

THE SOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY

THOMAS LUMISDEN STRANGE,

LATE A JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS,

"Go to Agni, for he is nearer to thee than I am."—

Indra's reply to the supplication of Sanehsapha.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 57 AND 59 LUDGATE HILL.

1875.

All rights reserved.

110 on 280

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THE volume I now present completes a series of works undertaken by me in view of examining the pretensions of the Bible to be the Word of God. The questions I have hitherto dealt with are the canons of the Old and New Testaments; the supports thought to be supplied by miracles and prophecies; the historical character of the gospel accounts of Jesus as a supernatural being; the great Aryan migration as having influenced India, Persia, and Europe, and the consequent spread of mythologies and other religious conceptions from the East to the West; the pretensions of the Jewish nation to be the people of God, and the true character of their prominent legends; the processes of creation as traceable from actual phenomena; and the antiquity of the earth and its human inhabitants. For these inquiries I have endeavoured to qualify myself by an extensive course of reading, and as I have been careful at every point to state my authorities, I give others the opportunity of instructing and satisfying themselves on these interesting subjects that I myself have had, and can thus leave them to their conclusions.

The preceding efforts have been designed as stepping-stones to my present production, in which I aim at

exposing the true character of Christianity. My qualification here is that for many years I was as firmly bound to the system as any of its most devout adherents, and that as no one can more absolutely than myself have thrown off its shackles, in favour of what I believe to be the only true basis of religious faith and confidence, I am able to trace for others the grounds upon which they may possibly make the same progress that I have done, out of the bondage of a humanly constructed creed, to the liberty and the satisfaction to mind and conscience obtainable only by reliance on a real and natural foundation. My doctrine, to express it in a few words, is the all-sufficiency of the Almighty, certainly avowed in other creeds, and among them in that of the Christians, but practically denied by the conditions, devised, and to be realized, through which alone, it is conceived, the divine action in our favour is maintainable. Am I to sacrifice to him as in ancient days, or to plead a sacrifice enacted for me? Then is my sacrifice my prime support, and the Almighty stands only as a purchased or acquired ulterior refuge. Have I to use a mediator in order to approach and secure acceptance by him? Then is this mediator my first friend, and the Almighty becomes relegated to a more remote and secondary position. It is vain to estimate the conditional props and appliances as of imperative necessity, and then to claim the expected end as the work of an independent and all-sufficient agent.

The ordinary course of criticism exercised upon the Christian scheme has been directed to ascertaining, as well as circumstances may permit, the authenticity and era of the several canonical scriptures and of the writings of those who are accounted the early fathers. In the pre-

sent work I venture to extend the inquiry to the solution of the question, when Christianity itself may first have had being. It will be understood that I object to draw my facts from the canonical scriptures themselves when these facts are of a character, as assuredly is the case in the present instance, to be established by their own actualities. Directly Christianity became an accepted creed, avowed by multitudes, the circumstance must have attracted attention, and have left its impress on the records of the day. I object to acknowledge the existence of the fact until its necessary impress may be fairly observable, and in prosecuting my task must claim freedom from the bonds of concessions which I feel have been improperly made in the course of these inquiries by one writer unguardedly adopting what others have been led to say before him. Our aim should be to judge of all things as they really are, and not merely as they may be imagined or wished to be.

The conclusion to which I have come is that there is a very decided gap between the occurrence of Christianity, and the era asserted for the facts alleged as those on which the system has its foundations. *It follows that the facts themselves, so bound in an historical expression of them at a particular period, cannot have been enacted, and that the creed has otherwise to be accounted for.*

It will be asked, can this possibly have been so? Can the great circumstances attaching to Christianity have been asserted and believed in while destitute of any true reality?

That a religious movement based upon the allegation of superhuman agency and divine revelation, but in truth wanting in such supports, may take effect, we

have seen illustrated in our own days by the uprise and growth of Mormonism. If Joseph Smith, by means of a declared angelic visitation, and a miraculously provided record, and so lately as in the year 1844, could operate upon multitudes with his newly-devised religious scheme, it may be readily understood that a similar feat, without much difficulty, may have been performed in the remote and ignorant days of the occurrence of Christianity. At this very moment we have before us the strange pretensions of Mrs Girling, the declared bride of Jesus, influencing, in serious action, the New Forest Shakers she has gathered around her, on the allegation of the personal revelations and divine associations to which she lays claim. The body, it is true, is not considerable in number, but it is in its infancy, and it more than equals that asserted for the first gathering of Christians (Acts i. 15). We can also point backward, and still some centuries on this side of the Christian era, to the sudden institution of that powerfully constituted and wide-spread persuasion introduced by Mahomed, for which also a divine authorization is claimed; and in centuries beyond Christianity, but yet within the historic period, to the equally potent religious system founded by Buddha, in like manner declared to have been drawn from a superhuman source. About the same time Confucius launched in China his ethical teachings, which have ever since satisfied the religious wants of an extensive portion of that empire; and still further back, at some unknown period, we can discern the work among the Persians of Zoroaster, who claimed for his revelations direct communication from the Most High. These are operations in behalf of new

or reformed religions among mankind, to the supercession often of those creeds which existed before them, the success of which, through mere missionary efforts, without supernatural agency, amply suffices to account for the introduction and prevalence of such a system as Christianity, (whatever the wonderments asserted for its basis), through precisely similar natural means.

Another feature which I examine is the growth of Christianity from stage to stage in its distinguishable phases of doctrine. Such variations of an already established system are even more readily effected than the propagation of a new faith from its foundations. Their progressive occurrence serves also to enable us to understand the culmination and exhibition of the faith in its matured form.

Christianity, while aiming at religious unity round a declared divinely endowed centre, presents the aspect of hopeless disunion. The divisions are not few, but countless, and are continually on the increase. They prove the impossibility of concurrent thought and belief when exercised over the constituents of an artificial, complicated, and exacting faith. Recently there have been Congresses held of various sorts for the purpose of discussing difficulties and promoting union. A remarkable attempt of the kind has been made at the Bonn Conference. The parties engaged represented the Greek Church, the Old Catholics, and the Anglicans, all governed by allied principles, and apparently sincerely desirous of coming to a mutual understanding on points of difference. But the result on the reporter's mind was that if even the semblance of union was to be secured, it could only be by the parties engaged casting a cloak of

charity over their diverging opinions, with an agreement to differ, not upon non-essentials only, but upon essentials (*Contemporary Review* for Nov. 1874, pp. 891, 892). But this cloak of charity practically does not and cannot exist. No earnest mind, holding to what is felt to be truth important to observe, can think lightly of, or hold consistent fellowship with, those who repudiate any serious portion of his creed, and maintain themselves with other props or standards. Differences of creed must inevitably insure differences of ecclesiastical standing and practice. The various sections into which Christians are divided, represent, consequently, distinct bodies, holding defined positions in protest against every other segment of Christianity but their own. With these, ordinarily, there is no pretence of being influenced by the so-called bonds of charity, but all seriously outside the pale of their persuasion are to them as dissenters, heretics, or apostates. Some openly unchristianize their supposed erring brethren. And as these distinctive bodies have ascertained and taken up their positions, they assume the attitude of orthodoxy, and shelve all who have gone before them as heterodox. I will point to two such parties who lie at the extremes of Christianity, and who have assumed their peculiar doctrinal postures in our day. These are the Ultramontane Catholics, and that section of the Plymouth Brethren owning Mr Darby for their leader, and known as Exclusives. The Ultramontanes are distinguished by holding to the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary and the infallibility of the Pope. These are positions which have hitherto been afloat in Catholicism, but have only recently been made authoritative. They

are dogmas of a very distinct form which have now been built upon the previous Christianity, essentially altering its character, and have nevertheless been accepted by a certain and considerable body. And on the 29th November last, Archbishop Manning, by a circular then read out in the chapels of his diocese, declared that all who did not in their hearts receive and believe the said doctrines, had by that act of unbelief ceased to be Catholics (*The Times*, 30th November 1874). The Exclusive Plymouth Brethren have in like manner consolidated themselves in their position in times quite modern, and will hold no sort of fellowship, ecclesiastical or social, with those who differ with them. It is thus that Christianity has been built up from the beginning, the primitive form having been surcharged, from time to time, with the features which now constitute Christianity. For example, at the afore-said Bonn Conference, when the parties felt each other on the question of tradition, they appear to have come upon a very awkward circumstance. "Before," observes the Rev. J. Hunt, the writer of the article in the *Contemporary Review*, "Dr Dollinger can get his 'authoritative' tradition, he must discover his method of discovering it. The early centuries, which are the most important, will present the greatest difficulties. Even on a question so important as Christ's divinity there is no agreement among patristic scholars as to what was taught by the Nicene Fathers. Petavius and Huetius, Sandius and Episcopius, Daniel Whitby and William Whiston, have all testified, as the result of their studies, that the ante-Nicene Fathers were Arian" (p. 883). The point of doctrine in question was decided at the

Council of Nicœa, and the Arians, (now represented by the Unitarians), though the earlier body, were set aside by the newly-constituted orthodox party as heretics, and in this manner Christianity became invested with the recognition of the divinity of its imputed founder. The Buddhists had performed the like feat in behalf of their founder, also at a time distant from that of his earthly existence. I have endeavoured to trace out the various serious additions that have been made in building up Christian doctrine to its present standard, as discernible in the Christian scriptures themselves, the effect of which has been to push into the back ranks of so-called heresy the earlier forms traceable in the canonical scriptures, and prominently that of the primitive Judaic section, who have been designated, when made heretical, Ebionites.

The result is that the Christianity of the recognized scriptures, so formed, in its developed and altered state, cannot be traced to the imputed founder or his first followers, whose teachings would have to be disallowed in the present day as insufficient and positively erroneous, and that the system, as it actually stands, owes its being to exactly such operations as create before our eyes the divergent sects into which the Christian community are continually breaking. That is, teachers having no pretence to inspired authorization, have conceived doctrines which have found favour with a majority, and in the end have been currently accepted as integral portions of the system. It needs the pressure of some very potent engine to repeat now the process enacted at the Nicene Council to obtain judgment on the religious elements prevalent in distracting Chris-

tendom, and to prescribe what is to be universally received. This, if possible to be effected, would place before us something resembling an united church, but it would be impossible to allege that it rested on divine foundations. And what would be true of such an operation now is true of what occurred when the canonical Christian standard was originally composed.

My work concludes with those moulds for Christianity, and especially for its central personage, which have been derived from Greek, Egyptian, Buddhist, and Hindú mythologies. Directly we may be satisfied that a phase of faith, or religious representation, is dependent on conceptions which we all reject as pagan and idolatrous, there is an end of any real grounds for the persuasion that the imitated form has been obtained from a pure, true, and superhuman source. Nor can the parent form be put aside as a mere ideal figuration devoid of the solid consequences attaching to the Christian image. With the Hindús the faith in Ráma is as substantial a sentiment as that of the Christian in Christ. At one time my duties in India involved the charge of a jail and attendance at the executions of criminals. Trials calling for the sentence of death had to be referred to the superior court at Madras, for whose benefit the whole of the examinations had to be translated. There was always thus in these cases a considerable interval between the trial and the sentence and its execution. I was then a devout Christian, and used to take advantage of my opportunities to "bring" the prisoners who were in these risks "to Jesus." They were ordinarily of the uneducated class, but one was otherwise, having been a servitor in a pagoda. He had professed himself influenced

by what I had put before him, but when we met at the gallows he proclaimed his trust to be in Ráma, and not in Christ. He died earnestly calling upon his fancied mediator and saviour. What are we to say to such a phenomenon? Ráma's character is painted in the most exalted colours, and is described in a history considered to be an embodiment of divine truth. Ráma was a god incarnate, devoting himself for the good of mankind. What is there to induce a follower of his to relinquish him for just such another form presented to him from a foreign quarter? And do a man's eternal prospects depend upon his critical selection of the true history? Happily the means are ample for our extrication from any such dilemma, and, as I may acknowledge to have been the case in my own instance when I was involved in these meshes, it is simply ignorance of the true character of the materials before us, coupled with a vein of superstition, inherited, working round us, and cultivated in us from early youth, that forges those bonds in which mankind are held to the prevailing baseless expressions of belief.

GREAT MALVERN, *March* 1875.

CONTENTS.

I.—THE ERA OF CHRISTIANITY.

	PAGE		PAGE
The Christian creed,	1	The testimonies attributed to	
Eusebius our first Christian		Josephus respecting Jesus,	20
historian,	1	— respecting James the	
Christianity made publicly ap-		Just,	22
parent in time of Constan-		— respecting John the	
tine,	1	Baptist,	23
The dearth of materials on		The absence of evidence to	
which Eusebius worked,	2	Christianity in the writings	
He stands as the only author-		of Josephus,	25
ity for the times preceding		The Talmud,	27
him,	2	Its treatment by the early	
The Christian literature,	3	Christians,	28
Unreliability of Eusebius,	3	The absence therein of any	
"Pious frauds" in literature		mention of Christianity,	29
justified in those days,	3	The legend of Yishó Nôsi,	30
Pseudonymous and spurious			
writings, Jewish and Chris-		The writings of the Pagan	
tian,	6	authors,	31
The credulity of the early		The alleged letter of Pliny	
times,	7	to Trajan,	32
Divinities said to have mixed		The passage as to Nero's	
with mankind, and human		persecutions in Tacitus,	34
beings deified,	10	The statement ascribed	
Eusebius not above his day,	11	to Suetonius,	36
His use and account of the		None of these passages cover	
Septuagint,	12	the facts alleged for Chris-	
His uncritical representations,		tianity,	37
His use of Josephus,	14	The early Christian authorities,	38
His historical inconsistencies,			
His credulousness,	15	The apostolic fathers—	
Our dependence on Eusebius		Clement of Rome,	38
for what preceded him,	16	Polycarp,	40
The marvels involved in the		Barnabas,	42
history of Jesus,	16	Hermas,	42
		Papias,	42
The Jewish historians—		Ignatius,	43
Nicolaus of Damascus,	17		
Philo Judæus,	17	The apologists—Quadratus,	
Justus of Tiberias,	19	Aristides, Agrippa, Castor,	
Josephus,	20	and Aristo,	44

	PAGE		PAGE
Justin Martyr,	44	Theophilus, Athenagoras, and	
His 1st and 2d apologies, . . .	45	Hermias,	52
His dialogue with Trypho, . . .	48	The frequency of the appeals	
Tatian, Hegesippus, Dion-		addressed to Marcus Aure-	
ysius of Corinth, Meli-		lius. His character,	53
to, Apollinaria, the		The limited range of the early	
letter from the churches		Christian testimonies, . . .	55
in Gaul,	50	The Greek element in the	
		Christian writings,	56

II.—THE CONSTITUENTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

The projection of the advent		The Essene tenets of Oriental	
of the Messiah,	58	origin,	89
The Christian appropriation of		Etymology of the name of	
The Jewish Messiah,	58	Essene,	89
The Jewish character formed		The Essenes associated with	
after the exile, and their		the Pythagoreans,	90
hopes from that time in a		Christianity derivable from	
Messiah,	59	Essenism,	90
The Christian representation		The religious principles en-	
raised on the downfall of		forced in Christianity already	
the Jewish hopes,	61	prevalent among the Jews	
Alexandria the probable field		and other people,	90
of the new religious move-		The precepts and example of	
ment,	62	Socrates,	92
The deification of the word		The Platonists, Pythagoreans,	
and power of God,	63	and Stoics,	93
The Messiah as depicted in		The elements from these	
the book of Enoch,	64	sources passed into Chris-	
The studies and temperament		tianity,	94
of Philo Judeus,	65	The materials for Christianity	
His delineation of the Logos,		apparent in the writings of	
The Therapeuts and Essenes.		Philo,	94
The features in common to		Those occurring in the Jewish	
them and the Christians, . . .	68	writings, and prominently	
The sources of the Essene		in the Talmud,	96
beliefs,	87	The natural resources from	
Antiquity of the Essenes and		which Christianity was	
Therapeuts,	88	evolved,	100

III.—THE PHASES OF CHRISTIANITY.

The apostolic mission,	103	The doctrinal teaching ascribed	
Christianity not traceable his-		by them to him,	106
torically in the 1st and 2d		They exhibit him as a mere	
centuries of the Christian era,	104	man,	108
The Synoptic Gospels and Acts		The book of Acts. The first	
hang together,	104	annunciation of Christianity	
They exhibit primitive Chris-		at Pentecost,	109
tianity as a Judaic move-		Peter's further preaching, . .	110
ment,	104	Stephen's discourse,	110
The Synoptists represent Jesus		Peter's first address to the	
in Judaic character,	104	Gentiles,	111

	PAGE		PAGE
Paul's discourses,	111	Baur on the conflicting state-	
Paul's defences of himself, . .	111	ments relative to Paul in	
The Judaic position of the		the Acts and the epistle to	
first disciples,	112	the Galatians,	125
The Judaic position of Jesus		The epistle to the Romans, . .	127
according to the Synoptics, . .	113	The 1st epistle of Peter, . . .	130
The testimony of Eusebius to		The book of Revelation, . . .	131
primitive Christianity being		The epistle to the Ephesians, .	133
in Jewish form,	113	The epistle to the Colossians, .	134
The anti-Judaic doctrines of		The epistle to the Hebrews, . .	135
the divine nativity of Jesus, .	114	The epistles of John,	137
— of his being God incar-		The epistle to the Philippians, .	138
nate,	114	The epistles to Timothy, . . .	138
— of his death being accom-		The epistle to Titus,	139
plished sacrificially,	115	The 2d epistle of Peter,	140
The first disciples free of these		The gospel according to John, .	140
doctrines,	115	The discordance of doctrines, .	144
John the Baptist and James		The introduction of Gentile	
the Just exhibited as Essenes, .	116	doctrines,	144
The ministries of John the		The doctrines of the sacrificial	
Baptist and Jesus,	117	death and divinity of Jesus	
The epistle of James,	118	apparently not held to-	
The extension of the gospel to		gether,	145
the Gentiles,	118	The hands of Jews and Gen-	
The 1st epistle to the Thessal-		tiles in the Christian scrip-	
onians,	119	tures,	146
The introduction of Gentile		The various personations of	
doctrine,	119	Paul in the epistles attrib-	
The epistle to the Galatians, . .	120	uted to him,	147
The 1st epistle to the Corin-		The primitive forms of Chris-	
thians,	123	tianity shelved as heretical, .	147
The 2d epistle to the Corin-		The doctrines of the early	
thians,	124	Christian Fathers,	148

IV.—THE CONSTRUCTION AND INTEGRITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RECORD.

The composition of the Chris-		The opening made to the Gen-	
tian scriptures,	151	tiles,	160
Their purpose taken as war-		The command to preach the	
ranty of their facts,	151	gospel to all nations, and the	
The facts shaped upon as-		vision to Peter,	161
sumed prophecies,	151	The opening made by Paul	
The genealogies,	154	and Barnabas,	163
The birth from a virgin,	154	The death of Jesus treated as	
The birth at Bethlehem,	155	an expiatory offering,	164
The slaughter of the infants		The institution of the Eucharist, .	165
by Herod,	156	The willingness of the victim	
Jesus to be a Nazarene,	156	wanting,	166
His proclamation as Son of		His bearing the sins of the	
God,	157	world,	166
His taking on him our griefs, . .	158	His death unattended by the	
John as the precursor of Jesus, .	158	features of a sacrifice,	167
The riding upon an ass,	159	Who Jesus was taken to be, . .	168
The treachery and fate of		Jesus at the outset associated	
Judas,	159	with Essenians,	168

	PAGE		PAGE
His presentation as the Christ and the Son of God, . . .	169	The epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians, . . .	180
The incidents against his having thus proclaimed himself, . . .	169	The epistle to the Romans, . . .	180
The transfiguration, . . .	170	Paul's title of Roman citizen, . . .	182
The nullity of his alleged superhuman works, . . .	171	The late date at which the Pauline epistles are cited, . . .	182
His failure as a prophet, . . .	173	The apocryphal writings, . . .	184
His sphere in mere human knowledge, . . .	174	The thaumaturgical displays, . . .	184
His posture as an exemplar, . . .	176	The Christian scriptures not due to one controlling mind, . . .	185
The portraiture of Jesus in the fourth gospel, . . .	177	The order in which these writings may have appeared, . . .	186
How he is made to be the Son of God, . . .	177	The writers unshackled in their representations, . . .	187
The outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, . . .	179	What residuum of true fact there may be in the accounts given of Jesus, . . .	187
The authenticity of the Pauline epistles, . . .	179	The representations made of him essentially pictorial, . . .	188

V.—THE GENTILE MOULDS OF CHRISTIANITY.

The forms of belief met with in Alexandria, . . .	190	Judgment of the dead, . . .	201
Facilities for adapting them to Christ, . . .	190	The future state, . . .	201
Heroic personages who overcame evil or devoted themselves for the good of others, . . .	191	The doctrine of a Trinity, . . .	202
Bellerophon, . . .	191	The unity of the God-head, . . .	202
Perseus, . . .	191	Osiris, . . .	202
Theseus, . . .	192	The doctrine of incarnations, . . .	203
Hercules, . . .	192	The book of the dead, . . .	204
Metius Curtius, . . .	193	The Egyptian elements of religion adaptable to the Christian creed, . . .	204
Menœceus, . . .	192	The Oriental beliefs, . . .	204
Menippe and Metioche, . . .	193	The Buddhist canon, . . .	205
Admetus and Alceste, . . .	194	The character of Buddhism, . . .	206
Orpheus and Eurydice, . . .	194	Nirvāna, and belief in immortality, . . .	207
Prometheus, . . .	194	Correspondence of Buddhism with Christianity, . . .	208
Æsculapius, Pythagoras, and Plato, . . .	195	The history of Buddha, . . .	210
Dionysus, Persephone, and Adonis, . . .	196	The spread of Buddhism, . . .	211
The Eleusinian mysteries, . . .	196	Buddhism known of to the early Christians, . . .	212
The Greek elements of religion adaptable to the Christian creed, . . .	197	Association of Buddhism with Hinduism, . . .	214
The defences of the early Christians against the said adaptation, . . .	198	The imputation that the Hindus have copied from the Christians, . . .	215
Resources also found in Egyptian faiths, . . .	200	The first appearance of Christianity in India, . . .	216
Mediation and atonement, . . .	201	The hindrances to access to the Brahmanical centres by the early Christians, . . .	217

CONTENTS.

xix

	PAGE		PAGE
The correspondences of Christianity with Hinduism, . . .	218	Miraculous feasts, . . .	229
The use of sacrifice, . . .	218	Creating food out of nothing, . . .	229
Communion between gods and men, . . .	218	Creating wine, . . .	229
The water of life, . . .	219	Healing the sick, . . .	229
Purification by fire, . . .	220	Treasure obtained from fish's mouth, . . .	229
New birth, . . .	221	Moving mountains, . . .	229
The word of God, . . .	221	Washing feet, . . .	230
The offices of Yama in passing mankind to regions of bliss, . . .	222	The tale of Mándavya, . . .	230
His offices as judge of the dead, . . .	224	The sacrifice of divine beings, . . .	231
The condition of the blessed, . . .	224	The tale of Sunebsepha, . . .	232
The third heaven, . . .	225	The antiquity of the legends of Krishna and Ráma, . . .	232
Material celestial palaces, . . .	225	The plea that these legends are derived from the Christian records, . . .	233
Messages and tokens from heaven, . . .	226	The tale of Krishna, . . .	235
Death and noxious beasts, the work of Ahri-man, . . .	227	The marshalling of the Avatáras, . . .	238
Descending to hell, . . .	227	The tale of Ráma, . . .	239
The dogs of Yama, . . .	228	The Kalki Avatára, . . .	244
War in heaven, . . .	228	The blessedness attached to the reception of the tales of Ráma and Krishna, . . .	244
Miraculous births, . . .	228		

VI.—CONCLUSION.

What have we to supply on giving up the Bible? . . .	246	The right estimate of man's relations with God, . . .	251
Abandoning the old paths, . . .	247	The Christian's estimate thereof, . . .	253
Not judging by reason, . . .	249	Our objections to the principles as well as the facts of Christianity, . . .	254
The difficulty of obtaining a hearing, . . .	249		
Unity of aim in all religions, . . .	250		

\mathcal{F}_1

I.

THE ERA OF CHRISTIANITY.

CHRISTIANITY purports to be a system of religion derived from a superhuman source. It needed that a divine personage should descend from heaven to inculcate it by precept and example, and seal its doctrines with his blood. On this foundation is built up a scheme for the deliverance of mankind from sin and its consequences. The blood was shed sacrificially, and is of efficacy to ransom the sinner's soul and blot out all his guilt. The first Adam brought in sin and its penalty. The second Adam redeems those who rely on him from all evil, setting them, in their ultimate condition and sphere, above the possibility of perpetrating sin or incurring suffering. The message is a tempting one, if only it be offered on reliable grounds. It is specially acceptable to souls burdened with a sense of guilt, and deprived, by systematic teaching, from infancy, of all reliance on their Creator, as such.

Excluding, for the present, the canonical Christian scriptures, the earliest formulated history we have of this faith is by Eusebius, who was bishop of Cæsarea, and wrote towards the beginning of the fourth century. After the lapse, therefore, of nearly three hundred years from the death of the alleged founder of the system, we have the first attempt to place before us, historically, its uprise and development.

It is assuredly no advantage to the cause of Christianity that its outwardly discernible foundations were laid at so late a time as the reign of Constantine, and by one noted, not for virtue, but crime. Nor is it to the credit of its first historian that he should have been associated in the work of organizing the creed of Christianity with so flagitious a char-

acter, to whom, in the fulsomeness of adulation, he attributed supereminent godliness.

The writer, as might be expected, when treating of days when society was on a disturbed and imperfect footing, and literary productions scant and crude, came to his task with considerable disadvantage, and he consequently claims for his work lenient consideration. "I freely confess," he says, "it will crave indulgence, especially since, as the first of those that have entered upon the subject, we are attempting a kind of trackless and unbeaten path. Looking up with prayer to God as our guide, we trust, indeed, that we shall have the power of Christ as our aid, though we are totally unable to find even the bare vestiges of those who may have travelled the way before us; unless, perhaps, what is only presented in the slight intimations which some in different ways have transmitted to us in certain partial narratives of the times in which they lived; who, raising their voices before us, like torches at a distance, and as looking down from some commanding height, call out and exhort us where we should walk, and whither direct our course with certainty and safety" (*Ec. Hist.* i. 1). While the historian acknowledges having proceeded to his task in great destitution of materials, we have him ending by placing before us a work teeming with facts. Through the vista of fifteen hundred and fifty years we have to judge of the results thus arrived at. The author wrote with a particular purpose. "Whatsoever, therefore," he goes on to inform us, "we deem likely to be advantageous to the proposed subject, we shall endeavour to reduce to a compact body by historical narration." His object is to build up Christianity on historic foundations. He has to grope his way through unexplored and dubious channels; we, at this distant day, have to depend entirely on his judgment and integrity; and it cannot be said that he has not sufficiently shown his hand to place us upon our guard in accepting his results. "My first, my best, and almost my only authority," says Dr Donaldson, who has given the whole subject a careful study, "is Eusebius. . . . All subsequent writers have simply repeated his statements, sometimes indeed misrepresenting them. Eusebius therefore stands as my first and almost only authority" (*Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctrine*, I. 13, 14).

The most important guides which present themselves to the student of Christianity in the present times are, of course, the accepted scriptures. But Eusebius did not stand upon similar vantage ground with ourselves. The canon of the scripture was maturing itself in his day, but was far from being absolutely settled. There was a large body of writings, preceding and accompanying the now accepted scriptures, which, by existing universal consent, have been long disallowed as apocryphal. That distinction had been only partially drawn in the time of Eusebius, and he had to steer his course with no certain direction to guide him but his own judgment in deciding upon his authorities. He exercised this judgment apparently but little conscious of the perils besetting him.

There was also a flood of literature, illustrative of Christianity, consisting of doctrinal epistles, controversial writings, formal defences and apologies of Christianity, and also a current of traditionary information, from which he had to cull materials.

Dr Donaldson certainly has not been able to form a high estimate of the sole guide he has had to follow in his attempt to unravel the labyrinth of the writings of the early Christians. "Like all the rest of his age," he states, speaking of Eusebius, "he was utterly uncritical in his estimate of evidence, and where he, as it were, translates the language of others into his own, not giving their words but his own idea of their meaning, he is almost invariably wrong. Every statement therefore which he makes himself, is to be received with caution" (*Hist. of Christ. Lit.*, I. 14).

The times were not characterized by accuracy of representation. Deception in literary productions was not only practised, but openly defended. The object being to exalt religious sentiment among mankind, and to fix it on that form of faith which was accounted of paramount value, it was considered warrantable to promote these aims, by whatsoever means. The Christian writers were not the authors of such principles; they inherited them from the teachers that had gone before them. "The Platonists and Pythagoreans held it as a maxim that it was not only lawful, but even praiseworthy to *deceive*, and even to use the expedient of a *lie*, in order to advance the cause of *truth* and *piety*. The Jews, who lived in Egypt, had learned and received this maxim

from them, before the coming of Christ, as appears incontestably from a multitude of ancient records; and the Christians were infected from both these sources with the same pernicious error, as appears from the number of books attributed falsely to great and venerable names, from the *sibylline verses*, and several productions which were spread abroad in this (the first) and the following century" (Mosheim, *Ec. Hist.*, I., iii, 15). "With the greatest grief we find ourselves compelled to acknowledge, that the upright and laudable exertions thus made by the wise and pious part of the Christian community, were not only human means which in this century (the second) were employed in promoting the propagation of the Christian faith. For by some of the weaker brethren, in their anxiety to assist God with all their might, such dishonest artifices were occasionally resorted to, as could not, under any circumstances, admit of excuse, and were utterly unworthy of that sacred cause, which they were unquestionably intended to support. Perceiving, for instance, in what vast repute the poetical effusions of those ancient prophetesses, termed Sibyls, were held by the Greeks and Romans, some Christian, or rather, perhaps, an association of Christians, in the reign of Antoninus Pius, composed eight books of *Sibylline Verses*, made up of prophecies respecting Christ and his kingdom, with a view to persuade the ignorant and unsuspecting, that even so far back as the time of Noah, a Sibyl had foretold the coming of Christ, and the rise and progress of his church. This artifice succeeded with not a few, nay some even of the principal Christian teachers themselves were imposed upon by it; but it evidently brought great scandal on the Christian cause, since the fraud was too palpable to escape the searching penetration of those who gloried in displaying their hostility to the Christian name. By others, who were aware that nothing could be held more sacred than the name and authority of Hermes Trismegistus were by the Egyptians, a work bearing the title of *Poemander*, and other books, replete with Christian principles and maxims, were sent forth into the world, with the name of this most ancient and highly venerated philosopher prefixed to them, so that deceit might, if possible, effect the conversion of those whom reason had failed to convince. Many other deceptions of this sort, to which custom has very improperly given the

denomination of **PIOUS FRAUDS**, are known to have been practised in this and the succeeding century. The authors of them were, in all probability, actuated by no ill intention, but this is all that can be said in their favour, for their conduct in this respect was certainly most ill-advised and unwarrantable. Although the greater part of those who were concerned in these forgeries on the public, undoubtedly belonged to some heretical sect or other, and particularly to that class which arrogated to itself the pompous denomination of Gnostics, I yet cannot take upon me to acquit even the most strictly orthodox from all participation in this species of criminality; for it appears from evidence superior to all exception, that a pernicious maxim, which was current in the schools not only of the Egyptians, the Platonists, and the Pythagoreans, but also of the Jews, was very early recognized by the Christians, and soon found amongst them numerous patrons, namely, that those who made it their business to deceive with a view of promoting the cause of truth, were deserving rather of commendation than censure" (Mosheim, *Early Christians*, II., vii). "It is certain," says Mr Mackay, "that pseudonymous writing was from early times a common Israelitish custom. . . . Early Christian literature avowedly swarmed with what we should term forgeries" (*The Tübingen School*, 331, 335, citing Irenæus). Speaking of the credulity of the early Christian Fathers, the learned author of *Supernatural Religion* says, "No fable could be too gross, no invention too transparent for their unsuspicious acceptance, if it assumed a pious form, or tended to edification. No period in the history of the world ever produced so many spurious works as the first two or three centuries of our era. The name of every apostle or Christian teacher, not excepting the great Master himself, was freely attached to every description of religious forgery. False gospels, epistles, acts, martyrologies were unscrupulously circulated, and such pious falsification was not even intended or regarded as a crime, but perpetrated for the sake of edification" (I. 465, 466). "The early Christians adopted the very illogical principle of criticism, that whatever was edifying was true, whatever was true was genuine, whatever was genuine was old, whatever was old was apostolic, whatever was apostolic was authoritative, and whatever was autho-

ritative was considered to be clothed with divine authority. This fanciful and puerile method of criticism became a fruitful source of error, mysticism, nonsense, fable, fraud, and forgery" (*Primitive Church History*, 57, Mr Scott's Series).

The Pentateuch, as examined by the light of modern criticism, can no longer be ascribed to Moses; many of the Psalms are evidently of later date than the time of David; much of Isaiah, and a considerable portion of Ezekiel, are found to be additions made by other hands; and Daniel's period is not that of the captivity, but apparently of the Maccabæan era. The Jewish Apocrypha, which has found its way into the Alexandrine version, exhibits further acknowledged instances of pseudonymous writing. The Book of Enoch is a marked example of which the Christian evangelists have not scrupled to serve themselves, Jude going so far as to quote it openly as the production of the seventh man from Adam. We can quite understand the encouragement there was for the fabrication of the Christian Apocrypha, in which category are to be included the writings ascribed to the ante-nicene fathers. In respect of what we have from these fathers, Dr Giles assures us that there is no class of ancient literature, sacred or profane, more loaded with doubt and suspicion. The second of the epistles attributed to Clement of Rome is universally disallowed. The genuineness of the epistle bearing the name of Polycarp is disputed. Hefele, for cogent reasons, rejects the epistle of Barnabas. The Shepherd of Hermas is seen to be spurious. Eight out of the fifteen epistles ascribed to Ignatius are given up by common consent as not authentic; and the Rev. W. Cureton has brought to light MSS. from the East which shake the credit of the remainder. "Of the writings ascribed to Justin Martyr, and to Irenæus, more than half are acknowledged forgeries" (Giles, *Christian Records*, 53-58, 67). The epistle to Diognetus purports to be of the apostolic age, but has every mark of being a concoction of later times. The Clementine recognitions "form a kind of philosophical and theological romance." Professing to be of the apostolic period, they are relegated by some to as far forward as the fourth century (*Ante-nicene Christian Library*, III., 137, 138). Nor did secular writers, such as Josephus, Pliny, Suetonius, and Tacitus escape the efforts of the early Christian advocates to

support themselves with their authority by means of statements fabricated and introduced into their writings (*Our First Century*, Scott's Series).

