

The Independent

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOL. L

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1898

No. 2576

My Viking.

BY THEODORE ROBERTS.

My Viking, Singard Wolfing,
Where do you sail afar?
What southern planet sees you fling
Your vulture-flag of war?

'Twas August, O my Singard
You cleared the "Witch," and now
The sea-gulls scream above the thatch,
The farmer guides the plow.

'Twas August, O my sailor,
When you bade me good-by;
And now the willows bloom, and glad
The plovers mate and fly.

The Yule-tide passed like sea-spume,
So white the night and day.
The Christ Child brought no comfort,
With my Singard away.

And now the Easter season
Draws on across the hills;
The adder-tongues within the wood
Outglow the daffodils.

The bays are blue as sapphire—
The hills are smoky gray—
The headlands gaze along the sea
Through all the hazy day,

And wonder, giant-fashion,
What battles hold you now?
What lands can charm your northing heart
And stay your dragon-prow?

From your North hills and valleys
And maples budding red;
The sea-gulls beat my casement so,
And cry that you are dead.

My Viking, Singard Wolfing,
Where do you sail afar?
Above the sea a new star shows
Red, like a battle-scar;

And I have wondered, weeping,
If that red star could be
Your Viking-soul, set high above
The madness of the sea.

'Twas August, O my Singard
When you bade me good-by,
And now the willows are all green—
The river meadows dry.

And still while daylight lingers,
I gaze across the foam
And, dreaming, see your dragon-ship
Come gladly crashing home.

I start—the vast is sailless,
But in the South afar,
Above the sea rim, glows and burns
One comradeless red star.

NEW YORK CITY.

Some April Bird Notes.

BY WILLIAM HIGGS.

DURING the season of the arriving birds every movement is of interest, and a single tramp may be productive of a harvest of new observations, or of opportunities for verifying past impressions of whose accuracy there may still be a doubt. He who watches the birds will rarely pass a day in spring without adding to his stock of knowledge, even tho the territory under his survey may have been familiar hunting-ground for a decade. It is not perhaps that the phenomena themselves vary, so much as that a new apprehension of them presents itself to us, or they strike us from a different side. Tramping, the other day, through a stretch of country which I have traversed every spring for several years, I noticed

for the first time a flock of grassfinches or vesper-sparrows setting up a concerted song from the tops of a row of ash-trees. While I had frequently heard several of these birds singing together at sundown from the scattered boulders of a pasture, in what appeared to be plainly an antiphonal way, I had never before come upon anything at all approaching this unanimous burst or chorus, the contributors to which sang as if the general effect were the only thing in view, and not—as is their custom—as if each singer were intent on his own part solely, and contributed so much as he did contribute to the aggregate result as it were by the accident of simultaneousness. By habit the vesper-finch is little gregarious except at the time of his arrival and departure, and the presence of so many in one group was itself a matter of interest, seeing the singers comprised between a dozen and twenty birds. What struck me, however, as most unusual was the obvious determination of each performer to enhance the effect of the general volume of melody rather than to emphasize his personal contribution to it—two or three birds which were perched near together among the topmost branches being apparently the leaders of the chorus, and the rest taking their cue from them and turning in their direction. When we consider that nearly all our birds' songs consist either of soliloquy or are addressed as solos to the mate, and that the vesper-finch after the arrival of the females is in habit a rather solitary bird, the occurrence is certainly of interest, and points to the breaking down of what may be taken to be well-established traits in the presence of unusual conditions. Among all our familiar birds the robin alone seems naturally endowed with the ability of getting up what may properly be termed a concerted performance, tho the trait is familiar enough among the songsters of Europe; and there was something reminiscent of the linnets and chaffinches and yellowhammers of English fields and lanes in this action of their more sober-suited cousins.

