

justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing, one another."

The reasoning, therefore, as well as the authority of Paul seem to sustain the doctrine that the heathen have their probation in this life, and until some better reasonings and higher authority shall reach us, we do well to stand by the doctrine.

ARTICLE III.

THE BY-WAYS OF INFIDELITY.

BY JOHN T. PERRY, ESQ., OF EXETER, N. H.

As the manifestations of certain bodily diseases vary with the constitution and surroundings of the patient, so the symptoms of the great spiritual malady of indwelling sin are perplexing in their diversity. We read in the Gospel of Mark that many bore false witness against Christ and that "their witness agreed not together." Yet every one of these slanderers and perjurers was actuated by the same malignant disposition. He was bound to secure a conviction at all hazards.

An interesting volume might be written on the variations of unbelievers, and, if properly arranged, would be far more effective than Bossuet's arraignment of the diversities of Protestants. We should find atheism defended both as the foundation and the logical outcome of a rejection of the Scriptures, and again theism maintained as an intuition of the human intellect, thus making revelation superfluous. We should be urged to believe that our Lord,

while not divine, was the noblest of philanthropists and philosophers; that he was an impostor and a fanatic; and finally that he never existed,—the whole story of his life being an astronomical myth, or a new version of an Oriental fable. These theories and numberless blendings of them have all had their supporters. Yet the advocates of each show that none of the others will account for all the facts in the case, and real scholarship, saying nothing of man's spiritual needs, finds them all defective.

Men are strangely credulous when their interest, real or fancied, inclines them toward any special line of belief. They are peculiarly so when seeking an opiate for the conscience. Charles II said of Isaac Vossius, the erudite but sceptical Canon of Windsor, "This learned divine is a strange man; he believes everything but the Bible." The students of our theological seminaries must often pass a like judgment when considering the wild hypotheses to which German and other radical critics resort. Starting with the postulate that the miraculous and supernatural must be fabulous, no theory is deemed extravagant if it will only support a naturalistic interpretation. Yet these elaborated fallacies, and the objections dealt with in our standard defences of the faith, are not the main arguments which the pastor may have to encounter. If his labors are among the mechanics of our manufacturing cities and towns; if he runs across one of those studious but opinionated farmers or professional men in the country who are known to their neighbors as infidels or spiritualists—he will find him crammed with assertions and arguments that will astound him. He may easily recognize their falsity, but if not thoroughly well read, or the possessor of a good library, he may be compelled to restrict himself to a simple denial of his adversary's correctness.

The psalmist exclaimed, "I said in my haste, all men are liars," and we are inclined to repeat his declaration without any qualification, after reading the writings of various irresponsible and reckless unbelievers. These have often

attained a very wide circulation, though a somewhat obscure one, akin to that of the obscene publications absolutely prohibited by law. Houses in Boston, New York, Chicago, and other cities are constantly sending forth this class of literature. Every wild fancy uttered by some crack-brained man of learning is borrowed and emphasized as demonstrated truth; quotations from the Fathers and from modern theologians are garbled, and even forged, and facts admitted by all honest unbelievers to be undeniable, are set down as utterly fabulous.

The well-instructed man, minister or layman, will not be deceived by these impudent pretences. The coarseness and flippancy with which they are generally urged, and the blasphemy with which they are often accompanied, will also disgust many who might otherwise yield to the weight of apparent testimony. Comparatively few persons, however, are profoundly versed in religious history, and those who read to quiet their apprehensions are at least half perverted before they begin their studies. A more minute survey of the field may be of service to Christian workers imperfectly cognizant of this state of things.

A favorite field with unbelieving quacks is that of comparative mythology. Before modern philology had detected the fallacy of assuming that similarity of name proved the identity of entirely different persons,—that there was a connection, for example, between Manu Menes and Moses; that Abraham and Brahma, Sarah and Sarasvati were every one related—writers like Jacob Bryant and George Stanley Faber, while intending to support revelation, furnished many useful weapons to unbelievers of the conscienceless school. Sir William Jones and his associate pioneers in East Indian literature also did a great deal of harm by their ready acknowledgment of the antiquity claimed by the Hindoos for writings since found to date back only to the eighth or even twelfth century of our era. Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, and also our Teutonic fatherland have been ransacked for the prototypes of