Withal the credulity of these early ages knew no bounds. There was an appetite for wonders of any dimensions. "The Talmud and other Rabbinical writings are full of references to demoniacal possession." All diseases were ascribed to the action of the devil and other demons. "The interpretation of dreams became a public profession." The Jews believed in amulets and charms, in sorcery and magic (*Supernatural Religion*, I., 104-107). Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, admits that demoniacal influence was the common belief of the Jews. Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Theophilus of Antioch, Athenagoras, Tatian, Cyprian of Carthage, Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, and Chrysostom believed in the agency of good and bad angels (*Ibid.* 108-124). "Preternatural interference with the affairs of life and the phenomena of nature was the rule in those days, not the exception, and miracles, in fact, had apparently lost all novelty, and through familiarity had become degraded into mere common-place" (*Ibid.* 130). Josephus, in view of the statements appearing in Genesis vi. 1-4, accepted, as literally the case, that "many angels of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength" (*Ant.* I., iii. 1). Of Solomon he says, God had "enabled him to learn that skill which expels demons, which is a science useful and sanative to men. He composed such incantations also by which distempers are alleviated. And he left behind him the manner of using exorcisms, by which they drive away demons, so that they never return, and this method of cure is of great force unto this day; for I have seen a certain man of my own country, whose name was Eleazar, releasing people that were demoniacal in the presence of Vespasian, and his sons, and his captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. The manner of the cure was this,—He put a ring that had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon to the nostrils of the demoniac, after which he drew out the demon through his nostrils; and when the man fell down immediately, he adjured him to return into him no more, making still

mention of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed. And when Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a little way off a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon, as he went out of the man, to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know that he had left the man. And when this was done, the skill and wisdom of Solomon was shown very manifestly" (*Ant.* VIII., ii. 5). Josephus describes, as actual events, various portents which occurred at the siege of Jerusalem by Titus. A star, in the form of a sword, stood over the city for a whole year; at night, during the feast of unleavened bread, a light shone for half-an-hour round the altar and temple with the power of daylight; a heifer taken to be sacrificed brought forth a lamb in the midst of the temple; the eastern gate of the inner court of the temple, which was of brass, and so ponderous that it required twenty men to close it, when securely fastened with deep bolts, opened itself at night; chariots and troops of soldiers and armour were seen coming through the clouds; and at Pentecost the priests, when ministering in the inner court of the temple, "heard a great noise, and after that they heard a sound as of a great multitude, saying, 'Let us remove hence'" (*Wars*, VI., v. 3). Papias is reported to have said that "in his time there was one raised from the dead," and that one Justus, "who, though he drank a deadly poison, experienced nothing injurious, through the grace of the Lord" (*Euseb. Ec. Hist.* iii. 39). Clement of Rome cited the fabulous Phoenix in illustration of the resurrection. Of this bird, he stated there was but one specimen at a time. It lived five hundred years, and then built a nest of frankincense, myrrh, and spices, in which it laid itself and died. From its decomposed flesh there arose a new Phoenix, which took the nest, with the bones of its parent, and deposited them on the altar of the sun at Heliopolis, the act being repeated by successive birds every five hundred years, punctually to a day (1st Ep. to Cor., chap. xxv). Tertullian and other fathers used the same illustration. At the martyrdom of Polycarp the fire is said to have arched round him like a vault, refusing to burn his body, and the odour of precious spices came from the pile. Finally he was stabbed to death, and the blood gushing from him extinguished

the flames (*Martyrdom of Polycarp*, chap. xv. xvi). Barnabas believed that the hyena annually changes its sex, becoming at one time male, at another female (Ep., chap. x). Justin Martyr's belief in the agency of demons was very distinct. "Since of old," he says, "these evil demons, effecting apparitions of themselves, both defiled women and corrupted boys, and showed such fearful sights to men, that those who did not use their reason in judging of the actions that were done were struck with terror; and being carried away by fear, and not knowing that these were demons, they called them gods, and gave to each the name which each of the demons chose for himself" (1st Apol. v). Irenæus, Eusebius observes, "shows that even down to his times instances of divine and miraculous power were remaining in some churches. So far are they (the heretics) from raising the dead, as the Lord raised, and as the apostles, by means of prayer—for even among the brethren frequently in a case of necessity, when a whole church united in much fasting and prayer, the spirit has returned to the ex-animated body, and the man was granted to the prayers of the saints. . . . Some, indeed, most certainly and truly cast out demons, so that frequently those persons themselves that were cleansed from wicked spirits believed and were received into the church. Others have the knowledge of things to come, as also visions and prophetic communications; others heal the sick by the imposition of hands, and restore them to health. And, moreover, as we said above, even the dead have been raised, and continued with us many years" (Euseb. *Ec. Hist.*, v. 7). Tertullian declared that "the carcasses of the giants of old time" were apparent, their "bony frames being still extant" in his day. He gravely communicates these extraordinary tales. "I am acquainted," he says, "with the case of a woman, the daughter of Christian parents, who in the very flower of her age and beauty slept peaceably (in Jesus), after a singularly happy though brief married life. Before they laid her in her grave, and when the priest began the appointed office, at the very first breath of his prayer she withdrew her hands from her sides, placed them in an attitude of devotion, and after the holy service was concluded, restored them to their lateral position. Then again, there is that well-known story among our own people that a body voluntarily

made way in a certain cemetery to afford room for another body to be placed near it." He also believed in the actuality of demons. "Socrates," he states, "while yet a boy was found by the spirit of the demon. Thus, too, is it that to all persons their *genii* are assigned, which is only another name for demons." "There is hardly a human being who is unattended by a demon; and it is well known to many that premature and violent deaths, which men ascribe to accidents, are in fact brought about by demons" (*On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, chap. xlii; *De Anima*, chap. xxxix., li., lvii). Origen supported the statement that Jesus was born of a virgin with the allegation that there was a certain female animal which had offspring without contact with a male. He said there were still in his time Christians who could "expel evil spirits, perform many cures, and foresee events, according to the will of the Logos." He believed also that stars and comets appear to mark changes of dynasties and other events of importance on earth (*Contr. Celsus*, chap. xxxvii., xlv., lix).

Not only were demons concerned with mankind, the gods themselves, in these early days, walked the earth and held intercourse with them; and it was a common thing for those who were exalted among the human race to be translated to the sphere and conditions of the divinities. With such tales the early Christians are found to have been familiar. Alexander the Great was a reputed son of Jupiter, and after death, observes Clement of Alexandria, was canonized as the thirteenth god (*Exhortation to the Heathen*, chap. x.). Ariston, Origen informs us, was said to have been prevented having marital intercourse with his wife Amphictione until Plato, of whom she was pregnant by Apollo, was born (*Contr. Celsus*, chap. xxxviii.). The warning was conveyed in a dream, and the birth was from a virgin (Cranbrook, *The Founders of Christianity*, 181, note, citing Lewes' *Hist. of Philos.*). The Gnostics, Irenæus states, possessed images, and among them that of Jesus, which they set up with the images of Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle (*Against Heresies*, I. xxv. 6). Tiberius, according to Tertullian, proposed to enrol Christ among the gods (*Apol.* sec. 5). The habit was to deify the Roman emperors. "With perfect propriety," says the writer,

sneeringly, "you give divine honours to your departed emperors, as you worship them in life" (*Apol.*, sec. 13). Caius Caligula (A.D. 33-41) accounted himself a god, and designed to have a statue of himself erected as such in the Jewish temple (*Philo*, IV. 116, 146). Paul and Barnabas, we are told, were taken to be Jupiter and Mercury. This is said to have occurred at Lystra, in Phrygia, the region visited by these divinities when they received hospitality from Philemon and Baucis, according to the tale in Ovid. "The gods," the people said, "are come down to us in the likeness of men," whereon they proposed to sacrifice to them (*Acts* xiv. 11-13). Simon Magus was considered a god, and honoured with a statue at Rome. "And almost all the Samaritans," we are informed, "and a few even of other nations, worship him, and acknowledge him as the first god" (*Justin Martyr*, 1st *Apol.* xxvi.). Irenæus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus have the same fact. Apsethus, a Libyan, gave himself out for a god (Hippolytus on *Heresies*, VI. ii.). Menander, a Samaritan, a pupil of Simon Magus, declared himself, as had his master, an æon, or emanation of God (*Mosheim*, *Ec. Hist.* i. 143). Apollonius of Tyana was reputed to be the son of Jupiter (*His Life*, by Philostratus, I. 13). Hierocles, speaking of his miracles, asserted that he had done greater things than Christ (*Life of Eusebius*, Bohn's ed. xvi.). His statue was placed by Severus in his lararium, side by side with those of Jesus Christ, Abraham, Alexander the Great, and Orpheus (*Man's Origin and Destiny*, by M. A. of Baliol, 714). Decius Mundus was able to pass himself off as Anubis in the Temple of Isis, and so defile a noble matron named Paulina, who thought she was honoured with the embraces of the Egyptian divinity (*Josephus*, *Ant.* XVIII. iii. 4). Tacitus has an account of a celestial youth ascending to heaven in a column of fire (*John Jones*, *Ec. Res.* 410).

These, then, were the characteristics of the times in which our earliest ecclesiastical historian had to hold his course. Pseudonymous writings, and positive literary fabrications, were currently resorted to, and every form of extravagant fable found ready acceptance. Eusebius was of his own day, and not beyond or above it, and what we take at his hands comes to us with the taint over it of the times in which he lived.

He had to deal with the Jewish scriptures, and we find him, according to the prevalent practice of the early Christians, resorting to that most imperfect representation of them we have in the Septuagint; and this version he exalts to the standing of an inspired record. He gives currency to the obviously incredible tale of the manner in which the translation was conducted, his authority being Irenæus. The people of Jerusalem sent "seventy of their elders that were best skilled in the Scriptures, and in both languages, to Ptolemy, and thus Providence favoured his design. But as he wished them to make the attempt separately, and apprehensive lest by concert they might conceal the truth of the Scriptures by their interpretation, therefore separating them from one another, he commanded all to write the same translation, and this he did in all the books. Assembling, therefore, in the same place, in the presence of Ptolemy, and each of them comparing their respective versions, God was glorified, and the Scriptures were recognised as truly divine, as all of them rendered the same things, in the very same expressions, and the same words, from the beginning to the end. So that the Gentiles present knew that the Scriptures were translated by a divine inspiration" (*Ec. Hist.* v. 8). In this collection occur, it must be remembered, those writings disavowed by Jews and Protestants as apocryphal, and which include such puerilities as the tales of Tobit, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon.

Eusebius presents us with a correspondence between Agbarus, prince of Edessa, and Jesus Christ, verifying the same from the archives of Edessa; associated with which representation is an alleged mission of John for the conversion of Agbarus and his people, which was attended with miraculous demonstrations (*Ec. Hist.* i. 13; ii. 1). He cites Tertullian for the fact that Pontius Pilate transmitted to the emperor Tiberius an account of the miracles of Jesus, and his resurrection from the dead, representing that the mass of the people believed him to be a god; on which Tiberius is said to have proposed that he should be admitted into the Roman pantheon (ii. 2). He alleges that Mark evangelized Alexandria in the time of Philo, who had given an account of the churches established by him, and cites a tradition that when Philo was at Rome he had intercourse with Peter, who was there preaching

the gospel (ii. 16, 17). He assumes the Therapeuts, as described by Philo, to have been the converts of Mark, and represents them, at this early day, to have been apparently in possession of the Christian scriptures. "It is highly probable," he observes, "that the ancient commentaries which he (Philo) says they have, are the very gospels and writings of the apostles, and probably some expositions of the ancient prophets, such as are contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews and many others of St Paul's epistles" (ii. 17).

Have we consummate ignorance and erroneous judgment, or wilful misrepresentation, exhibited in these statements? The testimony from Edessa appears personal to Eusebius, and its character is sufficiently transparent. No one in the present day attaches the slightest credence to the private correspondence with the alleged Agbarus attributed to the asserted saviour of the world, and yet we have from our historian the very letters that then passed, with an apparent voucher for their authenticity. The allegations of Tertullian no prudent person would accept on any subject. He was of a fiery impulsive temperament, reckless in his statements. Distant from the localities he testified of, being of Carthage in Africa, we are required, on a most important point, which would have attracted universal attention in the Christian world, to admit his statement of what took place between Judea and Rome a hundred and sixty years before his time, he being the sole person conscious of the occurrence. Eusebius's imputations respecting Philo, are against the clearly apparent facts. We have fortunately the works of this author extant before us, and can satisfy ourselves that of Mark, Peter, or Christians in any form, he knew nothing. He was a doctrinaire, occupied on just such subjects as would have required him to notice Christianity had he been aware of the movement; but he has not a word upon the subject. The allegation that the Therapeuts, whom he describes, were Christians, and the writings they used the Christian gospels and epistles, is a statement of unsurpassable hardihood. The Therapeuts, if nominally Jews, were really closely allied in doctrine and practice to the Asiatic ascetics. They had no knowledge of Christ, who was not named among them. Supposing Philo lived and was occupied with his writings to the age of

eighty, he could not have survived the resurrection by above thirty years. The suggestion that the ancient writings he describes the Therapeuts as possessing could possibly be the Christian scriptures, is a demand on one's credulity which it is inconceivable that any one should have made. It was well known, and the information must have been at the command of Eusebius, that the Therapeuts antedated Christianity by a considerable period, and therefore stood entirely independent of the movement. The historian would seem to have been here trading on the ignorance that surrounded him.

In respect of Josephus, he has endorsed the remarkable passages introduced into his writings relative to Jesus, John the Baptist, and James the Lord's brother (i. 11 ; ii. 13). It is not to the credit of our author's critical acumen that he should have supposed that one remaining a devout Jew should have written of these personages with the degree of acceptance proper only to one who was himself a Christian. Of these the statement of the most importance, namely, that concerning Jesus as the Christ, is first brought to notice by Eusebius himself, while Origen's writings show it had no existence in the works of Josephus in his day. Another of these passages, namely one of those relating to James the Just, appears to have been expunged from Josephus some centuries after the time of Eusebius ; that is, it has been given up by the Christians themselves. I have to treat more particularly of these circumstances hereafter in dealing with the testimony of Josephus.

Finally, Eusebius, in building up his history, puts together circumstances that could not possibly have co-existed. He has constant recurrences of martyrdoms, all that was required to bring down the visitation being the acknowledgment by the accused that he was a Christian. Directly this confession was made death was inflicted, the heathen requiring to hear no more (*Ec. Hist.* v. 1). And yet we are called upon to believe that at these very times there were long successions of Christian bishops openly maintained at Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Alexandria, Laodicea, and Cæsarea, that there were frequent controversial writings indited to put down heresies, and that formal apologies for Christianity were addressed in writing to the Roman authorities.

So far for the reliance we are to place in Eusebius as a competent critic groping his way in the midst of scanty and questionable materials. Then we have to view him in the aspect of a digester of facts in an age of unhesitating credulity. Of the incredibilities that we have had before us, he accepts as true the portents described by Josephus as having occurred at the siege of Jerusalem; the miraculous powers of the early Christians reported by Papias and Irenæus, including the restoration of life to the dead; the demoniacal agency spoken of by Irenæus; and the marvels that are said to have occurred at the martyrdom of Polycarp (*Ec. Hist.* iii. 8, 39; iv. 15; v. 7). We have seen him also endorse the miraculous execution of the Septuagint translation, alleging that this incorrect version is to be accepted as of divine accuracy, notwithstanding also its serious disagreements with what the Hebrews present to us as the original text. He narrates, as possibly the case, that the army of Marcus Aurelius was refreshed by a shower of rain, brought down by the prayers of Christian soldiers in one of his legions (v. 5); he records as credible that the apostle John raised one from the dead at Ephesus (v. 18); he gives us the tale of one Natalius being "lashed by holy angels through the whole night," on account of heresy, and showing the marks of his castigation in order to be readmitted as a penitent to communion (v. 27); he speaks of miracles being wrought by one Narcissus, among which was the conversion of water into oil to supply the deacons at the time of their vigils during "the great watch of the passover" (vi. 9); he says, that on a certain festival day a victim was thrown into the springs of the Jordan, and that this, "by the power of the dæmon, in some wonderful manner entirely disappeared," but that when one Astyrius prayed to God, through Christ, "to refute this seducing dæmon, the victim immediately floated on the stream," and the marvel was put an end to (vii. 17); he tells us, moreover, that when martyrs were cast before wild beasts for destruction, by the power of Christ, "the devouring wild beasts would not dare either to touch or to approach the bodies of these pious men." "They would not," he goes on to say, "even touch the holy wrestlers standing naked and striking at them with their hands, as they were commanded, in order to irritate the beasts against them.

Sometimes, indeed, they would also rush upon them, but, as if repulsed by some divine power, they again retreated;" so that in the end the martyrs had to be disposed of with the sword. "At these scenes," the author assures us, "we have been present ourselves, when we also observed the divine power of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ himself present, and effectually displayed in them" (viii. 7).

Such is the writer who has supplied us with all we have of the early history of Christianity over the first three centuries of its alleged prevalence. On the proper apprehension of the testimonies belonging to this important period the true character of the movement seriously depends. From the time of Eusebius and Constantine, the system was in open exercise. How it stood in the previous centuries rests upon the writings that have descended to us, and the marshallings of our author. Of these writings a large proportion are condemned as apocryphal; that is, they were written when and by whom we know not, and are destitute of authority. The task is therefore ever before us of selecting the possibly genuine out of a mass of assuredly spurious productions. Of the accepted scriptures, the Gospels, and Acts, which are the portions conveying historical materials, are really anonymous, and no competent critic assigns them a time earlier than the course of the second century. The true fact is that it is as uncertain when or by whom they were written, as it is when or how we have any of the recognized Apocrypha. For what else is presented to us in the earliest Christian literature, we are dependent upon no better source than Eusebius.

The incidents associated with the uprise of Christianity are of a complexion to have attracted universal attention. A virgin produces a child by contact with the Deity, without the agency of a human father. The birth is celebrated by an angelic choir announcing it to shepherds then met with. Magi, prophetically instructed, and guided by a moving star, come from some distant quarter to greet the infant as the future king of the Jews. The ruler of the Jews institutes a cruel massacre to destroy all infants of the neighbourhood, thinking thus to get rid of his dreaded rival. The child escapes, and proves to be a god incarnate. He displays his divine power in numerous ways, among which is the raising of the dead.

He confers the same power on all who believe in him. As he closes his mortal career, darkness spreads over the earth, nature is convulsed, and the dead disturbed in their graves. He rises to life, shows himself on earth, and ascends bodily to heaven. He proves to be that Messiah in whom the hopes of Israel had long centred. These things could not have occurred without attracting the notice of the historians of the day, and especially those of the community directly acted upon. The labours of such historians fortunately, in more or less fulness, are before us, and this prime test of the degree of credit to be attached to Christianity may be satisfactorily applied.

The first to be adduced is Nicolaus of Damascus, who lived in the time of Herod, and survived to that of his son and successor, Archelaus. We have not his work, but only what is reported of him by Josephus, who drew materials, it may be judged, from him. Nicolaus was a learned and eloquent Jew, employed by his people, on two occasions, to defend them against the Greeks of Ionia. He was intimately associated with Herod, having been "always conversant with him, and acquainted with whatsoever he did, and with the circumstances of his affairs." Herod sent him to defend him before Cæsar when involved in troubles connected with Arabia. When Antipater was charged before Varus with a design to poison his father Herod, Nicolaus appeared in behalf of Herod, and exposed Antipater. On the death of Herod, when Antipater disputed the succession of Archelaus, he pleaded for the latter. And when the Jews complained of the oppressions of Herod and Archelaus, and wished to have an end put to the kingly rule, he defended the administration of these kings (Josephus, *Ant.* XII. iii. 2; XVI. ii. 3; XVI. ix. 4; XVII. v. 4; XVII. ix. 6; XVII. xi. 3). By his position he must have been cognizant of whatever affected the interests of Herod; and the miraculous birth of the rival infant, and all connected with that event, including the massacre of the innocents, must have come before him. He wrote an extensive history, of which Josephus evidently availed himself; but not a particle of information on the subject of Jesus is traceable to him in the pages of Josephus.

The next authority to be cited is Philo Judæus, a copious writer, whose works are happily extant. He lived in that

important time covering the whole period ascribed to the founder of Christianity. He was of Alexandria, and was deputed by his fellow Jews in the year A.D. 42 to Rome, to seek for them the protection of the Emperor Caligula. At this time he was advanced in years. He says, speaking of the expected issue of his mission, "But I myself, who was accounted to be possessed of superior prudence, both on account of my age, and my education, and general information, was less sanguine in respect of the matters at which the others were so greatly delighted" (*Works of Philo*, Bohn's ed., IV., 140). When he wrote an account of his mission he was an old man. "How long," he observes, "shall we, who are aged men, still be children, being indeed as to our bodies gray-headed through the length of time we have lived" (IV. 99). He survived Claudius (Bryant on *Philo*, 34), who demised A.D. 54. Taking Philo at this period to have been about 70 years of age, we may assume that he was born about B.C. 16, and lived and wrote to about A.D. 60. Philo was much occupied in interpreting the Jewish scriptures. His studies and tone of mind led him to dilate upon the attributes of the divine Logos, or personified Word of God, a position Jesus is said to have filled; and he entered into close descriptions of that devout sect around him, known as the Therapeuts, who approached so closely the type of Christianity, that Eusebius has ventured to allege them to have been Christians. Alexandria, according to tradition, was one of the first places evangelized, the reputed agent being the apostle Mark. Rome was also, according to the Epistle to the Romans, a place in which Christianity flourished at an early period, Peter being traditionally the alleged missionary. Eusebius desires it to be believed that Philo fell in with both Mark and Peter when thus occupied. He appears to have frequented Jerusalem at the appointed festivals, as every devout Jew was bound to do. "When I was on my journey towards the temple of my native land," he writes, "for the purpose of offering up prayers and sacrifices therein" (IV. 240). And yet, with all these opportunities at Alexandria, Rome, and Jerusalem, a contemporary of the alleged Messiah and his apostles, occupied on subjects intimately associated with the mission imputed to them, and deeply interested in all that affected the religious

welfare of his people—himself a voluminous writer—Philo shows entire ignorance of the advent of the Jewish Redeemer, the embodiment of his idealized Logos; and equally so of the testimony of his acts, doctrines, and the body of followers said to be gathered to his name in Jerusalem, and spreading their creed around them. These things could not have been, and Philo have known nothing of them, and knowing them, it is impossible to account for his silence concerning them.

The third whose evidence should have been rendered is Justus of Tiberias. He was a contemporary of Josephus, and his active opponent in fomenting that disaffection in Galilee which Josephus was deputed to suppress. Josephus was born about the year A.D. 37, or just four years after the alleged resurrection. He was consequently of the generation next succeeding that of the asserted Messiah. Justus stands in this time, and was a prominent person in Tiberias, a city on the borders of that lake of Gennesareth where so much of the action of the gospel is laid. Here, at all events, if the incarnate deity had occupied the scene and immortalized it with his works, the fame of his deeds and doctrines must have been rife. Justus wrote an extensive history, which has not survived, but is adverted to by Josephus (*Life*, sec. 65; *Ant.* XVIII., ii. 3, note); and Photius (a celebrated Byzantine author and critic of the ninth century), who made himself acquainted therewith, gives us the information respecting the work which we now need. "I have read," he says, "the chronology of Justus of Tiberias, whose title is this, *The Chronology of the Kings of Judah, which succeeded one another*. This (Justus) came out of the city of Tiberias in Galilee. He begins his history from Moses, and ends it not till the death of Agrippa (A.D. 43), the seventh (ruler) of the Jews; who took the government under Claudius, had it augmented under Nero, and still more augmented by Vespasian. He died in the third year of Trajan, where also his history ends. He is very concise in his language, and slightly passes over those affairs that were most necessary to be insisted on; and being under the Jewish prejudices, as indeed he was himself also a Jew by birth, he makes not the least mention of the appearance of Christ, or what things happened to him, or of the wonderful works that he did" (*Life of Josephus*, sec. 65,

note). The fact is valuable that in the very region of the alleged marvels they are unnoticed by a writer living near upon the times, and treating of them. The reason for his silence Photius, as a Christian, could not see might be the non-occurrence of the facts. Justus, as an historian, was bound to have said something of such an eventful career as that attributed to Jesus, and his Jewish prejudices would have been sufficiently served by adverting to him as a false Messiah, whom his nation had rejected, and who had come to an inglorious end.

The last of the Jewish historians living in or close upon the day alleged for Jesus of whom we have any record, is Josephus. He was born, as I have already noticed, about the year A.D. 37, and wrote his account of the Wars of the Jews in A.D. 75, and his Antiquities in A.D. 93 (*Whiston's Note on Preface to the Wars*). He covers thus the times next succeeding those ascribed to Jesus, or the apostolic era, when the Holy Ghost is said to have descended in power, and the gospel to have been spread abroad with marvellous effect, signs and wonders accompanying the preachers of that day in verification of their divine mission (Mark xvi. 17, 18; Acts v. 12). Josephus was of the priestly tribe, and claimed to be of royal descent. He was in high repute among his fellow-countrymen for character and learning. He was deputed by the Jews of Jerusalem to quell disturbances arising in Galilee, and was much occupied with the affairs of the city of Tiberias on the banks of the lake of Gennesareth. He was cognizant also of the affairs of Antioch and Damascus, of which he wrote. At the age of twenty-six, or in A.D. 63, he visited Rome, and after the fall of Jerusalem Titus established him in Rome, where he was treated with consideration by the successive emperors, Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian (*Life*, sec. 3, 76; *Wars*, II., xx. 2; VII., iii. 3). He thus moved over the very scenes of the gospel action, and the places where Christianity is said to have been first established.

There are certain passages in the works of this author, connected with Christianity, which demand immediate attention. The first is that celebrated statement appearing relative to the Christ, to which I have already alluded as a recognized forgery. "Now there was about this time," the author is made to say,

"Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works—a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was (the) Christ; and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day" (*Ant.* XVIII., iii. 3). The language is plainly that of a Christian, and not such as would be held by a Jew. Nor can it have proceeded from one so near the alleged events of Christianity as Josephus, who, sixty years after the atonement said to have been made by the Messiah, would not have had to point to the fact that he still had a following "at this day" as a noteworthy circumstance. Fortunately this passage not only reveals itself as one which could not have come from the pen of a devout and consistent Jew such as Josephus, but it has been introduced so clumsily as at once to make it apparent that it is an interpolation. In the previous section (the second) Josephus describes a commotion in Jerusalem in the time of Herod, concluding with these words: "And since the people were unarmed, and were caught by men prepared for what they were about, there were a great number of them slain by this means, and others of them ran away wounded; and thus an end was put to this sedition." The fourth section then begins in evident continuation of the subject. "About the same time also another sad calamity put the Jews into disorder." The passage respecting Jesus fills section third, which has thus been thrust in to the interruption of the real thread of the author's discourse. That it formed no part of the original work of Josephus is made apparent by the testimony of Origen. He tells us what was attributed to Josephus up to his day. Josephus had spoken of John the Baptist, and of James the brother of Jesus, but not otherwise of Jesus himself. "Now this writer," he states, "although not believing in Jesus as the Christ, in seeking after the cause of the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple, whereas he ought to have said that the conspiracy

against Jesus was the cause of these calamities befalling the people, since they put to death Christ, who was a prophet, says nevertheless—being, although against his will, not far from the truth—that these disasters happened to the Jews as a punishment for the death of James the Just, who was a brother of Jesus (called Christ).” “If then,” he adds, “he says that it was on account of James that the desolation of Jerusalem was made to overtake the Jews, how should it not be more in accordance with reason to say that it happened on account (of the death) of Jesus Christ, of whose divinity so many churches are witnesses” (*Against Celsus*, I., xlvii). Had there been in the writings of Josephus that passage which we now have respecting Jesus, Origen could not have failed to have made use of it in his argument with Celsus, when occupied in bringing before him the testimony of Josephus. On the contrary, he has to admit the absence of any sufficient notice of Jesus by Josephus, and to endeavour to account for his silence. The interpolation, consequently, must have been made after the time of Origen, who is said to have written about the middle of the third century. That the passage is a fabricated one is also evidenced by the circumstance that at one time it stood in the account of the Wars verbatim as we find it in the Antiquities (*Wars*, II., ix. 1, note).

The ascription of the downfall of Jerusalem to the stoning of James the Just, imputed by Origen and Eusebius to Josephus, no longer appears in the works of Josephus. It is traceable to the time of Georgius Syncellus, about A.D. 790 (Whiston's *Josephus*, *App. Diss.* I.). In what part of the works of Josephus it stood is uncertain. Origen, in his Commentary on Matthew, appears to refer to it as being in the 20th chapter of the Antiquities, while in *Hieronym. de Vir. Illustr. in Josepho* it is alluded to as standing in the 18th chapter. The Alexandrine Chronicle refers to an account of the stoning of James as in the 5th chapter of the Wars, which is no more there (*Josephus*, *App. Diss.* I.). The proper place for the notice of the alleged death of James, and the acceptance of the event by the Jews as the cause of the judgment sustained by them in the downfall of Jerusalem, would assuredly be the History of the Wars, and it is singular if it made its appearance only in the Antiquities. The passage being

withdrawn amounts to an admission of its spuriousness, and the whole action of the insertion and the withdrawal exhibits the unscrupulous manner in which the records left to us by Josephus have been tampered with. Possibly when the forged passage respecting Jesus had established itself, the opinion of Origen that the fall of Jerusalem was properly ascribable to Jesus having been put to death, rather than to the martyrdom of James, may have led to the removal of the statement respecting James as involving an obvious inconsistency.

The notice we have remaining of the death of James is this:—"Festus was now dead, and Albinus was but upon the road; so he assembled the sanhedrim of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others (or some of his companions); and when he had formed an accusation against them as breakers of the law, he delivered them to be stoned" (*Ant.* XX. ix.). After what has foregone respecting the death of James, as described by Josephus, this passage may well be questioned. It is much against it that no such statement regarding James appears in its appropriate place in the *History of the Wars*. And it is fatal to it that Josephus is here made to know of Jesus as represented to have been the Christ, and yet had said no more of his remarkable assumptions and asserted actions.

We have now to consider the passage in Josephus concerning John the Baptist, which is this:—"Now, some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as punishment of what he did against John, that was called the *Baptist*, for Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing (with water) would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away (or the remission) of some sins (only), but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. Now, when (many) others came in crowds about him, for they were greatly moved (or pleased) by hearing his words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the

people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion, (for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties, by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly, he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Macherus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death. Now, the Jews had an opinion that the destruction of this army was sent as a punishment upon Herod, and a mark of God's displeasure against him" (*Ant.* XVIII. v. 2). This passage has met with better success than the others in which testimony for the personages of Christianity has been attributed to Josephus, and it is common to this day to acknowledge it as affording reliable evidence that Josephus knew, at all events, of John the Baptist, and thus wrote of him. My own view of the passage is far otherwise. It appears to me as clearly traceable to Christian hands interpolating the record of Josephus as is the case in any of the other instances. Josephus is made to interest himself in the character of John's ministry, and to take considerable pains to make it intelligible, and to recommend to others this person (whom the Christians accept as the forerunner of Christ). One within the pale of this ministry might so write, but scarcely one wholly outside the limits of Christianity, and who, if he had heard of Jesus as the Christ, must have rejected him. There is the same absurd idea as was advanced in the instance of the death of James, namely, that the Jews had gone out of their way to construe the ordinary events of history as divine manifestations made in support of the Christian cause. The context also plainly shows the passage to have been thrust in in the midst of another subject. The first section relates to the overthrow of Herod's army by Aretas, and ends thus,—“So Herod wrote about these affairs to Tiberius; who, being very angry at the attempt made by Aretas, wrote to Vitellius, to make war upon him, and either to take him alive, and bring him to him in bonds, or to kill him, and send him his head. This was the charge that Tiberius gave to the president of Syria.” The third section opens thus,—“So Vitellius prepared to make war with Aretas, having with him two legions of armed men.”

The second section has been introduced in interruption of the narrative, and obviously by another hand. Josephus was a necessary witness to the Christians, and it is thus that he has been made so.

Josephus has aimed at communicating whatever was of interest connected with his people. He is a laborious and conscientious writer, and his work describes what concerned the Jews in their religious standing as well as their secular history. He gives copious accounts of that interesting sect, the Essenes, whose tenets were so allied to what afterwards appeared as Christianity, that Eusebius, as we have seen, has not hesitated to claim the Therapeuts, a similar sect belonging to Alexandria, as actually Christians. Josephus has also described the known pretenders of those days to superhuman power, as well as other leaders who appeared and influenced his people, such as Judas and Manahem, who were Essene prophets—Judas the Galilean the founder of a sect, and Theudas, and a certain Egyptian, who were impostors, and led astray many (*Ant.* XIII. xi. 2; XV. x. 5; XVIII. i. 1, 6; XX. v. 1; XX. ix. 6). Scaliger's opinion of our author as an authority may here be referred to, as coming from an impartial and competent judge. "Josephus," he says, "is the most diligent and the greatest lover of truth of all writers; nor are we afraid to affirm of him, that it is more safe to believe him, not only as to the affairs of the Jews, but also as to those that are foreign to them, than all the Greek and Latin writers; and this, because his fidelity and his compass of learning are everywhere conspicuous" (Whiston's *Josephus*, *App. Diss.* I). Had the Messiah of the Jews appeared and offered himself to his people in the generation preceding Josephus, proclaiming his mission with many manifestations of divine power, so that the "fame" of what he was doing in Galilee had spread itself "throughout all Syria," attracting "multitudes of people" to him "from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem, and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan" (*Matt.* iv. 24, 25); and had the work of the Messiah established itself after his death, drawing in many adherents to his name from among "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia,

in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes and Arabians" (Acts ii. 9-11), and leading, from a very early time, to the organization of settled Christian communities in Judea, Antioch, Damascus, Rome, Greece, and Asia Minor, it is impossible that Josephus should not have heard of events of such vast importance, and of influences so solid and widely spread, or have failed to accord them notice; but not a word is traceable to him, except in the spurious passages, to show that he had any knowledge of Jesus, his apostles, or followers. He is of Jerusalem, the headquarters of the Christian movement, where the awful scene of the death of the founder of the faith was enacted, and hears nothing of them there; he is for a considerable space of time officially employed in Galilee, passing continually over the very spots upon which the reputed saviour of mankind had trod, and which he had immortalized with his divine acts, but no tidings of him reached him in this region; he passes the last years of his life at Rome, that city the fame of whose faithful ones was "spoken of throughout the whole world," but has no consciousness of the existence of them or their creed. He describes the religious action at Antioch, the place where first the name of Christian sprang up, without knowing of the denomination there. Active proselytism is going on in this locality, but it is into the Jewish, not the Christian community. "They" (the Jews), he says, "made proselytes of a great many of the Greeks perpetually, and thereby, after a sort, brought them to be a portion of their own body" (*Wars*, VII., iii. 3). It is just what the Gospel speaks of as coming from the mouth of Jesus, "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte." He shows a similar movement in Damascus, that city made celebrated by the occurrence in its neighbourhood of the divine vision accorded to Paul, converting the would-be persecutor of the Christians there, into their most renowned and active preacher; but, again, it is a passage of the Pagans, not into Christianity, but into Judaism that is spoken of. The people of the place slaughtered the Jews in numbers, because they had been proselytizing their females. "Yet," our author says, "did they distrust their own wives, which were almost all of them

addicted to the Jewish religion" (*Wars*, II. xx. 2). He describes, in his history, the persecution of the godly during the war with the Romans, but these were Essenes (*Wars*, II. viii. 10). Eusebius conveniently accounts for the absence of Christians at this critical time by alleging that they withdrew beyond the Jordan to Pella, under divine monition (*Ec. Hist.*, III. v).

The Talmud is a collection of Jewish writings, eminently suited to have given us an account of that movement among the Jews, which developed itself into Christianity. I follow the statements of Mr Emanuel Deutsch, whose article in the *Quarterly Review* for October 1867, on the subject, attracted such deserved attention. The Talmud, he informs us, is "an encyclopædia of law, civil and penal, ecclesiastical and international, human and divine." "It is a microcosm, embracing, even as does the Bible, heaven and earth. It is as if all the prose and the poetry, the science, the faith, and speculation of the old world were, though only in faint reflections, bound up *in nuce*." Its origin is "coeval with the return from the Babylonish captivity." It contains, "besides the social, criminal, international, human, and divine law, along with abundant explanations of laws not perfectly comprehended, corollaries and inferences from the law, that were handed down with more or less religious reverence, an account also of the education, the arts, the science, the history, and religion of this people for about a thousand years; most fully perhaps of the time immediately preceding and following the birth of Christianity. It shows us the teeming streets of Jerusalem, the tradesman at his work, the women in their domestic circle, even the children at play in the market-place. The Priest and the Levite ministering in their holy rites, the preacher on the hill-side surrounded by the multitude, even the story-teller in the bazaar: they all live, move, and have being in these pages. . . . Athens and Alexandria, Persia and Rome, their civilizations and religions, old and new, are represented at every turn." "We have, apart from the clearest and most irrefutable evidences of witnesses, all the ordinary internal evidences of history. We have an array of carefully preserved historical names and dates, the general faithfulness and truth of which have never yet been called into question. From the great synagogue down to the final com-

pletion of the Babylonian Gemara, we have the legal and philosophical development of the nation always embodied as it were in the successive principal schools and men of their times. Its chief importance for religious history is the manner in which it informs us of things and circumstances at the time of the birth of Christianity, among the Priests and Pharisees, of the education, synagogues, preaching, of women, of angels and demons, &c. It gives us the ethical sayings, the parables, gnomes, &c., which were the principal vehicle of the common Jewish teaching from an almost pre-historic period" (*Literary Remains of Emanuel Deutsch*, 11, 12, 136, 138).

It is clear that when Christianity became a fact, whether in the era ordinarily attributed to it, or at a later time, the occurrence of so remarkable an event as a proclaimed and accepted Messiah, especially if accompanied by the marvels alleged to have attended the advent of Jesus, must have attracted the attention of that community who were in the habit of descanting on all subjects associated with their nation and faith in their comprehensive and ever-progressing Talmud. If such a personage in truth made his appearance, we should have had from these Jewish writers some representation of the character of his mission, and of the supports or credentials with which it was introduced, and have been told why, when he "came unto his own," "his own received him not." Whatever there may have been in the Talmud bearing upon Christianity, it is clear it was not of a description to support the Christian pretensions; for the efforts of the Christians appear to have been very earnest and persistent to expunge all matter therein supposed to have any allusion to the circumstances of their faith. "In the Basle edition of 1578," Mr Deutsch informs us, which is the standard one, "the Censor stepped in. In his anxiety to protect the 'Faith' from all and every danger—for the Talmud was supposed to hide bitter things against Christianity under the most innocent-looking words and phrases—this official did very wonderful things." "Ever since it existed—almost before it existed in a palpable shape—it has been treated much like a human being. It has been proscribed, and imprisoned, and burnt, a hundred times over. From Justinian, who, as early as 553 A.D. honoured it by a special interdictory Novella, down

to Clement VIII. and later—a space of over a thousand years—both the secular and the spiritual powers, kings and emperors, popes and anti-popes, vied with each other in hurling anathemas, and bulls, and edicts, of wholesale confiscation and conflagration, against this luckless book. Thus, within a period of less than fifty years—and these forming the latter half of the sixteenth century—it was publicly burnt no less than six different times, and that not in single copies, but wholesale, by the waggon-load.” “What alterations there are in the Talmud are owing to censors who changed passages that were supposed to clash with Christianity, and produced the most singular obscurities. The censor’s work was fruitless, for in reality there was nothing in the genuine Talmud to be taken out” (*Ibid.*, 5-7, 137).