For the first time in my remembrance I received, a day or two after my adventure with the finches, a new impression in connection with the high-hole or golden-winged woodpecker. The phenomenon, however, is a matter of psychology rather than of ornithological science—an experience of the subjective consciousness. This bird, arriving generally some days later than the robin and the song-sparrow, I had never until this season made the entry of my initial sight of him without turning back the pages of my note-book under the, generally very vivid, impression that I had put him down before. This impression is probably due to the presence with us of the spotted woodpeckers through the winter, and their increased activity and obtrusiveness in later February and March; so that, being accustomed to the general habits and the peculiar ascending and descending flight of the species, the mind finds something familiar in the appearance of the newcomer, and is a little bewildered by the necessity of revising its impressions and recognizing him as a new arrival. At any rate, and be the psychological explanation what it may, I had never come upon my first high-hole without the feeling that I had seen the bird before. This year, however, that impression was absent, and I recognized the well-known flash of gold and the white of the tail coverts with a feeling of distinct surprise. The bird was crossing the road in front of me from a higher to a lower level, and the loops of its flight brought it alternately above and below the line of sight, so that its upper and under plumage was visible by turns. I was near enough at first to catch a glimpse of the exquisitely mottled breast, as well as of the crimson of the nape.

The red-tailed hawks, of which several are in evidence on the flats in my vicinity, confine their flight

as yet to the lower air-spaces, and use their wings but sparingly. It is probable that they are tired by their long journey; and, besides, the problem of food is less easy of solution than it will be by and by. August is, pre-eminently the month for observing their evolutions—at which time the birds resort to higher and more open ground, and sometimes sail for hours in sight of the same observing point. I have gone a journey of several miles and returned to find apparently the same family group soaring above the shoulders of the hill, as they were doing when I passed outward—an interval of nearly three hours elapsing between the time of my two observations of them. Had the birds been traversing the upper air-spaces in the same vicinity all this time, or had they descended in the meanwhile to perch, and, perhaps, to feed, near the spot where they had had their nest?

Driving yesterday along the eastward hill I watched a magnificent redtail come slowly over the crest and alight upon one of the upper branches of a maple by the roadside. In settling the bird used its wings as a sort of parachute for several seconds, balancing itself with exquisiteadroitness, and daintily picking out the twig upon which to perch. Then it slowly folded its pinions and sat motionless but observant until the approach of a chorkling crow caused it to lift its head a little. The black-coated newcomer, however, passed on with half-scolding, half-defiant caws; but not so a second one, which made directly for the maple. Seeing this fellow within a few feet of him, and obviously intent on mischief, the hawk thought best to decline a combat and retreated to an elm in the pasture some two hundred yards away. Whereupon the crow descended on the very twig the hawk had left, and with ruffled feathers and a distended throat indulged in a series of congratulatory chorkles. It was a bit of comedy of a most instructive order in the field of outdoor politics—the triumph of noisy clamor over consummate but refined ability, the victory of a sprawling, raucous hodman over a master of the arts of fence.

On one of the smaller maples by the watering-trough a purple finch was singing, the dark red of its throat showing almost black against the blue-gray of the sky. The song of this bird is a flowing, liquid warble, and adapts itself perfectly to the increasing warmth and the genial, mellowing sunshine. I know no song that seems to partake more fully of the essence of the spring. Tho he is among the earliest of our arrivals, and I hear him warble an attenuated strain on some of the sunny days of March, it is only when the buds are starting that he launches forth in serene abandonment, and notifies the observing among his hearers that maple-sugar-making days are done.

McDONOUGH, N. Y.

The Red Cross in Cuba.

BY STEPHEN E. BARTON,

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS.

IT will doubtless be of interest to you to know the origin and progress of the Red Cross connection with the present relief movement in Cuba. The shocking and pitiable condition of the Cuban *reconcentrados* so appealed to the sympathetic impulses of President McKinley that he desired to initiate some plan by which the generous and humanitarian hearts of the American people could give substantial and material expression in the form of medical aid, food and clothing. He called upon Miss Clara Barton, as the head of the Red Cross, to counsel with him.

The several interviews between Miss Barton and the President and Secretary of State during December last took form, as may best be shown by the following letter, written by Second Assistant Secretary of State, Alvey A. Adee, on the first day of January.

of the loyalty of this community sentiment than to any other one cause. Her more recent success in debating, again, is due to a like appeal, largely through the college press (an important factor in her community life), to the same community sentiment. What the religious and moral young men of Yale have done to make its moral and religious sentiment "strong, wholesome and pure"—to quote the words of a New Haven citizen, prominent in all civic reform movements, but not himself a Yale graduate—has been accomplished by a like appeal.