Bible narratives, and even Hesus, the Mars of the Celts, has been declared a Saviour, simply on account of his name. Bible Myths, a volume published in New York two or three years ago in sumptuous octavo form, and which has reached a third edition, is one of the most outwardly decorous of the compilations of infidel falsehood, and yet one of the most dishonest. By its side Dr. Inman's far from candid or trustworthy works become fairly respectable. A score of less pretentious books of the class might be mentioned. The design of all is to show that scriptural history is largely the repetition of heathen myths, and often to fix upon revelation some of the most abominable doctrines and symbolism of the old Gentile systems. The subject is too broad and varied for detailed treatment here. It is enough to say that the Mosaic code carried no doctrine from the land of the captivity except its assertion, otherwise derived and greatly emphasized, of that unity of the Godhead which the earliest Egyptians seem faintly to have perceived, but had generally abandoned long before the Exodus. Some resemblances of ceremonial have been pointed out, but they are few and superficial. The Osiric myth, claimed by some to be an anticipation of the incarnation and crucifixion, may have embodied a recollection of the prediction respecting the seed of the woman and the serpent's head. As Wilkinson says: "This being the divine goodness, his [Osiris'] manifestation upon earth, his death and resurrection, and his office as judge of the dead in a future state, look like the early revelation of a future manifestation of the Deity converted into a mythological fable."

Still, the traces of Egyptian influence upon Israel are rare and unimportant, while modern archaeology is constantly strengthening the proofs of the genuineness and authenticity of Genesis. The tombs of Beni Hassan and manifold documents and inscriptions show that where Scripture and Herodotus are at variance Scripture is always right. No wandering Jew, five or six centuries

after the events recorded, could have avoided some, at least, of the errors into which the sharp-sighted Grecian fell. Yet unbelieving quackery is still dispensing fables about Egypt.

India has not ceased to be a favorite field with this class. "Bible Myths" makes much of it, and repeats many old and oft exploded falsehoods. Krishna, unfortunately admitted by the Rev. Thomas Maurice, ninety years ago, to date—in the modern phase of the story—hundreds of years before Christ, was probably an historical character. Yet in the pre-Christian books he is simply a scholar and hero. In the old Buddhist Sutras he is not mentioned among the gods worshipped when Buddhism arose. The legend grew, and in the later episodes of the Mahabharata he had become a wonder worker, though here and there in the main poem his deity is denied. In a still later episode, the philosophical Bhagavad Gita, he has risen to supreme God. Dr. Lorinser claims that traces of John's Gospel are to be found in the Bhagavad, and the general voice of modern scholarship ascribes it to the third Christian century. The full-blown Krishna of infidelity, between whose life and that of Christ there are a few partial coincidences, but many more glaring discrepancies, is the theme of the Harivansa, a long post-Christian supplement to the Mahabharata, and especially of certain Puranas, none of which are earlier than the eighth century, while others are scarcely mediæval. There can be no remarkable antiquity in documents that refer to Mahomet and to post-Christian dynasties of Kings. These Puranas were claimed by the Hindoos to be of hoary age, and were accepted as such by the English scholars of the "Asiatic Research" era. Modern scholars, however, like Weber, Barth, and Monier Williams, see that the Puranic era is as remote and as different from the Vedaic as is Tennyson from Caedmon or the Venerable Bede. Yet some well-meaning defenders of the faith, like Dr. J. P. Lundy in his *Monumental Christianity*, virtually surrender everything to unbelief by mak-

ing mediaeval Krishnaism a primitive cult and anticipation of Christianity. They are wholly unconscious of their mistake, but, starting with a preconceived theory, turn and twist everything to agree with it.

Astronomical interpretations of religion seem to have originated in Dupuis' *Origine de Tous Les Cultes*, and Volney's *Ruines*, based upon the first-named work though actually published a little earlier. Sir William Drummond gave it countenance in his *Oedipus Judaicus*, and later the eccentric Godfrey Higgins combined it with Krishnaism in his ponderous *Anacalypsis*, a monument of perverted industry and wrong-headed scholarship, as also a quarry from which innumerable fallacies have been dug. The stars can be made to speak both for and against Christianity. While Dupuis and Volney have racked celestial phenomena to make them the origin of anti-Christian incidents and doctrines, and these, in their turn, the foundation of Scripture, writers like Miss Rolleston, in her *Mazzaroth*, and Dr. Seiss, in his *Gospel in the Stars*, find the constellations to be records of patriarchal orthodoxy and of the earliest Messianic prophecy. Senart has applied the same process to Buddhism, but the facts have been too much for him. Goldziher and others have attempted to revive the method in connection with Jewish history, and the Sun myth hypothesis, so popular with a certain school of thinkers, is its latest modification. The best proof of its fallacy lies in the completeness with which both Washington and Napoleon have been shown to be myths by the legitimate application of its principles. Borrowed chiefly from Dupuis and Volney, Astro-Theology will be found to constitute a main source of the arguments of the notorious Rev. Robert Taylor, of "Diegesis" and "Devil's Pulpit" fame, and of many humbler imitators. The hypothesis would seem too extravagant to need refutation, yet an exposure of one of its chief points, made long ago in Faber's *Difficulties of Infidelity*, is as applicable to-day as when first written :