Professor Theodores, of Owen’s College, Manchester, another learned member of the Jewish community, enables us to apprehend the fact here alleged that the Talmud never has contained anything having a distinct bearing upon the facts alleged for Christianity. While the Christians interfered with all editions of the Talmud accessible to them, some appear to have escaped their notice, and these are still available to us in their original integrity. Professor Theodores says, “Those published under the censorship of Christian ecclesiastical authorities were, moreover, purposely mutilated, or, as it was styled, expurgated, void spaces being left wherever those learned men fancied to detect allusions disrespectful to the state religion. But all these passages are found, with their native semblance on, in editions of the Talmud published in Constantinople, and they are now unceremoniously reproduced in Central and Western Europe—the conviction having gained ground that the Christianity of this age has nothing whatever to fear from *that* quarter, especially as it is far from probable that in those suspected passages there is any reference to Pauline Christianity at all. Altogether, the history of the rise and progress of the Church receives no light from the Talmudic traditions. The Mishna, although dating from the end of the second century, betrays no knowledge of the existence of Christianity. . . . In neither Gemara are Christians or Christianity mentioned by name. There are indeed allusions to disputations between the Doctors and certain querulous people

denominated 'Minim' (heretics), whom some writers persist in making into Christians; but this term is so vague that it is applicable to any of the numerous sects, or branches of sects, which in those ages filled, not only Palestine, but all Asia, Egypt, and the classical lands of Europe, with the tumultuous excitement of religious warfare. As the controversies alluded to in the Gemaras have, in most instances, some divergent interpretation of a Mosaic law in view, it is highly probable that those disputes lay between the Talmudic doctors and such Jews as had, like the Ebionites and Nazarenes, adopted some of the dogmas of Christianity, without, however, leaving the pale of Judaism by rejecting the law of Moses; but Pauline Christians, mainly of Grecian birth, and in whose opinion the Mosaic law was no longer obligatory, were certainly regarded by the Rabbis of the Talmud as Gentiles to all intents and purposes, between whom and the teachers of the law there was no common ground left for discussion, and no discussion took place" (*Essays, &c., by Professors, &c., of Owen's College, 366-368*).

The distinction drawn by Professor Theodores is one that should ever be borne in mind in estimating early Christianity. There were two factions, the one so allied to Judaism as to present no elements which a Jew might not discuss on the basis of the Law of Moses; the other so framed in Gentilism as to possess features with which no Jew might connect himself, and in which, consequently, he was sensible of no interest wherewith to concern himself. And from the silence of the Talmud on what affects Christianity, it is evident that the movement must have been far other than is described in the Christian scriptures. Certain sectaries arose, known through preachings and writings, and not from enacted facts, and these were not exercising among the Jewish community any such influence as to attract the regards of their literary leaders. That Jesus and his disciples lived and moved among them, exhibiting marvellous signs, wrought on earth, and called down from heaven, in attestation that he was the Messiah who had arrived among them to give new life to the nation, certainly could not have occurred without eliciting notice from the devout and earnest writers of the Talmud.

Professor Theodores gives the legend of one Yishó Nôsri

on which the early Christians, in their sensitiveness, fixed, as being a caricature of Jesus; but the features of the story so little resemble those of the career attributed to Jesus that no caricaturist would have hit his mark who thus distantly described the object aimed at. Yishó Nôsrî is said to have been a disciple of Rabbi Yehoshua, who took him to Alexandria to avoid persecution to which his sect of the Pharisees was then exposed. Yishó manifested such levity on the journey that the Rabbi excommunicated him. Afterwards he relented towards him, when Yishó broke from him and set up an idol which he worshiped, and induced others to worship. This brought down a sentence of death by lapidation and strangulation, which was executed upon him and his five disciples, named Mathaï, Nigaï, Nesar, Búni, and Thóda. It is impossible to trace Jesus or his apostles in this history, and the time thereof, moreover, is laid about a century before the beginning of the Christian era. Excluding this legend, the Professor remarks, "It must for ever remain impossible to link the accounts of the Talmud to those of the gospels, either for mutual support or destruction" (*Ibid.* 368-370).

The absence, then, of all contemporaneous Jewish support to the history attaching to Christ is fatal to the integrity of this history. Pagan writers were not under equal obligations to have noticed him, but Christian advocates have looked to this source wherewith to fortify themselves, and it is necessary, therefore, that it should be considered. Mr Robert Taylor, in his *Diegesis*, has brought together all that is traced to classic authors bearing upon Christianity. Some of these supposed advertences are too indistinct to call for observation. Others need only to be pointed to as generally acknowledged forgeries, such as the report of Pontius Pilate to the Emperor Tiberius, which I have already had occasion to refer to, the description of the person of Jesus Christ attributed to Publius Lentulus, the marvellous impression of his features on the Veronica handkerchief, and the corroboration of the darkness said to have occurred at the crucifixion ascribed to Phlegon. These are instances of the active endeavours set on foot to support Christianity by means the resort to which would not have been thought of had real evidence been available.

Practically, the question may be narrowed to the considera-

tion of what may have been said by three of these authors, namely, Pliny the younger (A.D. 106-110), Tacitus (A.D. 107), and Suetonius (A.D. 110). The subject has been carefully examined by two able writers in Mr Scott's series, one the learned author of "Our First Century," who rejects the evidence as spurious, and the other, Mr Edward Vansittart Neale, who, in his article entitled "The Mythical Element in Christianity," upholds it.

Pliny is represented as addressing the Emperor Trajan for instructions how to deal with Christians as a class of people he had to put down by forcible measures. He says, "Having never been present at any trials concerning those persons who are Christians, I am unacquainted not only with the nature of their crimes, or the measure of their punishment, but how far it is proper to enter into an examination concerning them." It is impossible to conceive a Roman pro-consul in the dilemma described. The duty before him was of the simplest character, and he could have required no one to inform him that when parties were brought before him as deserving punishment, it was for him to call upon their accusers to say of what they were guilty, and to prove their allegations. Pliny is then made to exhibit his helplessness still further. Not knowing "well what is the subject matter of punishment, or of inquiry," he is furthermore "perplexed to determine whether any difference ought to be made on account of age, or whether the young and tender, and the full-grown and robust ought to be treated all alike; whether repentance should entitle to pardon, or whether all who have once been Christians ought to be punished, though they are now no longer so." Truly here is a measure of ineptitude impossible to have existed on the part of any functionary of the law, and still less on that of the ruler of a province in direct relations with the emperor. He does not know what to inquire about, or what to do; he is ignorant even whether he is to make a distinction between the guilty and the guiltless; and on questions of mere moral import he wonders whether he is to measure the thews and sinews of the possible delinquents! After this he proceeds to describe his course of action. "In the meanwhile," he says, "the method I have observed towards those who have been brought before me as Christians is this: I interrogate them whether they

were Christians; if they confessed I repeated the question twice, adding threats at the same time; and if they persevered I ordered them to be executed immediately." So that we have Pliny represented as entirely ignorant what the crime of being a Christian involved, feeling that discrimination of circumstances should be exercised in meting out some punishment to them, the nature and scale of which he was, however, incompetent to judge of, needing guidance from the Emperor, and yet boldly proceeding to threaten the accused with consequences unless they abandoned he knew not what, and on their refusal executing them all, and informing the Emperor that he had done so. This can be no report of any actualities, but simply scene-painting of a very inartistic kind. After this, strange to say, Pliny is made to appear fully aware of all that it concerned him to know of the Christian tenets. He applies to the accused the test of paying divine honours to the statue of the emperor and the images of the gods, and of reviling Christ; he describes their meetings and worship of Christ as God, their resolutions against all evil practices, their coming together to partake of a "common and innocent repast," and his having ascertained, through "putting to the torture two women who were called deaconesses," that there was "nothing" to be "discovered," connected with the adherents to Christianity, "beyond an austere and excessive superstition." On this he determined, he says, to adjourn the trials, and await instructions, proceeding, however, to notice that the new faith had been spreading itself over the whole land, and rendering the temples deserted. It is easy to see here the hand of the painter. We have one scheming to make the best possible representation of his creed, and to magnify its success. Those who followed this creed were, even under the description of their persecutors, the holiest and most blameless of men, suffering death without a cause, and yet covering the land with converts. The Romans were tolerant of all religions, and it would therefore have been a direct violation of the laws and policy of Rome for any one to have acted towards a body of harmless people with the senseless brutality attributed to Pliny. But the Emperor's reply to his subordinate is said to have been "mild and merciful." "He approves of the governor's conduct, as explained in his letter,"

says that the Christians are not to be sought for, nor anonymous accusations against them received, and that the test to be applied when they were brought up was to be their consent to worship the Roman divinities (Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*). In short, the reply is one in appearance only, and destitute of realities. It neither rebukes the subordinate who stands committed to the extremes of feebleness and cruelty, nor gives him any solid instructions for his future guidance.

The testimony imputed to Tacitus is associated with Nero and the burning of Rome (A.D. 64). A report was spread about that Nero had ordered the conflagration, on which Tacitus is made to say, that to suppress the rumour Nero "falsely charged with guilt, and punished with the most exquisite tortures, the persons commonly called Christians, who were hated for their enormities. The founder of that name," he adds, "one Christus, was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea, in the reign of Tiberius; but the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again, not only through Judea, where the mischief originated, but through the city of Rome also, whither all things horrible and disgraceful flow from all quarters, as to a common receptacle, and where they are encouraged."

The question first to be considered, is the presence of Christians at Rome in the year 64. According to the Acts of the Apostles, and the marginal chronology in the authorized version, Paul was on the spot the previous year, and so little were the Christians known of any where in that region that the chief Jews of the place, on his arrival, beg him to tell them what they were to think of the movement. They knew nothing of the accusations Paul is said to have lain under as a leader of the party, and say, "We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against" (xxviii. 22). Thereupon he preaches to them as to people who heard of Christianity from his lips then for the first time. This account in the Acts absolutely negatives the statement attributed to Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, that there was already at Rome a church whose "faith" was "spoken of throughout the whole world" (i. 8). Then we have Josephus at Rome from the

year 70 till the close of the century, knowing nothing of the existence of Christianity. The passage appearing in Tacitus is not noticed by such writers as Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and above all Eusebius. Tertullian and Eusebius have the representations ascribed to Pliny the younger in his alleged letter to Trajan, but show no acquaintance with that in Tacitus. They also appear to have been unaware of the particular persecution connected with the burning of Rome therein described. This fact, but without citation of any authority for it from Tacitus or any other, Mr Vansittart Neale allows is first met with in the writings of Sulpicius Severus at the close of the fourth century. The earliest MSS. of Tacitus, containing the passage in question, Mr Neale further states, are two that are traceable to the monastery of Casino, said in the years 1427 and 1428 to have been copied there in the eleventh century.

The testimony for the passage under consideration is thus on all sides the reverse of satisfactory. The act imputed to Nero is such an instance of wanton atrocity resorted to in connection with an event of historic notoriety, that no writers occupied with the trials of the early Christians could have failed to have noticed it, had there been such an occurrence ; there is even room to conclude that there were no Christians at Rome at the time in question to have been so dealt with ; at length, three centuries and a half after the period of Nero, some one, in depicting his crimes, brings against him this charge of sacrificing Christians as the incendiaries of his capital, but without quoting Tacitus for the circumstance ; and at length, about a thousand years after the era of Tacitus, the passage before us makes its appearance ; and it comes to us under the very suspicious hand of a monkish copyist. There is perhaps no source of apparent independent testimony for the existence of Christianity in its first alleged age, to which its advocates more confidently appeal, than this statement in the work of the renowned historian Tacitus, but the integrity of the passage, it may be seen, rests upon no true foundations. To the multitude of the fabrications of the early Christian times, this piece of evidence may be added ; nor is it traceable to the first ages, but belongs to a period and a class of persons universally mistrusted in Protestant circles.

The statement ascribed to Suetonius also relates to the times of Nero. He says of Nero, as it is represented, that "many severe regulations and new orders were made in his time. A sumptuary law (to check expense in banquets), was enacted. Public suppers were limited to the sportulæ; and victualling-houses were restrained from selling any dressed victuals, except pulse and herbs, whereas before they sold all kinds of meat. He likewise inflicted punishment on the Christians, a sort of people who held a new and mischievous superstition. He forbade the revels of the charioteers, who had long assumed a licence to stroll about, and established for themselves a kind of prescriptive right to cheat and thieve, making a jest of it. The partisans of the rival theatrical performers were banished, as well as the actors themselves." It is clear that the enactments the author referred to related to the habits and amusements of the people which the Roman emperor desired to place under close limitations. He sought to repress extravagance in living, and in public entertainments. The creed and destinies of the Christians had nothing to do with the subject matter in hand. The notice of them has been apparently thrust in by some foreign hand between what relates to victualling-houses and the revels of charioteers. The early Christian writers, embracing Tertullian and Eusebius, knew nothing of this passage; and Melito, an apologist said to be of the latter part of the second century, clears the Roman emperors to his day of any formal acts for the repression of Christianity by violent measures. He says, professedly addressing Marcus Antoninus, "For now the race of the pious is persecuted, an event that never took place before" (Donaldson, *Hist. of Christian Lit.* III. 230). Mr Neale points out that this writer has a passage showing that Nero and Domitian had "been inclined, through the persuasion of certain envious and malicious persons, to bring our doctrine into hatred." This, however, is mild language, not involving the diabolical acts attributed to Nero, in the name of Tacitus, at the burning of Rome, nor descriptive of the positive legislation to repress Christianity by punitive measures, of which Suetonius is said to have spoken. Melito may thus be said to bear a testimony rebutting what is imputed to both these authors, supporting thus the con-

clusion that their evidence has been made up since his day. With this the testimony of Lactantius, who died A.D. 325, accords. He seems to have known of no persecution of Christians earlier than the time of Decius, A.D. 249-251 (*Prim. Church Hist.*, 64-68). "One thing is certain," observes the author I now cite, "namely, that outside the church there does not appear to be any trace of the Christians prior to the persecution of them, A. 249, ordered by Decius."

But whatever may be thought of the genuineness of the statements we have been considering attributed to these Roman authors, they do not suffice to support the actual pretensions of Christianity. They merely serve to show that there was such a person as Jesus Christ, who suffered death under Pontius Pilate, and was the founder of a religious sect. Of his divine nativity, his miraculous displays of power, his resurrection and ascension, they say nothing; and by passing over such marvellous circumstances in entire silence, these writers, if they did treat of Christ, effectually disallow that he was an incarnate God, exhibiting himself as such, and openly and outwardly recognized as such by manifestations from heaven.

The learned author of *Primitive Church History* notices the suspicious gap we have in this branch of the evidence offered for Christianity. "Is it possible," he asks, "that Josephus, Suetonius, Pliny (junior), and Tacitus, really knew more about Jesus Christ than those early apologists for the Christians" (Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus), "who never name him? Or is it possible, that if 'great multitudes of Christians,' during our first century, attracted the attention of one Jewish and three Pagan writers, who flourished towards the end of that period, that not even one Pagan writer would have taken notice of so remarkable a sect during the whole of our second century." "The fact," he observes, "(1), that there is not any Pagan writer of our second century who mentions the Christians; and (2), that those early apologists never mention Jesus or Christ, amount almost to positive proof that the passages regarding the Christians now found in Josephus, Suetonius, Pliny (junior), and Tacitus, are forgeries" (15).

The last branch of testimony to be considered is what may

be derivable from the earliest Christians we hear of, apart from the characters figuring in the narratives of the scriptures, with which I do not at present deal. I follow the able revision, in this branch of inquiry, instituted by Dr Donaldson, in his work to which I have already referred.

Dr Donaldson, as I have noticed, refers to Eusebius as "his first, his best, and almost his only authority" for what concerns those we have now to deal with, who are termed the Christian fathers. I have shown how little Eusebius is to be depended on for critical acumen and judgment of fact, and that there are even grounds for believing that he must have placed before us as testimonies what he had reason to know were otherwise than trustworthy. "Jerome," Dr Donaldson observes, "has often been called the greatest critic of the fathers; . . . but there is nowhere in his writings proof of his being acquainted with writers unknown to Eusebius. . . . Besides all this, we know . . . that if his anger were roused, truth and decency were cast to the winds" (I. 15). Epiphanius, he remarks, is sometimes cited as an authority, and then he gives an instance of this writer's gross ignorance of geography. "The Pheison," he says, "is called the Ganges among the Indians and Ethiopians. The Greeks called it Indus. For it encircles the whole of Elivat, both little and great, even the parts of the Elymeans, and passes through Great Ethiopia, turns to the south, and within Gades flows into the great ocean. Of his historical confusions," Dr Donaldson adds, "we shall have many instances" (I. 17). "As we advance in time," Dr Donaldson continues, "our authorities become fewer. . . . The chroniclers form a numerous class. They are all more or less dependent on Eusebius" (I. 18). The prospect of anything like true history from these sources is thus the reverse of being encouraging.

We have a class of persons introduced to us as apostolic fathers; that is, they are presumed to be the immediate disciples of those who are the reputed companions of Jesus, to whom he committed the dissemination of his faith. These are Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Barnabas, Hermas, Papias, and Ignatius.

Eusebius designates Clement the third bishop of Rome. His authority is Irenæus, living, as it is thought, a hundred and seventy years after the resurrection. Tertullian, whose time

is placed about ten years earlier, represents Clement to have been the first bishop (Donaldson, I. 93). "The most precise information which we have is in Eusebius. He quotes Irenæus, and elsewhere gives the same succession as he gave, stating that Clement succeeded Anencletus in the twelfth year of the reign of Domitian, 93 A.D., and died in the third year of the reign of Trajan, 101 A.D. On what authority Eusebius assigned these dates we do not know." Dr Donaldson adds of Eusebius, but on what grounds it is not apparent, that "we can have little doubt that he was tolerably careful;" and then observes, "On the whole, this is the most satisfactory information we can now obtain on the subject" (I. 92, 93). The representations of Irenæus, the authority on whom Eusebius has depended, are these. "The blessed apostles Peter and Paul, having founded and built up the Church, gave the office of oversight to Linus. This Linus Paul has mentioned in his letters to Timothy. He is succeeded by Anencletus. After him, in the third place from the apostles, Clemens obtains the oversight, who also saw the apostles themselves, and conversed with them, and who still had the preaching of the apostles ringing in his ears, and their doctrine before his eyes." "The minute accuracy of these statements," Dr Donaldson observes, "is open to question. Everything must depend on the critical faculty of Irenæus, which unfortunately was not great" (I. 91, 92). His perceptions would assuredly not be assisted by the vista of a century and a half through which he had to look. Dr Donaldson goes on to point out that the epistle to the Romans shows that Paul was not the founder of the church at Rome, and that Peter's share in the establishment of Christianity there, is a matter greatly disputed. Dr Donaldson furthermore observes, "We see a perverting influence at work in the minds of Irenæus and his contemporaries in their strong wish to be able to trace up their doctrines to the days of the apostles." For example, "Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of Clemens as an apostle, and Origen calls him a disciple of the apostles, and identifies him with the person mentioned in Philippians iv. 3" (I. 92).

Of the many writings attributed to Clement, Eusebius accepts but one as genuine, which purports to be an epistle from the church at Rome to that of Corinth (*Ec. Hist.*, iii. 16). A

vast body of writings, termed the Clementine Recognitions, are universally allowed to be spurious. They are looked upon as "a kind of philosophical and theological romance" (*Ante-nicene Christian Library*, Intr. Notice). The epistle to the Corinthians does not bear the name of its author. It is only by supposition that it is attributed to Clement. The first who mentions the epistle is said to be Hegesippus, stated to be a contemporary of Justin, whose time at the earliest is given as A.D. 138. The first to assign the authorship of the epistle to Clement is Dionysius, who is stated to have lived in A.D. 250 (Donaldson, I. 90, 91). The epistle itself came to light only in A.D. 1628, being found appended to the Alexandrian codex. It is not complete, and there is no assurance that it has not been corrupted. In it the Corinthians are adverted to as an ancient church, and the elders "appointed by the apostles, or afterwards by other illustrious men," are spoken of "as borne witness to for a long period" (*Ibid.*, I. 99, 102, 108).

There being ample room to question the existence of a church at Rome during the first century, the succession of bishops provided for such a church in that period equally falls to the ground. That Clement stood in such succession there is no reliable testimony. We do not know who the person so named was, or when he had existence. A number of confessedly spurious writings are put forward in this name. The single epistle currently accepted as his does not bear the record of his authorship, and the name of Clement is attached to it by one who lived more than a century and a half after his alleged time. The epistle extant before us as that in question is discovered more than fifteen hundred years after its asserted date. What certainty we have of its identity, or purity, it is vain to inquire. The epistle itself has phrases indicating that it was written at some considerable period after Christianity had been established, and there is no room, therefore, for supposing that it belongs to a very early age, or the alleged apostolic period.

For our introduction to Polycarp we are indebted, equally as for our introduction to Clement, to Irenæus, a man of an uncritical turn of mind, bent, in an age when scrupulosity was ill observed, on bringing before us characters associated with

the asserted apostolic age. Polycarp is a great engine of this description. Irenæus claims personal acquaintance with this renowned saint. "I can tell," he says, "the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse, and also his entrances, his walks, the complexion of his life, and the form of his body, and his conversations with the people, and his familiar intercourse with John, as he was accustomed to tell, as also his familiarity with those that had seen the Lord. How also he used to relate their discourses, and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord. Also concerning his miracles, his doctrine; all these were told by Polycarp, in consistency with the holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the doctrine of salvation" (Euseb., *Ec. Hist.*, V. 20). Polycarp is stated by Eusebius to have suffered martyrdom in the reign of Verus (Donaldson, I., 181). The emperor so designated was Marcus Aurelius, who began his reign in A.D. 161. The martyrdom is commonly placed at a few years later. Supposing the contemporaries of Jesus, so freely spoken of, to have survived to A.D. 80 or 85, or to about eighty years before the death of Polycarp, at what age is it possible that he could have imbibed their instructions with the sufficiency and profitableness described?

The marvels at the martyrdom of Polycarp relegate his history to the type of the fabulous, and this account is traceable to the possession of Irenæus. The narrative appears in a letter purporting to be from eye-witnesses belonging to the church in Smyrna. They heard the voice from heaven, and saw the wondrous signs exhibited at the immolation of the saint. "What took the Christian brethren," asks Dr Donaldson, "to the stadium? Were they going to glut their eyes with the sight of their aged pastor devoured by wild beasts? Was there not a strong feeling prevalent among Christians that it was sinful and cruel to attend these shows, even when slaves were the object of the sport? Nay, would not the Church itself have pronounced a strong condemnation against these very individuals for thus being found in a place consecrated to the vilest exhibitions of idolatrous worship?" (I., 162). Irenæus is said to have had a copy of this epistle, to which other transcribers trace the copies they made (*Ibid.*, I., 170,

174). We thus derive all we know of Polycarp from Irenæus, an insufficient witness, who puts this saintly form before us in what assumes a mythical aspect.

There is an epistle ascribed to Barnabas. It does not bear "the author's name, is not dated from any place, and is not addressed to any special community. . . . The first writer who mentions it is Clement of Alexandria, who calls its author several times the 'Apostle Barnabas'" (*Supernatural Religion*, I., 239). The letter refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, and was written therefore after that event. Its date onwards to the close of the second century (or the period of Clement of Alexandria) is uncertain (Donaldson, I., 209, 220). Eusebius considers it a spurious production (*Ec. Hist.*, iii. 25). Barnabas, the alleged companion of Paul, is represented to be a Levite, still sympathizing with Jewish rites. The writer of the epistle exhibits an aversion thereto, as well as ignorance on the subject. He commits the gross mistake of saying that Abraham circumcised his three hundred and eighteen followers, and allegorizes on this number, as if the Old Testament had been written in Greek (Donaldson, I., 204-208). "The great mass of critics are now agreed in asserting that the composition, which itself is perfectly anonymous, cannot be attributed to Barnabas, the friend and fellow-worker of Paul" (*Sup. Rel.*, I., 239).

The Pastor of Hermas is first quoted by Irenæus, who terms it scripture. The next to quote it is Clement of Alexandria, who calls it inspired. Origen also considered it inspired. Eusebius says it was disputed by some, but was read publicly in the churches. Neither Origen nor Eusebius knew who the author was. Tertullian denounced the work as apocryphal. The apostles are said by the writer to have passed away, and to have been replaced by a succession of teachers, which indicates the passage of time (Donaldson, I., 255-259, 265). That he is the person named in Romans xvi. 14 is an assertion wholly unsustainable.

We first hear of Papias from Irenæus, who describes him as a hearer of John and an associate of Polycarp. Eusebius points out from the writings of Papias that the statement is an inaccurate one, the declaration of Papias being that he was a hearer, not of the apostles, but of those who were intimate

with them, and notices that he describes two Johns, one the apostle, and the other a presbyter, with which latter was his association (*Ec. Hist.*, III., xxxix). The correction is of importance in showing how little Irenæus is to be depended upon even for the use of materials before him.

There are fifteen epistles attributed to Ignatius. Of these eight, which are not mentioned by either Eusebius or Jerome, are universally disallowed as spurious. Of the seven acknowledged by Eusebius there are two Greek recensions, and it has been a great question which of the two should be accepted. The shorter version has been commonly preferred, but it has been objected to by such critics as Jortin, Mosheim, Griesbach, Neander, and Lardner, as well as others, and that both have been interpolated is commonly allowed (*Antenicean Christian Library*, Introductory Notice). In 1845 Dr Cureton brought to light Syriac versions of three of the accepted epistles which throw a doubt upon the Greek collections (*Super. Rel.*, I., 264). Eusebius gives a tradition that Ignatius was taken from Syria to Rome where he suffered martyrdom, citing Irenæus as an authority. He is said to have been "carried through Asia (Minor) under a most rigid custody," and yet to have been able to "fortify the different churches in the cities where he tarried, by his discourses and exhortations." He says, "From Syria to Rome I am contending with wild beasts by land and sea, by night and day, being tied to ten leopards, the number of the military band, who, even when treated with kindness, only behave with greater ferocity;" and yet it is pretended that during this journey he found opportunities for writing the seven epistles which Eusebius acknowledges (*Ec. Hist.*, III., xxxvi.) The epistle bearing the name of Polycarp refers to this martyr journey, and also to the epistles that are universally condemned as unauthentic, and thus condemns itself (*Super. Rel.*, I., 279). There is a counter statement that Ignatius was martyred at Antioch (*Ibid.*, I., 273). "The whole of the literature ascribed to Ignatius is, in fact, such a tissue of fraud and imposture, and the successive versions exhibit such undeniable marks of the grossest interpolation, that if any small original element exist referrible to Ignatius, it is impossible to define it, or to distinguish with

the slightest degree of accuracy between what is authentic and what is spurious" (*Ibid.*, I., 279).

The last class of writers with whom I propose to occupy myself are persons whom Dr Donaldson designates as apologists; that is, they were writers who are said to have addressed the emperors of Rome, or the public at large, in behalf of the Christians. The emperors so spoken of are Hadrian (A.D. 117-138), Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138-161), Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161-180), and Commodus, who was admitted by his father to participation in the imperial dignity in A.D. 176, and reigned in succession to him from A.D. 180 to 192.

Four of these writers are associated with the time of Hadrian, namely, Quadratus and Aristides, who are stated to have addressed apologies to the emperor, Agrippa Castor who is described as a controversialist, and Aristo of Pella. Quadratus is said to have declared that there were in his day those who had lived "whilst our Lord was on earth." Nothing else is known of him or the others, none of their writings being extant. We depend entirely upon Eusebius for the fact that there were such persons, and that they were Christians (*Ec. Hist.*, iv. 3, 6, 7; Donaldson, II., 51-61); but when we find Eusebius accounting the Therapeuts as Christians, and the writings they used as the Christian scriptures, it is clear that little dependence is to be placed on his discrimination or accuracy in respect of persons otherwise totally unknown.

We come now to the familiar name of Justin Martyr, which is attached to writings giving a very full account of the tenets of the Christians. "The best part of the information which we have with regard to Justin Martyr is derived from his own writings. The few particulars which we gather from others relate almost exclusively to his death." He himself describes how he came to embrace Christianity. "We know almost nothing of Justin's life subsequent to his conversion." Irenæus, Hyppolitus, Tertullian, Eusebius, and others refer to him as a martyr. "The circumstances of his death, however, are involved in doubt." "There exists a martyrion of one Justin and some others, which many believe to be a narrative of the martyrdom of Justin Martyr. The document has been handed down to us by Simeon Metaphrastes" (a Byzantine writer of the ninth and tenth centuries. *Smith's Dict.*). "The name of the

author is not given, and the writer does not say how he got his information. The only points to be ascertained therefore are, whether the Justin referred to is our Justin, and whether the narrative is true." On both heads Dr Donaldson is inclined to accept the document, but he has to admit "that there is no historical evidence for its truth." He believes "that it is trustworthy, though entirely devoid of historical testimony." After this he proceeds to say, "The few introductory words with which it commences are evidently the work of some editor who lived after the time of Constantine. They give the exact day and month of the martyrdom, and state that the saints when taken were brought to Rusticus, the prefect of Rome. The date given is worthless." "There is no clue to exact dates in the history of Justin. We know from Eusebius that he addressed his first Apology to Antoninus Pius, and his second to Marcus Aurelius. He mentions in the first that the Jewish war of Barchochabas had taken place in his time (A.D. 131-136). He speaks of Christ being born a hundred and fifty years before, but here," Dr Donaldson observes, "round numbers are used. The *Chronicon Paschale* places his martyrdom in A.D. 165, a probable date; but there is no reason to suppose that it is anything more than a guess." Dr Donaldson then refers to the declaration made by Epiphanius that Justin was put to death in the reign of Hadrian, which he terms an "absurd statement," and to an attempt to show from Epiphanius and Cedrenus that it occurred onwards about the year 148. He adds, "But if we cannot trust Eusebius, our only authority for placing Justin's martyrdom in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, we know nothing in regard to the date of Justin's death. The value of Eusebius' opinion," he then observes, "is not great, but it is infinitely to be preferred to the utterly uncritical statements of Epiphanius or Cedrenus" (Donaldson, II, 62-74, 85).

It is, I think, pretty clear that we have nothing to depend on for Justin, but what may be drawn from the writings bearing his name. These we have now to consider.

The First Apology is addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, his adopted sons Verissimus (Marcus Aurelius) and Lucius, "the holy senate," and "the whole people of the Romans." Antoninus was adopted by Hadrian in A.D.

138. Immediately after this Antoninus adopted Marcus Aurelius, who was now styled Marcus Aelius Aurelius Verus Cæsar (*Smith's Dict.*). Dr Donaldson infers that because Verissimus is addressed in the Apology without the appellation Cæsar, the document must have been written before the year 139 (II. 83). This is not conclusive to myself. The time of the adoption and of the imposition of the dignity of Cæsar synchronize, and I cannot see how it should have been thought necessary to address Aurelius before his adoption. The omission of his title, then, may have been due to oversight. In fact, the referring to him thus familiarly by his cognomen Verissimus, in so important a document, without even giving him his proper names, is an evidence of looseness such as can scarcely have really occurred. Lucius, it furthermore appears, though termed a "philosopher," was but in his eighth or ninth year at the assumed date, an anomaly which Dr Donaldson endeavours to defend (II. 83). Why, it must be asked, on such an occasion, could it have been thought necessary to introduce the name of a child? And there being the emperor himself to look to as all sufficient, what was to be gained but the passing a slight upon him to call also for the interposition of his adopted sons, the senate, and even the whole Roman people? These blemishes, it appears to me, afford room to call in question the reality of the document.

The most various opinions have been expressed as to the genuineness of the writings ascribed to Justin, and part of them have by common consent been rejected as "unquestionably spurious" (Donaldson, II. 74). Dr Donaldson himself accepts both the Apologies, but he shows there is a great conflict of opinion as to the so-called second Apology, the tendency being to incorporate it with the first; but whether as an introduction, an integral portion, or an appendix thereto, seems to be uncertain. This opinion involves the inference that the true second Apology spoken of by Eusebius has been lost (*Ibid.* II. 75-82).

The scheme and handling of the Apology ill accord with the conditions out of which the address purports to have arisen, and with its avowed aim. We have the representation that Christians were ordered out to suffer death without trial, without evidence of offence, and on the mere ground that they

were Christians (*First Apol.* chap. 2-4, 68; *Second Apol.* chap. 2). Justin, then, had only to make known his position as a Christian to incur the penalty, and yet is able to indite and present this long address scathlessly, and even, as it is said, to put forth a second such Apology. In the production we have before us the writer carries the war, needlessly, and provokingly, into the enemy's country. He describes what he terms demons, addicted to the grossest sensualities and false arts, and says that these are the gods of those whom he addresses, and their instigators against the innocent and virtuous Christians (*First Apol.* chap. 5, 6, 14, 25; *Second Apol.* chap. 12). He says he has no design to please or flatter the exalted personages he is addressing, and in fact indulges in what amounted to actual offensiveness towards them. "But, as we before said," he observes, "we are persuaded that these things are prompted by evil spirits, who demand sacrifices and service even from those who live unreasonably; but as for you, we presume that you who aim at (a reputation for) piety and philosophy, will do nothing unreasonable. But if you also, like the foolish, prefer custom to truth, do what you have power to do. But just so much power have rulers who esteem opinion more than truth, as robbers have in a desert" (*First Apol.* 2, 12). When the writer had to be conciliatory, and to induce the ruling power to deal with his people fairly and justly, would he go out of his way to provoke hostility? He was concerned with obtaining protection and tolerance for the Christians, and we find him raking up the tales of the sensualities and crimes of the pagan gods, and thrusting these before the emperor and the whole Roman people publicly (*First Apol.* chap. 21, 25; *Second Apol.* chap. 12). He makes the ridiculous and provoking assertion, that the whole framework of the Roman theology was devised by demons, in imitation of the circumstances prophesied as to Christ, in order to defeat the mission of Christ when he came (*First Apol.* 54, 62, 64). Then he has long expositions of the prophecies concerning Christ, and describes the tenets and practices of Christians, in which those addressed could have taken no possible interest, and he even repeatedly introduces to them the altogether foreign subject of those with whom the Christians, in their inner circle, had clashed as heretics, such as Simon Magus, his consort

Helena, his disciple Menander, and Marcion (*First Apol.* chap. 26, 56, 58; *Second Apol.* chap. 15).

The reputed Apology has thus little the character of a genuine address of the description alleged for it. It is not from one with a sense of peril hanging over him, for himself and his co-religionists, endeavouring to conciliate the arbiters of their fate. The writer is quite at his ease, lecturing those he addresses, setting forth the gods they adored in the most odious colours, and entering into lengthened descriptions of the tenets and practices of his people, which no one not of themselves would care to look into. There is nothing to turn aside an oppressor to a fair and righteous course; there is nothing to commend the objects of the alleged persecution to his favour or tolerance. So mischievous an interference with the oppressors' creed could but provoke hostility, and arm the authorities with further motive for putting down a pestilent sect, itself incapable of countenancing any faith but its own. Nor will the testimonies of Melito and Lactantius, to which I have already referred, allow of the supposition that a remonstrance of the kind in question was needed in the time of Antoninus Pius.

The dialogue with Trypho is attributed to Justin by Eusebius. Some dispute its genuineness, but Dr Donaldson is not of the number. It is also a question whether it is a real or a fictitious representation. Dr Donaldson, while holding to its reality, allows that it looks like an imitation of a dialogue of Plato or of Cicero, as others have remarked. It opens, he observes, nearly in the same way as Cicero's Brutus. "While I was walking in the morning in the walks of the Xystus, some one, accompanied by others, met me with the words, 'Hail, Philosopher!' and on this he turned round and walked along with me, and his friends also turned round along with him." Who Trypho was, it appears, is not known, neither is Marcus Pompeius, to whom the dialogue was addressed. It is impossible to fix the date of the composition, the only indications of its time being that it was posterior to the longer Apology, and occurred after the conclusion of a Jewish war, which is considered to have been that of Barchochebas, when Jerusalem finally fell in the reign of Hadrian (Donaldson, II. 86-89, 198).