In short, the moral and religious young men of Yale are united and aggressive in the same way that they would be if their object were to promote athletics or debating. Their leaders take a place of leadership in the community life, and make the influence of the moral and religious body felt as a body from this vantage-ground. Here is a unique distinction of moral and religious work at Yale, that its representative men are often the representative men of the community life, those who achieve its highest social honors in securing the most coveted senior society elections and other undergraduate distinctions. To look over the annual record of the Yale Y. M. C. A. is, to one familiar with Yale, to note among its officers and its various committee members, name after name of students who are recognized social leaders. They give tone to the community life as a whole, create the standard, "set the stroke." It is becoming harder and harder each year for a popular student, known to be "fast," to secure society recognition in senior year. Under the Yale society system (in the college proper, not in the Sheffield school, to which some of the things said do not unqualifiedly apply, owing to a less developed community life as the school has no dormitories), by which each year has its own societies and the most prized and the most select come in senior year, a constant sifting process is going on. This aids greatly in extending the influence of a moral leadership, in making it, once recognized, a dominant leadership. Perhaps it is no wonder, then, that the growth of the Yale Y. M. C. A. has been phenomenal in three years, from 500 to over 1,300—the figures given in the last Annual Record issued at the close of the last college year—out of a total of undergraduate students in the college and Sheffield school of about 1,800. Says a summary in the Record covering this period:

"The annual receipts have increased from \$2,000 to \$5,000; a new department of systematic beneficence has been founded; the City Mission Committee has secured the use of a building, with rooms for meeting and for lodgers; an employment bureau for needy students has been carried; \$3,000 has been added to the endowment fund of the graduate committee; agencies for reaching members of the incoming class, helping them to secure rooms and board, and interesting them in the student Christian work, have been developed; a department of Bible study has been built up, including the systematic training of leaders for Bible-classes."

The agencies for reaching the incoming class are, perhaps, as potent as any in keeping clean the life at Yale. A recent graduate, one who was a leader in his class socially as well as in religious work, writes, in a personal letter:

"If men can be kept straight for their first month at Yale, the chances are that they will stay so throughout their course. The Y. M. C. A. appreciates this fact, and through many agencies does all in its power to get men to take the right stand at first. A most important move in this direction, started, I should say, about five years ago, is the sending prominent undergraduates back to their old schools, where they themselves fitted for college, to give coming Yale men a good square talk, right out from the shoulder, on the importance of clean morals in college. This is a real gain."

The testimony of this most competent and trustworthy witness is: Of those who fall into immorality during the early part of Freshman year, "the number who persist in it right through the course is extremely small."

This fact, that the most of those who fall into immoral living return again to clean living, is significant of the wholesome tonic quality of the Yale atmosphere. Of how many other communities of young men, similarly conditioned, can the same thing be truthfully said? The very presence of temptations, such as must exist in a city of toward 100,000 people, has developed in the Yale community life an aggressive virile type of Christian morality. This type is not satisfied with its own virtue, but seeks to create social standards to which others must conform, and to put forth active effort to save those who are in peril of yielding to

temptation. The "Americanism" of what is called the "Yale spirit," the democracy of common ideas which is there preserved because as yet, despite the increase of students, the college is not lost in the university, the consequent closeness of touch which makes the community responsive to strength of influence, have all contributed visibly to raise the tone of Yale life; so visibly as to commend it to observers of the standing of Dwight L. Moody and Bishop Vincent as the life to which they choose to trust their own sons. They recognize in its independence certain qualities which it would lack if it were smaller, not situated in a city the size of New Haven, and governed on a more restrictive and paternal system. For while a large university like Yale has its obvious disadvantage on the moral side as compared with the smaller college, because the latter can be more closely watched and restricted—not infrequently to the encouragement of secret vice—it has also its great compensating advantage in the strength and independence of character developed, if the heart of its community life be sound.