" Mr. Volney gravely assures us that the divine personage, whom Christians, during the space of well-nigh eighteen centuries, have ignorantly revered as their crucified Redeemer, is neither more nor less than the sun in the firmament; that the Virgin Mary is one of the Zodiacal signs, the constellation Virgo to wit; and that Christ's crucifixion by Pontius Pilate and his resurrection from the dead on the third day are nothing more than the sun's declension to the winter solstice and his subsequent return to the summer solstice through the vivifying season of spring. . . . Mr. Volney [Dupuis does the same], to rid himself of the troublesome evidence of Tacitus, who flourished only about seventy years after the time, is willing to imagine that he wrote from the false depositions of the Christian prisoners, Hence, according to Mr. Volney, it very easily happened that the unlucky historian was shamefully befooled by a set of gross liars, who themselves chose to be worried by dogs and to be crucified and to be burned alive in support of what they all the while knew to be an absurd falsehood."

Buddha has succeeded Krishna in the field of reputable scepticism, but he has been appropriated also by the forgers and pretenders. Over fifty years ago, Bouvier, a French author, held up Samanacodam, a half Buddhist, half Christian demi-god, much revered by the Siamese, as the foundation of what he deemed the Christ-legend. He appears to have derived many of his facts from the very uncritical narratives of the Jesuit fathers sent to Siam by Louis XIV. St. Jerome mentions the report that Buddha was born of a virgin, and General Cunningham declares that the sculpture on the Bharavat tope, dates back to the third century before Christ, and represents Buddha's incarnation. Yet this incarnation proves to have been in the form of a white elephant, and is in no way biblical in its accompanying circumstances. Moreover other Buddhist sculptures do not begin to be biblically suggestive till shortly before Jerome's time, say the third or fourth century. The unquestionably pre-Christian rock-cut inscriptions of King Asoka, the Buddhist Constantine, mention Buddha as a man and an ascetic reformer, not at all as a wonder worker or divine incarnation. Most of the alleged coincidences, even in the later legends, cease to appear such at all when closely compared, and we must remember that none of the existing Buddhist writings can certainly

be traced back of the fifth century of our era, three hundred years after Christian missionaries are known to have visited India. How would our unbelievers treat the claims of a life of Christ written A. D. 900? Yet Buddha was born some four or five centuries before Christ, a thousand years earlier than the existing narratives and after Isaiah had proclaimed that a virgin should conceive and bear a son. The German Seydel has labored hard to prove that the first versions of several New Testament miracles occur in primitive Buddhist legend, but the attempt is pronounced a failure, by the illustrious Albrecht Weber, and has been shown to be such in the lately published volume of Professor Kellogg of Allegheny Seminary. So much for the Buddha of scholarly unbelief. In the works of the dishonest virtuperators the Christian resemblances are multiplied and intensified, and Buddha is even said to have been crucified, though according to all trustworthy accounts he died from eating improper food, at the age of fourscore.

Passing to the early Christian era, we find these worthies repeating the old story that the canon of the New Testament was settled at Nice by a vote. A few have discovered that Laodicea was a more likely place, but all pretend that there was canonical confusion before, the Gospel of the Infancy being in as high repute as that of Matthew or John, and an alleged story of the obscure synodist Pappus is repeated that the Gospels and Epistles finally adopted mounted upon the table. We are gravely informed that the passage respecting Christ in Josephus is universally recognized as spurious, and that there is no other evidence of our Lord's existence than a doubtful passage of Tacitus, a passage which, though pronounced unimpeachable by Gibbon, we shall soon see is dismissed as an unblushing forgery. If the admissions of Celsus are cited, we are told that Origen garbled his opponent's statements in order to be able to refute them.

Eight or nine years ago, a crotchety Scotchman named

Ross published a volume to show that the works of Tacitus were forged by Poggio Bracciolini, early in the fifteenth century. The idea was not altogether new, for two hundred years ago, Father Hardouin conceived the notion that most of the classics were mediæval inventions. Later, Semler, one of the fathers of modern rationalism, endeavored to prove that the celebrated letter of Pliny to Trajan respecting the Christians of Bithynia was spurious. Mr. Ross fortified his theory by some plausible statements of alleged facts. He was taken in hand, however, by a contributor to the *Edinburgh Review* of October 1878, and convicted of stupid blundering, if not of positive dishonesty.