The marks to guide us to the conclusion that this dialogue is not the report of an actual discussion appear to me insurmountably strong. We have no certainty who wrote it, or when. Neither party to the discussion is known, nor the individual to whom it purports to be dedicated. The resemblance to such productions already occurring in literature raises a presumption that this may be a similar resort to a fictitious vehicle of thought. A Jew was not likely to seek enlightenment from one who was seemingly a Gentile philosopher, as is here represented to have been the case. He would feel so strong in the divinity of his own creed and its supports, that he would scarcely come out in the character of an inquirer from one who was outside the limits of the calling of God. He is made to address for instruction whom he knew not, but apparently one who stood in Paganism. The so-called Justin indulges him with an account of the course of tuition he had gone through ere embracing the Christian faith. At first, he says, "I surrendered myself to a certain Stoic," in pursuit of the "knowledge of God." "I left him, and betook myself to another, who was called a Peripatetic." Then he states, "I came to a Pythagorean, very celebrated—a man who thought much of his own wisdom." This man dismissed him because, forsooth, he was ignorant of music, astronomy, and geometry. "In my helpless condition," he goes on to say, "it occurred to me to have a meeting with the Platonists, for their fame was great. I thereupon spent as much of my time as possible with one who had lately settled in our city—a sagacious man, holding a high position among the Platonists—and I progressed, and made the greatest improvements daily." After this, he says, "While I was disposed, when I wished at one period to be filled with great quietness, and to shun the path of men, I used to go into a certain field not far from the sea. And when I was near that spot one day, which having reached I purposed to be by myself, a certain old man, by no means contemptible in appearance, exhibiting meek and venerable manners, followed me at a little distance;" and this person, after discussing with him the measure of knowledge derivable from the philosophers with whom he had been, converted him to Christianity. It is, I think, apparent that in these repre-

sentations the author is not dealing with true actualities. He has a scheme before him for the exhibition of all he holds to of the Christian faith, and he thus introduces it. He passes through the hands of the great philosophic schools of Greece, and finding no satisfaction in what was there taught, eventually lays hold of the true knowledge of God and his ways towards mankind as centring in and revealed in Christ. But his various teachers are ideal personages without a name. The places where they are met with are all equally vague. Who was the renowned Pythagorean, or who the celebrated Platonist he studied under, we might, at all events, have been told, and it would have been interesting to know who the early Christian was, who so impressed him. From what community did he come, and what were his relations with those who may have been the actual companions of Jesus? After this the assumed Justin deals with the so-called Trypho. The latter makes but a poor stand for his own sacred code, and does little to search out the Christian advocate, to whom he ever yields with courteous facility. The narrator reports the very words that passed on either side on these occasions. His dialogue with the Christian teacher occupies eight pages octavo in the translation given in the Antenicene Christian Library. It would be a feat in any one after a considerable interval to report such a conversation *verbatim* to another. The discussion that follows with Trypho extends over one hundred and eighty-one pages, with every word that was uttered on either side recorded. We are here in the presence of an impossibility, which, without other grounds, should determine the question before us. It is plain this is no real dialogue, but merely an ideal representation, through the channel of which the author has ventilated his opinions. In an historical point of view, therefore, the document possesses no value. We know not whose views we have thus put before us, or when the author lived antecedent to the time of Eusebius.

We have now a number of writers reputed to be of the period of Marcus Aurelius. There is Tatian, of whom Dr Donaldson says, "We know nothing of the time of his birth, or of his parents, or of his early training." "Irenæus tells us that Tatian was a hearer of Justin. He speaks as if he knew very little about him." There are two allusions to Justin in

the work of Tatian. "Nothing is known of his death." The only work of his remaining extant is an Oration to the Greeks (III. 4, 8-10, 20). Hegesippus is an historian on whom Eusebius has much relied. "Our principal source of information in regard to Hegesippus is Eusebius. The historian derived all his knowledge of Hegesippus from his own work." He adverts to games in honour of Antinous, the favourite slave of Hadrian, as having been instituted in his day. This would place him in the time of Hadrian. Eusebius alleges that he "lived during the time of the first succession of the apostles." He carries him on to the era of Marcus Aurelius. The work of Hegesippus is not now extant, and we are dependent upon the reports thereof by Eusebius (III. 182-184). Dionysius of Corinth is of the same alleged period. "The only information which we have with regard to this Dionysius is derived from Eusebius, and relates almost exclusively to his letters." His writings have not been preserved. Dionysius is said to have mentioned Pinytus, Phillippus, and Soter as writers of the time of Aurelius, and Eusebius adds the names of Modestus and Musanus. Nothing, however, is known of any of these (III. 214, 218, 219). We come now to Melito, to whose statement that the Christians had not suffered persecution in the earlier times preceding him I have already had occasion to advert. He is said to have addressed an apology to Marcus Aurelius. "We know nothing of his life, except that he went, as he tells us himself, to the East." "Our principal authority in regard to the works of Melito is Eusebius" (III. 221-223). Apollinaris also is said to have presented an apology to Marcus Aurelius. Nothing is known of him but that he is mentioned by Eusebius, who cites Serapion (III. 240). There is furthermore a letter said to have been addressed by the churches in Vienna and Lugdunum to the brethren in Asia (Minor) and Phrygia, respecting a violent persecution of the Christians represented to have broken out in Gaul. In his *Chronicon* Eusebius states this to have occurred in the seventh year of Marcus Aurelius, and in his history in the seventeenth. For extracts from this letter we are dependent on Eusebius. "The style of the letter," Dr Donaldson observes, "is loose. It abounds in antitheses and strong expressions. It also mixes up incongruous figures.

Its statements are not, therefore, to be looked on as cold historical accuracies." Dr Donaldson at the same time accepts the production as a genuine representation by some one, it is not known whom, in behalf of the churches in question (III. 250, 251, 256, 262).

Some of those who are said to have been of the time of Marcus Aurelius are traced onwards to that of his successor Commodus. One of these is Theophilus. "Our information with regard to Theophilus is derived from his own work, and from the short notice which Eusebius gives of him and his writings. We do not know where he was born." "Theophilus mentions the death of Marcus Aurelius, but says nothing of the death of Commodus." He gives the age of the world from the creation as 5695 years, which corresponds with the year of the death of Marcus Aurelius (Donaldson, III. 63-66). Another is Athenagoras, of whom we know only through Philip Sidetes and the inscription prefixed in the manuscripts to his writings. Philip of Sida was a Christian writer of the fifth century (Smith, *Dict.*), removed thus by two centuries and a half from the era of Marcus Aurelius. Dr Donaldson considers him unreliable as an historian. The inscription purports that Athenagoras addressed the emperors Marcus Aurelius, and Commodus. "At what time this inscription was written, and on what authority, are matters entirely unknown." "He speaks of the emperors as surpassing all, as much in the extent and accuracy of their learning as in prudence and power; and as excelling all in piety to the real godhead." "Every nation," he is represented as saying to the emperors, "throughout your dominions follows its own customs without hindrance. The inhabitant, for instance, of Ilium regards Hector as a god; the Lacedæmonian worships Agamemnon. Everywhere the people offer what sacrifices they like to whatever god they like. This you and your laws permit, since ye deem it impious that one should not believe in a god, but necessary that each should worship the gods of his choice, that men may be restrained from vice by fear of the gods. The whole world thus enjoys deep peace. On Christians alone ye have not bestowed sufficient care, allowing us to be persecuted and plundered on no other pretence than that we bear the name of Christ. And it is not merely our

goods that our enemies desire, but they wish to deprive us of life. We make no objection to being punished if we are found guilty; but if the only proof of the accusation hurled against us is our name, it is the duty of your philanthropic monarchs to repel the accusation by law" (III. 107-109, 125). There is a work attributed to Hermias in which it is thought an acquaintance with the writings of Justin Martyr and Tatian is shown. "All the guesses made with regard to this Hermias are baseless, and the fragment of his work gives no clear indication of any date or circumstance in his life" (III. 179).

It is observable how many of the writers in the group we have now had in view are made to cluster round the name of Marcus Aurelius. And of these Justin introduces him in his Apology, and three others, namely Athenagoras, Melito, and Apollinaris, in like manner come before him with formal appeals in behalf of their co-religionists the Christians. The letter imputed to the churches in Gaul attributes to him an order sanctioning the proceedings taken there in the instance of those who adhered to the Christian faith (Donaldson III. 274); that is they might be tortured, fastened into iron chairs and burnt to death, or destroyed by being cast before wild beasts. I have already had occasion to observe that the alleged existence in all important cities of chains of bishops holding office in undisturbed succession, and the very productions of these apologists, forbid the idea, that in these times to be known as a Christian, of itself entailed the forfeiture of life. There is an incident in the career of Marcus Aurelius, as made use of by the Christians, which also wars against the imputation that he was a party to the alleged intolerance and persecution. This is the circumstance of what has been designated The Thundering Legion. An opportune shower of rain in one of his military expeditions saved his army from drought, and enabled them to gain an important victory over their enemies. The Latin writers ascribed this deliverance to the enchantments of magicians, or the prayers of their emperor. The Christian writers allege that it was due to the prayers of Christian soldiers in one of his legions, who threw themselves on their knees, according to their usage, when drawn up in battle array before the enemy, and called

down the blessing. "There are epistles of the most learned emperor Marcus still extant," says the unhesitating Tertullian, "in which he himself bears testimony, that when his army was ready to perish for want of water, it was saved by the Christians" (Euseb., *Ec. Hist.* v. 5). If Christians were admitted into the imperial army and allowed openly to practise their adorations, it is apparent that the sect enjoyed free toleration in the reign of this emperor. The incident in question is said to have occurred in the year 174, in a contest with the Quadi (Smith, *Dict.*), and is therefore associated with the latter portion of his reign. Dr Smith, however, accepts all the current declarations of persecutions in this reign, including even the unrecorded martyrdom of Justin, and the mythical account of the immolation of Polycarp. At the same time he shows that the personal character of the emperor was other than that belonging to a persecutor. He bore, he says, the distinctive epithet of "the philosopher." When a child, Hadrian playfully designated him *Verissimus*, "as a tribute to the sincerity and truthfulness of his disposition;" when Cassius sought to usurp his throne, his "forgiving temper" and "lenity" were manifested towards all concerned in the attempt. The "leading feature" in his character was his "devotion to philosophy and literature." "In jurisprudence especially, he laboured throughout life with great activity, and his constitutions are believed to have filled many volumes." Is it possible that the edicts of such a man could have been directed to the destruction of an innocent race practising godliness in their own form? "The education and pursuits of M. Aurelius exercised the happiest influence upon a temper and disposition naturally calm and benevolent." "He was firm without being obstinate; he steadily maintained his own principles without manifesting any overweening contempt for the opinions of those who differed from himself; his justice was tempered with gentleness and mercy." "In public life, he sought to demonstrate practically the truth of the Platonic maxim, ever on his lips, that those states only could be truly happy which were governed by philosophers, or in which the kings and rulers were guided by the tenets of pure philosophy." "No monarch was ever more widely or more deeply beloved. The people believed that he had been sent down by the gods,

for a time, to bless mankind, and had now returned to the heaven from which he descended." Surely this was not the man to have authorized the alleged persecutions in Gaul, or to have called forth the efforts of the so-called Apologists.

The Jewish historians, as I have endeavoured to show, by their silence, exclude the possibility of the Christian movement having taken effect in the first century of the asserted Christian era, and the testimony of the reputed Christian authors must be considered, in an historical point of view, as an absolute blank to the reign of Commodus, or for a hundred and fifty years from the asserted death of Christ. After this, the writers of note were Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Irenæus, Origen, and Hippolytus, who are said to have flourished from A.D. 180 to 222; and Cyprian and Dionysius, stated to be of A.D. 250 and 254. There were also certain noted so-called heretics of an alleged earlier time, as Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Valentinus, Cerdon, and Marcion. The whole, I believe, depend on the sole authority of Eusebius for the times they lived in. Of all these writers Irenæus is the most important for the cause of Christianity, and unfortunately none of them present a more dubious aspect as to true being and era than he does. He associates himself in his youth with the mythical Polycarp, who is alleged to have been contemporary with the apostles, and is traceable to the time of Victor, the asserted thirteenth bishop of Rome, or, according to the current chronology, A.D. 192 (Euseb., *Ec. Hist.* iv. 14; v. 24). His personal testimony must therefore be spread over something like a hundred years. The probability is that these writers, on whom Eusebius depends, lived much nearer than stated to his own time; otherwise, we have him working out his history provided with testimonies for the earlier ages, and devoid thereof for approaching a century when he arrives at his own period.

The case for Christianity thus is, that in the early portion of the fourth century we have the system openly recognized and established through the efforts of the sanguinary Constantine, supported by the unreliable Eusebius; that what occurred before their time is shadowy and uncertain; and that the utmost that can be done is to point to a class of possibly reliable literature which may show the existence of the creed during an antecedent period of a century and a half, beyond

which all is cloudy mist without landmarks, until we arrive at the closing period of Josephus' life, to which time we may assure ourselves there was no such thing as Christianity.

Several of the prominent actors in the Christian movement, such as Peter, Apollos, Titus, Timothy, Barnabas, Cleopas, and the four reputed evangelists, present themselves bearing Greek names. The whole of the Christian literature, including the sacred scriptures, is in the Greek tongue, and the citations therein made from the Jewish scriptures are drawn ordinarily from the Greek version of the Septuagint. These are features effectually disjoining the movement from Judea and Galilee and the times asserted for the uprising there of Christianity. The subject is well handled in a pamphlet in Mr Scott's series by the Rev. Thomas Kirkman, entitled "Orthodoxy from the Hebrew Point of View," which I now make use of. Mr Kirkman points out that eighteen hundred years ago the language spoken in Palestine was a form of Hebrew, and that it is amply apparent through Josephus, who was of the generation after the alleged Christ, that Greek in his day was unknown to the people of those parts. "In the last chapter of his *Antiquities*, which he says he wrote in the fifty-sixth year of his life, he gives this account of himself, adorned with terms of sufficient self-commendation:—'I have taken pains to acquire a knowledge of Greek: I have become skilled in it grammatically, but the habitual use of my native tongue has prevented my accurate utterance of that language.'" "In his first book against Apion, § 9, he says, 'Afterwards (*i.e.*, after the siege) I got leisure at Rome, and when all my materials were prepared for that work, I made use of some persons to assist me in learning the Greek tongue; and by these means I composed the history of these transactions.'" "Again and again he informs us that he was employed as interpreter; he was sent several times to parley with the besieged, in their native tongue." The words, "Epphatha," "Talitha Cumi," and the cry on the cross, Mr Kirkman observes, are the only words in the Christian scriptures representing the language of the people among whom the great scenes of the gospel are said to have been enacted. These are thrust in in just such a way as to show that the writer knew something of the language; and their presence, in this forced manner, serves

to weaken rather than maintain the genuineness of the representations thus made. Mr Kirkman further observes we have a Hebrew gospel of Matthew spoken of, but not extant, and how it could have disappeared is not apparent; while there is substituted for it, under what circumstances we are equally ignorant of, a Greek version of the same alleged evangelist. It is not till the age of Constantine, observes a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* of the current year (1874), that, in the library established at his capital, we have any public collection of Christian literary efforts. In the more ancient libraries of Greece and Rome they had found no place. The writer feels the circumstance a singular one, but it is consonant to the conclusion to which all other indications tend. It was at this time that the movement attained solidity and public notoriety, its earlier traces being comparatively feeble, and its doctrinal lines immature and uncertain.

II.

THE CONSTITUENTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

It is a distinguishing feature of Christianity, that in it everything is made to centre around the person of Jesus of Nazareth, appearing as the Jewish Messiah. Admitting the existence of the hope in such an advent of one who was to redeem Israel out of all their troubles, and give them their longed-for ascendancy over those who had been hostile to them, and had oppressed them, the assertion that there had been such an appearance might readily rise upon the lips of those who were desirous to work upon such a hope, and resuscitate the spirit of their co-religionists, especially in times when it was thought fair to resort to fiction to promote the religious sentiment. Between the period alleged for the accomplishment of this advent and the promulgation of faith in the event, there occurred, as there is room to believe, the interval of at least a century and a half, during which time there was ample opportunity for those concerned in maintaining the occurrence, to give it, out of the materials at their hands, the colouring suitable to promote its currency.

From the time of the Maccabæan struggles especially, the Jewish mind had been straining for such a deliverance as was to be wrought by their expected Messiah. Their aspirations found vent in such Psalms as the 2d, 18th, 46th, 47th, 72d, and 110th, where the heathen are represented to rage, and the kings of the earth to set themselves against the Lord, and his anointed, who was to have them assigned to him for his inheritance, to break them with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces as the potter's vessel. "Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me. They cried, but there was none to save them :

even unto the Lord, but he answered them not. Then did I beat them small as the dust before the wind: I did cast them out as the dirt in the streets." "O clap your hands, all ye people; shout unto God with the voice of triumph. For the Lord most high is terrible; he is a great king over all the earth. He shall subdue the people under us, and the nations under our feet." "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies . . . The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." These are effusions, some of which are probably due to the Maccabæan times, expressing the hopes the Jews entertained in the success of their then heroic leaders. It has been found convenient to apply them to the lowly and unwarlike Jesus of Nazareth, but in a non-natural and prophetic sense. The Jews have never had their looked-for deliverer; and the Christians, filching away their hope, have set their Messiah up for themselves, imaginatively, in another unforetold and ideal shape.

The character of the Jewish people, such as now known to us, was formed after their return from the captivity in Babylon. It is then only that we find current among them that sacred code by which they are so distinguishably marked. Previously they stood in no better position than the idolatrous tribes by whom they were surrounded. Each had their local divinity, who was Dagon, Chemosh, Baal, Milcom, &c. With the Jews it was Jahveh. After the captivity, the cultivation of the religious feelings became with them a true sentiment. Their thoughts centred upon the universal Creator, though they were still foolish enough to believe those who assured them they were the objects of his particular regards. Jerusalem became to them the city of God, where the throne of their exalted Messiah was to be established in supremacy over all other nations. An intense nationality sprang up, strengthening itself round the image of the sovereign coming to them, who was to be armed with superhuman power and attributes, as the express emissary of the Almighty. "The origin of the Talmud," which is a running record of the inner-life of this people for a thousand years onwards, dating from this period, is, says Mr

Emanuel Deutsch, "coeval with the return from the Babylonish captivity. One of the most mysterious and momentous periods in the history of humanity, is that brief space of the exile. What were the influences brought to bear upon the captives during that time, we know not. But this we know, that from a reckless, lawless, godless populace, they returned transformed into a band of Puritans. The religion of Zerdust, though it has left its traces in Judaism, fails to account for that change. Nor does the exile itself account for it. Many and intense as are the reminiscences of its bitterness, and of yearning for home, that have survived in prayer and in song, yet we know that when the hour of liberty struck, the forced colonists were loth to return to the land of their fathers. Yet the change is there, palpable, unmistakable; a change which we may regard as almost miraculous. Scarcely aware before of the existence of their glorious national literature, the people now began to press round these brands plucked from the fire—the scanty records of their faith and history—with a fierce and passionate love, a love stronger even than that of wife and child. These same documents, as they were gradually formed into a canon, became the immutable centre of their lives, their actions, their thoughts, their very dreams. From that time forth, with scarcely any intermission, the keenest as well as the most poetical minds of the nation remained fixed upon them. 'Turn it, and turn it again,' says the Talmud, with regard to the Bible, 'for everything is in it.' 'Search the scriptures,' is the distinct utterance of the New Testament" (*The Literary Remains of Emanuel Deutsch*, 12, 13). "The most monstrous mistake has ever been . . . our confounding the Judaism of the time of Christ with that of the time of the wilderness, of the Judges, or even of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (*Ibid.*, 27). "In this same period," (that is, succeeding the captivity), "all those fierce yearnings for a Deliverer, an Anointed, a Messiah—one of the highest and most ideal conceptions of Humanity—found their loudest and most glowing utterance" (*Ibid.*, 167). "Every sermon, every discourse that treated of holy things, ended with the one comprehensive formula, 'And may to Sion come the Redeemer'" (*Ibid.*, 143). "Of Messianic passages, Jonathan" (in his Targum) "has pointed out those mentioned below; a number not too large,

if we consider how, with the increased misery of the people, their ardent desire to see their Deliverer appear speedily must have tried to find as many places in the Bible as possible warranting His arrival. So far from their being suppressed," (as has been unwarrantably stated), "they are most prominently, often most pointedly, brought forward. And there is a decided polemical animus inherent in them—temperate, as far as appearance goes, but containing many an unspoken word: such as a fervent human mind, pressed down by all the woes and terrors, written and unwritten, would whisper to itself in the depths of its despair. These passages extol most rapturously the pomp and glory of the Messiah to come, by way of contrast to the humble appearance of Christ; and all the places where suffering and misery appear to be the lot forecast to the Anointed, it is Israel, to whom the passage is referred by the Targum" (*Ibid.*, 373).

Dating the possible uprise of Christianity at a late period in the second century, there had passed over the heads of the Jewish people their last and crowning calamity, when Jerusalem was destroyed in the reign of Hadrian, and its inhabitants dispersed (1 Thess. ii. 16). There was an apparent end of all the high promises to be realized for the stock of Abraham, through the Messiah, with which they had fed themselves. It is not surprising that fervent spirits among this people, or those associated with them as proselytes, should have been led to recast these promises, and give them another solution. A remarkable exhibition of such an attempt occurs in the Epistle to the Galatians, where, with unsurpassable hardihood, the natural stock of Abraham are swept away in favour of an ideal progeny in Christ. "Now to Abraham," says the writer, "and his seed were the promises made, He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." Again, "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." It is an ingenious method of making a promise, which says one thing, to mean another; but, after all, the device has no better foundation than what must be designated a quibble. It is doubtful whether the word זרע in the Hebrew has any plural form; but if so used, whether in Hebrew or in Greek, the phrase would no more be applicable to human pro-

geny, but mean vegetable seeds, as is also the case in our own language. The writer, in effect, stultifies himself in the last of the passages I have cited, by employing the word in the singular to denote "Abraham's seed."

Assuming Christianity to have arisen on the basis of the Jewish hopes, and after the dispersion, its field, necessarily, was somewhere outside the limits of Judea; and when we find all the writings of the early Christians, canonical, apocryphal, and patristic, recorded in the Greek language, and the citations therein from the Jewish scriptures ordinarily derived from the Greek version of the Septuagint, we are driven to ascribe to the movement some Greek centre; and, naturally, Alexandria suggests itself as the site of the new religious development.

"For many centuries the city of Alexandria was second in importance only to Rome. Commerce and literature were united within its walls in a close alliance, of which there has been no example, before or since. It was situated advantageously on the great highway of intercourse between the east and the west. Its mixed population, gathered from all lands, was the type of its intellectual system. It was connected with India on the one side, and on the other with Africa; and it brought Syria, and Asia Minor, and Italy, into renewed relations. It possessed the beautiful Greek language, so copious and exact, so fit for the uses of poetry and science, which had spread along the shores of the Mediterranean, and through the Levant. Alexandria was in some respects a second Athens. There was the library and the museum, which attracted a concourse of learned men from Chaldea, and Persia, and Egypt itself. The east contributed its dreamy mysticism, and Greece its clear and graceful thought. . . . For the Alexandrians all philosophy had its origin in Aristotle or Plato. . . . The Pythagoreans had their influence. . . . There was a strange mixture, at Alexandria, of people and opinions; Jews, who abounded in the city from the days of its founder, learned Platonism, while the heathens became acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures; and at the same time, the extensive intercourse with Asiatics, which followed the conquests of Alexander, introduced the Oriental doctrines" (The Rev. S. Robins; *A Defence of Faith*, 7-17).

Nothing is more apparent than that Christianity seems

with those elements abounding in the region we have in view, where Oriental, Greek, and Egyptian philosophies and mythologies, were presented to influence and feed the Jewish sentiment and aspirations, in aid of the development of the new form of faith, which, on the wreck of the old hopes, in the times we treat of, was gradually and tentatively launched upon the attention of mankind.

It was a very ancient idea, belonging to the early Hindú theorists, that the Supreme Being was too purely spiritual to operate directly in putting into form those grosser materials with which all terrestrial objects are constructed. It was thought necessary, therefore, to devise some intermediate agency for carrying out the creative processes. The task was committed severally to Brahmá, Prakriti, Prajapati, Manu, and Vishnu. The Egyptians, similarly, have assigned it to Pthah and Cneph, and the Greeks have done so, as respects the human race, to Prometheus and Deucalion. The express agency for these operations in the western theologies is what is termed the Word of God, a species of deification traceable to the east. The goddess Vach (*vox*) is its form with the Aryans. She is called in the Rig-veda "the speech of the primeval spirit," and is said to be the daughter of Brahmá (Rowland Williams, *Christianity and Hinduism*, 100). The early Christians show themselves to have had a knowledge of this source of ideality. The Bráhmans, says Hippolytus, term "discourse" God, and describe him as corporeal (*Refutation of all Heresies*, I. xxi). The image occurs again in the Aryan Manu (*mens*), the embodiment of the intelligence or wisdom of the Diety. We recognize in these conceptions the Logos of the Pythagoreans and Platonists, who were confessedly indoctrinated from the east. These ideas passed on to the Jews likewise. By the wisdom of God, and the fiat of his word, the heavens and the earth, it was seen, had been established (Ps. xxxiii. 6; Pro. iii. 19; Jer. li. 15); and it was easy to give the power a personality. "The Lord possessed me," it is said, "in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth: while as yet he

had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there : when he set a compass upon the face of the depth : when he established the clouds above : when he strengthened the fountains of the deep : when he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment : when he appointed the foundations of the earth : then I was by him, as one brought up with him : and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him " (Prov. viii. 22-30). The " Wisdom of Solomon," one of the apocryphal books, is much occupied with the subject. The attribute of wisdom is personified, and then it is observed, " What she is, and how she came up, I will tell you, and will not hide mysteries from you : but I will seek her out from the beginning of her nativity, and bring the knowledge of her into light, and will not pass over the truth " (vi. 12-22). " She is the breath of the power of God, . . . the image of his goodness " (vii. 25, 26). " And wisdom was with thee : which knoweth thy works, and was present when thou madest the world " (ix. 9). The consolidation of the image proceeded until it assumed the characteristics of a divine sonship. " I was my father's son," it is said, " tender and only beloved in the sight of my mother " (Prov. iv. 3.) " Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended ? Who hath gathered the wind in his fists ? Who hath bound the waters in a garment ? Who hath established all the ends of the earth ? What is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell ? " (Prov. xxx. 4). " I will declare the decree : the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my son ; this day have I begotten thee " (Ps. ii. 7). Such a divine personage Daniel describes moving about in the fiery furnace with Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, whose " form," he said, " was like the Son of God ; " and such an image would readily assume the proportions of the expected Messiah.

The Book of Enoch, an apocryphal work supposed to be of about B.C. 50 (Colenso, IV. 309), shows the advance of the Jewish mind to this ultimate stage. It is a production describing " the person and the times of the Messiah," gathering together " the scattered allusions of the Old Testament in one grand picture of unspeakable bliss, unalloyed virtue, and unlimited knowledge " and representing the Messiah, " not

only as the king, but as the judge of the world, who has the decision over everything on earth and in heaven." He is "the Son of God, the Elected One, the Prince of Righteousness; he is gifted with that wisdom which knows all secret things; the spirit in all its fulness is poured out on him; his glory lasts to all eternity; he shares the throne of God's majesty; kings and princes will worship him, and will invoke his mercy; he pre-existed before all time; 'before the sun and the signs were made; and the stars were created, his name was already proclaimed before the Lord of all spirits;' 'before the creation of the world he was elected;' and although still unknown to the children of the world, he is already revealed to the pious by prophecy, and is praised by the angels in heaven" (*Ibid.* IV. 311, 312). This work is quoted by Jude under the supposition that it comes from the alleged true Enoch, the seventh descendant from Adam, and its phraseology is easily traceable in the canonical Christian gospels and epistles which have liberally made use of it.*

Philo Judæus is an exponent of Jewish religious thought in the times before us, in the region of Alexandria, the apparent birthplace of the Christian philosophy. He occupied himself much with discourses on the Jewish scriptures, which he allegorizes with the utmost freedom; and being so imbued with Grecian doctrines as to be accounted a follower of Pythagoras and Plato (*Euseb. Ec. Hist.* IV. 4), we have in him that combination of Jewish and Grecian sentiment which enters so largely into the composition of the Christian Logos. On this subject he dilated with a zest proportionate to the zeal which animated him, and the liberty he gave himself in the flow of thought. "I am not ashamed," he observes, "to relate what has happened to myself, which I know from having experienced it ten thousand times. Sometimes, when I have desired to come to my usual employment of writing on the doctrines of philosophy, though I have known accurately what it was proper to set down, I have found my mind barren and unproductive, and have been completely unsuccessful in my object, being indignant at my mind for the uncertainty and vanity of its then existing opinions, and filled with amazement at the power of the living

* "The Bible: is it the Word of God?" 50-53.

God, by whom the womb of the soul is at times opened and at times closed up ; and sometimes when I have come to my work empty, I have suddenly become full, ideas being, in an invisible manner, showered upon me, and implanted in me from on high ; so that, through the influence of divine inspiration, I have become greatly excited, and have known neither the place in which I was nor those who were present, nor myself, nor what I was saying, nor what I was writing ; for then I have been conscious of a richness of interpretation, an enjoyment of light, a most penetrating sight, a most manifest energy in all that was to be done, having such an effect on my mind as the clearest ocular demonstration would have on the eyes" (II. 50).

Philo engaged himself in setting forth the Jewish scriptures in a light more acceptable to minds philosophically governed as his own, than was presented by the bare features of the narratives of the Pentateuch. This he effected by an elaborate and very wilful system of allegorizing, substituting speculative moral conclusions for the facts of the text before him. The world was said to have been made in six days, because six is a perfect number in its parts and its entirety. This number represents orderly arrangement, such as creation calls for. The fourth day in which the heavens were "adorned" also involves a numerical perfection. The completed seven days have a very high numerical value, on which the author dilates copiously. The paradise in which the first human couple were placed, stocked with plants possessing the different virtues of the soul, was a symbolic representation rather than what was "strictly accurate." It typified "the dominant character of the soul, which is full of innumerable opinions as this figurative paradise was of trees." The serpent "is the symbol of pleasure, because in the first place he is destitute of feet, and crawls on his belly with his face downwards. In the second place, because he uses lumps of clay for food. Thirdly, because he bears poison in his teeth, by which it is his nature to kill those who are bitten by him," and so on. Working upon the Greek speculative philosophy with which he was imbued, he aimed at analyzing and delineating the attributes of the Almighty, giving them specific shape ; and the exaltation of mind that ensued when

the thoughts were let loose in this direction, he mistook for direct inspiration. In the present day we should know how to deal with a writer thus influenced, but Philo was addressing congenial spirits in an atmosphere suitable for the reception of his lucubrations. That he should be attracted to the operations of the imaginary Grecian Logos, and model this object on a Jewish Messianic form, was a result natural to such a writer at such a time. But what becomes of the authority of the Christian canonical record, it must be asked, when we find the attributes of its central figure, in all their high and very remarkable specialities, anticipated and drawn by the pen of a fanciful writer, such as this, himself standing absolutely free of Christianity?

I take advantage of Mr Bryant's labours in presenting the following compendium of Philo's views of the Logos in their bearing upon the canonical representations. Philo states him to be :

The Son of God (Mark i. 1; Luke iv. 41; John i. 34; Acts viii. 37).

The second Divinity (John i. 1).

The first-begotten of God (Heb. i. 5, 6; Col. i. 15).

The image and likeness of God (2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 3).

Superior to angels (Heb. i. 4, 6).

Superior to all things in the world (Heb. ii. 8).

The instrument by whom the world was made (John i. 3; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2, 3, 10).

The substitute of God, upon whom all things depend (Eph. iii. 9).

The light of the world, and intellectual sun (John i. 4, 9; viii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 9).

The Logos only can see God (John i. 18; vi. 46).

He has God for his portion, and resides in him (John i. 1, 18; xiv. 11).

The most ancient of God's works, and before all things (John i. 2; xvii. 5, 24; 2 Tim. i. 9).

Esteemed the same as God (Mark ii. 7; Phil. ii. 6).

Eternal (John xii. 34).

He sees all things (Heb. iv. 12, 13; Rev. ii. 23).

He supports the world (John iii. 35; Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3).

Nearest to God, nothing coming between to disturb that unity (John x. 30; xiv. 11; xvii. 11).

Free from all taint of sin, voluntary and involuntary (Heb. iv. 15; ix. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 22).

Presiding over the imperfect (Luke v. 32; 1 Tim. i. 15).

The fountain of wisdom, to which all should diligently repair, that

by drinking from that sacred spring they may, instead of death, obtain everlasting life (John iv. 14; vii. 37, 38; 1 Cor. i. 24; Col. ii. 3).

A messenger sent by God to man (John v. 36; viii. 29, 42; 1 John iv. 9).

The advocate and intercessor for mortal man (John xiv. 16; xvii. 20; Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25; 1 John ii. 1).

He ordered and disposed of all things (Col. i. 15, 16; Heb. xi. 3).

The Shepherd of God's flock (John x. 14; Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 25).

Possessed of creative and princely power (1 Cor. xv. 25; Eph. i. 21, 22; Rev. xvii. 14).

The Physician that heals all evil (Matt. ix. 12; Luke iv. 18; vii. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 24).

The Seal of God (John vi. 27; Eph. i. 13).

The sure refuge, to whom, before all others, we ought to seek (Matt. xi. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 25).

The heavenly nutriment of the soul (Matt. v. 6; John vi. 51, 53).

The instrument of spiritual liberty (John viii. 36; 1 Cor. vii. 22; 2 Cor. iii. 17; Gal. v. 1, 13).

Who frees men from corruption, and entitles them to immortality (Rom. viii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 52, 53; 1 Pet. i. 3, 4).

God's beloved Son (Matt. iii. 17; Luke ix. 35; Col. i. 13).

Through whom the well-disposed disciples of God will be one day translated to an incorruptible and perfect order of beings (Rom. viii. 17; Eph. i. 11; Col. i. 12; 1 Pet. i. 4).

By whom the just man, not given over to utter death, shall be raised and brought near to God in heaven (John vi. 44; xii. 26; xiv. 1-6).

The true High Priest, without sin, and anointed with oil (John i. 41; viii. 46; Acts iv. 27; Heb. iv. 14; vii. 26; 1 Pet. ii. 22).

The Mediator (1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. viii. 1-6; ix. 11, 12, 24).

Bryant on *Philo*, 107-154.

Another feature of the times antecedent to the Christian era, which entered very decidedly into the composition of Christianity, was the prevalence of asceticism, as imported from India, and prevailing among the Jewish sects known as the Therapeuts in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and as the Essenes in Palestine. These have been fully described by Philo and Josephus; and we have seen that Eusebius recognizes the resemblance of the Therapeuts to the Christians so unreservedly, as to have made the very bold declaration that they were in fact Christians.

These sectaries, though differing in name, were in essentials alike. Their aim, in keeping with every form of asceticism, was

to bring the body under subjection, in order to promote spiritual advancement, they being content to forego the enjoyments of this life in view of securing blessing in the life that was to come. The Essenes occupied villages, and pursued the ordinary vocations of life, addicting themselves chiefly to agriculture. The Therapeuts gave themselves up to a more secluded life in the deserts, where they passed their time in ministering to the wants of others, temporal and spiritual, and in contemplation. Both lived in associated bodies, the Therapeuts in monasteries. They discouraged matrimony. The Essenes allowed no women to enter their community. The Therapeuts admitted them, but required them to live apart from the men, and divided them off even at times of joint public worship.

The Essenes, by a solemn vow, bound themselves to "exercise piety towards God," to "observe justice towards men," to "do no harm to any one," to "hate the wicked, and be assistants to the righteous," to "show fidelity to all men, and especially to those in authority," to be "perpetually lovers of truth," to "keep clear from theft," and from "unlawful gains" (Josephus, *Wars*, II., viii. 7). "As for their piety towards God, it is very extraordinary" (*Ibid.*, sec. 5). The Therapeuts abstained from pleasure, put away pride, and cultivated the good-will of mankind (Philo, III. 525). The Essenes "exceed all other men that addict themselves to virtue, and this in righteousness." They believed in the immortality of the soul, and earnestly strove for "the rewards of righteousness" (Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII., i. 5). The Therapeuts were equally devout and pure in conduct. They accounted themselves "citizens of heaven;" they prayed morning and evening, and the interval was "by them devoted wholly to meditation on and practice of virtue" (Philo, IV. 7, 20).

Treating these devotees as essentially representing the same movement, I proceed to notice the points of correspondence which give evidence that the Christians shaped themselves upon the like model. My materials for the Therapeuts and Essenes are drawn from Philo, III. 523-526; IV. 4-9, 15-20, 220, 221; and Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII., i. 5; *Wars*, II., viii. 2-11.

(1.) ESSENES.—They did not "store up treasures of silver and gold," and were "despisers of riches."

CHRISTIANS.—“Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also” (Matt. vi. 19-21). “So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God” (Luke xii. 21). “How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!” (Luke xviii. 24). “They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil” (1 Tim. vi. 9, 10).

(2.) ESSENES.—“They eat nothing of a costly character, but plain bread and a seasoning of salt, which the more luxurious of them do further season with hyssop; and their drink is water from the spring.” “They eat only so far as not to be hungry, and they drink just enough to escape from thirst, avoiding all satiety, as an enemy of and a plotter against both soul and body.”

CHRISTIANS.—“Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink” (Matt. vi. 25). “Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares” (Luke xxi. 34). “And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air. But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, when I have preached to others I myself should be a cast-away” (1 Cor. ix. 25-27). “Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand” (Phil. iv. 5). “And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content” (1 Tim. vi. 8). “Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul” (1 Pet. ii. 11).

(3.) ESSENES.—They have “all things in common, so that a rich man enjoys no more of his own wealth than he who hath nothing at all.” “What belongs to one belongs to all; and,

on the other hand, whatever belongs to the whole body belongs to each individual." "There is no one who has a house so absolutely his own private property that it does not in some sense also belong to every one; for besides that they all dwell together in companies, the house is open to all those of the same notions who come to them from other quarters. Then there is one magazine among them all; their expenses are all in common; their garments belong to them all in common; their food is common, since they all eat in messes."

CHRISTIANS.—"And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need" (Acts ii. 44, 45). "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common. . . . Neither was there among them that lacked, for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold and laid them down at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need" (Acts iv. 32-35).

(4.) ESSENES.—"Then, because of their anxious desire for an immortal and blessed existence, thinking that their mortal life has already come to an end, they leave their possessions to their sons or daughters, or perhaps to other relations, giving them up their inheritance with willing cheerfulness."