That no one who knows Yale can doubt for a moment. There its friends are content to rest its case. They do not claim that all questions of policy, method and discipline have been met with equal wisdom. They do claim that its determining principle has been justified by the results. By laying a large share of the responsibility on the students themselves the tone of Yale life has been remarkably raised; excessive drinking has been very greatly diminished; drinking in secret has been practically banished; a public stigma has been put upon open immorality; the active interest of a constantly growing number has been aroused in the things for which a Y. M. C. A. stands. Thus a public sentiment has been created which commands respect for any sincere man, however "Puritanic" his views, and which requires morality as a condition of recognition for social leadership—this despite a great increase in students drawn from every part of this great country, constituting a community whose cosmopolitanism is unequaled by any other of our universities.

As her friends know her, Yale, true to her traditions, is still educating men, more men representative of the best type of educated manhood than ever before in her past.

WATERBURY, CONN.

The Institution of the Lord's Supper.

BY PROF. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.

IN recent years historical and literary criticism has been applied to the institution of the Lord's Supper, not out of any hostility to it or to any particular doctrine relating to it, but simply for the reason that it is the most important institution in the Christian Church.

The institution of the Lord's Supper is reported in the three Synoptic Gospels, but not in the Gospel of John. It is agreed that Matthew and Luke use as their primary sources the Gospel of Mark and the Logia of Matthew. There can be no doubt that Matthew and Luke have derived their reports of the institution of the Lord's Supper from the Gospel of Mark. The report of Mark is, therefore, the original source of the narrative. It is as follows:

"And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye; this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them; and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mark 14: 22-25).

Matthew makes no important addition to the narrative except in the words "unto remission of sins" (26: 28), which are doubtless a correct explanation of the words of Jesus on the part of the evangelist; but it is improbable that Jesus himself used them. They are not given even by Luke. Luke, according to the common text, adds to "This is my body" the words "which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me" (22: 19); and to "covenant in my blood" the words "that which is poured out for you" (22: 20). But as the margin of the Revised Version says: "Some ancient authorities omit 'which is given for you . . . which is poured out for you'; that is, these words and all the intervening matter.

In the edition of the Greek Testament of Westcott and Hort, used as the standard text by most English-speaking scholars, this is placed in brackets and it is said:

"These difficulties, added to the suspicious coincidence with 1 Cor. 11: 24 f., and the transcriptional evidence given above, leave no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of Luke."

This opinion is now held by Wendt and a large proportion of modern critics. It is purely a question of textual criticism. No one can accuse Bishop Westcott of dogmatic bias against the catholic view of the Lord's Supper. I do not hesitate to take my stand with these critics and my colleague Dr. McGiffert on this question.

It is evident that the Synoptic Gospels report the institution of the Lord's Supper as the sacrificial meal of the new covenant, but know nothing of the institution of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament to be observed continuously in the future. This does not in the slightest degree impair the divine authority for the permanent celebration of the Lord's Supper; for that rests upon the testimony of Paul in the Epistle to the Corinthians and upon the earliest Christian traditional practice; it simply puts the whole matter in the historical light of the testimony of the earliest authorities and, as I shall now endeavor to show, gives us rich fruit.

1. The essential idea of the Lord's Supper now comes into clear light. The one great thing in the mind of Jesus which he sought to impress upon his disciples was that he was now establishing a new covenant by a sacrifice of the new covenant. The essential words are: "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many" (Mark 14: 24). This covenant sacrifice is in antithesis to the covenant sacrifice at Horeb, described in Exodus 24: 1-12: The whole nation was taken into a covenant relation with God; the blood of the victims was scattered about on the people; and their representatives, the seventy elders, ate and drank the sacrificial meal in the theophanic presence of God. This sacrifice was once for all; it could never be repeated either in the presentation of victims or in the partaking of the sacrificial meal. Precisely in the same way this new sacrifice of the covenant was a sacrifice made once for all, and its sacrificial meal was partaken of by the Apostles, the representatives of the Church for all time; and it could never be repeated. The blood was given under the form of wine in a cup, the flesh under the form of a loaf of bread. It was essential that this fundamental meaning of the Lord's Supper should be impressed upon the Apostles and the Church. Too great dependence upon Paul's statement rather than that of the Gospels has led many Christians to bury the essential meaning of the Lord's Supper under the secondary significance which is involved in the perpetual celebration.