He may, or he may not have been influenced by the desire to get rid of the important testimony of Tacitus to the crucifixion, and to the sufferings of the Christians under Nero. Whatever may have been his motives there can be no doubt respecting an anonymous American already author of one of those lists of alleged biblical contradictions which suggested the important defensive work of the Rev. J. W. Haley. This person, having taken the very appropriate pseudonym of "Antichrist," proceeded to erect a remarkable structure on the foundation laid by Mr. Ross whom he accepted as infallible. He also gave his approval to that Jewish mediæval libel, the Toldoth Jeschu. By this he attempted to make it appear that the historical prototype of an almost fabulous Christ, of whom no Tacitus ever wrote, lived eighty or one hundred years before Pilate's administration. The accuracy of the Toldoth is evinced in its declaration that David, not Solomon, was the builder of the first temple, and also in its making King Jannæus, who died in the year 675 after the building of Rome, the husband of Helena, who actually married her brother Monobazus, and flourished about A. U. C. 794, forty or more years after the Christian era. Had our author looked into, and been able to construe, the Latin column in *Wagenseil's Tela Ignea Satanae*, he would

have found one branch of his argument refuted as early as 1687. Of Mr. Ross' overthrow, and the consequent rehabilitation of Tacitus, he seems never to have heard.

Many a pastor may find his efforts blocked by such reckless compilers as "Antichrist." The youthful or illiterate unbeliever whom he is desirous to reclaim, and who remains impervious to approved statements of the evidences, may have been misled by what we may style the apocrypha of infidelity, rather than by better known influences. Be the case as it may, heads are turned and consciences are paralyzed.

We may be charged with unnecessarily delving in a moral and intellectual garbage heap, but bad books are as slow to die as are bad influences in general. A curious evidence of the longevity of a worse than worthless volume is afforded by George Bethune English's Examination of Christianity, a work of which probably few of our readers have heard. Early in the present century its author, after graduating from Harvard College, began to study for the ministry. From a theological student he became a violent sceptic, setting forth his new unfaith as above mentioned. The book created a great, though temporary, stir in the religious circles of Boston and Cambridge. Its argument was one that Lardner and Paley failed to meet. Prophecy, it held, was almost the sole evidence of the claims of Jesus to the Messianhip, and he was not the fulfilment of prophecy, unless in a figurative and indefinite sense. The religion of nature was also contrasted with revelation, much to the advantage of the former. One or two efforts at refutation were not very successful. English passed for a learned wonder until Edward Everett, then in the first triumphs of his ministry, discovered that the new Celsus was a plagiarist. He had found his weapons in the writings of the English deists of the eighteenth century, largely in Collins' Grounds and Reasons, and Tindal's Christianity as Old as the Creation. Having thus traced the borrowings to their sources, Mr.

Everett's task was not a hard one. He only had to quote, with modern improvements the arguments of Leland, Chandler, Conybeare, and the other opponents of deism, to silence his adversary. The rout was complete; English entered the Egyptian service, and is reported to have died a Mahometan. For the truth of this last rumor we will not vouch. His book did not die with him. Though forgotten in Christian circles, it is among the standard issues of a Jewish publishing house at Toronto, and as such was exhibited in the Canadian department of the Philadelphia centennial. It passes, we suppose, for an able Gentile proof of the Jewish doctrine that Jesus was not the promised deliverer of Israel.

Where Thomas Paine or Colonel Ingersoll or modern pseudo-science has drawn one from Christian beliefs and observances, the minister's task is comparatively simple. The standard treatises on natural theology and the popular defences of the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures may help to clear the wanderer's head. Different treatment is required, however, when it has been filled with positive fables. When one has come to believe that the world has had traditions of sixteen crucified Saviours, with nearly parallel lives, he needs to be reminded that his informant has mistaken Alcides and Hercules for different personages, is unable to identify Romulus with Quirinus, and garbles quotations from Gibbon and other writers, to make them read precisely opposite to the author's intent. Such stupidity and wilful falsehood, and even worse examples, can be found in the very widely circulated writings of the late Kersey Graves!

It is a remarkable and honorable exception to this dishonest tendency of unbelievers that Professor W. E. Coleman, of San Francisco, an accomplished Orientalist, though far from orthodox believer, fearlessly exposed and sternly arraigned the deceptions practised by Graves, and several others of the school, and that the *Religio-Philosophical Journal* of Chicago freely opened its columns for this much

needed work. The writer and the paper have brought upon themselves a flood of bitter denunciation from the detected criminals, and the books are still circulated, just as if they were as unanswerable as their authors pretended at the start.