CHRISTIANS.—"Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me" (Matt. xix. 21). "And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not: from henceforth thou shalt catch men. And when they had brought their ships to land, they forsook all, and followed him" (Luke v. 11). "And after these things he went forth and saw a publican named Levi sitting at the receipt of custom: and he said, unto him, Follow me. And he left all, rose up, and followed him" (Luke v. 27, 28). "Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundred-fold now in this time,

houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come, eternal life" (Mark x. 28-30). "So, likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv. 33). "Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ" (Phil. iii. 8).

(5.) **ESSENES.**—"They have no certain city, but many of them dwell in every city; and if any of their sect come from other places, what they have lies open for them, just as if it were their own; and they go into such as they never knew before, as if they had been ever so long acquainted with them. For which reason they carry nothing with them when they travel into remote parts."

CHRISTIANS.—"Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat. And into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence. And when ye come into an house, salute it. And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it; but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city" (Matt. x. 9-15). "And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing" (Luke xxii. 35).

(6.) **ESSENES.**—"Nor do they allow of the change of garments, or of shoes, till they be first entirely torn to pieces, or worn out by time."

CHRISTIANS.—"He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none" (Luke iii. 11).

(7.) **ESSENES.**—"Only these two things are done among them at everyone's own free will, which are, to assist those that want it, and to show mercy."

CHRISTIANS. "But rather give alms of such things as ye have" (Luke xi. 41). "Distributing to the necessity of

saints; given to hospitality" (Rom. xii. 13). "But this I say, He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver" (2 Cor. ix. 6, 7). "Charge them that are rich in this world, . . . that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate" (1 Tim. vi. 17, 18). "But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 16). "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (James i. 27). "But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (1 John iii. 17).

(8.) **ESSENES.**—"They also think it a good thing to obey their elders."

CHRISTIANS.—"Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God." "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief." "Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints" (Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24).

(9.) **ESSENES.**—"They undertake that they "will ever show fidelity to all men, and especially to those in authority, because no one obtains the government without God's assistance."

CHRISTIANS.—"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God" (Rom. xiii. 1, 2). "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work" (Tit. iii. 1). "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men" (1 Pet. ii. 13-15).

(10.) **ESSENES.**—"They are eminent for fidelity."

CHRISTIANS.—"He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much" (Luke xvi. 10). "Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful" (1 Cor. iv. 2). "They that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful" (Rev. xvii. 14). "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True" (Rev. xix. 11).

(11.) **ESSENES.**—"And are the ministers of peace."

CHRISTIANS.—"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God" (Mat. v. 9). "Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another" (Mark ix. 50). "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men" (Rom. xii. 18). "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another" (Rom. xiv. 19). "Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you" (2 Cor. xiii. 11). "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. xii. 14).

(12.) **ESSENES.**—"They dispense their anger after a just manner, and restrain their passion."

CHRISTIANS.—"But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire" (Matt. v. 22). "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, said the Lord" (Rom. xii. 19). "Be ye angry and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath." "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you" (Eph. iv. 26, 31, 32). "Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye" (Col. iii. 13). "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath:

for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God" (James i. 19, 20).

(13.) **ESSENES.**—"Whatsoever they say also is firmer than an oath; but swearing is avoided by them, and they esteem it worse than perjury; for they say, that he who cannot be believed without swearing by God, is already condemned."

CHRISTIANS.—"But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: nor by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great king. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil" (Matt. v. 34-37). "But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and your nay nay; lest you fall into condemnation" (James v. 12).

(14.) **ESSENES.**—"Nor is there ever any clamour or disturbance to pollute their house, but they give every one leave to speak in their turn; which silence thus kept in their house, appears to foreigners like some tremendous mystery; the cause of which is that perpetual sobriety they exercise."

CHRISTIANS.—"He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets" (Matt. xii. 19). "And the chief priests accused him of many things: but he answered nothing. And Pilate asked him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they witness against thee. But Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled" (Mark xv. 3-5). "Then he (Herod) questioned with him in many words; but he answered him nothing. And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused him" (Luke xxiii. 9, 10). "And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth" (2 Tim. ii. 24, 25).

(15.) **ESSENES.**—"These Essenes reject pleasures as an evil, but esteem continence, and the conquest over our passions to be virtue." "Perceiving with more than ordinary acuteness and accuracy, what is alone or at least above all other things cal-

culated to dissolve such associations, they repudiate marriage ; and at the same time they practice continence in an eminent degree ; for no one of the Essenes ever marries a wife." "The women also share in this feast (held by the Therapeuts), the greater part of whom, though old, are virgins in respect of their purity, . . . out of an admiration for and love of wisdom, with which they are desirous to pass their lives, on account of which they are indifferent to the pleasures of the body, desiring not a mortal but an immortal offspring, which the soul that is attached to God is alone able to produce by itself and from itself."

CHRISTIANS.—"All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb : and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men : and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it" (Matt. xix. 11, 12). "For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I." "Art thou loosed from a wife ? seek not a wife." "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord : but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife." "There is a difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit : but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband" (1 Cor. vii. 7, 8, 27, 33, 34).

(16.) ESSENES.—"Those that are caught in any heinous sins, they cast them out of their society ; and he who is thus separated from them, does often die after a miserable manner ; for as he is bound by the oath he hath taken, and by the customs he hath been engaged in, he is not at liberty to partake of that food that he meets with elsewhere, but is forced to eat grass, and to famish his body with hunger till he perish ; for which reason they receive many of them again when they are at their last gasp, out of compassion to them,

as thinking the miseries they have endured till they came to the very brink of death, to be a sufficient punishment for the sins they had been guilty of."

CHRISTIANS.—"For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened." "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person" (1 Cor. v. 3-5, 7, 13). "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow" (2 Cor. ii. 7). "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" (2 Cor. vi. 14, 15). "Of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i. 20). "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed" (2 John 10).

(17.) ESSENES.—"Before sun-rising they speak not a word about profane matters, but put up certain prayers which they have received from their forefathers, as if they made a supplication for its rising."

CHRISTIANS.—Tertullian informs us that it was the custom of the early Christians to pray, turning to the East, whence they were accused of worshipping the sun, as in the religion of Persia (*Apol.*, sec. 16).

(18.) ESSENES.—"A priest says grace before meat; and it is unlawful for anyone to taste of the food before grace be said."

CHRISTIANS.—"And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass, and took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves to his disciples, and the disciples to the multi-

tude" (Matt. xiv. 19). "And he took the seven loaves and the fishes, and gave thanks, and brake them, and gave to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude" (Matt. xv. 36). "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it" (Matt. xxvi. 26, 27). "And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them (after the resurrection), he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them" (Luke xxiv. 30). "Howbeit there came other boats from Tiberias nigh unto the place where they did eat bread, after that the Lord had given thanks" (John vi. 23). "And when he (Paul) had thus spoken, he took bread, and gave thanks to God in presence of them all: and when he had broken it, he began to eat" (Acts xxvii. 35). "He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks" (Rom. xiv. 6). "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. x. 31). "Meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer" (1 Tim. iv. 3-5).

(19.) **ESSENES.**—In every house there is a sacred shrine which is called the holy place, and the monastery in which they retire by themselves and perform all the mysteries of a holy life, bringing in nothing, neither meat, nor drink, nor anything else which is indispensable towards supplying the necessities of the body, but studying in that place the laws and the sacred oracles of God enunciated by the holy prophets, and hymns, and psalms, and all kinds of other things, by reason of which knowledge and piety are increased and brought to perfection."

CHRISTIANS.—"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly" (Matt. vi. 6).

"And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives" (Matt. xxvi. 30). "Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and

making melody in your heart to the Lord" (Eph. v. 19). "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord" (Col. iii. 16). "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing Psalms" (James v. 13).

(20.) **ESSENES.**—"The seventh day is accounted sacred, on which they abstain from all other employments, and frequent the sacred places which are called synagogues, and there they sit according to their age in classes, the younger sitting under the elder, and listening with eager attention in becoming order. Then one, indeed, takes up the holy volume and reads it, and another of the men of the greatest experience comes forward and explains what is not very intelligible, for a great many precepts are delivered in enigmatical modes of expression, and allegorically, as the old fashion was; and thus the people are taught piety, and holiness, and justice, and economy, and the science of regulating the state, and the knowledge of such things as are naturally good, or bad, or indifferent, and to choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong, using a threefold variety of definitions and rules, and criteria, namely, the love of God, and the love of virtue, and the love of mankind." "Then the eldest of them who has the most profound learning in their doctrines comes forward and speaks with steadfast look and with steadfast voice, with great powers of reasoning, and great prudence, not making an exhibition of his oratorical powers like the rhetoricians of old, or the sophists of the present day, but investigating with great pains, and explaining with minute accuracy the precise meaning of the laws, which sits, not at the tips of their ears, but penetrates through their hearing into the soul, and remains there lastingly; and all the rest listen in silence to the praises which he bestows upon the law, showing their assent only by nods of the head, or the eager look of the eyes."

CHRISTIANS.—"Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20). "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst." "And after eight days again, his disciples were

within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst" (John xx. 19-26). "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them" (Acts xx. 7). "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching" (Heb. x. 25).

"And when they had ordained them elders in every church" (Acts xiv. 23). "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine" (1 Tim. v. 17). "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee" (Tit. i. 5). "Likewise ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder" (1 Pet. v. 5).

"And there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 5-8). "How is it, then, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying" (1 Cor. xiv. 26).

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour" (Matt. v. 43). "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Matt. xxii. 37, 39). "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. xiii. 9, 10). "The Lord direct your hearts into the love of God" (2 Thess. iii. 5). "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love." "And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God love his brother also" (1 John iv. 7, 8, 21).

"And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with

excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God." "And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. ii. 1, 4, 13).

(21.) **ESSENES.**—"They labour with great diligence till the fifth hour. After which they assemble themselves together again into one place; and when they have clothed themselves in white veils, they then bathe their bodies in cold water. And after this purification is over, they every one meet together in an apartment of their own, into which it is not permitted to any of another sect to enter; while they go, after a pure manner, into the dining-room, as into a certain holy temple, and quietly set themselves down."

CHRISTIANS.—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit" (John xiii. 10). "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified" (1 Cor. vi. 11). "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (2 Cor. vii. 1). "Even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word" (Eph. v. 25, 26). "According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. iii. 5). "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water" (Heb. x. 22).

(22.) **ESSENES.**—They "think" it "a good thing" "to be clothed in white garments." "They come together (to their meals) clothed in white garments."

CHRISTIANS.—"And was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light" (Matt. xvii. 2). "The angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow" (Matt. xxviii. 2, 3). "And entering

into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment" (Mark xvi. 5). "And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel" (Acts i. 10). "They shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy" (Rev. iii. 4). "I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear" (Rev. iii. 18). "And round about the throne were four and twenty seats: and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment" (Rev. iv. 4). "After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 9, 14). "And the seven angels came out of the temple, having the seven plagues, clothed in pure and white linen" (Rev. xv. 6). "And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints" (Rev. xix. 8).

(23.) **ESSENES.**—"When they send what they have dedicated to God into the temple, they do not offer sacrifices, because they have more pure lustrations of their own; on which account they are excluded from the common court of the temple, but offer their sacrifices themselves; yet is their course of life better than that of other men." "They are above all men devoted to the service of God, not sacrificing living animals, but studying rather to preserve their own minds in a state of holiness and purity."

CHRISTIANS.—"But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice" (Matt. ix. 13). "And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices" (Mark xii. 33). "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. xii. 1). "For the law having a

shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect" (Heb. x. 1). "In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me), to do thy will, O God" (Heb. x. 6, 7). "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people" (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9). "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God" (Rev. i. 5, 6).

(24.) **ESSENES.**—"Being citizens of heaven and of the world."

CHRISTIANS.—"And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii. 6). "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ" (Phil. iii. 20). "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God" (Col. iii. 1). "For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly" (Heb. xi. 14-16). "But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. xii. 22, 23). "For here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come" (Heb. xiii. 14).

"And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee." "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John xvii. 11, 15, 16). "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the

covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters ; for then must ye needs go out of the world " (1 Cor. v. 9, 10).

(25.) **ESSENES.**—"Their doctrine is this : That bodies are corruptible, and that the matter they are made of is not permanent ; but that the souls are immortal, and continue for ever ; and that they come out of the most subtile air, and are united to their bodies as in prisons, into which they are drawn by a certain natural enticement ; but that when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh, they then, as released from a long bondage, rejoice and mount upward."

CHRISTIANS.—"Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body (Rom. viii. 23). "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. xv. 53). "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven " (2 Cor. v. 1, 2).

(26.) **ESSENES.**—"They condemn the miseries of life, and are above pain, by the generosity of their mind. And as for death, if it will be for their glory, they esteem it better than living always ; and indeed our war with the Romans gave abundant evidence what great souls they had in their trials, wherein, although they were tortured and distorted, burnt and torn to pieces, and went through all kinds of instruments of torment, that they might be forced either to blaspheme their legislator, or to eat what was forbidden them, yet could they not be made to do either of them, no, nor once to flatter their tormentors, or to shed a tear ; but they smiled in their very pains, and laughed those to scorn who inflicted the torments upon them, and resigned up their souls with great alacrity, as expecting to receive them again." "At different times a great number of chiefs of every variety of disposition and character have occupied their country, some of whom have endeavoured to surpass even ferocious wild beasts in cruelty, leaving no sort of inhumanity unpractised, and have never ceased to murder their subjects in whole troops, and have even torn them to pieces while living, like cooks cutting them limb from limb, till they themselves, being overtaken by the vengeance of

divine justice, have at last experienced the same miseries in their turn: others again having converted their barbarous frenzy into another kind of wickedness, practising an ineffable degree of savageness, talking with the people quietly, but through the hypocrisy of a more gentle voice, betraying the ferocity of their real disposition, fawning upon their victims like treacherous dogs, and becoming the causes of irremediable miseries to them, have left in all their cities monuments of their impiety, and hatred of all mankind, in the never-to-be-forgotten miseries endured by those whom they oppressed; and yet no one, not even of these immoderately cruel tyrants, nor of the more treacherous and hypocritical oppressors, was ever able to bring any real accusation against the multitude of those called Essenes or Holy."

CHRISTIANS.—"What shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of . . . (those) who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again, and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection; and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented, of whom the world was not worthy" (Heb. xi. 32-38). "Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on this behalf" (1 Pet. iv. 16).

In the above comparative view of the Jewish and Christian sectaries, there are features which certainly have belonged to the devout portion of mankind at all times, such as the restraining the passions, cultivating peace with others, observing moderation and temperance, repressing the desire for riches, and exercising submission to elders and those in authority. But there are others in common to them of so distinctive a nature as to mark those possessing such characteristics as assuredly cognate sects.

One of these distinguishing circumstances is the having all

things in common. It is not represented that this, as a fixed social rule, was enjoined upon the Christians by their founder. The practice arose voluntarily among themselves, and it is fair to conclude that they must have adopted it from what prevailed around them among the Essenes. That such was the origin of the usage is corroborated by the fact that when Essenism died out, this custom failed to be followed by the Christians, except in special monastic establishments.

It is remarkable that while the Essenes took no part in the Jewish sacrificial rites, they nevertheless observed the Sabbath, putting the day to use for religious exercises. In this respect they were followed by the Christians, who here again had no ordinance from their founder to account for the usage.

Eunuchism was alien to the Jewish institutions. A person so disabled was an outcast from the congregation of Israel, and could not enter the precincts of the temple, or make any offering there (Lev. xxi. 20; Deut. xxiii. 1). The Jews were allowed the utmost freedom with women as wives and concubines, and were ever encouraged to carry out the original precept to be "fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." The possession of numerous offspring was accounted among them a special blessing. "Lo, children are an inheritance of the Lord . . . ; happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them" (Ps. cxxvii. 3-5). It is true that in Isaiah lvi. 4, "eunuchs" that "keep the Sabbaths" are spoken of, and that they are adverted to favourably also in the apocryphal book of Wisdom (iii. 14). But in the face of the positive enactments of the Jewish law, the expression in Isaiah must be taken to be a figurative one. The founder of Christianity appears, however, to have encouraged positive eunuchism, as facilitating access to the "kingdom of heaven," and the writer of the epistle to the Corinthians absolutely persuaded his hearers to avoid matrimony as a condition calculated to turn the spirit aside from "the things of the Lord." Herein, again, the Essene model must have been in view; and as Essenism expired, celibacy, for Christians in general, was no more thought of.

On the face thereof it appears a remarkable instance of confidence in his divine resources, on the part of the founder of Christianity, that he should be able to send out his follow-

ers without any provision for the way; but when we see that he was merely following out the prevailing usage of the Essene brotherhood, the marvel disappears, and the imitation of Essenism is all that is in view. And here also, since Essenism has become extinct, this peculiar usage has also disappeared, and the Christian missionaries have to go forth provided as any other men.

In like manner Essene communism explains how the founder of Christianity could give the assurance to his people that those who abandoned brethren, sisters, and houses, for his sake, should meet, even in this life, with a hundred fold more than all they had parted with, in the new community to which they were to be introduced;—a saying true so long as Essenism subsisted, but no longer.

Essenism also enables us to understand the mysterious process indicated in the epistle to the Corinthians of delivering over an open transgressor to Satan "for the destruction of the flesh," in view that "the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." We have no system allowing of any such method being put in force, but with the Essenes it was accomplished readily. Their rules of purification and diet subjected an outcast, who might still retain his vows, to the penalty of starvation. He could accept food from none but the brethren, and when ejected from their community, was thus left to perish; and now that Essenism is no more, this form of discipline is impracticable, and therefore unheard of.

Philo and Josephus both associate the Essenes with the Jews, but they leave us in some uncertainty as to the real sources of their belief. Philo says they "derive their name from their piety," and that they followed "the laws of their country, which it would have been impossible for the human mind to devise without divine inspiration" (III., 523, 524). Had he been referring to the Mosaic laws, he would scarcely have raised the question of the authority to which they were entitled. Josephus speaks of their "studying the writings of the ancients," and says they "preserve the books belonging to their sect, and the names of angels, reading the holy books," and venerating "the name of their legislator" (*Ant.* XVIII., i. 2; *Wars*, II., viii. 2, 6-9, 12). The legislator thus pointed to is obviously some other than Moses. He appears to be

some one special to the Essenes in their distinctiveness as a sect, and though they may have made use of the Mosaical writings, they are seen to have had other books "belonging to their sect," and these treating of the angelic powers in a degree beyond what is met with in the Jewish scriptures. Philo shows that the writings peculiar to them had a certain measure of antiquity. He refers to them as those "of ancient men," who had been "founders of one sect or another," and who had "left behind them many memorials of the allegorical system of writing and explanation." He appears also to refer to their employment of the Jewish scriptures, where he says they made use of "the sacred scriptures," which they explained "by mystic expressions in allegories" (IV. 6-18).

What was ancient in the times of Josephus and Philo could have had no connection with Christianity, but stood at some earlier age. Josephus speaks of an Essene named Judas, who prophesied the death of Antigonus, the predecessor of Herod, and of another named Manahem, who, when Herod was a child, predicted that he should be king of the Jews (*Ant.* XIII. xi. 2; XV. x. 5). These are events anterior to Christianity. Philo says that in his day Therapeuts were to be "met with in many places, for it was fitting that both Greece and the country of the Barbarians should partake of whatever is perfectly good; and there is the greater number of such men in Egypt, in every one of the districts, or nomi, as they are called, and especially around Alexandria; and from all quarters those who are the best of these therapeutæ proceed on their pilgrimage to some most suitable place as if it were their country." "Not only private individuals, but even mighty kings, admiring the men, venerate their sect" (IV. 5, 6, 222). The Therapeuts thus, in Philo's time, are seen to have been of sufficient standing to have spread themselves abroad in various countries, and to have attracted the attention of those in power. While suggesting that the name of Essene may be expressive of holiness, as traceable to the word *ἅγιος*, "holy," Philo allows the derivation to be made "not according to any accurate form of the Grecian dialect" (III. 523, 526, and note). Their name, observes Keim, "has provoked countless interpretations" (*Hist. of Jesus of Nazara*, 360). The etymology of the name having been lost sight of, is an indication of its

remote origin. The idea of Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*) was that the sect had existed thousands of years (*Mankind, their Origin and Destiny*, by an M.A. of Baliol College, Oxford, 367).

The Essenes are identifiable with those Indian ascetics who were known to the Greeks as Gymnosophists. "These Gymnosophists," says the learned author last cited, "who were formerly in great power in the island of Meroe, giving laws to the kings, became afterwards the Essenes, or Carmelites, and their books, which they were bound by such solemn oaths to keep secret, must have been the Vedas, or some Indian books containing their mythological traditions" (*Ibid.* 126). The practices of the Essenes were strictly analogous to those of the Asiatic ascetics, who have existed from time immemorial, and became in the historic period expressed by Buddhism. Josephus, in his early days, attached himself to one Banus, who was apparently an Essene. This man, he tells us, "lived in the desert, and used no other clothing than grew upon trees, and had no other food than what grew of its own accord, and bathed himself in cold water frequently by night and by day in order to preserve his chastity" (*Life*, sec. 2). This was the life to which the great sages described in the Indian epics committed themselves, and which Râma followed during his exile, making the woods his home, feeding on herbs, and clothing himself in the bark of trees (*Williams, Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 13, 68, note). The Essene customs of abstaining from animal food, performing daily ablutions in order to maintain spiritual purity, resorting to these ablutions before meals, or when tainted by contact with those of a lower class, and undergoing death by starvation rather than submitting to the defilement of taking the food of those who were accounted impure, are characteristic of the Hindús to the present day.

The signification of the term *Therapeutæ* is sufficiently apparent. It expresses the act of healing, and it was their vocation to go about ministering to the sick in body or in mind, an idea remaining to us, observes M.A. of Balliol (368), in our word curate. The Essenes similarly devoted themselves to benefit mankind (*Keim, Hist. of Jesus*, 361, note). They may possibly have taken their name from the Aswins, two Hindú divinities associated together for good works, and especially occupying themselves as healers among mankind, enabling

the lame to walk, the blind to see, and the aged to renovate their youth (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 255, citing Goldstücher; Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.*, I. 10, citing Wilson's *Rig Veda*).

The Essenes are also associable with the Pythagoreans, and through them with the East. "These men," says Josephus, speaking of the Essenes, "live the same kind of life as do those whom the Greeks call Pythagoreans" (*Ant.* XV., x., 4). "The Essene principles are connected in a multitude of instances with the speculations of the school of Pythagoras, who, according to his biography by Iamblichus, had passed from Egypt into the Holy Land, upon Carmel, the mount of Elijah. . . . There was in both an ascetic habit of life, a rejection of flesh, wine, of marriage, and of sacrifice of animals; both prescribed the wearing of white garments, purifications, a sacerdotal tone, a moral life, a refraining from oaths and slavery, an organisation into ranks, silence and the observance of mysteries, belief in a divine destiny, and intermediate beings; both taught reverence for the sun, and retreat from the world, as well as the immortality of the soul, allegorical interpretation, and the teaching of numbers, magic, and soothsaying" (Keim, *Hist. of Jesus*, 381).

This is all that appears to be known of these interesting sects occupying Judea and the neighbourhood of Alexandria, but it suffices abundantly to show that they derived their peculiar tenets from the East, and that they stood clear of Christianity at an age decidedly anterior to that of the Christian movement. When, therefore, marked similarities occur between their ways and those of the Christians, it is apparent which of the two stood as the teachers, and which as the learners and copyists. We end by the conclusion that the Essene usages and doctrines have entered largely into the composition of Christianity.

Beyond the special methods of devoting themselves to a godly life adopted by the Christians from the models afforded them by the Essenes, there was the general flow of the desires of the religiously disposed portion of mankind towards cultivating access to the Almighty and conformity to his will, which resolved itself into the expression of love towards God, and goodwill towards one's neighbour.

There is a strong basis of natural religion permeating the Jewish scriptures, which is what, in fact, gives these writings their true vitality. They taught that God was "of purer eyes than to behold evil," and could not "look on iniquity" (Hab. i. 13); and that "none" could safely "imagine evil in their hearts against his neighbour" (Zech. viii. 17). "Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, Execute true judgment, and show mercy, and compassions every man to his brother; and oppress not the widow nor the fatherless, the stranger, nor the poor; and let none of you imagine evil against his brother in your heart" (Zech. vii. 9, 10). "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?" (Isa. lviii. 6, 7; see also Isa. v. 16; xxviii. 17, 18; lvii. 15, 16; lxi. 8; Ezek. xviii. 4-9). The observance of the ceremonial and sacrificial law, whatever the authority under which it was said to have been established, could, it was acknowledged, afford no true remedy against sin, or suffice to secure the favour of God (1 Sam. xv. 22; Ps. xl. 6-8; Isa. i. 11; Hos. vi. 6; Joel ii. 13; Amos v. 21; Mic. vi. 6). Nothing but a spiritual work wrought upon the heart of man could introduce him to the knowledge of God, and establish his ways in righteousness (Jer. xxxi. 31-34; Ezek. xi. 19, 20; xxxvi. 25-27).

These are universal truths accepted by all godly races, and thus have not originated with Judaism or Christianity. "Five centuries before the Christian era Buddhism had already inculcated gentleness and compassion, not only towards men, but towards all living creatures. Among the Jews themselves, the Rabbi Hillel had already taught, a generation before Christ, that the commandment of loving one's neighbour as one's self constituted the very essence of the law. To assist even our enemies was a maxim of the Stoics in Jesus' time. And but one generation later, although without, and independently of him, and strictly in keeping with the principles of the Stoic school, Epictetus called all men brothers, inasmuch as all were the children of God" (Strauss, *The Old Faith and the New*,

95). "The requital of good for evil, the virtue of loving an enemy instead of ill-treating him, had been appreciated by the philanthropy of the Greeks and Hindoos; Horace's 'Nil conscire sibi' is the apostolic eulogium of a good conscience; the maxims, 'Guard the thoughts of the heart,' and 'Do to others as you wish them to do to you,' are among the maxims of Confucius." In the Talmud, in many parts, it is said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" is the first of moral rules. "A Pagan having asked Rabbi Hillel to explain the Jewish law in few words, was answered, 'that which you would not that another should do to you, that do not you to him; this is the sum of the law; the rest is a mere commentary on it.' The other great command, 'to love God with all the heart and soul' was notoriously the property of the Jew before it passed into Christianity. . . . Jesus did not announce his moral maxims as his own, but as the essence of what was already to be found in the Scriptures. . . . 'Be ye holy,' says the Jerusalem Targum, 'as the angels who serve before the Lord your God.' . . . 'It is better,' says the book of Tobit, to give charity than to heap riches, for 'charity preserves from death, and cleanses from all sin'" (Mackay, *Rise and Progress of Christianity*, 23, 24).

About four hundred years before Christ the true principles which should govern mankind in their relations with each other, and towards the Almighty, were illustrated by Socrates in his doctrines and practice. He maintained "that the first principles of morality, which are common to all mankind, are laws of the Supreme; and the distinction between them and mere human laws he finds in the fact that they can never be transgressed with impunity. He was a sincere, upright, disinterested man, and withal singularly pious, according to the light he had received. His disciple and intimate friend, Xenophon, declares that he never undertook any work without first asking counsel of the gods. A sense of God, a strong faith in the influence of God, and a deep desire to be governed by it, were habitual to his soul. The youth of Athens had been long corrupted, as he thought, by a class of instructors who set little value on what they taught, or others believed, but great value on dialectic power and rhetorical art, by means of which even falsehood might be commended to the minds

of men. Socrates resolved to lift up goodness and truth, in themselves, as the noblest end of living; and to show that the office of philosophy was to deliver mankind from the dominion of prejudice, ignorance, and vice, to inspire them with the love of virtue, and, through a careful intellectual and moral discipline, to guide them to happiness. His position, from the first, was that of a philosophical moralist; and choosing Athens as his sphere, he devoted his life to the diffusion of what he believed to be the highest truth. His entire time was spent in this work; he sought for scholars, not only among men of rank, but also among labourers and mechanics, and, contrary to the general practice in that day, he exacted no remuneration." He incurred poverty, and his fellow citizens, no longer able to endure his merited rebukes, condemned him to death. In his defence he says his time had been passed in cultivating the souls of his hearers, that while esteeming and loving his fellow citizens, he obeyed God rather than them. He felt assured that in passing out of life, he was being transferred to a happier state (Dr. J. Young, *The Christ of History*, 162-168).

Plato was a disciple of Socrates, and combined his philosophic teaching with that of Pythagoras. This brought him into contact with those oriental sources from which Pythagoras had drawn his ideas, especially of divine emanations, out of which has grown the doctrine of the Logos. He was followed nearly a hundred years later by Zeno, the founder of the school of the Stoics, who attached himself to the various prominent teachers of his day, culling from their doctrines all that he could best approve of himself. The ethical system of the Stoics was "wonderfully grand, and wonderfully pure." They taught "that the highest end of life is to contemplate truth, and to obey the Eternal Reason and the inscrutable law of the universe; that God is to be revered above all beings, to be acknowledged in all events, and to be universally submitted to; that the noblest office of wisdom is to subject the passions, dispositions, and conduct to reason and virtue; that virtue is the supreme good, and is to be pursued for its own sake, and not from fear or from hope; that it is sufficient for happiness, and is seated only in the mind, and being so, renders man independent of all external events, and happy in every condition; that the consciousness of well-doing is reward enough

without the applause or approbation of others, without even their knowledge of our good deeds; and that no prospect of self-indulgence, and no fear of loss, or pain, or death, must be suffered to turn us aside from truth and virtue" (Young, *Christ of Hist.*, 158).

"There were none whose sentiments and discipline were so well received by the ancient Christians as those of the Platonists and Pythagoreans;" their system being to mortify the flesh, and to pass their days in solitude and contemplation, in order to promote communion with the Deity, and to ensure a happy end after death (Mosheim, *Ec. Hist.* I. 195). "The Platonists were the nearest of all philosophers to Christianity, and they might find in their religious notions and their psychology many points of union with Christianity. Hence it happened that many of the early teachers of the church had been prepared by the religious idealism of Platonism for Christianity as a spiritual religion, and used their philosophical education afterwards in its service" (Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion*, I. 165).

The Jews of Alexandria became indoctrinated with the Greek philosophy, the imaginative system of the orientals, and the views of Pythagoras and Plato, which ingredients through them passed into Christianity (Reuss, *Hist. de la Theo. Chrét.*, 104-106). The writings of Philo awakened a profound interest in the teachings of Socrates and Plato in the Jewish world and among the primitive Christians (Young, *Christ of Hist.*, 159, 160). Philo considered the flesh the seat of original sin, warring against the soul, the spirit of God ever arousing the soul to resist the invasions of sin. He recognized two classes of men, those who lived in the flesh, and those who lived in the spirit. The sin of Adam was the source of misery and death to his descendants. The soul was to be fed at first with milk and plain nourishment, and afterwards with strong meat. Almost in the language of Heb. ix. he describes Abraham as seeking a better country which God would give him, and finding his reward in regarding the things that are not as though they were. Righteousness he held to be the gift of God to man, not of debt, but of grace. Faith, hope, and love ruled before him. Faith was the substance of things hoped for, but the highest attribute was love. He

compressed the law into two great commandments, and spoke of "the stewards of the divine mysteries," of "the true riches," and of "hungering and thirsting after righteousness." He furthermore treated of a Holy Ghost, of a first and second Adam, of the faith of Abraham, and of bread which came down from heaven (Prof. Jowett, *The Epistles of Paul*, I. 494-514). Philo viewed God as one whom we should love, serve, and imitate in holiness. He rewards humility and punishes pride. The happiness of man is his union with God, and his misery is the being separated from him. Men can pray only as he teaches them. We are not to hurt our enemies or avenge ourselves on them. It is better to suffer wrong than to do it. God is the sole cause of good, and cannot be the cause of evil. The love of our neighbours should be founded on our love of God. The world is nothing but corruption, and we should fly from it to cleave to God who is alone our health and life. In this world we are surrounded by enemies with whom we have continually to combat so as to endure. We cannot conquer but by God or angels sent for our help. The knowledge of the Logos gives happiness after death. The soul is immortal; the dead rise again to a final judgment of the righteous and the wicked, who pass to eternal happiness or misery (E. P. Meredith, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, 437, citing M. Dacier).

To these striking illustrations of the consonance of the Christian doctrines with the teachings of Philo I add a few others, which will be found in Philo's works, IV. 223, 243, 244, 250, 263, 265, 274. Philo put the Deity before him in that paternal aspect in which the Christian scriptures represent him. "There is no form of address," he observes, "with which a king can more appropriately be saluted than the name of father" (Matt. xi. 27; John i. 18; iv. 23; vi. 46; x. 38; xiv. 6, 11). He recognized the working of the conscience as a divine instrument used for the governance of mankind. "The mind," he says, "is the witness to each individual of the things which they have planned in secret, and conscience is an incorruptible judge, and the most unerring of all judges." "Who is there who does wrong who is not convicted by his own conscience, as if he were in a court of justice, even though no man correct him?" (Rom. ii. 14-16; viii. 27 1 Cor. ii.;

10; Rev. ii. 23). The warfare between God and the world was with him as the struggles of light with darkness" (John i. 5; viii. 12; xii. 46; Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 6; vi. 14; Eph. v. 8; 1 Thess. v. 5; 1 John i. 5-7). "It is as impossible," he declares, "that the love of the world can co-exist with the love of God, as for light and darkness to co-exist at the same time with one another" (John viii. 23; xv. 18, 19; xvi. 33; xvii. 14, 16, 25; xviii. 36; Gal. vi. 14; James iv. 4; 1 John ii. 15-17; iii. 1; v. 4, 5). The future state and its unknown glories were before him. He could speak of one who "dies as to this mortal life, but still lives, having received in exchange a life of immortality" (Rom. vii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 31; 2 Cor. v. 15; vi. 9; Phil. i. 21), wherein "perhaps he will see what he never saw before" (Rom. viii. 24, 25; 1 Cor. ii. 9; 2 Cor. iv. 18; Heb. xi. 1). He apprehended that it required a mediator to allow of God dealing with the material creation. "The things of creation are far removed from the uncreated God, even though they are brought into close proximity following the attractive mercies of the Saviour" (John i. 3; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2). Disallowing the efficacy of the Jewish ordinances, he exclaims, "What can be a real sacrifice except the piety of a soul devoted to the love of God?" (Rom. xii. 1; Heb. x. 5-7). "Since God," he concludes, "penetrates invisibly in the region of the soul, let us prepare that region in the best manner that we are able to, or rather that it may be a habitation fit for God; otherwise, without our being aware of it, God will depart and remove to some other abode" (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 22).

Springing out of Judaism, it is natural to expect that the older system should have provided materials that might find their way into the new, and such certainly has been the case. The change wrought in the character of the Jews, after their return from the Babylonish captivity, introduced among them religious sentiments and aspirations which readily passed into the workings of the religious life aimed at by the Christians, so that the devotional elements of Christianity, fed from all sources to that time prevailing among the seriously disposed in the surrounding nations, found fixed aims and persuasions,

and peculiar methods of expression, in the forms current among their elder brethren the Jews.

"From this period," observes Dean Milman, "the immortality of the soul, and the belief in another life, appear more distinctly in the popular creed. . . . In the writings of the Babylonian prophets, in the vision of the dry bones in Ezekiel, and the last chapter of Daniel, these doctrines assume a more important place ; and from the later books, which are usually called the Apocrypha, these opinions appear to have entered fully into the general belief. They formed, as is well known, the distinction between the Pharisaic sect, the great body of the people, and the Sadducees, the higher order of free-thinkers. In other respects, particularly in their notions of angels, who now appear under particular names, and forming a sort of hierarchy, Jewish opinions acquired a new and peculiar colouring from their intercourse with the Babylonians" (*Hist. of the Jews*, II. 14, 15). The prophets before the exile did not teach the doctrine of the resurrection and future reward, but it is clear that when Jesus appeared on earth, these persuasions were popularly current among the Jews. The belief in angels, good and bad, sprung up, especially in one who was the tempter and accuser of mankind, and this passed into the Christian creed. The doctrine of predestination, of the fall, of the introduction of death and of sin, and in fact the most of the great problems which were introduced in the Christian system occupied the Jews (Reuss, *Hist. de la Theol. Chrét. au siècle Apostolique*, 67, 86-89). The doctrine of the resurrection had long been recognized by the Jews. It is, for the first time, dogmatically announced by Daniel. It occurs also in Hosea (xiii. 14)—"I will ransom them from the power of the grave ; I will redeem them from death." And in Isaiah (xxvi. 19)—"Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise" (Mackay, *Rise and Progress of Christianity*, 25, 26).