2. Furthermore, this sacrificial meal of the new covenant was the fulfilment of many predictions of the Old Testament prophets. Jesus was, doubtless, thinking of the new covenant predicted by Jeremiah (31: 31-37); Ezekiel (34: 25-31; 37: 26-28), and especially of the Second Isaiah, where the new covenant is directly connected with the Servant of Yahweh. (Is. 42: 6; 54: 10-17; 55: 3; 59: 21; 61: 8, 9. See Briggs's "Messianic Prophecy," pp. 496, 497, and "Messiah of the Gospels," pp. 120-121.)

3. The second most important word of Jesus on this occasion, "I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God" (Mark 14: 25), looks forward to a speedy advent of the Lord. In view of the fact that they had been partaking of a passover cup, it is natural to suppose that he was thinking of another passover cup. It is improbable, in view of this prediction of an advent again very soon, probably ere another passover, that Jesus would have instituted a permanent sacrificial meal in the Lord's Supper.

It seems therefore to be evident, on the basis of the Synoptic Gospels, that Jesus instituted on the night of his betrayal a sacrificial meal of the new covenant by which his people for all time were by their representatives, the Apostles, established in the dispensation of the new covenant of Jesus Christ our Savior; and that no subsequent celebration of the Lord's Supper was then thought of.

How then shall we explain the statement of the Apostle Paul as to the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor., 11: 23-29? It is evident that the Apostle in this passage comes to speak of the Lord's Supper because of abuses that took place in connection with its frequent celebration in the assembling together of the Corinthian Christians, and that therefore the pervading and controlling conception is that of frequent

celebration. This gives a very different historical situation from that of the institution of the Lord's Supper according to the Gospels. But Paul also reports the institution of the Lord's Supper by the Lord himself, and in that institution gives material, which is not only additional to that given in the Gospels, but which is not easy to reconcile with the Gospels. This material is: "This do in remembrance of me" (11:24). "This do, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me" (11:25). To this Paul adds, probably his own words: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (11:26).

These two sentences, attributed to Jesus by Paul, certainly imply a perpetual celebration. And they are interpreted by Paul as reaching on from the Lord's death till his second advent. This passage is introduced by the statement: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread" (11:23). It is necessary now to ascertain the meaning of the Apostle here. His account of the institution he states that he derived from the Lord. There are several ways in which Paul receives "of the Lord."

a. The Lord granted him Christophanies on several occasions. In these he gave him instruction as to the future; never as regards the past. It is not probable that Paul would have neglected to give a clearer account of such a rare and glorious event as a Christophany if that had been granted him for this purpose.

b. Paul identifies the guidance of the Holy Spirit with the teaching of the Lord. Whatever the Holy Spirit inspired him to think or do he would regard as from the Lord; and so an institution by the Apostles under the direction of the Holy Spirit was then, and always has been considered in the Church as an institution of the Lord. No other position is tenable by the Church of Christ. It is a modern error that the direct teaching or institution of Jesus is more authoritative than his indirect teaching and institution through the Apostles under the guidance of the Spirit.

c. It is evident that Paul did not derive his account from a written source, an early Gospel; because it is so different from the Gospels.

d. It is altogether likely, therefore, that he had received the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper from the Lord mediately through the Apostles; in other words, through oral tradition. If this be so, then it is easy to see how there may have been combined in this tradition, in its oral transmission, or even in the mind of Paul himself, the words of Jesus on two different occasions. An example of such a combination is found in one of Paul's addresses (Acts 26: 15-18), where he combines as if in one Christophany the words of Jesus in two different Christophanies (see Acts 9: 13-18; 22: 12-21). If Paul could combine the words of Jesus to himself on two occasions, as if delivered on one occasion, he might easily combine the words of Jesus to the Apostles on two occasions, namely, on the night of his betrayal and subsequent to his resurrection, as if delivered on the night of his betrayal. A large number of examples of such combinations could be given, if we had space, from the entire range of biblical history. This then seems to me a very natural explanation of the discrepancy between the two reports of the institution of the Lord's Supper—namely, that it was first instituted as a sacrificial meal of the covenant sacrifice on the night of his betrayal, and then after his resurrection our Lord, at one of the many conferences with the Apostles, such as those reported in the Gospels, instituted the perpetual observance of the Lord's Supper and attached it to the passover and the sacrificial meals of the ordinary peace-offerings. This view I advanced in my "Messiah of the Gospels" (p. 125), and I see no reason to change my opinion. It is quite true that this is a speculation; but so are all efforts to reconcile Paul with the Synoptic Gospels in this particular. But any of these speculations is much to be preferred to the theory which has so long prevailed that Jesus instituted a Lord's Supper of perpetual observance on the night of his betrayal, a theory which cannot stand the light of textual, literary and historical criticism.

