When therefore in the last century the Mogol kingdom broke up, the Sikhs in the Punjaub, as well as the Mahrattas in the Deccan, became heirs to their power. Internal disputes would have destroyed the Sikhs, if an energetic man had not arisen, who knew how

to enforce their unity. This was Ranjit Singh (1780–1839), who founded an empire at Lahore, which has caused much trouble to England, and was only finally conquered after two wars, in 1849. At the present day there are in the Punjaub about two million believers in the Sikh religion.

It must not be concluded from the above, that the empire of the great Mogol was a strong bulwark of Mohammedan orthodoxy. This would be a priori improbable. The imperial house was of Mongolian origin, and the Mongolian conquerors of the middle ages were generally distinguished by religious large-heartedness. Various creeds received reception and attention from them. 'God in heaven and the Khan on earth' was their motto. Although the great Mogols of Delhi had become Mussulmans, yet great zeal for this religion cannot be ascribed to them, and their subjects for the most part belonged to Hinduism. On this soil the religious activity of the famous Akbar developed. This emperor occupied himself greatly with various religions. He was brought up in Islam, but surrounded himself with Hindu sages and poets, and chose most of his ministers from among his Hindu subjects. The community of the Parsis also attracted him greatly, and with great trouble he procured a priest to instruct him in the doctrine of Mazdeism. Finally he paid great attention to Christianity, and Portuguese missionaries attained a high position at his court. Akbar has been honoured as a forerunner of the studies of the comparative science of religion, but he hardly possessed a scientific interest, in the modern sense of the word. A busy life and a profound religious disposition caused him to seek in various

religions what answered his requirements; but the Emperor was wise and prudent enough to recognise that a state whose subjects differed as much in belief as in race must depend on religious toleration. The principal religions attracted him in various ways: the monotheism of Islam, the deep thoughtful symbols of Hinduism, the fire and sun worship of the Parsis, and the moral greatness of the figure of Jesus (although Christian dogmas did not appeal to him). He thought that one should and must pray to God in all sorts of ways, and took part in the religious customs of various religions. Nevertheless he strove to comprehend the essence of truth, which he recognised everywhere, in a new religion. Supported by his minister Abu'l Fazl, he organised the divine religion (Din-Ilâhi) in which the unity of God, the development of the divine life in the world, and transmigration form the chief dogmas. Special cult was paid to the sun, at which the king officiated. As head of the religion he occupied a peculiar position, and the faith of the Ilahiah found expression in this confession: 'There is no God but Allah, and Akbar is Allah's Kalif.' The new religion barely survived its founder, but in it we find the characteristics of many newer Hindu forms of belief: such as a unitarian conception of God, which did not however renounce pantheism, the authority of the founder or teacher, and moral earnestness. The reign of Akbar was especially distinguished by this last feature. To avoid evil was to him the centre of all religions, and all honour is due to him, because he energetically opposed child marriages, and the burning of widows, the two great evils of Indian civilisation. We possess an interesting witness of the eclectic and

syncretistic spirit of this age in the work of a man who had travelled much. This was Mohsan Fani, who lived during the seventeenth century, and gave us a detailed account of the various religions which he became acquainted with, in his Dabistan. He distinguishes twelve, and he mentions as the five principal religions those of Parsism, Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. It is of great value to possess the impressions of an educated contemporary concerning the condition of these religions during the seventeenth century in India.

We have treated the most important, but by no means all the religious reforms of the Hinduistic period. The number of teachers who founded a school, sect or religion (these names are not strictly defined) was great, but their organisations often lasted only for one generation, to be then resolved into other forms.

Chapter 82. — The Form of Worship.