Mr Deutsch affords materials for tracing much that characterizes Christianity to the earlier source of the Talmud. Speaking of the time ensuing after the return from the captivity, he says :—"This period is the one in which Christianity arose ; and it may be as well to touch here upon the relation between Christianity and the

Talmud—a subject much discussed of late. Were not the whole of our general views on the difference between Judaism and Christianity greatly confused, people would certainly not be so very much surprised at the striking parallels of dogma and parable, of allegory and proverb, exhibited by the Gospel and the Talmudical writings. The New Testament, written, as Lightfoot has it, ‘among Jews, by Jews, for Jews,’ cannot but speak the language of the time, both as to form and, broadly speaking, as to contents. There are many more vital points of contact between the New Testament and the Talmud than divines yet seem fully to realise; for such terms as ‘Redemption,’ ‘Baptism,’ ‘Grace,’ ‘Faith,’ ‘Salvation,’ ‘Regeneration,’ ‘Son of Man,’ ‘Son of God,’ ‘Kingdom of Heaven,’ were not, as we are apt to think, invented by Christianity, but were household words of Talmudical Judaism. No less loud and bitter, in the Talmud, are the protests against ‘lip-serving,’ against ‘making the law a burden to the people,’ against ‘laws that hang on hairs,’ against ‘Priests and Pharisees.’ The fundamental mysteries of the new Faith are matters totally apart; but the ethics in both are, in their broad outlines, identical. That grand dictum, ‘Do unto others as thou wouldst be done by,’ against which Kant declared himself energetically, from a philosophical point of view, is quoted by Hillel, the President, at whose death Jesus was ten years of age, not as anything new, but as an old and well-known dictum, ‘that comprised the whole law.’” Christianity has published abroad “that ‘Kingdom of Heaven,’ of which the Talmud is full, from the first page to the last.” “According to the Talmud, danger *always* supersedes the Sabbath”—that is, the Sabbath rule places no restriction against performance of acts of mercy, and for the deliverance of others out of extremity. “The Resurrection is to take place by the mystic power of the ‘Dew of Life’ in Jerusalem—on Mount Olivet, add the Targums” (the Mount of Olives, according to one of the accounts, being the place whence Christ ascended into heaven). “With regard to Paradise, the idea of something inconceivably glorious is conveyed at every step. The passage, ‘Eye has not seen, nor has ear heard,’ is applied to its unspeakable bliss. ‘In the next world there will be no eating, no drinking, no love and no labour, no envy, no hatred, no contest. The righteous will sit with

crowns on their heads, glorying in the splendour of God's Majesty.' "The Holy Ghost, an expression of most common occurrence in the Haggadah, is thus summarily explained by the Talmud:— . . . 'With ten names,' says the Talmud, 'is the Holy Ghost named in Scripture.'" "'Thy will be done in heaven; Grant peace to them that fear Thee on earth; and whatever pleaseth Thee, do; Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer'—is the formula suggested by the Talmud for the hours of mental distraction or peril" (*Lit. Rem. of E. Deutsch*, 26, 27, 30, 53, 54, 79, 91, note).

The Rev. John Gregorie, drawing from a Jewish source, gives us a fuller version of the Talmudical prayer, put into the lips of Jesus, as his special form of prayer. The corresponding phrases are distinguished by italics—"Our Father which art in heaven, be gracious to us, O Lord our God; *hallowed be thy name*, and let the remembrance of thee be glorified in heaven above, and upon earth here below. Let thy kingdom reign over us, now and for ever. Thy holy men of old said, Remit and *forgive* unto all men whatsoever they have done against me. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil thing. For thine is the kingdom, and thou shalt reign in glory for ever and for evermore" (M.A. of Balliol, 177).

Mr Moncure Conway, in his *Sacred Anthology*, affords us further means of instituting these comparisons. I draw from him the following passages from the Talmud, to which I have added the corresponding texts from the Christian scriptures. "Whoso looketh upon the wife of another with a lustful eye is considered as if he had committed adultery" (Matt. v. 28). "Let thy yea be just, and thy nay be likewise just" (Matt. v. 37; James v. 12). "What thou wouldest not like to be done to you, do not to others; this is the fundamental law" (Matt. vii. 12; Rom. xiii. 10). "Study not the law, that thou mayest be called a wise man, a Rabbi, and a teacher" (Matt. xxiii. 8; James iii. 1). "Judge not thy fellow-man until thou be similarly situated." "Judge all men with leniency." "With the measure we mete we shall be measured again" (Matt. vii. 1, 2; Rom. ii. 1; xiv. 4, 13; 1 Cor. iv. 5; Jam. iv. 11, 12). "It would greatly astonish me if there could be any one found in this age who would receive an admonition; if he be ad-

monished to take the splinter out of his eye, he would answer, 'Take the beam out of thine own'" (Matt. vii. 1, 3). "Love thy neighbour as thyself: this is a fundamental law in the Bible" (Matt. xix. 19; xxii. 39, 40; Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14; James ii. 8). "Imitate God in his goodness. Be towards thy fellow-creatures as he is towards the whole creation. Clothe the naked. Heal the sick. Comfort the afflicted. Be a brother to the children of thy Father" (Matt. v. 43-45; vi. 26-30; xxv. 35, 36; Mark xvi. 18; Luke iii. 11; Acts v. 15, 16; 2 Cor. i. 4; xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6; v. 14; James i. 27; ii. 15, 16; v. 14, 15; 1 John iii. 17). "A man who studies the law, and acts in accordance with its commandments, is likened to a man who builds a house, the foundation of which is made of freestone, and the superstructure of bricks. Storm and flood cannot injure the house. But he who studies the law, and is destitute of good actions, is likened unto the man who builds the foundation of his house of brick and mortar, and raises the upper storeys with solid stone. The flood will soon undermine and overturn the house" (Matt. vii. 24-27). (*Sacred Anthology*, 18, 19, 22-25).

"It is impossible," observes Mr Deutsch, "to read a page of the Talmud and of the New Testament, without coming upon innumerable instances of this kind, as indeed they constantly seem to supplement each other. We need not urge the priority of the Talmud to the New Testament, although the former was redacted at a later period. To assume that the Talmud has borrowed from the New Testament, would be like assuming that Sanskrit sprang from Latin, or that French was developed from the Norman words found in English" (*Lit. Rem.*, 54, 55, note).

Christianity, it is thus apparent, was not the result of a special revelation from above, but the growth of circumstances, and developed out of the materials, working in a natural manner, in the human mind, in the place and at the time that the movement occurred. The downfall of the Jewish expectations of temporal prosperity led to the projection of spiritual and eternal happiness as the goal really set before the intended children of the promises. The allegorical system of interpreting the scriptures then prevailing, aided such an adaptation of the prophecies affecting the Jewish

people and their Messiah. The very ancient and wide-spread doctrine of the Logos, matured, expanded, and judaically appropriated and adjusted, furnished every position and attribute needed for the projection of one who should stand forth as a divine mediator, the vehicle of all blessing for the earth and its human occupants. The characteristics of such an agency were present, ready conceived. It only required to advance the assertion of the personage who had realized them. And in the ethics of philosophers Oriental and Grecian, the aspirations and religious sentiments of devout Jews, and the tenets and holy walk of those remarkable ascetics the Therapeuts and Essenes, who gave up the enjoyments of this life to cultivate their association with the life that was to come, the doctrinal elements were in view, in current acceptance, to give power to Christianity, and animate the movement into one of solid religious action. The gold and the gems were all there, and it needed only the hand of the artificer to construct them together in a necklet. The outlines of the system had been sketched in ; the filling up of the picture was what remained to be effected.

III.

THE PHASES OF CHRISTIANITY.

IN endeavouring to trace the progress of the Christian doctrines from their earliest to their most developed form, we are practically limited to the materials derivable from the Christian scriptures, there being, according to common acceptation, no extraneous helps, of an independent kind, furnished by any other writings, to assist us in the research. The statement is that Jesus surrounded himself with twelve special witnesses to all he said and did, whom he commissioned to promulgate to mankind the purport of his mission. Such a circumstance should have provided the world with ample testimonies of the ministry thus ordained, showing in what places it operated, and with what effects. But beyond what is alleged in the Christian scriptures of these ministrations, elsewhere, not a token remains that there were such persons as the apostles in action for the propagation of the faith, and the early history of the movement is consequently shrouded in obscurity. "The distance of time, and the want of records," observes Mosheim, "leave us at a loss with respect to many interesting circumstances of the peregrinations of the apostles; nor have we any certain or precise accounts of the limits of their voyages, of the particular countries where they sojourned, or of the times and places in which they finished their glorious course." He admits, in effect, having nothing to depend upon but the meagre statements in the Acts, all other sources appearing to him recent and fabricated (*Ec. Hist.* I. iv. 6). "The great obscurity," he elsewhere confesses, "which hangs over nearly every part of the early history of Christianity, not only prevents us from marking with precision

the extent of the apostle's progress, but also renders it impossible for us, with any degree of confidence, to name any particular churches as founded by them, except such as are mentioned in the writings of the New Testament" (*Early Christians*, I. 145). Even when we advance to the second century of the asserted Christian era, the position is not improved. Speaking of this period he says, "It is not easy to point out particularly the different countries on which the light of celestial truth first rose in this age," and he finds it therefore difficult to determine whether the converts were of the first or the second century (*Ec. Hist.* I. i. 3). That there was an extension of the Christian field at this time he assumes must have been the case, but adds, "Being destitute of any documents on the subject that can properly be relied on, it is impossible for us, with any degree of exactness, to specify, either the time, circumstances, or immediate authors, of this further diffusion of the blessings of the gospel, or particularly to distinguish the provinces which had hitherto remained uncheered by, and now first received, the light of celestial truth, from those to which it had been communicated in the former century" (*Early Christians*, II. 1). That is, outside the Christian scriptures, we have not a shadow of evidence that there was such a thing as Christianity in these early ages.

The Synoptic Gospels are obviously linked together in a common statement. It is apparent also that they have been extensively framed upon some common prior account.* The Gospel according to Luke allows the fact that there were "many" such narratives that had preceded it. The author does not profess to have witnessed what he describes, nor even does he allege that the writers who had preceded him had possessed such advantage. On the contrary, he allows that he and the others have derived their facts from other persons who professed to have been the witnesses of what is recounted. The stage of interruption between the facts and the statement of them is thus openly allowed; nor are the informants even named. The Synoptic Gospels carry the narrative to the death and resurrection of Jesus. The Acts of the Apostles continues the history, so as to put before us the first promulgation of the

"The Bible; is it the Word of God?" 34-41.

gospel, as founded upon the events of the history of Jesus. This record is furthermore associated with the synoptics in that there is the aim to show that it comes from the pen of the author of the third gospel.

Christianity having its rise out of Judaism, and in realization of Jewish hopes, it is natural to expect that in its first form it should represent Judaism. The allegation of the vision to Peter proves that to a certain time the feeling was that the mission of Jesus had no applicability to any part of the human race but the children of Israel. It needed a voice from heaven to assure Peter that he might open his mouth with the message of salvation also to the Gentiles, and he had afterwards to account for his action, apologetically, to his brethren.

The Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles amply illustrate the fact that Christianity, at its outset, was no more than a Jewish movement. There is a strong uniform line of doctrine throughout these scriptures which never transgresses Judaic requisitions, while other elements belonging to the stage when Christianity became a Gentile faith, undoubtedly occurring in the Gospels, but not in the Acts, stand out as manifestly incongruous introductions made at a later period. This feature of the Judaic character of primitive Christianity I have now to trace out.

The synoptists represent Jesus, at every turn, in strict form, as a Jew, and in Jewish connection. In Matthew his pedigree is traced to Abraham, and no further. Herod is made to stand in fear of him as the future king of the Jews. At the close of his career he makes the exhibition of entering Jerusalem as its king, and it is in this capacity, when about to suffer, that he is arraigned, mocked, and crucified. Jerusalem is accordingly "the city of the great king;" the gospel is that of the kingdom; and in the futurity the apostles are appointed to twelve thrones to rule over the tribes of Israel. The ministry of John, as that of the precursor of Jesus, was restricted to "Jerusalem and all Judea;" if God is able to raise up children to himself out of stones, they were to be "children unto Abraham;" if many are to be brought in "from the east and west," they are to "sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven;"

if God is to be proclaimed, it is as "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Jesus upheld the Jewish economy in all its integrity, declaring that he came, "not to destroy the law or the prophets," "but to fulfil" their requisitions to the uttermost. He viewed the temple as the "house" of God, and so purified it; and its predicted overthrow by the Gentiles he bound up with the end of all things and his own return to judge the world. He restricted his disciples in their ministrations to the Jewish community. They were not to go "into the way of the Gentiles," or "into any city of the Samaritans," but were to confine themselves "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" and he led them to expect that by the time they had "gone over the cities of Israel," this being the assigned limit of their ministrations, he would reappear in final judgment and glory. The healing of the Roman centurion's servant, which was out of rule, was accounted for by the supremacy of his faith, as brought to the test of the divine standard, being declared greater than any to be found "in Israel;" and the Canaanitish woman, when pleading for her daughter, is made to feel herself of an outcast race, before special mercy is extended to her. Possibly these incidents may have been introduced, thus apologetically, at a later time, when Christianity had passed into a phase to make it applicable to Gentiles. In the gospel according to Mark the Jewish features similarly appear. John's ministry is restricted to Judea and Jerusalem; we have the gospel of the kingdom, the incident of the Syrophenician woman, the temple recognized as the appointed "house of prayer," its fall bound up with the end of the world, and Jesus questioned, mocked, and crucified as the King of the Jews. The gospel according to Luke is of a like character. The ministry of John, prophetically announced, is confined to the Jews. "Many of the children of Israel" were to be turned by him "to the Lord their God." The annunciation made of Jesus was that he was to fill "the throne of his father David," in order to "reign over the house of Jacob for ever;" in him were to be realized the promises made "to Abraham, and to his seed for ever;" he was the "horn of salvation" set up by God "in the house of his servant David." At his entry into life he had to undergo the Jewish circum-

cision, that signet on the flesh of his position in the family of Israel; and his mother had to be purified, according to the ordinance for females after child birth, in the temple. He was there accepted, in this his early infancy, as one who while shedding light upon the Gentiles, was to be the glory of God's people Israel; he was to be a testing point "for the fall and rising again of many in Israel," and was upheld to view as the appointed divine agent "to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem." When he entered upon his ministry the healed leper was sent by him "to the priest" to offer for his cleansing the gift "according as Moses commanded;" the centurion's servant is dealt with exceptionally, because of his faith surpassing what was found "in Israel;" the woman bowed with infirmity for eighteen years is restored as "being a daughter of Abraham;" Zacchæus is accepted "for as much as he also is a son of Abraham." The saved are to find themselves in association with "Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets;" God is the God of these patriarchs, and heaven is a Jewish realm. The beggar of the parable, at his death, is "carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom;" the testimony to the world below continues to be "Moses and the prophets;" Jesus suffers as the reputed King of the Jews; the redemption expected of him by his forlorn followers met with at Emmaus was that of "Israel;" and in his future kingdom thrones were promised to his apostles whereupon they should sit and rule over the twelve tribes of Israel.

There is in these scriptures a maintained course of doctrinal teaching, embracing none of the specialities afterwards attaching to Christianity, but consisting simply of precepts, based on natural religion, which a Jew might recognize. The mission of the precursor, John, was "to give knowledge of salvation" to the people of God, which was to be effected "by the remission of their sins" (Luke i. 77). He accordingly baptized those who came to him "confessing their sins," "with water unto repentance" (Matt. iii. 6, 11)—thus sealing their acceptance. Such was the consummation of his offices. The teaching of Jesus was to the same effect. In what is termed the Lord's prayer the condition of acceptance is good conduct. "If we forgive men," his people had to say, their heavenly Father would "also for-

give" them (Matt. vi. 12-15). "When ye stand praying," he told them, "forgive, if ye have aught against any: that your Father also, which is in heaven, may forgive you your trespasses" (Mark xi. 25, 26). Forgiveness beget forgiveness, and the process was to be carried on perpetually—"seventy times seven" times, if necessary (Matt. xviii. 21, 22); and the forgiveness was to be granted freely, without conditions or consideration. This is illustrated in the parable of the unforgiving servant, whom his master rebukes for his illiberality to his fellow-servant, saying, "O, thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me" (Matt. xviii. 32). That was the sole governing circumstance. He had asked for forgiveness, and therefore got it. This appears also in the parable of the two debtors, whose creditor, "when they had nothing to pay"—when they could offer nothing in consideration of the obligation—"frankly forgave them both" (Luke vii. 42). It is illustrated, moreover, in the parable of the prodigal son, who no sooner repents and turns to the father, than the father receives him, without stipulation or condition, with open arms. This is described as a repentance unto life, meaning eternal life, the father saying, "It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found" (Luke xv. 32). The poor publican, who had no plea whatever to raise but "God be merciful to me a sinner," was held amply "justified" (Luke xviii. 13, 14).

Jesus, in the confidence in his own mission imputed to him, is represented as dispensing forgiveness of his own proper authority. In healing the man sick of the palsy, he alleged that he had "power on earth to forgive sins," and said, showing what were the conditions, "Go ye, and learn what that meaneth; I will have mercy, *and not sacrifice*; for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance." The sick man accordingly rose, with his sins forgiven him (Matt. ix. 2-13). In the like way he also absolved the woman who anointed him, saying, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; *for she loved much*" (Luke vii. 47).

In keeping with this line of doctrine, he made the final condition of man to depend upon his maintaining righteous conduct. "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord," he

said, "shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in heaven" (Matt. vii. 21). The good tree and the corrupt tree are to be known severally by their fruits (Matt. vii. 16-20). The wise man is he who hears these sayings of his, "and doeth them;" and the foolish man is he who hears them, "and doeth them not." The one is as a man building "his house upon a rock," so sound are his foundations; and the other is as one building "upon the sand" (Matt. vii. 24-27). "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned" (Matt. xii. 37). "Whosoever," said Jesus, discriminatively, "shall do the will of my Father, which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matt. xii. 50). So entirely did salvation depend upon personal qualification, that the figure was used of undergoing dismemberment, so as to "enter into life" maimed, rather than, by retaining the offending members, incurring the risk of "everlasting fire" (Matt. xviii. 8, 9). The parable of the sower teaches that upon personal fruits a man's fate in the final judgment depends (Matt. xiii. 18-23). The parable of the net distinguishes the personally wicked and the personally just, as bad and good fishes (Matt. xiii. 47-49). The parable of the sheep and the goats is to the same purport. Those who have done well—feeding the hungry, sheltering the stranger, clothing the naked, visiting the sick and imprisoned—are accepted; and those who fail in these duties are rejected (Matt. xxv. 31-46). These are throughout the conditions of the judgment, which is according to works.

As belonging to this primitive stage of Christianity, we may place those descriptions of Jesus, which involve that he was no more than one of the human family. The genealogies in Matthew and Luke are destitute of purpose, unless to connect him lineally with David, through Joseph. The words in brackets in Luke, to the effect of his "being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph," are probably interpolated. The writer could have had no object in framing the genealogy but in the assurance of its applicability. Luke had, in fact, just before, distinctly referred to Joseph and Mary as "his parents" (ii. 41), and had made Mary, in addressing him, speak of Joseph as his "father" (ii. 48). The people accordingly knew him as the

son of Joseph, the carpenter (Luke iv. 22 ; Matt. xiii. 55), whose calling he himself pursued (Mark vi. 3). At his birth, Mary had to "purify" herself, "according to the law of Moses," as in the case of any ordinary birth, and to make for her son the offering in redemption, as prescribed for all the first-born of the stock of Israel (Luke ii. 22-24) ; and, as any ordinary mortal, he grew, not only in "stature," physically, but "in wisdom," mentally and morally (Luke ii. 52). He declined the imputation of that goodness which belongs to God alone (Matt. xix. 17) ; he was devoid of the omniscience pertaining to God (Mark xiii. 32) ; he disclaimed the ability to rule the appointments in the hereafter (Matt. xx. 23) ; he withdrew to pray in private, as feeling the need of divine support from a source external to himself (Mark i. 35 ; Luke v. 6) ; the circumstances to which he was reduced brought him to anguish, so that he repeatedly entreated God to deliver him out of them (Matt. xxvi. 38-44) ; and on the cross, in his abject misery, he concluded that God had forsaken him (Matt. xxvii. 46). His position was not very determinate, but it amounted to no more than that he was a mere man. He referred to himself as a prophet (Luke iv. 24) ; he was taken for no more even when he raised one from the dead (Luke vii. 16) ; he was greeted simply as a prophet when he made his public entry into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 11) ; the Pharisees were deterred from laying hands on him, because it was in this light of being a prophet that the multitude had accepted him (Matt. xxi. 46) ; and after his death, certain of his followers, who had hoped for great things from him, showed that they had viewed him as no more than a prophet (Luke xxiv. 19). Who he might be was not exactly apparent. He had been taken to be John the Baptist come to life again, or one of the other prophets (Mark vi. 14-16).

The book of Acts exhibits the operations of the earliest followers of Jesus. We therefore get in it the form of doctrine such as purports to have flowed from the founder of the faith to its first commissioned disseminators. And as these are said to have been specially empowered for their work from above, their teaching is presented with professed completeness and authority.

On the notable day of Pentecost, we have, from the lips of Peter, the proclamation of the first message communicated to

man, founded upon the accomplished work of Jesus. If ever we were to expect the fulness of the gospel testimony displayed with power, it would be on such an occasion as this. That the message was an effectual one, we are given to understand, as "about three thousand souls" were at once gained over by it. It was, we are to recollect, a Jewish audience, addressed, in respect of their faith, by one of themselves. They were, we are expressly told, "Jews, devout men, out of every nation," to whom the apostle made his appeal as "men of Israel," and "the house of Israel." The message in no way went beyond the bounds of such a position. The leader they were called upon to acknowledge was presented to them as one who was to fill the throne of David. He was "a man" approved of God by miracles, wonders, and signs, whom wicked men had killed, but whom God had raised from the dead, in order to give him his appointed standing, in headship, over the nation. They were to signify their adherence to him by being baptized in his name, and their passport to acceptance was repenting of their sins (ii. 1-36).

After restoring a lame man in the temple, Peter again preached Jesus. He held him to view as that "prophet" of whom Moses had spoken as one who should be raised up unto them of their brethren, like unto himself. That is, he described him as of human origin, such as themselves. In Jewish aspect, God is referred to as "the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob," glorifying his son Jesus. Him God had raised from the dead, to establish him in the headship appointed for him. Repentance was again declared to be the qualification for acceptance (iii. 12-26). On this occasion about five thousand converts were added (iv. 4). Subsequently, he renewed his discourse, showing the special and limited range of the office of Jesus, as raised up to be "a Prince and a Saviour" for "Israel." Repentance was all that was needed to secure forgiveness (v. 31).

We then have the discourse of Stephen, ending with his martyrdom. It is altogether Jewish in complexion. He runs over the history of the nation, from the call of Abraham to the building of the temple by Solomon. Jesus is adverted to as the prophet foretold by Moses, who was to be one of themselves, as he was. Stephen accused the people of having slain

him, as they had slain the prophets, but proclaimed his exaltation, declaring he saw him at the moment "standing on the right hand of God," for which blasphemy his audience stoned him (vii. 2-60). Those who were dispersed at the persecution that then ensued, showed themselves still an exclusive Jewish sect, "preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only" (xi. 19). We next hear of the conversion of the eunuch by Philip, who testifies that Jesus was the lamb led to slaughter prophesied of by Isaiah, on which the eunuch accepts him as the Christ, the Son of God (viii. 27-38).

We have now the first address presented to Gentiles, not, it must be remembered, by the appointment of the master, but under the influence of the special vision vouchsafed to Peter. All that is here said of Jesus turns upon the circumstance of his headship. God had accepted him, endowed him with power, raised him from the dead, appointed him the judge of mankind, and tendered the remission of sins to all who put their trust in him (x. 34-43).

The remaining discourses are by Paul. Though an opening by this time had been made for the Gentiles, still prominence was given to the Judaic section. "Men of Israel," says the preacher, "and ye that fear God, give audience." Then God is introduced to them as "the God of this people Israel." He thereupon recounts the Jewish history from the exodus to David, and proclaims Jesus as "of this man's seed," so maintaining his human origin. He describes his resurrection as introducing him to his sonship, in fulfilment of the saying in the Psalm, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." He concludes by still adverting to him as one of the human family, saying "through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins" (xiii. 16-41). Paul is afterwards found in Athens, where he preaches Jesus, again introducing him in human aspect merely, speaking of him as that "man" whom God had ordained to judge the world (xvii. 31). His theme, "both to the Jews and also to the Greeks," was "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." This he described as comprehending "all the counsel of God" (xx. 21, 27).

After this Paul undergoes constant persecution from the Jews, as guilty of subverting their economy. He ever defends

himself as one of themselves, and a respecter of the laws of Moses. He says, "I am verily a Jew, born in Tarsus" (xxii. 3); "I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee: of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question" (xxiii. 6), sheltering himself thus under the acknowledged creed of the Pharisees, who believed in a resurrection. When he falls into the hands of Lysias the chief captain, this officer perceives that the whole question between him and his accusers was one of their law (xxiii. 29). When brought before Felix he described himself as a worshiper in the temple at Jerusalem, conforming to all that had been laid down in the law and the prophets. He took up thus a purely Judaic standing, and he explained that the sum of the doctrine he had been announcing was "a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (xxiv. 10-15). When taken before Festus, after his accusers had "laid many and grievous complaints" against him, he avowed that "neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple," had he "offended anything at all" (xxv. 7, 8). Finally, he had to defend himself before Agrippa. He appears before him as a Jew, accused of heresy by his brother Jews, and takes comfort that he has been brought before one who was "expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews," and so claims a patient hearing. The gist of his doctrine, he explains, is the hope of a resurrection, in view of which he called upon all men to "repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance," preaching Christ as the centre and support of this movement. He bore witness, he declared, to "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come," thus keeping strictly within the pale of the Judaic dispensation (xxvi. 2-23). It was, he declared, "for the hope of Israel" that he had been bound in chains, and his ministry consisted in "persuading" his hearers "concerning Jesus," "both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening" (xxviii. 20, 23).

The disciples, at the opening of the book, are found addressing the risen Jesus with their expectation that he was to "restore again the kingdom to Israel" (i. 6), and throughout, the ministrations described are held in Jewish connection. Peter and John are found "in the temple at the hour of prayer" (iii. 1); all the apostles were "daily in the temple"

teaching and preaching (v. 42); when the door is opened to the Gentiles the discussion respecting what should be required of them is maintained in view of Jewish standards (xv. 1-29); Paul has Timothy circumcised because of the Jewish believers (xvi. 3); he himself performs a vow in the temple, in the course of which he has to "purify" himself judaically, because of the "many thousands of Jews" "which believe," who were, nevertheless, "all zealous of the law" (xxi. 20-26); and when accused of having "gone about to profane the temple," he declares that he worshiped "the God of his fathers," that he had "disputed" with no man in the temple, that he had come "to bring alms to his nation, and offerings," and was "found" "purified in the temple" (xxiv. 5-18) as a Jewish worshiper should be.

There can be no more decisive proof of what the nature of the mission of the alleged founder of Christianity may have been, than the representations made of the practice and preaching of his first followers. They are before us to promulgate all that they can trace from him. He himself had entered life as a Jew through the portal of circumcision. He upheld the law, frequented the temple at its appointed festivals, occupied himself with Jewish interests, restricted his disciples in their ministrations to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, warred with Scribes and Pharisees, but never had a word of testimony to offer against the Pagan idolatries surrounding him. His sympathies were called out for his native land and her beloved capital alone: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." Finally, at death, his body was embalmed by his followers and disposed of "as the manner of the Jews is to bury." When we find his disciples maintaining themselves as Jews, avowing their conformity to the Jewish laws, practising the temple ordinances, declaring that they held to nothing but what constituted the hopes of their fathers, and feeling no liberty, at the outset, even to address the Gentiles, it becomes quite apparent that in the first form of Christianity, as ostensibly traceable to the founder, we have nothing more than a Jewish sect. Eusebius here helps us to understand that such was the case, saying of fifteen bishops of whom he professes to know as successors of the apostles, "there are

all the bishops of Jerusalem that filled up the time from the apostles until the above-mentioned time, all of the circumcision" (*Ec. Hist.* iv. 5). His acceptance of the Therapeuts as Christians is also in keeping with the circumstance of the Judaic character of primitive Christianity. When, then, we meet with elements incorporated in the Christian scheme such as no Jew could accept and remain a Jew, we may assure ourselves that these have been later introductions gathered out of non-Jewish circles.

The divine nativity of Jesus is such a feature. "If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, both the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shalt thou put away evil from Israel. If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour's wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you" (*Deut.* xxii. 22-24). The circumstances of Mary and her child fit exactly into the conditions of this edict. She was a damsel betrothed to a husband, another "overshadowed" her, and had a child by her. Such a birth, under the exigence of Jewish law, could not have been suffered. The immaterial being on whom the paternity was founded would of course not be forthcoming, but the woman would be put to death. No Jew could possibly bring himself to believe that the deity would thus grossly violate his own law.

The consequent walk on earth of an incarnate god is another feature that would be repelled by the Jewish mind. "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul" (*Deut.* xiii. 1-3). "The prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name,

which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die" (Deut. xviii. 20). The test is neither the sign, nor the doctrine, but the object presented. Is any other deity, in addition to the one known God then held to be speaking, introduced to notice? That is the sole consideration by which the worshipers of Jehovah (*Jahveh*) were to govern themselves. A divinity in the flesh, encompassed with all the infirmities to which flesh is heir (Heb. iv. 15), would be, assuredly, some "other god" than the one believed to be ruling invisibly in the heavens; and no amount of testimony from miracles or doctrine could commend such a one for acceptance by a Jew as associable with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob he was accustomed to adore.

A third stumbling-block for the Jew in matured Christianity is the representation that the death of Christ was accomplished sacrificially, in atonement for the sins of the world. The Jew had been taught to look upon human sacrifice as an abomination such as characterized the followers of the execrable Moloch. When a prophet of his people could ask, with holy indignation, "Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" it would be inconceivable that the Almighty should take the step denounced and promote the immolation of his "only-begotten son" as a means of removing sin. If, when Abraham contemplated such an act, it was thought expedient to substitute a ram for his son for the sacrifice, it would be utter confusion to revert again to the human victim in substitution for the ram.

Of these three elements the early disseminators of the creed put forward in the name of Christ are shown, in the book of Acts, to have been absolutely free. Christ with them was a mere man, lineally descended from David, and receiving his honours and power, and his exalted position as the arbiter of the destinies of the human race, from God, after death, at his resurrection. The passport for mankind to the favour of God was personal repentance, and belief in Christ in his appointed headship; and the death of Christ, as the death of any other who had suffered for conscience sake, involved no more than martyrdom. There is just one passage in the Acts which may be held to attach a higher signification to the

event. It is where, in ascribing to Paul a prediction of the future condition of the church, he is made to refer to the "church of God" as what Jesus had "purchased with his own blood" (xx. 28). The passage, in the guise of a prophecy, may be suspected of having been put in after the circumstances described had had effect. The phrase, moreover, may denote no more than that the exaltation of Christ, as the head of the church, and the ruling centre of her interests, had been earned through his sufferings (Phil. ii. 8, 9; 1 Pet. i. 11). To require for a repentant sinner also the provision of a sacrifice, and one of this stupendous import, if a truth, was a condition that needed to be proclaimed in the plainest possible language.

In judging of the elements that have entered into the composition of Christianity, an important ingredient has been found to be the tenets of the Essenes. They are accounted a Judaic sect, and the passage through this channel in the Judaic form of Christianity is apparent.

John the Baptist is presented as the forerunner of Jesus. Had this truly and simply been his position, after introducing Jesus he should have withdrawn, or have ranged himself behind him. But such was not the case. John, after Jesus appeared upon the field, continued his system of making converts and baptizing them (John iii. 21). The two acted independently of one another, Jesus, however, as it is said, drawing in the greater number of converts (John iv. 1). John's ministry was known of to Jesus as what was going on apart from himself (Luke vii. 29, 30). The want of association between the two was so decided that John, when his own career had been brought to a close by his being thrown into prison, had to send some of his disciples to Jesus to ascertain who he might be (Matt. xi. 2, 3). His followers, met with years later, are found to have been gathered to his own name, and not to that of Jesus (Acts xviii. 25, 26). The two, moreover, differed from one another essentially in practice. John was an ascetic, dwelling in the desert, and restricting himself in his diet to the wild products around him. Jesus frequented the habitations of others, and lived freely as they did (Matt. xi. 18, 19). John, pursuing the method of the Pharisees, inculcated fasting. Jesus placed his followers under

no such restraint, and accounted for his freer system by assuming the character of a bridegroom, asking, "Can the children of the bridegroom mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast" (Matt. ix. 14, 15). It is accordingly clear that John, in maintaining fasting, was not conscious of the presence of the bridegroom, and was in fact no follower of his.

John, in his character of an ascetic, made his habitation in the desert, as was the custom of the Therapeuts. He denied himself the enjoyments of life, abstaining, as the Essenes and Therapeuts, from eating flesh, and clothing himself with rough garments, as the prophets of old (2 Kings i. 8; Isa. xx. 2; Zech. xiii. 4), for one of whom he passed current (Matt. xi. 14). He also pursued the system of purification by water followed by the Essenes and Therapeuts to remove the taint of sin. Seeing the strong vein of Essene doctrine introduced into the synoptic narratives, it is fair to assume that we have in the alleged precursor John one of this type of asceticism. James, "the brother of the Lord," as described, was another such. "He drank neither wine nor fermented liquors, and abstained from animal food. . . . He never wore woollen, but linen garments. . . . His knees became as hard as camels', in consequence of his habitual supplication and kneeling before God" (Euseb. *Ec. Hist.* ii. 23).

The public career of Jesus opens, when he became of matured age, with his baptism by John. This is an act that carries with it the significance of acknowledged discipleship. The evangelist is conscious of the incompatibility with the character sought to be maintained for Jesus of being a special emissary from above and lord and master of all, that he should be presented thus in a position of subordination, indebted for initiation in his mission to another. He attempts to clear himself of the difficulty, but with obvious want of success (Matt. iii. 14, 15). John, we have seen, was no follower of Jesus, and now the reverse is found to be the case, Jesus being exhibited as the disciple of John. In this manner, apparently, Jesus enters the Essene community, afterwards marking out for himself a more independent position. That is, while inculcating certain lines of Essenism, he does not

accept their restrictions of diet, and asserts for himself individual prominence, the Essenes figuring only as an undistinguished brotherhood. Then we have him presented as the Jewish Messiah, in whom centred all the hopes of the nation; and thus, in the end, we get that Judaic form of religion which characterized the founder and his first adherents, as depicted in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the apostles.

In this category the Epistle of James must be included. It is addressed to the twelve tribes of Israel, ignoring the Gentiles, and it inculcates natural religion as to be drawn from the Jewish scriptures. The accepted ones are begotten "with the word of truth" (i. 17); it is "the engrafted word" which has saved their souls (i. 21); "pure religion" is "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world" (i. 27); salvation turns upon good works, as in the instances of Abraham and Rahab (ii. 14-26); the hearers are exhorted to exercise patience until the coming of the Lord, who is the judge standing at the door (v. 7-9).

The next step in the onward course of Christianity was the extension of the offer of the new faith to the Gentiles. The book of Acts shows that there was a time when these races were considered to be unentitled to the privileges of the gospel. The vision of Peter is introduced to warrant the application of its terms to them. The discussion raised in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts gives the movement another origin. The churches of Judea, it may be there seen, were still maintaining the Judaic form in all its integrity, some of their body saying, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Paul and Barnabas, though Jews by race, were of the Greek spheres of Tarsus and Cyprus, and among their neighbours of the Grecian town of Antioch had introduced no such exactions. In addressing themselves to these Gentile citizens, it is made apparent they were not acting under the authority of Peter's alleged vision, but in pursuance of their own reading of the Jewish scriptures, which, while providing supreme advantages for the children of Israel, allowed some measure of reflex blessing to reach the Gentiles (xiii. 47; xv. 14-17). We may apprehend, therefore, that these semi-Gentile preachers, or such as they were, had, in an independent manner, gained over adherents from the Greeks of Antioch, and that members of the

churches of Judea, hearing of the movement, attempted to quell it, and failing, had to accommodate themselves thereto in the best manner they could effect. Such appears to be the history of the extension of the faith to the Gentiles. It was an act not due to the institution of the reputed founder, but was in truth against his ordinance; it was not practised by his first followers, but, on the contrary, discouraged by them when they came to know of it. The work was, essentially, that of unauthorized preachers, following the bent of their own sentiments, among a population to whom they were allied in nationality if not in race; and but for such adventitious circumstances Christianity must have remained in the character in which it was first launched of a Jewish sect.

In endeavouring to trace the advances made in the development of Christianity, I follow, not the canonical arrangement of the Christian scriptures, which is a purely arbitrary one, but rather the order of the doctrines, as this progresses from stage to stage towards ultimate maturity. I make no use of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, the epistle to Philemon, and that of Jude, as they do not afford sufficiently clear materials to aid the inquiry I am undertaking.

The first Epistle to the Thessalonians embraces no higher line of doctrine than what we have already had before us. The Thessalonians are recognized as followers of the churches in Judea (ii. 14). The attempt of the Jews to prevent the spread of the gospel to the Gentiles is adverted to (ii. 16), probably from being an event fresh on the minds of those addressed. The death of Christ is accounted a mere death, such as the prophets also had undergone (ii. 15). The deliverance expected was to be at the return of the Lord in power (iii. 13; iv. 14-18; v. 23).

I now group together the Epistle to the Romans, the 1st and 2d of Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Galatians, ascribed to Paul, and the 1st Epistle of Peter. These exhibit decided Gentile sympathies, and place the salvation of man upon the Gentile element of a human sacrifice as accomplished in the death of Jesus.