We now see that there was a very simple and natural evolution in the institution of the Lord's Supper.

1. It was first instituted as a sacrificial feast of the new covenant, celebrated once for all on the night of the betrayal.

2. It next was connected with the passover meal, involving an annual celebration at Easter; and this is doubtless at the basis of the usage in all the great historic Churches from the earliest times requiring of all Christians an Easter participation in the Lord's Supper. So Paul (1 Cor. 5: 7, 8) distinctly attaches the Lord's Supper to the Passover and represents the Lord himself as our Passover.

3. It was finally connected with the sacrificial meals of the ordinary peace-offerings. Accordingly, Paul brings into sharp antithesis the sacrificial meals of Christians and the sacrificial meals of idols (1 Cor. 10: 14-22). These peace-offerings were of great variety, such as the thank-offering, the free-will-offering, the votive offering, the marriage offering and the like. Through these associations arose the practice of making the celebration of the Lord's Supper in connection with gifts to the poor, the expression of thanksgiving, the consecration of one's self and others, and the ceremony of marriage, which prevailed throughout the history of the Church. It may also be said that in these ordinary peace-offerings of the Old Testament the blood always went to the altar and was never applied in any way to the participants. From the point of view of these peace-offerings, therefore, there is some reason for the ancient practice in some Churches of a communion only in one kind, namely in the bread alone.

One thing stands out with great clearness as the result of the critical study of the institution of the Lord's Supper, namely, that it is a sacrificial meal. In all its relations to covenant sacrifice, Passover, and peace-offerings of every variety, it is always and everywhere that. It is significant that the fresh, critical study of its historical institution should lead to the same result as the recent discussions of the subject with reference to the reunion of Christendom. The Pope of Rome and the Anglican archbishops agree that the essential thing in the Lord's Supper is sacrifice. There is no doubt that we are on the eve of a reconsideration of the whole subject, and all Christians should thank the New Testament critics that they have thrown so much light on the history of its institution and have, thereby, enabled us to stand on solid basis for a more profound study of its theological and practical significance.

The Greek Thought of the Future Life.

BY PROF. PAUL SHOREY,
OF CHICAGO UNIVERSITY.

WITH one exception every possible shade of historic belief or sentiment concerning the life beyond the grave can be matched in the extant literature of Greece and Rome. The crude animism that conceives the tomb as the eternal habitation where the ghost still dwells in need of food and tendance; early man's pious devotion to the little gods of his hearth and the spirits of his ancestors; the poet's intimation of immortality; the philosopher's demonstration that it must be so; the mystic's ecstatic vision of bliss reserved for the initiated; the materialist's sullen affirmation that "the spirit only means the breath"—all these can be amply illustrated from Homer, Pindar, the inscriptions, Plato, Cicero, Epicurus and Lucretius. The one note never struck is the triumphant certainty of Christian assurance "O death where is thy sting, O grave where is thy victory?"

To the Greek even more than to ourselves, this world is the mother of all we know, and to the definitely pictorial and realistic Greek imagination there was something vague and unsatisfying about all attempted visualization of the further shore. Despite the reasonings of philosophers and the revelations of the mysteries, the Hades of the average Greek always resembled the shadowy limbo to which Dante consigns the souls of great men born before Christ—their sole punishment "that without hope we languish in desire." Such is the condition of the shades whom Odysseus meets on the meadow of Asphodel, and the words of Achilles still go straight to the shuddering heart of the natural man!

"O glorious Odysseus seek not to comfort me with fine phrases about death. Liefer were I to be a serf, the hireling of some poor man in the world above than to be lord and king over all the ghostly dead."