The forms of worship in India are as numerous as the dogmas and myths. From a religious, as well as from a social standpoint, all forms and grades of life are here found side by side. In this country, which can show such an ancient civilisation, and where powerful kingdoms have flourished, there has never been a feeling of united nationality. The communal constitution which really belongs to prehistoric times, when smaller groups were held together by blood-relationship or a common worship, exists there to the present day. This explains the absence of a national religion and the great division into sects. In the religious life also we are met by the same variety. Side by

side there exist masses, not even raised above the coarsest fetishism, and educated people who are pure theists, and submit to various acts of worship, knowing that the one god can be worshipped in many ways, and under many forms. In thoughts and customs the Hindu unites the most ancient and modern elements: such as ancient Brâhmanic rites originating in the Vedas, and customs taken over from Buddhism, or peculiar to the sectarian religions, or originating with the aborigines, or formed under the influence of Islam. All this mixed up together forms the Hindu religion; in it everything is compatible and everything flows together. Even where religious communities have remained apart, they are tolerant of each other and often have their religious places in common. Benares, the sacred town of the Hindus, the real centre of Sivaism, is famous for its numerous and wealthy mosques. In Ceylon, on the summit of Adam's Peak, the Buddhists worship the impression of Buddha's foot, the Sivaits, that of their god, and the Mussulmans, a relic of Adam. And again in the north, Mussulmans, Sikhs, and Hindus have Sakhi Sarwar, the sacred place of pilgrimage, in common.

No one can blame us for not mentioning the numerous gods, spirits and objects of worship in detail; for many are known to us by what we have already said. The ancient Vedic gods, such as Agni, Indra, and Varuna, are still adored, especially in domestic worship. The Srâddha ceremonies for ancestors still occupy an important place. But the great gods of the sects are really dearest to the hearts of the pious. These are Vishnu (as Râma, and Krishna), Siva with his son Ganesa (or Ganapati). The sun is

also zealously worshipped. Many spirits, vampires and demons also, play a great part under various names (Bhûta, Vetala, Yaksha, Preta). Amongst rivers the sacred stream of the Ganges enjoys especial honours. But animals, such as cows, and above all snakes (the worship of the Nâgas was widespread amongst the Buddhists also), trees, and inanimate objects are actual fetishes. A sacred tree also, or an unhewn stone, is often looked on by the inhabitants as the guardian spirit of the village.

This worship, more especially that of the chief gods, is located in many temples, some of which are most magnificent. The Saivas alone are said to possess 1008 temples, according to the number of their god's names. The most sacred are at Benares, but those in southern India (Tanjore, Madura, &c.) are more splendid. The service of the temple consists in keeping the rooms clean, and in the clothing, washing, and decorating of the idols. The gifts brought to these idols mostly consist of flowers, oil, incense and food, of which the priests and the servants of the god receive their share. Bloody sacrifices are offered to Siva and his wife only. In some temples there are dancers and singers, who practise sacred prostitution; but this licentiousness occurs more particularly in the worship of Vishnu and of Durgâ. Idolatry prevails in these temples also. Idols were unknown in the ancient Brâhmanic worship, at least they are seldom mentioned, but in Hinduism one finds them on all sides. These idols vary a great deal, from a rough stone to the gold statue set with precious stones. Besides this there are all kinds of monstrous forms, many-headed and many-armed, &c., as, for instance,

the sculptures in the Elephanta grove, which unite Śiva and Pârvatî in one body, and represent their numerous followers as dwarfs. BARTH remarks most aptly, that in Hindu idols one sees all shapes 'outside the limits of what is possible and beautiful.' These idols are mixed up with many symbols, but mere symbols also often occur, more especially the Liṅga. There is, for instance, a court in the temple at Tanjore where no less than 108 stone Liṅgas are set up.