Judge Waite, of Chicago, cannot escape the imputation of fraudulent literary pretension, though his much bepuffed *History of the Christian Religion to the year 200* is more decent in tone than most of the works to which we have referred. It is a labored attempt to demonstrate that the miraculous element did not enter into Christian tradition until late in the second century. It is refreshing to find in his pages that points deemed strategic by even advanced representatives of the Tübingen School are not at all doubtful, and he exceeds, if possible, the anonymous author of *Supernatural Religion* in brushing away as a cobweb every troublesome fact. The chief danger of the work lies in its positiveness. Half learned readers are very likely to become its victims, for its dogmatism often has the semblance of demonstrated truth. That he is not competent to discuss his subject is apparent both from his seeming ignorance of German, and from his mistaking a *Catena Patrum* for the name of a veritable church father! Yet he has displayed a lawyer-like skill in the selection and arrangement of his fallacies.

The practical lesson which we would draw from the existence of this unpleasant and disgraceful class of writings is that infidelity is largely a disease of the moral nature. Sceptical publications are used as opiates for the conscience, rather than as guides for the intellect. As the physician is on the lookout for abnormal appetites and the contagion of bad drainage, so the spiritual healer must push his inquiries beyond the circle of merely intellectual difficulties. The foreign missionary deems it necessary to gain a thorough knowledge of the superstitions which influence his barbarous flock, and the delusions of our home heathen require equally complete investigation. A friend

on entering the shop of an intelligent but imperfectly educated man, the other day, happened to mention the Bible. "Which Bible do you mean?" was the immediate reply. The question was doubtless inspired by the study of Kersey Graves or some equally trustworthy authority of the low infidel school.

Yet not the illiterate alone fall a prey to the irresponsible anti-Christian propagandists. When Jacolliot's Bible in India, pronounced by Max Müller, and other competent critics, an outrageous fraud, was published about sixteen years ago, not a few educated persons accepted its pretended quotations from the Vedas as genuine. They really thought that Jezeus Christna was the proper name of Krishna and that Adimo and Heva of Ceylon were the originals of Adam and Eve. It may not be necessary that all pastors should be profoundly read in the ethnic faiths, but there is every reason that they should become familiar with their outlines, and able to trace out their relations to Christianity and to the deliverer promised to our first parents. Such general surveys as Hardwick's Christ and other Masters, and, with due qualifications, Freeman Clarke's Ten Great Religions, and special treatises like Kellogg's Light of the World and Light of Asia, will be found very useful. Several small but excellent monographs by Rhys Davids, Monier Williams, and other scholars, published by the London Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, will at least serve as the foundations of more minute investigations. Monier Williams' Indian Wisdom, Whitney's Oriental and Linguistic Studies, Barth's Religions of India, Weber's History of Indian Literature, Döllinger's Gentile and Jew, and Legge's Religions of China may assist the student over later stages of his inquiry. At all events, the tillers of the Master's field should be fully aware that tares of an unsuspected variety are being sown; should make themselves competent to recognize them and, when possible, to uproot them. Philanthropy deems it no unworthy condescension to

relieve the sufferers in the slums, and certainly spiritual maladies, as much as physical afflictions, should arouse our pity and stimulate our efforts.

ARTICLE IV.

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ETHIOPIC BY PROFESSOR GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D.,
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, O.

CHAP. XII. 1. And it happened in the sixth week, in the seventh year thereof, Abram said unto Tarah, his father, saying, "Father!" And he said, "Behold, here I am, my son!" 2. And he said: "What assistance and what pleasure have we from all the idols which thou dost worship and before which thou dost prostrate thyself? 3. For there is no spirit in them, but they are dumb statues and a deception of the heart: do not worship them. 4. Worship the God of heaven, who sends down dew and rain upon the earth and does everything upon the earth and has created everything through his word and all living things are from before his face. 5. Why do ye worship those who have no heart and spirit in them; for they are the works of hands, and upon your shoulders do ye carry them, and ye have from them no help, but a great disgrace to those who make them and a deception of the heart to those who worship them: do not worship them!" 6. And Tarah said: "I also know it, my son; but what shall I do with this people who command me that I should serve them? 7. If I tell them the truth, they will slay me; for their soul clings to them to worship and to glorify them. 8. Keep silent, my son, lest they slay thee!" 9. And these words he spoke to his two brothers, and they became angry at him, and he kept silent. 10. And in the fortieth jubilee, in the second week, in the seventh year thereof, Abram took to himself a wife, and her name was Sara, the daughter of his father, and