Even Plato, despite his three proofs of the immortality of the soul, can only say:

"To attain to certainty about such a matter in this life is hard or impossible; failing that, it becomes a man to take the best and most irrefragable of human theories and let this be the raft on which he sails through life,

unless he can find some safer and surer vehicle—some word of God to convey him."

But before philosophers could demonstrate, skeptics deny and religious souls yearn for a divine word to confirm immortality, it was necessary that the idea itself should develop into a definite conception. Tennyson has said:

"Those that in barbarian burials kill'd the slave and slew the wife,
Felt within themselves the sacred passion of the second life."

But it is a long way from this first faint divination to a true moral and religious conception of immortality. The growth of such an idea has been conjecturally traced by modern scholars through Homer, Hesiod, the lost Orphic poets and Pindar. The future world took shape and color from man's imperious need to believe in a more ideal justice than obtains on earth—his desire to see with the eyes of faith the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous or of the favorites of Heaven. Amid the gibbering bat-like ghosts of Homeric Hades, Sisyphus rolling his stone, Tantalus panting for the ever-receding waters, Tityos gnawed by the vulture are relatively real, for they suffer. This is the beginning of the idea of Hell. Heaven or Elysium, the vision of fulfilled desire, is developed from the fancy of some happy isle to which the hero favored by the gods is rapt away in the body after earth's trials and labors are done.

"But for thee, Menelaus, fosterling of Zeus, it is not appointed to die and meet thy doom in horse-breeding Argos. The immortals shall send thee away to the Elysian plain and the limit of the world, where dwells Rhadamanthus of the golden hair, and a life of delicious ease is prepared for men. No snow nor wintry chill nor storm of rain draws nigh that happy spot; but even the ocean sends forth for refreshment the love breezes of zephyr. Such lot is thine, because thou hast Helen for thy bride and Zeus is of thy kin."

It is characteristic of the Greeks that they did not dwell on the idea of Hell with the hideous relish of the Etruscan and the Egyptians. As Mephistopheles disconsolately remarks in Goethe's "Faust":

"And as for sulphur, why you scarce can smell
A trace of sulphur in this Grecian hell."

Pindar paints in glowing colors the joys of Elysium. Of the wicked he merely observes: "But the other part suffer pain too dire to look upon." With Plato the development of ancient thought in this direction ends. In the series of beautiful myths with which he supplements his philosophical proofs of immortality he portrays the Last Judgment, the pains and purificatory stages of Purgatory, the tortures of the damned, the rewards of the blessed in such wise that the world's later thought has added little to his imagination save the Christian's glad certitude. Plato himself says of the imaginative details of his picture:

"A man of sense ought not to say, nor will I affirm, that the description which I have given of the soul and its mansions is exactly true; but since the soul has been shown to be immortal we may safely affirm that something of the kind is true."

Despite Mr. W. K. Gray's warning that if we wish to believe in immortality we most not try to conceive it too definitely, mankind in general yearn for the vivid imaginative embodiment of the faith, and those who, in Emerson's phrase (herein differing from Jesus), have pleased the people with this picture have for the most part copied Plato directly or indirectly—Virgil in the sixth *Æneid*, Cicero in the *Dream of Scipio*, Seneca, Dante; and the rest. But Plato was a philosopher, Pindar and Virgil were poets, what was the belief of the common people of Greece and Rome? Ah, who can tell what the inarticulate masses really think in any age? Do they believe more or less than the formulas of their official creeds and the implications of their cults? We have the testimony of Lucian; but a professional mocker, a Lucian, a Voltaire, an Ingersoll, is naturally prone to exaggerate the crude letter of the faith which he makes it his mission to turn to ridicule. No very vivid conception of the actual reality of Charon and the triple-headed Cerberus, and all the paraphernalia and stage properties of Pluto's realm was needed to induce a Greek or Roman to put an obol in the mouth of his dead as all his neighbors did, to pour a libation of wine and water and honey at his father's tomb as we place flowers on the graves where we surely do not think our dead abide, or to allude to the chambers of Persephone, and the Elysian fields, in the traditional literary language in his epitaph. Of this conventional character are the vast majority of the thousands of