In the religious practices there still exists, up to the present day, much dating from the ancient ritual or from ancient customs. We have already spoken of gifts made to ancestors; and to the same class belongs all that refers to domestic worship and family religion. The ancient ascetic trait still permeates the Hindu religion. No European can equal the Hindu or the Mohammedans of India in fasting. One difference only from the ancient Yogis is prominent, namely, that in modern India fasting mostly takes place at stated periods, and is therefore embodied in the religious calendar. This religious calendar, with its many great festivals, belongs to the characteristic signs of Hindu worship [1]. We shall here mention the Hindu festivals only, and not the Mohammedan, however numerous [2]. The great Hindu festivals and pilgrimages at which care is taken that there should be many attractions at the sacred towns, such as music, processions, festival-plays, &c., are the culminating points of the social, as well as of the religious life of the

[1] Part of this is treated by H. H. WILSON, 'The Religious Festivals of the Hindus' (Works, II).

[2] Cp. GARCIN DE TASSY, Mémoire sur les particularités de la religion musulmane dans l'Inde (1869).

Hindu. In this we discover a difference between public and private cult, unknown to the ancient Brâhmanic Indian. The popular religions take care to provide great public meetings for worship, of which Buddhism, with its processions and festivals, had already set the example. These gatherings form the meeting-place for the followers of various religious circles, within the boundaries of Hinduism.

At the great festivals, such as at *K*r*i*sh*n*a's carnival in March, at the festival of the sun in January, at *K*r*i*sh*n*a's birthday in August, at the ten September days of the Durgâpûg*â* in Bengal, and at the goddess' feast of lanterns in October, &c., *Ś*aivas and Vaish*n*avas take part in common. Only the most strict condemn in both religions, from a moral point of view, the licentious behaviour to which the masses readily devote themselves during these days. Puri in Orissa is one of the most important places of pilgrimage, whither many hundreds of thousands go yearly for the festival of *G*agannâtha (Vish*n*u). The statement, that it is customary for many human beings to be willingly crushed under the god's chariot, has been proved by HUNTER to be without foundation. Such a practice would be utterly repellent to the mild service of Vish*n*u, who abhors all bloodshed. But it is perfectly true, that every year amongst the thousands of pilgrims, many fall a victim to the misery and pestilence of the hot seasons.

CHAPTER 83. — **The Present Day.**

Books of Reference. Most of the numerous descriptions of travels and sketches, &c., are worthless; but the following ought to be mentioned: A. C. LYALL, Asiatic Studies; MONIER WILLIAMS, Modern India and the Indians (3rd ed. Tr. Or. S.); R. N. CUST, Pictures of

Indian Life; W. J. WILKINS, Modern Hinduism, being an account of the religion and life of the Hindus in Northern India (1887). A connected statement and survey are given in HUNTER'S book, The Indian Empire, which has been already mentioned, and in GOBLET D'ALVIELLA'S L'évolution religieuse contemporaine chez les Anglais, les Américains et les Hindous (1884).

In our century also, India has had its great teachers or founders of religion, and Hinduism has proved its vitality, not merely in the noisy worship of the people, but also in the serious work of thought and sentiment among men of genius. We begin with Rammohun Roy (1774–1833), the founder of the Brahma Samâj. He was keenly opposed to idolatry and clung to the unity of the godhead, which he declared to have been manifested much earlier in the Veda than as taught in the Bible or Koran. He had already begun to bring about friendly relations with European culture, when he died whilst on a visit to England. His successor Debendranath-Tagore took the important step of breaking with the authority of the Vedas. His Brahma-Dharma preached much more definitely than did his predecessor, the unity and spirituality of God, the creator of the whole world, whom alone one must serve. He was followed by Keshub-Chunder-Sen (1838–1884), a man of fiery spirit, persuasive eloquence, and with far-reaching ideas, but, owing to these high gifts, he was dragged into playing a part for which his moral power was not sufficient. He began by trying to introduce religious reform into social life, and he utterly ignored all difference of caste. On this question he separated in 1866, because Debendranath-Tagore fought shy of these radical results. Debendranath-Tagore remained the head of the community, which henceforth received the name of Âdi-