The line of doctrine taken in these writings could not have been thrust upon a community essentially Jewish in creed without occasioning violent contest. The reported teaching of

the reputed founder had led those who ranked themselves as his followers to believe that if they repented they would at once be "frankly" forgiven. They had been told that when standing in life he had thus forgiven those he dealt with; for example, the palsied man, and the female who had anointed him. How could they receive the declaration that there could be no forgiveness but by his death, through the efficacy of his blood shed for them? To require of them the paramount condition of a sacrifice, was to alter the whole character of the dispensation offered them; and to say that this should be the sacrifice of a human victim, was to do the utmost possible violence to the teaching they had received, as they believed, from a divine source. The apostles were inculcating their master's doctrine of free forgiveness or repentance, and maintaining strict adherence to the Jewish economy, and their authority also had to be set at naught. A commotion, on the attempt being made to convert the Jewish creed, based on the mission of Jesus, into a practically Gentile one, was inevitable, and accordingly we have ample evidence of such a contest in the scriptures before us.

All critics have seen that the Paul of the Acts and the Paul of the Galatians are essentially two very different beings, and it has been the custom to accept the representation in the Galatians as belonging to the genuine man, and to view the statements in the Acts as an untrue account of him, arranged and put forward for a particular purpose. The Epistle to the Galatians shows us Paul standing in entire independence of the apostles, and in collision with them, while in the Acts he is described as occupied in Judea in concert with them. It is commonly held that the latter is a picture drawn to keep out of view the scandal of such a want of concord. But if this is a right criticism, there is much more also in the Acts to be accounted for. Paul's career is given us to its close when he is left in durance in the hands of the Roman authorities, and we find him maintaining to the end his Jewish characteristics, free of the Gentile elements which form the very essence of the teaching ascribed to him in the epistles. It is obvious that we have two distinct schemes of doctrine, the one Judaic, and the other Gentile. Both forms, in point of actuality, are represented to have occurred in the Church, and

therefore each picture, as a picture, may be thought to be founded on fact. The Acts show us Paul in association with Barnabas, and at variance with the Judaic Christians, opening out a way for the Gentiles. The door once set open, Gentilism flowed in as a flood. The author of the Epistle to the Galatians was an active propagandist in this way, and what more likely, when pseudonym and fictitious representations were practised to promote religious beliefs, than that the writer, in promoting the Gentile sentiments of belief, should support his views with the name of Paul, and so recast his history as to provide him with adequate authority for the new line of doctrine to be introduced. This is a supposition which, it appears to me, amply accounts for the discordance between the representations concerning Paul made in the book of Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians, and affords, furthermore, a clue for the comprehension of the extraordinary position set up for Paul in the latter record.

Taken in this aspect, we are now to contemplate the Paul of the Galatians. In this epistle there is a bold subversion of the promises made to Abraham as understood by the Jewish community to embrace specifically themselves, and the application thereof indiscriminately to the Gentiles. "The blessing of Abraham" was to come on the Gentiles "through Jesus Christ." By means of the quibble, for it is no less, on which I have already expatiated, he was that "seed" of Abraham to which the promises were confined. The distinction between Jew and Greek was at an end (iii. 28), and if any were "Christ's," then only were they "Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." The method in which Christ was thus utilized was the Gentile one of converting his death into a sacrifice. He "redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," as it is written, "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." In this manner he "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world." All this turned upon the crucifixion of Christ. This was to be the event continually set before us (iii. 1), by participation in which we were to be partakers also of the resurrection life, to which Christ had been introduced, with all its attendant blessings (ii. 20).

So great a departure from the Jewish system would scarcely

occur in one who was himself an Israelite. Such a person would naturally cling to the advantages belonging to him in the sacred scheme, as of the chosen family. This writer has no such sentiments, because he has no such position. He is of those who "are Jews by nature," meaning apparently in the new nature, through adoption in Christ. He holds the law in supreme contempt. It consisted of "weak and beggarly elements," involving nothing better than a worldly "bondage." The writer accordingly elects to be known as the apostle "of the uncircumcision."

With such proclivities, and such a purpose to advance, the writer was under the necessity of asserting for himself independent authority. Accordingly he is "an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." His commission came from the risen Jesus, and he held as of small account that traceable only to Jesus in the flesh. He says, "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." He adds, "when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." So confident is he of the source of his inspiration that he says, "If any preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Knowing, evidently, of the counter history attaching to the Paul he personated, he contradicts it in the most positive manner. For three years he did not go near Jerusalem, and then was there for but fifteen days, when he saw none other of the apostles but Peter and James; affirming this, in itself unimportant circumstance, with an oath. Then fourteen years elapse before he again visits Jerusalem; and when he meets with the leaders of the Christian movement, "who seemed to be somewhat," though in fact of little real account, he says, "they who seemed to be somewhat" (repeating the contemptuous phrase), "in conference added nothing to me." Peter and others "who seemed to be pillars," with whom he represents he came into discussion, he openly charges with

"dissimulation," by which even his companion Barnabas for a time was "carried away."

What the writer's view of the constitution of Christ when on earth is not sufficiently exhibited. He says, "when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his son, made of a woman, made under the law" (iv. 4). It is possible his pre-existence before he appeared on earth may be here intended, but so important a circumstance should not be left to be discovered by inference. I incline, therefore, to think that the passage has no such meaning, and that we have no other representation of Christ than that he was of human origin, subject as the rest of his race to the law.

In the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians the writer asserts, as in the Galatians, the absolute independence of his position. He describes himself as "called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God." "Am I not an apostle?" he asks; "am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are not ye my work in the Lord?" "the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord." In expressing fellowship in the death of Christ through the use of the eucharistic elements (x. 16, 17), he claims to have derived the ordinance from direct revelation made to himself (xi. 23). He sets at nought the Jewish economy. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing." "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles." The Jewish restrictions, accordingly, as to clean and unclean food, were at an end. "All things" were "lawful." "Whatsoever is sold in the shamble," he said, "that eat, asking no question for conscience sake." "Whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question." The writer was conscious of the discord prevailing around him in the Christian community, where there were those who said, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ." What was the difference between the doctrines of the asserted Paul and Cephas we are aware; but what was the line taken by those who distinctively may have held they were "of Christ?" Possibly these maintained a scheme of doctrine differing from that of the rest in being more allied to the pure exclusive Judaic institution traceable to Christ. The writer, with his special revelation, dissents from that position. He has brought Jew and Gentile together on one level, and his

dependence is on the Gentile element of the sacrificial death of Jesus. He preached "Christ crucified;" he "determined not to know anything" among those he addressed "save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." "For I delivered unto you," he declares, "first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." Of God he says he is the Father "of whom are all things," and then of Christ as he "by whom are all things, and we by him." I think this refers to no more than the work of Christian redemption. His divinity is not expressed, and he is referred to in mere human aspect. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." As one "man" brought in the ruin, it has been arranged that another "man" should provide the remedy. In this sense "the first man Adam was made a living soul," and "the last Adam" a quickening spirit." "The head of every man," he observed, "is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." This is federal headship, but not identity of constitution. As Christ has associated himself with us, so God is associated with Christ.

The 2d Epistle to the Corinthians is of like character to the first. The writer is careful to maintain the nature of his mission. He is "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God." "Do ye," he asks, "look on things after the outward appearance?" That is, are ye taken with the externals of profession or of authority? "If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's. For though I should boast somewhat more of our authority, which the Lord hath given us for edification, and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed." "I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more." "I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me: for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be

nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds." In the endeavour thus to maintain his authority, the writer betrays his consciousness that it was such as might very readily be called in question. He was warring against the earlier accepted creed, and maintaining that the Jewish dispensation, inscribed on "tables of stone," was a "ministration of death," which had been "done away" in favour of the ministration of spirit and of life which he was enunciating. God, he said, hath "reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ" (that is acting in Christ), "reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;" making "him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Christ is called "the image of God" (iv. 4), but it is clearly in the sense of reflecting him spiritually, and not in the way of an external representation. It is also said of him, "that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor" (viii. 9). The phrase might be applicable to his pre-existence with the Father before being sent out into the world, but it is not otherwise apparent that the writer had attained to such a view. Probably no more is meant than that he who knew no sin took on himself the sins of the world, and suffered accordingly. Nothing, in fact, is recognized as of accepted value in Christ, but what belonged to him in his new nature after resurrection. His former condition presented him merely in human aspect, and with that the writer will not occupy himself. "He died for all," he declares, "that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more." He will acknowledge nothing connected either with Christ himself or his people, but the "new creation." "Old things," he says, "are passed away; behold, all things are become new." The condition of Christ when on earth is thus entirely disallowed as representing only the human nature.

The Epistle to the Galatians, observes Baur, "places us in the midst of the great excitement of the critical struggle

which had begun between Judaism and Christianity, in the decision of the momentous question whether there should be a Christianity free from Judaism, and essentially different from it, or whether Christianity should only exist as a form of Judaism, that is to say, as nothing else than a modified and extended Judaism." "The standpoint from which the elder apostles looked at Paul cannot be sufficiently kept before us. It is as clear as possible that, at this time at least, fourteen years after the conversion of the apostle Paul, their circle of vision did not extend beyond Judaism." Treating still of the Epistle to the Galatians, he says, "There can scarcely be any doubt with regard to these Judaizing opponents, that from the way in which the apostle opposed them, the conflict was now for the first time being carried on. We see that this is the first time this subject has been handled; the apostle perceives that he is absolutely obliged to give an account of how he was summoned to his apostolic office, and he speaks of it in such a manner as he could not have done, if he had ever before come in contact with these opponents in the same way. He puts himself thoroughly in opposition to them; as thoroughly as can only be done when for the first time the full importance of a principle dawns upon a man, and when the maintenance of this principle against a vexatious opposition constitutes the task of his whole life" (*Paul, his Life and Works*, I. 131, 263, 266).

In the Judaic form of the early Christian faith, and in the nature of the struggle from Judaism into Gentilism, as depicted prominently in the Epistle to the Galatians, it will be seen that I am quite in accord with this leading German critic. In fact, no one analyzing the doctrines in these scriptures could well come to any other conclusion. The point that is really open for consideration and discussion is whether the sketch drawn of Paul in the Galatians is a genuine one. It has, I think, been too readily assumed to be such. Baur appears to hold that the new light that had burst upon Paul was first enunciated by him some fourteen years (according to the Epistle—chap. i. 18; ii. 1—it would be seventeen years) after his conversion. If so, Paul must have previously been Judaizing, as stated in the Acts. But this is not the nature of the representation made in the Epistle to the Galatians.

The light is described to have burst upon Paul, as a special revelation, at the moment of his conversion. "Immediately," he declares, "I conferred not with flesh and blood." His isolation from the apostles and their line of doctrine, is maintained as characterizing him from the first; and he never uttered, he would have us know, any other than this gospel, savouring of Gentilism, which he is here advocating. We have to consider whether such a phenomenon can actually have had occurrence. Would a convert of the time of Judaic Christianity, have had the light, and the audacity, to take so bold a stand, throwing off and defying the leaders of the movement, and asserting at once for himself a very different form of faith from theirs? Admitting the thaumaturgy, admitting the vision and the special illumination, asserted for Paul, the rest might assuredly follow. Otherwise, it is impossible to suppose that a recent convert could at once have marked out for himself the distinctive career designated for Paul in the Epistle before us. But what more natural conclusion remains to be drawn than that, in the growth of time, after the introduction of Gentiles into the Christian community, in the manner recounted in the Book of Acts, essential Gentile doctrines came into favour, and that some zealous advocate for the change has launched the new form of doctrine upon us in this Epistle, in the name of Paul, clearing him of the earlier teachers, and fortifying his position with a direct revelation made to him from heaven?

We have to turn now to the Epistle to the Romans. The writer is still careful to describe Paul as "called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God," "the apostle of the Gentiles," and disposed to "magnify his office;" but, in the progress made in the dissemination of his particular creed, he is not found under the necessity of announcing his independence with the same earnest protestations employed in the previous Epistles. Nor can he be the Paul of the Galatians, as he describes his missionary course to have begun at Jerusalem (xv. 19), and avows constant connection with that region (xv. 25, 31). The Gentile sympathies are strongly maintained, though there is a show of priority accorded to the Jew. The gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." The law

is set practically at nought, the human race being equally in the hands of God for judgment, whether the law existed or not. "There is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law." The Jews are judged by the written code, and the Gentiles by the law of "their conscience," "written in their hearts," which process puts the formal Jewish code, as a divine necessity or appointment, out of the field. "Uncircumcision" is then declared to be as good as circumcision; "for he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Is God, he asks, "the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith"—a distinction, it may be observed, without a difference. The writer cleverly makes use of the circumstance that Abraham had obeyed his call while in the state of "uncircumcision," and had "received the sign of circumcision," as the "seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised;" and had become thus the father, "not of the circumcision only," but of those who should "walk in the steps of that faith" "which he had, being yet uncircumcised." Then he argues that those are not the "heirs" that are "of the law," else "faith is made void," and so claims Abraham as "the father of us all." In this latter expression, it may be suspected he betrays himself to be a Gentile. His aim is certainly to be accepted as a Jew; but, in the endeavour to assert Jewish standing, he overstrains himself. He tells us (xi. 1) that he was of the tribe of Benjamin; but as the Jews have been without the sense of their tribal distinctions since the period of the captivity,* no Jew could be capable of asserting his tribe. It is a Gentile, following the Jewish scriptures, and ignorant of fact, who does so.

"The children of the flesh, then," the writer distinctly says, "are not the children of God: but the children of the promise

* The Legends of the Old Testament, 118.

are counted for the seed," in which category he necessarily includes his Gentile associates. "There is no difference," he openly states, "between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." The vehicle of salvation is the recognition of the sacrifice of Jesus. We are "justified" freely by the grace of God, "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." "By whom we have now received the atonement." Of Christ it is said that he was God's "own son," whom he had sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (viii. 3); his "own son," whom he had not spared, but "delivered him up for us all" (viii. 32). This might indicate the pre-existence of Christ with God as his son before he came to earth, had the fact been otherwise made apparent as one the writer had accepted. Such, however, is not the case. He shows us Christ as only in human capacity when on earth, his place in sonship being conferred upon him at his resurrection. He describes him as "made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (i. 3, 4); a representation entirely according with that in the Acts (xiii. 33), where at his resurrection the prophetic saying of the psalmist is said to have been fulfilled, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." An image made "like to corruptible man" would be no better than the fanciful delineations of the godhead by the heathen (i. 23). Christ, therefore, it may be assumed, was no such image in the apprehension of the writer. "By one man," he says, "sin entered into the world, and death by sin," and therefore by another, even "by one man Jesus Christ," the grace of deliverance "hath abounded unto many." "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ" (v. 12-19). "If the spirit of him

that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you" (viii. 11); the realization of the whole scheme depending, not on what Christ was in the flesh, but on what God had done for him in raising him from the dead.

The phrase in Rom. ix. 5, "God blessed for ever," would militate against these conclusions if a genuine portion of the epistle, and bearing the highest signification that can be attached to the words. I understand, however, that it is considered to be a doctrinal interpolation, though of an ancient period. But if its integrity is to be insisted on, consistency with the remainder of the epistle requires that the language should be accepted in some other light than as expressing the divinity of Jesus. Possibly, I would suggest, the phrase is merely ejaculative, and refers to the Deity himself.

The first Epistle of Peter embraces a line of doctrine similar to what we have had in view, and not apparently advancing beyond it. Peter is represented addressing "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." They are said to be such as "in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." These, then, would seem to be Gentiles, and if so, the Peter before us is not the Peter of the Epistle to the Galatians, whose offices were confined to the circumcision. The "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" is the instrument for purification from sin. They had been "redeemed," "not with corruptible things," "but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." He "suffered for sins, the just for the unjust." Of the divinity of Christ when on earth there is no mention. His death is said to have been "fore-ordained before the foundation of the world" (i. 20), but this is no assertion of his pre-existence. He is said to have been "put to death in the flesh" (iii. 18), and to have "suffered" "in the flesh," which presents him only in human form. The power of the deliverance wrought through him turned altogether upon his resurrection, as effected

by the agency of God. God, it is said, "hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." We are to "believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory." And we are to have "the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." The writer shows himself so little conversant with, or occupied by, Jewish interests, that the probability is he was a Gentile, personating Peter.

The book of Revelation has a character of its own, distinguishing it from all other writings of the New Testament. It is decidedly Jewish in its spirit, handling Jewish elements, but with a door set open for the Gentiles, and possibly an acceptance of the Gentile doctrine of the sacrifice of Jesus. It is furthermore in advance of the writings we have been reviewing in maintaining distinctly the pre-existence of Jesus before his appearance on earth. The writer shows a violent animosity towards the pure Gentile faction. He cannot, it may be concluded, pardon them the overthrow they made of the Jewish policy,—the obliteration of all difference between Jew and Gentile,—the transference to the whole race of man of the promises specially assigned to the Jews. While allowing the Gentiles a measure of blessing in the future ages, he takes care that all the supreme manifestations in the coming times, whether on earth or in heaven, shall be of strictly Jewish complexion. The writer says therefore seemingly of the Gentile movement, in the name of the risen Jesus, as if he himself were speaking to those addressed, "Thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars;" "which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan." "Behold I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." It was unpardonable not only to deprive the Jews of their cherished privileges, but to do so in the guise of Jewish teachers, armed with the office of apostles. This circumstance the writer, it is clear, had before him; and, as the period in which he wrote would allow of, he was, in all probability, behind the scenes, knowing full well the actuality of the personations he was denouncing. It may be judged that it was just of such scriptures as we have been considering,

passed off in the names of Paul and Peter, that he was writing. The house, in truth, is exhibited divided against itself, and the hollowness of its foundations are exposed.

The Jewish features in this book are numerous. We have the Mosaic tree of life translated to the celestial paradise, with its leaves devoted to "the healing of the nations," standing apparently in some lower and weaker position to need such support; the doctrines of Balaam and of Jezebel, with abhorrence expressed at the eating things sacrificed to idols; the key of David locking or unlocking all blessing; the lamb as the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root and offspring of David; the 144,000 sealed of all the tribes of Israel, the Gentiles, of all nations and kindreds, standing as a promiscuous and undistinguished multitude; the temple of God with its altar, and the outer court left to the Gentiles; the ark of the testament in the temple; the song of Moses raised in combination with that of the Lamb; the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven; the Euphrates dried up and the judgment brought in upon Babylon; the new Jerusalem, in resplendent form, descending from heaven, bearing on its gates the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, and on its foundations those of the twelve apostles of the Lamb; the abolition of the curse. The whole is an evident Jewish rebound against the invasion of Gentilism. The writer's Jewish connection is furthermore shown by his sympathy with Essene doctrines. His saints are ever clothed in white raiment, and the alliance of the sexes is considered a defilement (xiv. 4).

At the same time the book has occurred at a period when the position of the Gentiles, as recipients of the promises in fellowship with Israel, was too firmly established to be disallowed. The Hebrew scriptures gave the warrant for such an admission, on which authority the Paul of the book of Acts had in fact gathered in the Gentiles. The writer is seen also to have been imbued with the doctrine of the efficacy of the blood of Jesus to remove sin, though it is not absolutely clear that he held it to have been poured out sacrificially as an atonement. Jesus is described as having "loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." He is presented in form of "a lamb as it had been slain," and is said to have "redeemed us to God by his blood out of every kindred, and

tongue, and people, and nation." These have "washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," They have "overcome" the devil "by the blood of the Lamb." The writer may perhaps be accounted a convert such as might be made at this day from the Jewish community, but still with stronger ties to the system departed from than would prevail now that practical Judaism, in the full exigencies of the creed, has been so long in abeyance. He has furthermore advanced to receive the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus, but has no note of his divinity. Jesus is "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending," "which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty; the first and the last." Still he was only a created being, "the beginning of the creation of God;" "the root" as well as the "offspring of David."

The Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians are on the like footing as to doctrine, but are of Gentile proclivities. They purport to be by Paul, but no more is said of his apostleship than that he holds it "by the will of God," the defiant, independent tone of the other epistles in this name we have examined being wanting. In the Epistle to the Ephesians the writer, so far from making Paul throw aside the older apostles and assert a gospel for himself not obtained from them, acknowledges these apostles thoroughly. The believers, he says, are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (ii. 20), and he styles them the "holy apostles," to whom the "mystery" of the salvation of Jew and Gentile in Christ has now been "revealed" (iii. 5). For himself he declares that he is "less than the least of all saints" (iii. 8). The Paul of the Ephesians is assuredly not the Paul of the Galatians. But he is probably equally a Gentile. The work of Christ has levelled all distinctions between Jew and Gentile. He speaks of those who are called "uncircumcision by that which is called circumcision in the flesh made by hands," in terms that no Israelite would have employed, and says that these who were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise," are now "made nigh by the blood of Christ;" "peace" is "preached" to those who "were afar off" as well as to those who "were nigh;" the Gentiles are become "fellow-heirs, and of the same body" as the Jews, "partakers" with them of the "promise in Christ by the gospel;" and "in the dispensation of the fulness of times,"

God is to "gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him." "Redemption" and "forgiveness of sins" are to be secured "through his blood;" "he is our peace," "having abolished in his flesh, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances," "that he might reconcile" all "unto God in one body by the cross." Christ, thus, "hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God," and God has accepted the sacrifice as a "sweet-smelling savour" gratifying to him. The writer shows himself to have a clear apprehension of the pre-existence of Christ. The work of our redemption was "according to the eternal purpose" of God, "which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord;" we were "chosen in him before the foundation of the world;" the "fellowship" of this "mystery" "from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God," who, it is declared, "created all things by Jesus Christ." "Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things)". The meaning of the writer is not very clear. I would suggest that he may be aiming at the conclusion that the fact of the ascension proves that Christ returned to the place from whence he had come; or, in other words, that he had left heaven, where he had existed from before the foundation of the world, to run his career upon earth. The proper inherent divinity of Christ, nevertheless, is not announced. On the contrary, he is shown to be indebted for his position to the action of God as much as we are ourselves. God has manifested his power "to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places;" he "hath quickened us together with Christ;" and "we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

The writer of the epistle to the Colossians refers in like manner as the previous writer to the "circumcision made without hands," and proclaims that there is now "neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian

Scythian, bond nor free ; but Christ is all, and in all." He has "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us," "nailing it to his cross." No one therefore was to judge them in respect of "meat," or "drink," or "of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days;" and they were not to be subject to ordinances, which were traceable merely to man, were all to "perish with the using," and were "rudiments of the world." If these are the ordinances the same writer speaks of as put out of our way and nailed upon the cross, it is clear that he was no Jew. In the very words used in the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 7), he speaks of our having "redemption" through the "blood" of Christ, "even the forgiveness of sins" (i. 14). Also, as in the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 10), of "peace" being made "through the blood of the cross," and God having thus been pleased "to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven" (i. 20). We are "reconciled in the body of his flesh through death." Christ is "the image of the invisible God," but still only a created being, "the first-born of every creature" (i. 15). "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (ii. 9). This does not however involve his essential divinity, but only the endowing action of God; for we are told that it "pleased the Father that in him all fulness" should "dwell" (i. 19). What depended on the pleasure of God to bestow, was then not inherent in Christ.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, unlike the rest of the epistles ascribed to Paul, is anonymous. Its authenticity was disputed in the earliest age, namely by Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, and the Latin Church generally.* Modern critics commonly disallow it. Professing to be addressed by a Hebrew to Hebrews, it is in a language foreign to and not in use among them. The writer is anti-Judaic in his spirit. The first covenant was "faulty," and put away. It "decayed," "waxed old," and was "ready to vanish away." Its services appertained to a "worldly sanctuary," carried out by means of "carnal ordinances," relating to "meats, and drinks, and divers washings." It depended for expiation of sin upon "the blood of bulls and of goats," which "it is not possible" "should take away sins." This covenant has therefore been "disannulled," "for the weak-

* "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" 59.

ness and unprofitableness thereof." "Perfection" was not to be had by means of the "Levitical priesthood." Their agency has therefore been thrown aside in favour of one who "pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar." Would a Jew speak thus disparagingly of the institutions of his people? The writer calls the veil of the tabernacle the "second" veil, associating it thus with the outer curtains, which to him would be the first veil, and thus failing to give it the special importance attaching to it. He says, within this veil was laid up a "golden censer," of which we never hear, and that the memorial pot of manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, were within the ark, equally as the tables of the covenant; whereas the said pot of manna and rod were deposited "before the testimony" (Ex. xvi. 33, 34; Num. xvii. 10), or outside the ark,—errors into which a Jew would scarcely fall. The writer clothes Jesus with the office of high priest, the "offering" he presented being "himself." He is considered to have entered the true holy of holies, or heaven, "by his own blood," thus "putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" so that we also, now, may have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." Singularly enough he cites the passage in the 40th Psalm, where it is imputed to God, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire," "burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required," as the warrant for this stupendous sacrifice (x. 5-10), and pleads, as evidence of the efficacy of the sacrifice, the declaration in Jeremiah (xxxi. 33, 34), that God had quite another method of freeing Israel from sin, namely, by means of the new covenant, carried out by his writing his laws in the hearts of his people, and so compassing their forgiveness. While obviously not the Paul of the Acts, who maintained that in nothing had he "offended," "neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple," equally is it apparent that he is not the Paul of the Epistle to the Galatians; for he derives his doctrine from the teaching of Christ while on earth, as "confirmed" to him "by them that heard him" (ii. 3); while the other, as I have repeatedly had to notice, obtained his from heaven, and from some other source than "flesh and blood." The writer apprehends the pre-existence of Jesus, but not his essential divinity. He was the Son of God, "by whom also he made the worlds" (i. 2); he enters

the world as the "first-begotten" (i. 6); he was "made" in being "a little lower than the angels" (ii. 9), which is the phrase also used for defining the standing point of the human race (ii. 7); "verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham," that he might "in all things" "be made like unto his brethren" (ii. 17); "forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (ii. 14); he therefore could be "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," being so constituted as to be susceptible of being "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (iv. 15). Jesus, therefore, while on earth, was a mere man, and as such the writer speaks of him (vii. 24; x. 12).

There is a passage which may be thought to interfere with this conclusion, where God is represented addressing him and saying, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (i. 8). The citation is from the 45th Psalm, where it is the psalmist who is speaking, and not the Deity; and the invocation must be taken as addressed to the Deity, and not to "the king" spoken of, who is one described throughout in human aspect, and as contracting a human nuptial alliance. To imagine otherwise is to convict the Hebrew psalmist of setting up a second God, which cannot have been the case.

The Epistles of John represent the like stage of doctrine, but are devoid of any show of connection with Judaism. The writer, however, wishes to be thought a Jew, speaking in the third epistle of the Gentiles, as if not of them. He depends upon the sacrificial element. "The blood of Jesus Christ," he says, "cleanseth us from all sin." "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." He is thus far removed from Jewish exclusiveness. The pre-existence of Jesus is asserted. He is "that which was from the beginning," "which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." God "sent" him "into the world," and constituted him with "eternal life." "That," we are told, "which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us)." The believers

have "fellowship" with him, and thus participate in this endowed life. "God," it is said, "hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his son." "We know," it is declared, "that the son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his son Jesus Christ." "This," it is emphatically laid down, "is the true God, and eternal life;" that is, it is thus that God is truly manifested to us, bestowing upon us eternal life through the medium of his son. The revelation of Jesus is not, however, that of God himself. "No man," he warns us, "hath seen God at any time." Jesus came "in the flesh," to deny which the writer maintains is to exhibit the "spirit of Anti-Christ." Jesus is the "only begotten Son" of God, and in the sonship thus constituted we are to believe. His essential divinity is not declared.

This paramount doctrine appears proclaimed in the remaining epistles bearing the name of Paul which I have to discuss. In the Epistle to the Philippians Paul, in co-operation with Timotheus, is styled merely "the servant of Jesus Christ." He asserts himself to be a Hebrew, particularizing even his tribe, and saying he was a Pharisee, but in no other way betraying any sentiment to associate him with Judaism. The specification of his tribe is an assertion no real Jew could have ventured to make. Union with Christ forms the ground of his hopes. He does not plead his own righteousness, as one who had fulfilled the law, but "the righteousness which is of God by faith" in Christ; desiring, he says, "that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." The sacrificial death of Christ may be included in the writer's creed, but it is not exactly expressed. He, however, has a distinct view of the divinity of Christ while on earth, alleging that "being in the form of God," he "thought it not robbery to be equal with God;" and yet, inconsistently, he makes the exaltation of Christ to depend, not on his own inherent attributes, but on the action of God exalting him.

In the Epistles to Timothy, Paul is the apostle of Jesus by the "commandment" and the "will" of God. "I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle," he insists, "and lie not; a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity." He calls

Timothy his "own son in the faith;" announces to him that "the glorious gospel of the blessed God" he proclaimed had been "committed to his trust;" exhorts him to "stir up the gift of God" which he had received by the laying on of his hands; to "take heed unto himself, and unto the doctrine;" and not to be "ashamed of the testimony" of their Lord, nor of him, his prisoner. This Paul, describing and upholding his own apostolic position, and schooling and exhorting Timothy, can scarcely be the Paul who placed Timothy in fellowship and on a level with himself in coming forward to indoctrinate the Philippians. He speaks leniently of the law, saying that it is "good, if a man use it lawfully," and was designed for the repression of ungodliness. Otherwise he shows no sense of association with Judaism. With the Judaic Essenes it is clear he had no sympathy; for he denounces the "forbidding to marry" and "to abstain from meats," counsels the younger widows to re-marry, and advises Timothy to make use of wine in moderation. He says that Christ "came into the world to save sinners," is the "mediator between God and men," and "gave himself a ransom for all," but otherwise does not advert to his sacrificial death. What passed "before Pontius Pilate" was that he there "witnessed a good confession," which points to his end as a martyr. Our salvation is made to depend upon fellowship with Christ. "If we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with him." But he appears to apprehend the pre-existence of Christ in saying that God's purposes towards us in Christ occurred "before the world began," but were made manifest now by his "appearing;" and he seems openly to proclaim Christ's divinity, in saying, "great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

In the Epistle to Titus the writer alludes to Gentiles as if himself not of them, citing a saying as by "one of themselves, even a prophet of their own;" but as he speaks disparagingly of "the circumcision," and contemptuously of Jewish doctrine under the designation of "Jewish fables," he probably was a Gentile personating Paul. The removal of sin by the blood of Jesus is not taught. Jesus is said to have given himself for

us, to redeem us from iniquity. This he might do without offering himself as a sacrifice. The "washing" depended on is that "of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Here reformation of conduct is in view, and accordingly "good works" are insisted on (iii. 8, 14). The pre-existence of Jesus is not declared, but it is said we are to be "looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," which is an annunciation of his divinity.

The second Epistle of Peter was disputed by Origen, Cyprian, and Eusebius,* and from this circumstance, and its distinctive doctrine, I detach it from the first Epistle. The writer speaks of his "beloved brother Paul," and adverts to his "epistles" in a way that could not have occurred in the Judaic Peter, whose "dissimulation" the Paul of the Galatians professes to have exposed. This feeling for the Gentile Paul indicates that the writer was probably himself a Gentile. He evinces no Judaic connection of any sort. Jesus is stated to have "bought" those who are his, but this need not have been by the outpouring of his blood sacrificially. The doctrine of works is preached (i. 5-11), and it is "through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" that his people are described to have "escaped the pollutions of the world." Jesus is spoken of as "our God and Saviour" (i. 1, *Greek*), and is said to operate on his people with "divine power," which involves his essential divinity.

The last section of the record remaining to be considered is the Gospel according to John. This is commonly looked upon, and with apparent justice, as embodying the culmination of the Christian beliefs. The contrast between the exhibition made of Jesus in this section of the scriptures, as compared with the portrait drawn of him in the synoptic gospels, has struck every critical student. I am at present concerned only with the distinguishing Jewish and Gentile traits in these records, my object being to trace the progress of doctrine from the Jewish form, in which it was first projected, to the Gentile form, in which we now have it. The synoptics represent Jesus as strictly a Jew in descent, action, and sentiment. The gospel of John has no such features. There is the question

* "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" 59.

raised in his presence of the need that he should be traced, as the Christ, not from Galilee, but from Bethlehem and David ; but the matter is left unsolved (vii. 41-43). There is, in fact, no note of his being of human descent. The paternity he ever lays claim to is a divine one. Of the Jews he says, "I know that ye are Abraham's seed," but he associates himself with a heavenly Father, of which connection, he remarked to them, "Ye neither know me, nor my Father." When they ask him whether he was "greater than their father Abraham," he disassociates himself from Abraham, pointing to him as *their* father, without acknowledging him as his. On the contrary, he boldly asserts that "Abraham rejoiced to see his day," adding, "Before Abraham was, I am." There is no Jewish exclusiveness in his doctrine. It was out of love to "the world" at large, and that "the world" might be "saved" by him, that the Father "sent" him. He came as "the light of the world," "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." He "came down from heaven," he declares, to give "life unto the world." So far from restraining his disciples from preaching to the Samaritans, as the synoptic gospels have it, he visited this region, there proclaiming himself as the Christ, and gaining over many of the place to believe in him ; and he announced to them that neither on the mount of the Samaritans, "nor yet at Jerusalem," was God to be specially sought out for worship, but that "the true worshippers" were those who should worship him "in spirit and in truth," independently of all locality. Jesus is thus entirely free of Judaism, whether by descent or in doctrine. His frequenting the temple at the stated festivals, and purging it of those who made it a place of traffic, are apparently concessions made to the Judaism of the day in which the life of Jesus is cast, for the sake of maintaining a consistent history.

The writer himself, it may be gathered, was a Gentile. A Jew could not have shown the visitation of the Christ, in the era described, in a form so devoid of Judaism. He refers to Jewish ordinances as himself not one of the people, speaking of "the Jews' passover," "a feast of the Jews," "the passover, a feast of the Jews," "the Jews' feast of tabernacles," "the Jews' preparation day," "the manner of the purifying of the Jews," "the manner of the Jews to bury," and, when address-

ing Jews, saying "your law," or referring to it as "their law." He erroneously describes Bethany as "beyond Jordan," and gives a miraculous power to the pool of Bethesda which no inhabitant of Jerusalem could have alleged; and he imagined that Annas and Caiaphas were high priests together, and, again, that the high priest was an officer annually elected.

That the death of Jesus was a sacrifice enacted as a propitiatory offering in expiation of sin, we are assuredly not told in this gospel. There is an attempted but questionable association with Jewish ordinance in styling Jesus "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (the animal in the Jewish rites fulfilling this office being a goat), and in applying to him the circumstance that the bones of the paschal lamb were not to be broken, as prophetic of the preservation from breakage at death of his bones, which might be taken as indicative that his death was of sacrificial import; but so important a characteristic, fraught with such serious doctrinal consequences, should not be left to bare inference, if the death had really been incurred in the sense of a sacrifice. The solid teaching ascribed in this gospel to Jesus supports no such inference. It is true he says he gives his "flesh" for "the life of the world," but this is not in the way of an atonement for sin. It is the provision by him of a life-giving element. "I am that bread of life," he declares; "this is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die." He represents himself also as "laying down his life for the sheep," but it is as "the good shepherd" dying in defence of the sheep when attacked by the wolf. The saying ascribed to Caiaphas that he was to die, "not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one" all "the children of God," does not necessarily involve a sacrificial offering. He might die as a martyr, or as a devoted leader, for conscience' sake, to attract men to the truth for which he suffered, and rally them around him. So he appears to declare when saying, "signifying what death he should die," "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The mediatory office of Jesus consisted in his being the power of God for the salvation of the world. He declared himself to be "the light of the world," "the door of the sheep," "the true vine," "the resurrection and the life,"

"the way, the truth, and the life." "No man cometh unto the Father," he maintained, "but by me." "The Father," he said, "loveth the son, and hath given all things into his hand." "For as the Father," he more specifically alleged, "hath life in himself; so hath he given to the son to have life in himself." "The son," therefore, "quickeneth whom he will." "This is the Father's will which hath sent me," "that every one which seeth the son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." "He that believeth on me," he assured his hearers, "hath everlasting life." To "as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." "He that believeth on the son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."

The pre-existence and divinity of Christ, which are involved in the above teaching, are clearly announced. "In the beginning" he was "with God." "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." He thus ante-dated the whole visible creation, of which in fact he was the constructor. "He was in the world, and the world was made by him." "He came down from heaven." "He was come from God," and after death "went to God." "I came forth from the Father," he stated, "and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." "Father," he says, addressing himself to the Almighty, "I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me;" that glory, he declares, "which I had with thee before the world was." In consistency with these supreme attributes, the exhibition made of Jesus when in the flesh is still that of a divinity. He was the revealed Word of God, or the Alexandrine Logos. "And the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father." "I and my Father," he declared, "are one"—one possibly in nature,

essence, and power, for so the surrounding constituents seem to require, and not merely one in spirit, to which sense some would limit the expression. "Believe," he said, "that the Father is in me, and I in him." Philip desired to see the Father, on which Jesus put himself before him, and said, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, then, Show us the Father?"

In a religion professing to be a divine revelation, we are entitled to expect completeness in all its essential enunciations, and certainly not contradiction. Such, we see, is not the character of the Christian scheme. While matured Christianity requires the acceptance of Jesus Christ in the entirety of his attributes, the actuality has been that he has been put before the world in detached morsels, which morsels, moreover, have not exhibited unity, but discord. If, for example, the scheme was primitively arranged to be appropriate only for the Jewish family, as such, it was a marked alteration of the plan to adapt it to the Gentiles. Nothing is more clearly apparent than that there has been such change of counsel and design. Then, if repentance could secure free forgiveness, as taught in the first instance, it was an essential alteration in the terms to introduce the requisition of a sacrificial offering, making of this the paramount condition. And if it was of importance to apprehend the pre-existence or the divinity of Christ, it was a misleading representation to describe him as a mere man, withholding to a later time the declaration of his divinity.