Samâj (old Samâj); whilst the reformers under Keshub constituted themselves as the Brahma-Samâj of India. In this circle Keshub-Chunder-Sen was continually introducing his social ideas. He was opposed to child marriages and the heathen rites of the Hindu religion, but yet he submitted to both, when it was essential to obtain a prospect of a wider spreading of his religion, by means of the marriage of his daughter with a Mahârâ*ga*. Still he tried to formulate some ideas which were partly very sublime. His awakened mind received the deepest impressions from Hindu, as well as from Christian philosophy and religion, and he tried to unite both in a loftier unity. He turned his eyes towards Europe far more than any of his countrymen. During a journey thither this learned man was fêted to an exaggerated degree in the highest circles of culture, and ever since then he was in active correspondence with MAX MÜLLER [1]. The idea gradually ripened within him, that he could give a practical religious turn to the principle of the general science of religion, as understood in Europe, and could found a religion which should embrace the elements of truth found in all religions. He gave to Christ the first place among the prophets, and when in a brilliant speech he had presented Christ as the great teacher of truth for India also, many people thought that he wished to go over to Christianity. But this was not what he meant: he only wished to overcome the opposition between Europe and Asia, Christian and Hindu, in his new cosmopolitan, unitarian, and mystic religion. In this religion, his own person was always taking an ever increasingly prominent position, as

[1] See MAX MÜLLER'S Biographical Essays (1884).

that of the inspired leader. MAX MÜLLER warned him against his theory of Âdesha, that is, the inner providential guidance, the voice of conscience as an authority in religious matters. At last a new religion was formally established; in 1880 Keshub proclaimed the new dispensation (Nava Bidhan), in which the harmony of all religions was said to be attained. But the thoughts of a spiritual religion were often expressed in symbols which he borrowed from Hinduism. The importance of the whole development of the Brahma-Samâj lies much more in the value of the persons and principles, than in the spread of the religion, which counts its followers only amongst the educated classes in the towns, and exercises no lasting influence on the people. It caused a reaction in the Ârya Samâj under the learned and much respected Dayânanda-Sarasvati (1827–1883), who defended the authority of the Vedas, and even declared that all true knowledge (even that of our own times), was possessed by the Vedic singers.

We must here mention a religious society not emanating from the Indian religion, but outwardly conforming with it, namely, the Theosophical Society. It was founded in America; but its leaders keep their eyes turned more especially towards India. These leaders (amongst whom are Colonel Olcott and Countess Blavatsky) claim to possess the secret which lies at the foundation of all religions, but is preserved most pure in the esoteric Buddhism of certain Lamas in Tibet. Several of these people write a great deal about the comparative history of religion, the secrets of which they reveal[1]. We thus see how in India

[1] See J. BAISSAC, La nouvelle Théosophie, R. H. R. (1884).

also, unitarian and mystic tendencies often combined together, are at work. We shall not here discuss what may be expected from such movements; an historical statement does not have to prophesy the future. We shall end our religious survey with a glance at the religious statistics of India, as given by HUNTER. They date, it is true, from the year 1871, but no important alterations have taken place since then. From the statistics, we see that the majority of the inhabitants cling to Hinduism, in round numbers 140 millions of the 190 forming the total number. To these must be added about two million Sikhs, and about three million Gainas and Buddhists (the latter in Burmah), more than forty million Mohammedans, and barely one and a half million Christians (Hindus and Europeans together). As regards this last number, we must remember that Christianity was introduced at an early date into India. Even if we do not accept the Hindu apostolate of St. Thomas as historical[1], it is nevertheless a fact, that in the fifth century Nestorianism spread along the Malabar coast. Since the year 1500 Catholic missionaries from Portugal have been active, and even at the present time the Catholics in Hindustan are more numerous than the Protestants. Protestantism, though it has been preached, ever since the last century by missionaries, some of them most excellent men, has not yet produced any lasting impression on the Hindus, least of all amongst the educated classes, but it has made real progress amongst the Dravidian population.

[1] See R. A. LIPSIUS, Die apokryphe Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden, I.