What a snare was here presented to the Jewish mind! Thousands of Jews at a time, we are told, accepted Christ when offered to them, in the first days, in Jewish type. What a deception, when he had been so accepted, to surround him with Gentile circumstances, impossible for a Jew, as such, to face! The fruits are apparent. The Jews are rarely to be met with in the fold of Christianity, which is substantially occupied by the Gentiles.

It is obvious that, through the opening of the door for the admission of the Gentiles, these anti-Judaic elements flowed in. One by one, as the invading body grew in strength, the things precious to them were introduced, and imposed upon the image of Christ. The process of the adaptations may be readily con-

ceived. The disciples had dwelt much on the death of Jesus. It was a life forfeited in the cause of righteousness. It was represented that the wicked, who could not abide such a testimony against themselves, killed him, as they had done the prophets of old. The patient and faithful sufferer, being, in point of fact, the Christ, was, as a consequence, exalted to glory. He was endowed with mastery over his enemies, and, at the end of the dispensation, was to rule them with a rod of iron. Those who confessed him in the interval were to be associated with him in this glory. To a Gentile mind, accustomed to believe in the efficacy of a human sacrifice as the most valuable offering that could be made to appease an offended Deity, it was easy to convert the death of Jesus into an expiatory offering. The blood had been poured out, and they believed in the atoning value of such blood. This, perhaps, was the earliest alteration made in the primitive scheme of Christianity. The next, apparently, was to elevate Jesus to the position of an *Æon*, or emanation of the Deity—one who existed with him in the remoteness of time, before the world was created, and who was used as his instrument in constructing the material creation. Such beings were known of to the Gentiles, and, in accepting the Christ as the medium of their temporal and spiritual welfare, it was natural to convert him into a chief *Æon*. His whole work, as well as position, was thereby magnified, and those who had their standing in him partook of the exaltation. The doctrine was of Oriental origin, and had taken root in Alexandria. Lastly, the absolute divinity of Jesus was insisted on. He was a God incarnate, in a form familiar to the Greek mythologists. Their minds were habituated to such a stretch of thought, and it was natural they should exercise it in favour of the object of their mental adoration.

But there was a difficulty in the adaptation of his divine essence to the death he had undergone. Could a being of immortal mould give up his life after the manner of a mere mortal? And how was the sacrificial character of the death to be maintained? The deposition of the material bodily substance, and its dispersion in decomposition, if effected, would be a poor offering to make for the redemption of the universe. The essential life itself must be forfeited, to produce a value,

such as the circumstances required. The difficulty is one still remaining to be solved in Christendom. The early Christian teachers appear to have evaded it by omitting all advertence to the sacrifice of Jesus, when they insisted on his divinity. I trace such a distinction in the records before us.

The Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans, and the First Epistle of Peter, preach the sacrificial death, but not the divinity; the Book of Revelation, the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Hebrews, and the Epistles of John, have the sacrificial death, and the pre-existence of Jesus before the world was made, but still not his essential divinity; the Epistles to the Philippians, Timothy, and Titus, the second Epistle of Peter, and the Gospel according to John, have the divinity, but not the sacrifice. Is this arrangement, common to so many of the scriptures in their several groups, fortuitous or designed? The Gnostics evidently felt their difficulty when they had to associate even their *Æon* with the death of a mere mortal. The carnal image of Jesus was, they said, occupied by an *Æon* when the spirit (according to the ordinary version) descended on him at his baptism; and at the time that he had to undergo death, this *Æon* withdrew, and ascended into heaven, and left the body to suffer. Have the Christian writers, conscious of the inconsistency, sought to evade the difficulty by silence?

That the Christian movement, when it took a Gentile complexion, was advanced by Gentile teachers, is, I think, sufficiently apparent. I attribute the Synoptic Gospels, the book of Acts, the epistle of James, and the book of Revelation, which teem with Judaism, to those who were in faith, and, perhaps, also in race, merely Jews. The epistles to the Thesalonians, though not disclosing Jewish proclivities, was probably by a Jew, since its form of doctrine does not go beyond the precincts of Judaism. The religious nationality of the authors of the epistles of John and those to Timothy, is not determinable from any thing appearing in these epistles. The remaining scriptures all give evidence of the hand of a Gentile.

In advancing the Gentile movement, the name of Paul has been freely made use of. The book of Acts shows him in a position to be thus commended to notice. He had opened

out the gospel to the Gentiles, and had successfully resisted the emissaries of the churches of Judea, who sought to repress his action and make Jews of them. When Gentile doctrines had to be recommended and made authoritative, it was natural, in the days before us, to father them on the renowned champion of the Gentile community. We have, accordingly, several very distinct Pauls, who may be thus enumerated.

1. Paul of the Acts of the Apostles, who is described as a pure Jew, in Jewish association. The Paul of the epistles to the Thessalonians also announced only what a Jew might receive, and therefore need not be classed as a different Paul.

2. Paul of the Galatians and Corinthians, in violent hostility with Judaism, disavowing all subjection to the apostles, or connection with the churches of Judea, and proclaiming an independent gospel.

3. Paul of the Romans, overthrowing Judaism with Gentilism, but not in the above spirit of excited hostility, and seen to have been all along in association with the Judean churches.

4. Paul of the epistle to the Ephesians, who, while preaching Gentilism, acknowledged the foundations of the church to have been laid down by the apostles and prophets. The epistle to the Colossians may have been by the same hand.

5. Paul of the Philippians, accepting Timothy as on a level with himself, and working with him.

6. Paul of the epistles to Timothy, holding Timothy under him in pupilage, and instructing him. The epistle to Titus may also be by this writer.

Those uncritical persons who accept the epistle to the Hebrews as the production of Paul, would introduce a seventh representation of him.

The canonical scriptures thus examined demonstrate to us that the doctrines of Christianity have owed their origin to no one solid recognizable source. Derived apparently from Essenism, and constituting at first mere Judaism, they ended in a purely Gentile demonstration. So completely were the first tenets cast off, that those who held them were reduced to the back ranks of heretical denominations. The Essenes were shelved as Encratites, and the Judaic Christians as Ebionites. The Jesus of the Synoptics, had he survived to this day, must have been so disposed of.

Beyond the canonical scriptures we have the works of numerous writers who embody the early doctrines of Christianity, and show us what these were. Dr Donaldson exhibits them to us in two classes, namely, the so-called Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, whose era, according to current acceptation, extends to the latter part of the second century, or a time comprehending one hundred and fifty years from the asserted death of Christ. My conclusions would place the very earliest of these at an interval removed by at least a hundred years from the alleged event, and possibly considerably more. The learned doctor says of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, "nowhere is Christ directly called God in them. Nowhere is a relief from punishment spoken of as the result of his life or death. His work from beginning to end is a purely moral work. There is no curious prying into the peculiar nature of Christ's death." "The Apologists do not speak of the doctrine of original sin, and they speak sometimes in language apparently opposed to it, because as yet the Church had no theory on the matter. . . . The same observation has to be made in regard to many other doctrines, such as those relating to the death of Christ. The Apologetic writings contain no theory on this subject. There is no indication that they looked on his death as a satisfaction to God as moral governor for sin. . . . The idea of personal happiness becomes more prominent in some of these writings than it is in the earlier. The idea, indeed, of personal holiness is still uppermost, but it is conjoined with that of personal happiness; and thus the way was opened up for the two questions, —how, on the one hand, Christ's life and death wrought holiness; and, on the other hand, how his life and death procured happiness. Attempted solutions of the first question will appear in the next age. The Church had to go through many phases of feeling and life before it was led to attempt a full solution of the last. . . . The doctrine which the Apologists discuss fully is that of the Logos, and the relation of the Son to the Father. . . . They feel content with the assertion that He was in a peculiar sense the Son of God, the bearer of the Divine message to men, the revelation of the Divine being to men. They make various assertions with regard to Him; such as that all power was given Him in heaven and earth;

that to Him every knee should bow ; that through Him the world was created ; that He was the first-born of all creation ; and that the Father had given up all things into His hands. But in none of them occur express and unmistakable assertions of the divinity of Christ" (*Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doct.* I. 86 ; II. 39, 40). "The first form of Christianity was Ebionitism, seen in the Apostles Peter, James, and John, and represented by the gospel of the Hebrews, which was the only gospel in use up to the middle of the second century. The gospel of Matthew is a form of this gospel, marking the catholic conclusion of the Ebionitic gospel literature. The church was Ebionitic up to the middle of the second century" (meaning for the space of a hundred years). . . . "The first literary document of the Roman Church, the Pastor of Hermas, is Judaic." Afterwards "appeared Hegesippus, the earliest historian of the church, and thoroughly Ebionitic. . . . The writings of Justin Martyr exhibit a peculiar phenomenon—a mixture of Ebionitism with Platonism, the Logos-doctrine being Platonic. . . . Ebionitic is Justin's whole view of the original connection and object of the incarnation of Christ; Ebionitic his complete silence in regard to the Apostle Paul, whose letters he never quotes, into whose peculiar doctrines he nowhere enters, and whose apostolic authority he consequently seems to have rejected ; Ebionitic his rough form of Chiliasmus, his Demonology, and the horror at the eating of sacrificial flesh connected therewith ; his view of the Holy Ghost, whom he seems to have reckoned among the angels ; his angel-worship ; his valuing the Old Testament so much above the New. The second stage of the church's progress finds the church Ebionitic, but arguing with a peaceful tendency. This is seen in the Clementine Homilies, in which the foundation is thoroughly Ebionitic ; but they form an intermediate step in the process of the development of Ebionitism into Catholicism." The Letters of Ignatius "express a desire for unity—the main idea by which the Pauline and Ebionitic elements were reconciled" (*Ibid.* I. 39-41, citing Schwegler).

In a later publication, the same author gives us other citations. Dr James Bennet, in a work entitled *The Theology of the Early Christian Church*, he informs us, says, "The incarnation, atonement, and intercession of the Redeemer, are not taught

by the Fathers in the formal, systematic manner which professed theologians afterwards adopted ; but the elements of a system are scattered with rude simplicity and perplexing vagueness over their works." Then he refers to Vaughan's *Causes of the Corruption of Christianity*, and Stoughton *On the Ages of Christendom*, saying that in both "the defective theology of the writers of the first three centuries is made a matter of lamentation." After this the learned doctor himself observes, "If it be true, as they (the writers of the evangelical school) say, that the early writers were heterodox on the Trinity ; if they knew nothing of a satisfaction of Divine justice, but spoke only in a vague way of this matter ; if they wavered in regard to original sin, some denying it entirely, and others expressing themselves with great uncertainty ; if their testimony to the inspiration of the New Testament is unsatisfactory and inconclusive—where was Christianity in those days ? Did it really sleep for three centuries ? Are we to suppose that there were Christians in those days, but that they never wrote books ? Or how is the chasm to be bridged ?" (*The Apostolical Fathers*, 78-80).

The solution is simple and decisive. The error is on the part of the modern theologians, who judge the pioneers of their faith by matters present now in Christianity and commonly accepted, but which, in the times of these early men, had not yet been invented.

IV.

THE CONSTRUCTION AND INTEGRITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RECORD.

WE have seen that the statements made in the Christian scriptures are not by persons who were themselves cognizant of the events described. The events are laid in one age, and the accounts thereof are introduced in another. We have seen, also, that Christians owe much that has been woven into their theology to their predecessors in the exhibition of religious thought, and that their task has been that of composition rather than of producing an original scheme. We have furthermore seen that the main doctrines of Christianity have been imposed, from time to time, on one another, and are not the fruit of a matured and pre-arranged system. We are now to ascertain what marks there may be that these scriptures have been put together in a manner not consonant to an independent record, and especially to one attributed to a divine source.

In the days when the task was undertaken, it was considered warrantable to promote religious sentiment by resort to fictitious statements; and now, at the distant period at which we have to judge of these representations, the writers are apt to obtain credit for their statements, because they were actuated by religious feeling in making them. The purpose gives rise to, and introduces the statements, and the statements are true, because introduced by persons with praise-worthy purpose. We must endeavour to get behind the scenes, and observe how the workers have really executed their task.

Arising out of Judaism, it is natural that the Jewish sacred writings should have been used in the representation of the Christian statements. And when the aim was to portray the central personage of the Christian system as the Jewish Messiah, it became necessary to apply to him such sayings of the Jewish

record as could be made to indicate the advent to be exhibited. There would be a temptation to make the events of the life to be described go hand in hand with the sayings that could be made to appear predictive of such a life. And there would be the tendency, either to shape the events to the prophecies, or the prophecies to the events. In the former instance, there would be a direct fabrication of statement, sufficient to overthrow the character for trustworthiness of any person guilty of so composing his history. We should feel ourselves in the hands of one capable of taking any liberty with our powers of belief to promote his ends. Once detected in misleading us with facts, which he knew to be no facts, we should cease to confide in him any further. In the other instance, the distrust created would be rather in respect of the judgment of the narrator than of his personal integrity. We should see that he was ruled by prejudice, and was scheming his way to some result to be established, and his weight as an interpreter would fail in scale accordingly. But should he be found both falsifying fact, and perverting texts, we should see ourselves engaged with one in every way to be mistrusted. Matthew deals largely in these adaptations, and, as an exemplar, we may consider with what measure of fairness he constructs his history.

The Messianic promises run very much in the name of David. It was necessary to link the declared Messiah with the patriarch, and this is effected by means of the genealogy with which the gospel opens. Isaiah was held to proclaim a miraculous birth from a virgin, of one whose name signified "God with us;" and the fulfilment is afforded in the nature of the birth of Jesus. The question is raised where he should be born as the Messiah. Micah was thought to settle it that Bethlehem was to be the place, and there the birth occurs. Hosea is observed to say, "Out of Egypt have I called my son," and the infant Jesus is represented as taken thither to be brought up again from that region. Jeremiah speaks of a lamentation raised for the loss of children; and we have Herod massacring infants at Bethlehem to remove out of his way the threatened king of the Jews, who was to supplant him. On his return from Egypt Jesus is described as taken to Nazareth, whereby an assumed prophecy that he should be called a

Nazarene is made to meet with a fulfilment. Isaiah describes a voice crying in the wilderness, and the position is said to be realized by John announcing his message in the desert near Jerusalem. There is the proclamation of a divine sonship in the Psalms. This is applied to Jesus by a voice from heaven at his baptism; and again at his transfiguration. Jesus is afterwards stated to have been visited and tempted by the devil. Jesus repels him with words taken from the Jewish scriptures, and the texts and the incidents of the temptation coincide. Deuteronomy points out that man should feed not on bread alone, but on the word of God, and Jesus is asked to turn stones into bread. The Psalmist supposes the angels to bear up the saint lest he should dash his foot against a stone; and the devil suggests that Jesus should test the promise by throwing himself from a pinnacle of the temple. Deuteronomy enjoins the worship of God alone; and the devil expects Jesus to worship him. Isaiah had spoken of the people of Zabulon and Nephthalim receiving a great light; and Jesus is made to visit those places with his ministrations. Isaiah describes one who had associated himself with our griefs and sorrows; and Jesus takes compassion on the sick and heals them. Malachi had announced a precursor to Jesus; and John is introduced to fill his place. Isaiah had spoken of one who should neither strive nor raise his voice in the streets; and Jesus evinces his modesty and reserve in not making known who he was. Jonah being three days and three nights in a fish's belly, is the foundation of a prophecy that Jesus should be for the like period buried out of sight in his grave. The Psalmist had adverted to one who had taught in parables; and Jesus conveys his instructions in that form. Zechariah had declared that the king of Jerusalem should ride upon a colt, the foal of an ass; and Jesus thus enters the city as its king. Jeremiah had complained of God's house being converted into a den of thieves; wherefore Jesus has to purge the temple of those trafficking there. In the Psalms praise is to be perfected out of the mouths of babes and sucklings; and children therefore are brought forward to praise Jesus. Zechariah had said that the shepherd should be smitten, and the sheep scattered, which is covered by the death of Jesus, and the dispersion of his followers. Zechariah had adverted to a transaction connected with a

potter, wherein a price had been weighed out of thirty pieces of silver; and for this sum Judas is made to betray Jesus, associated with which is the purchase of a potter's field. The Psalmist has lots cast for the garments of a sufferer; and so it is said to have happened in the instance of Jesus at his death. This is an easy method of composing a history. The question to be considered is whether it is also a truthful one.

The genealogy offered is to trace out the paternity of Jesus. He is derived from father to son, from Abraham to Joseph, in the line of Judah. But if it be true, as I am assured from reliable Jewish sources is the case, that the Israelites have had no sense of their tribes from the time of the captivity, what are we to think of the integrity of this table? The family selected is that of an obscure carpenter residing among the mixed population of Galilee. It is impossible to suppose an exceptional pedigree maintained in such a quarter. The writer puts forward the table in all simplicity as a matter to be received without a question. But what Jew, knowing the true circumstances of the void in the archives of the nation, could have accepted it? Can there be any other conclusion than that this table, framed for a particular purpose, is a purely fictitious document?

The next step taken in alleging the birth of Jesus from a virgin without connection with any human father, is a declaration at violent issue with the aforesaid genealogical table making Joseph his father. According to the manner of the birth, Joseph had nothing whatever to do with the production of Jesus, and there can be no pretence for putting before us his genealogy. There is no way of accounting for the discord of statement but by concluding that it is owing to two several hands in the record before us. One or other of those statements is an interpolation thrust in upon the original narrative. The possibility is that both are interpolations, made at different times, and this is the result I arrive at. No Jew could, I apprehend, have projected the genealogy. He would know that there was no information among his people from which it could be constructed. The work, I conclude, must have been that of one of Gentile extraction, who stood in Christianity when in its Judaic form, and thought to fortify the pretensions of Jesus to be the personage pointed to in the Jewish records

as the hope of Israel, in this manner, by tracing his descent from David. The account of the birth I also attribute to a Gentile, who has introduced the statement at a later day. Having to revert to this subject hereafter I need not further dilate upon it here.

The birth occurring at Bethlehem appears to be another improvement upon the first draft of the record. The errors committed in describing the character of the taxation that is said to have brought the parents of Jesus to this locality, and the placing the taxation in the time of Cyrenius, expose the statement as unhistorical. Nor, had Jesus been of Bethlehem, would he ever after have been styled as of Nazareth. The purpose of the representation is so apparent that the writer here, whoever he was, stands convicted of a deliberate concoction. These three subjects of the genealogy, the miraculous conception, and the location at Bethlehem, are treated of also by Luke, and always in hopeless disagreement on all details with Matthew.* The writers were drawing from imagination, and not from fact, and each put the matter as to him seemed best. Mark, while framing the substantial history of Jesus upon the same model, very observably stands clear of all these statements, and yet can intimate that he sets out with "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." If the earlier events narrated by Matthew and Luke were parts of the real history, could Mark have excluded them?

All critics comment on the unhistorical nature of the tale of the slaughter of the infants of Bethlehem attributed to Herod. Such an event could not have escaped the pen of Josephus had it occurred. The advertence to the lamentation consequently raised by Rachael is an unfortunate one, seeing that Judah, whose descendants are in question, sprang from Leah. The writer making such a mistake could scarcely have been a Jew. Mark and Luke do not possess this statement of the slaughtering, which is a sign that it is an interpolation. Luke's narrative is in fact so drawn up as not to allow of the occurrence. Fortunately we are able to discern the very source from which the writer has framed his representation. The materials are in truth in Josephus, to whom he would naturally go for what concerned Herod. Josephus's account

"The Bible: is it the word of God?" pp. 295-309.

of the conspiracy of Pheroras (a brother of Herod's) gives the mould of the gospel narrative in all its parts. Pheroras and Herod's son Antipater, the historian tells us, plotted against Herod. There were Jews of the sect of Pharisees who were hostile to the king, whom the wife of Pheroras gained over by paying a fine that had been imposed upon them as recusants to his authority. They professed to be able to predict future events, and were induced by her to foretell "how God had decreed that Herod's government should cease, and his posterity should be deprived of it; but that the kingdom should come to her and Pheroras, and to their children." The matter reaching the ears of Herod, he "slew such of the Pharisees as were principally accused," and "also all those of his own family who had consented to what the Pharisees foretold." Pheroras was required to put away his wife, which he refused to do. Thereupon "Herod commanded Pheroras that, since he was so obstinate in his affection for his wife, he should retire into his own tetrarchy; which he did very willingly, and swore many oaths that he would not come again till he heard that Herod was dead" (*Ant.* XVII. iii. 1, 3). Here we have a prediction of the overthrow of Herod's line in favour of another, a consequent slaughtering by Herod, the withdrawal of the rival pretender to another place, and his retreat thither till the death of Herod. It is not likely that the same chain of events should occur twice in the instance of the same person. The gospel writer, attracted by the details in the history of Herod, seems to have deliberately perverted them, and woven them into a tale which he has invented in illustration of the life of his hero, Jesus.

While Jesus is described as really of Bethlehem, he is always spoken of as of Nazareth. The writer thinks to fortify himself by saying that the appellation of Nazarene was given him in fulfilment of a prophecy. He does not point to the particular prophecy, and there is none such. The word, as it occurs in the Greek, is *Ναζωραῖος*. It appears again in Luke xviii. 37, John xix. 19, and Acts ii. 22; iii. 6; xxiv. 5. It is given in the Septuagint translation of Judges xiii. 5, 7, and xvi. 17 as *Ναζωραῖος*, where its signification is one who is devoted to the service of God as a Nazarite,—a derivative from the Hebrew word נָזַר, consecration. It is in this sense, there-

fore, that Jesus probably has been said to have been a Nazarene ; or, as it should more properly have been rendered,—a Nazarite. Such a place as Nazareth was apparently unknown to Josephus. Eusebius (*Ec. Hist.* i. 7) speaks of a village called Nazara, but he places it in Judea. The connection with Galilee is thus not apparent, and a Nazareth in Galilee, from which to derive Jesus, rests upon the unsupported and questionable authority of the Christian scriptures. The idea of the locality, in the time alleged, appears really to be due to a play on words, and ever greedy of supporting fact with prophecy, Matthew here imagines also the prophecy.

We have a voice from heaven proclaiming Jesus to be the Son of God. The words are obviously taken from the second Psalm, where the phrase is, "Thou art my son ; this day have I begotten thee." The representation brings before us the great question when, and how, the Messiah was to be made the son of God. The Psalmist says it is to be when God should be able to say, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion." Then it was that "the decree" was to go forth. The event announced is one still unaccomplished. The Christian scripture writers adapt it to the life of Jesus they had actually in hand, but are perplexed to decide upon the particular passage of his history to which to apply the important saying. Matthew gives it as an announcement made at his baptism, and again at his transfiguration ; but he sees it necessary to alter the language used, and in lieu of "this day have I begotten thee," substitutes "in whom I am well pleased." Is this an honest adaptation ? Is it not evident, whoever had the manipulation of the gospel narrative here, that it was felt that with a divine birth occurring to Jesus at his nativity, he could not be said to have received the endowment thirty years later at his baptism, or still further on at his transfiguration ? The book of Acts (xiii. 33) gives the passage in its integrity ; but refers it to another period. This writer knows nothing of the nativity, and therefore boldly makes Jesus to be adopted as the Son of God at his resurrection from the dead. The epistle to the Romans (i. 4) has a consonant statement, to the effect that he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." We

have thus five several periods when there occurs that particular "day" when Jesus had to be made the Son of God. It was at his birth, at his baptism, at his transfiguration, at his resurrection; or it has still to be effected (as the Psalmist himself declares) at his final advent when he is installed on his throne in Zion. The epistle to the Hebrews (i. 5; v. 5) twice gives the passage in its integrity, but does not attempt to define the period in Christ's career when it becomes applicable.

The allegation that the healing of the sick by Jesus was the realization of the description by Isaiah of one "smitten of God," who took on him the "griefs" and "sorrows" of others, is an example of misapplication of prophecy to fact which none but one bent upon so parading his subject could have been guilty of. Every other eye should see that the two things spoken of are entirely dissimilar. It is just such a misapplication to say that when Jesus charged the people whom he healed not to make him known, he was carrying out that saying of Isaiah respecting one who was not to "cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street." A process of adaptation must be distrusted when found in the hands of one determined at all hazards to surround his subject with prophetic fulfilments.

We have another remarkable attempt at straining prophecy to fit it to the narrative in the presentation of John as the precursor of the Messiah spoken of by Malachi. The terms of the prediction are, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord, and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." The personage announced is the well-known prophet Elijah. He was one who had not died as ordinary mortals die, but had been translated bodily when in life to heaven. Admitting such a fact, it was allowable to raise the expectation of his return. But it is quite another thing to clothe John in the rough garment of the Tishbite, and then to say with Matthew, "If ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come." The Evangelist must have been well aware that he was advancing what was untenable, and he does it with the hesitation of one con-

scious that he was going beyond the limits of an admissible statement. Moreover, the day of Jesus, and the day to which Malachi pointed, were altogether different. Jesus came in humility, as a servant, seeking out the sinner to save him. The Messiah of Malachi comes with all the powers and terrors of judgment.

We have had instances of prophecy adapted to events, and we have one now of the coinage of fact to fulfil a supposed prophecy. Zechariah had said, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." The Evangelist, ignorant of the spirit of the Hebrew, imagined that two animals were here spoken of, namely, the ass and its foal, and forthwith introduces two upon the field; whereas the phrase meant no more than to designate emphatically the animal to be used as an ass, even the foal of an ass. Mark and Luke keep within bounds by alleging but one ass employed on the occasion, but what are we to think of the integrity of Matthew, who, to suit his view of the prophecy, produces two? Can we be safe in following one who can thus deal with us in obtaining his facts? Moreover, the exhibition of Jesus in the manner made amounts to no more than an ideal display, ill fulfilling the exigencies of the prophecy. We require a real king, endowed with substantial attributes, capable of introducing material prosperity and glory to his expectant people, and exciting them to true well warrantable rejoicings; but in Jesus we have one merely borrowing the kingly title for the moment and occasion, effecting nothing for the people greeting him, and then removed to perish miserably and helplessly.

The last of these adaptations in Matthew, which I will here notice, is the assumed prophecy relating to the treachery of Judas. The account of the manner in which Judas came by his death, as given by Matthew, and in the Acts, is so discordant, that the presumption is, there was no such event.* This is strengthened by the circumstance that the writer of the Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 5) apprehends all the twelve apostles to have survived Jesus. The evangelist him-

* "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" p. 320.

self has it that they were all twelve to be supplied with thrones whereon to rule in glory in the hereafter. The representations in Zechariah, whom Matthew, to his discredit as an inspired writer, confounds with Jeremiah, would seem to have suggested the whole incident of the potter and the money paid down. But the facts are all variously arranged. In Jeremiah, the person priced at thirty pieces of silver himself has the money, and is told to "cast it unto the potter," which he does "in the house of the Lord;" whereas, in Matthew, Jesus has nothing to do with the money, it is the price of blood, of which Zechariah says nothing, and it is another than the person priced who gets the money and casts it down before the priests in the temple, and they buy a potter's field with it, which is all the connection there is with any potter. A discriminator of actual facts could not have garbled his representations in this way.

I need not pursue this branch of investigation any further, though similar examples of perverted statements might readily be gathered out of the narratives of the other evangelists. Matthew is the prime operator in the endeavour to combine fact with prophecy in depicting the history of Jesus, and we see with what entire want of scrupulosity he has proceeded to his work. Mark and Luke are so associated with him in their task, all travelling over the same ground in similar manner, and with use of the like materials, that the three stand or fall together. John has been projected on another footing, and he raises such a mass of violent contradictions of the other evangelists in delineating the attitude of Jesus, and describing his sayings and doings, as to deepen the confusion, and still more to subvert the credibility of the testimony. All this I have carefully examined in a previous work to which I must refer the inquiring reader.*

I have traced the passage of Christianity out of a form consistent with, and associated with Judaism, into one of positive Gentilism, and desire now to show how the movement was advanced through the channel of the Christian scriptures. It will introduce us to further phases of schemed and distorted statement.

The first difficulty that presented itself was, that whereas

* "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" sec. vii.

Jesus had been depicted in the synoptic gospels as instituting an exclusive Judaic dispensation, a door had been thrown open to the Gentiles for which a sufficient warrant was required. Matthew makes use of a prophecy of Isaiah to impute to Jesus the extension of his mission to the Gentiles, attributing to him the declaration, that "he shall show judgment to the Gentiles;" "and in his name shall the Gentiles trust." Can it be that these are the lips, in the same stage of the dispensation then said to be in course of introduction, which had prohibited his followers from going near the Gentiles, or addressing any word to them? Taking the matured Judaic scheme into account in all its allied parts, as delineated in the synoptic gospels, and as carried out in action according to the book of Acts, it is impossible to believe that the alleged founder of the faith could thus have stultified himself. Either he shut out hope from the Gentiles, or he gave it. He could not have done both. The use thus made of Isaiah, is probably therefore an interpolation brought in by a Gentile hand, after the Gentiles had secured their footing in the Christian community.

The synoptists conclude their narratives with the direct statement that Jesus, after his resurrection, gave a positive command that his gospel should be announced to all nations, as being applicable to all. Luke has the saving clause that they were to begin this action at Jerusalem. Could the master, possibly, have blown hot and cold in this way, giving a distinct interdiction in his life-time, and abrogating this after death? Nothing had changed but his own self, from being a man in natural life, to becoming one in resurrection-life. How did this affect the races of people to be dealt with? It will be said that his death involved consequences of such importance as to have opened up an entirely new dispensation. This, however, is not what the flow of the history puts before us. The death of Jesus, followed by his resurrection, secured nothing further, in the estimation of his people, in the first Judaic days of Christianity, than a headship in power for the advantage of those who were his. He is said to have preached this when in the flesh, and the accomplishment of the prediction altered nothing. The shedding of his blood for the benefit of the whole human race was an idea that sprang up later, when the Gentiles had obtained admittance. That was not a

circumstance apprehended at the time of the resurrection of Jesus, when he is said to have instituted his wider dispensation to embrace the Gentiles equally with the Jews. It is, therefore, apparent that at this time Jesus could not have made the opening for the Gentiles attributed to him, and the command ascribed to him must have been interpolated in the several gospels.

The book of Acts shows conclusively that there has been such building up of the record. We see that for a time after the death of Jesus his disciples considered themselves restricted in their ministration to the Jews only. He had interdicted their going among the Gentiles or addressing themselves to them, and this interdict still operated among them. So the history is framed. If Jesus, at his resurrection, had plainly declared to them that his gospel was to be offered to all nations, they could not have failed to see that the interdict had been removed, and they would have acted accordingly. It may be said that they were too confused at the apparition of Jesus to understand the nature of his injunction. Why, then, was it addressed to them at such a time by the all-knowing one? But they received subsequently, as it is said, endowment from the Holy Ghost at Pentecost to qualify them for all their work, and then, at least, the character of the mission entrusted to them should have been apparent to their minds. There can be no other conclusion by which to stand than that Jesus gave no such injunction to address all nations equally.

One part of the record is apt to afford means for overthrowing some other part. It is impossible to receive the statement of the miraculous endowment at Pentecost, and yet to convict the persons endowed of ignorance of the first essential duty for which they were commissioned, and thus endowed; namely, that they should proclaim the alleged saviour of mankind to every nation of the earth. And if the doctrines of the divinity of Jesus, and of his sacrificial death, are integral portions of his system, the endowment was a defective one which left them unprovided with these important constituents.

Again, the vision to Peter is dispersed by the subsequent action of Paul and Barnabas. They preached to the Gentiles on the authority of the Jewish scriptures. Notwithstanding the alleged vision, the emissaries from Judea strove so far to

put down the action as to call for the recognition of strict Judaism in requiring the Gentiles to be circumcised. In the discussion that ensued, neither the injunction of Jesus, nor the said vision, were appealed to as authorizing the call of the Gentiles, which was supported by appeal to the Jewish scriptures. The said injunction and vision must then be set down as nullities.

The conduct ascribed to Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, when he came forward as the apostle of the Gentiles, furthermore fatally overthrows the other portions of the record. If Jesus had solemnly selected his band of apostles to be the witnesses of all that he had said and done, and had commissioned them to carry his message to the ends of the earth ; if the Holy Ghost had been sent down from heaven to empower them to deliver this message ; if a vision from above had visited Peter to arm him with confidence to address the Gentiles ; how do we come to have in the Paul of the Galatians a special "apostle of the Gentiles," who could make it his boast that he never went near the constituted apostles ; that he received his doctrine from above, and not by contact with flesh and blood ; and that when, years later, he met with the apostles, they were incapable of instructing him in a particle of what he was bound to know. In this portraiture of Paul there is a total disallowance of all the other means said to have been divinely instituted for the enlightenment of mankind, and especially the Gentile portion of them. We are warranted, upon all grounds, in arriving at the conclusion that this movement towards the Gentiles was effected in some other manner than under the miraculous agency with which it is sought to justify and support the action. The step was not taken under the injunction of the risen Jesus, or through the bestowal of the vision to Peter, or by means of the special revelation made to Paul, as severally alleged. These are things of naught, put in for the sake of effect, and mutually destructive. Paul and Barnabas, Greek citizens, acting on passages in the Jewish scriptures which encouraged them, thought proper, of their own minds, and against the course taken by the first disciples of Jesus—that is against all constituted ecclesiastical authority—to proclaim him to the Gentiles. They did so in the Greek city of

Antioch, a place in which Josephus informs us the Jews were already in his time proselytizing. These were the natural means that suggested and advanced the movement, which was due to the force of circumstances and the propensities of the human mind, and to no special divine agency or manifestations.

The next change, apparently, that was effected was the conversion of the death of Jesus into an expiatory offering. This was a mighty alteration to suggest in the scheme of the reformed Jewish faith centring round Jesus. The teaching imputed to the founder that repentance insured forgiveness, and that all in the last day would be judged according to their works, had to be set aside for the sense that atonement required to be made for sin by the outpouring of his blood, before there could be any access to God, or acceptance by him. It was a doctrine not announced by Jesus, and was unknown to his immediate followers. It sprang upon the community at a later day, and had to be sustained with all the special authority claimed for its preacher in the Epistle to the Galatians. This was the secret of the overthrow of all the prior machinery. The instructions of Jesus when in the flesh, his enunciations when he showed himself at his resurrection, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, the angelic messenger sent to prepare Cornelius, and the "opening" of a door in "heaven" to shed forth a vision upon Peter, all went for nothing. "Jesus Christ, and him crucified," in this sense of the sacrifice, was the one thing necessary to be known and believed in, and this one thing had not been revealed on any of the alleged previous occasions, whatever the importance with which the manifestations had been surrounded. No wonder the writer of the Epistle to the Galatians found it necessary to sweep the whole paraphernalia that had preceded him away, and launch himself, and his doctrine, on his hearers, from an entirely new foundation. This, our second Paul, it will be remembered, was apparently the author of the Epistles to the Corinthians as well as that to the Galatians. His bold measure has established itself, but at the expense of the previous record. The parabolic teaching of Jesus is found absolutely defective. How could Abraham testify to Dives out of heaven, in the region of the departed, that Moses and

the prophets sufficed for the guidance and deliverance of his brethren from the perils of hell, if the only passport was the blood of Jesus? How could the divine father have thrown his arms round the prodigal son without the atoning and justifying blood being first pleaded between them? How could the suppliants using "the Lord's prayer," asking for forgiveness as they had forgiven others, hope for mercy without the offering of the indispensable blood? The picture of the paternal aspect of the Almighty, numbering the hairs of our heads, not letting a sparrow fall to the ground but under his ordering guidance, clothing the lilies in glorious apparel, "making his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sending rain on the just and on the unjust," was all unreal, if in truth he had placed the whole world under a curse, and was turning on them a look of wrath, to be averted only by blood.

Something has been done for the defective record to patch it up with the needed ingredient of the sacrifice. The saying of Jesus that he gave his life as "a ransom for many," the institution of the lord's supper, as recounted in the synoptic gospels, and such passages as that in John, which says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," certainly savour of the sacrifice, but do not actually proclaim it. The obligation was one of too vital consequence to be left to be guessed at. The sinner's jeopardy, and remedy, had to be plainly shown to him. The requisition that alone provided salvation had to be very clearly announced, especially to a Jewish mind, when it was a human sacrifice that had to be depended on. As much, however, as could be done for the record was, perhaps, here effected. And if we are to credit our second Paul, to him, or his time, the introduction of the eucharist is to be attributed. It is at this point only that the Pauline epistles exhibit any positive conformity to the gospel narrative, and the correspondence may be due to the interpolation or doctoring effected, as I suggest, in the gospels. "For I have received of the Lord," this writer declares, "that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you;

this do in remembrance of me;" and so likewise of the cup representing the blood shed for them. He did not get his information from the gospels, or from the apostles. In respect of these matters he had never "conferred with flesh and blood." He means therefore, in the fullest sense, what he says, that he had the institution from the "Lord" himself, and so imparted it to his hearers.

But other parts of the record remained inextricably in discord with the new doctrine, and prominently the received account of the agony in the garden, and the judgment and death of Jesus. These were apparently narratives too much encumbered with detail to be easily interfered with by the hand of the tamperer, and he has left them alone to the overwhelming disallowance of the use that has been thought to be made of the death of Jesus. The very essence of an offering, and especially of such an offering as that in question, is that it should be made willingly. But we have the figure before us of the miserable victim, foreseeing his doom, writhing in terror as his hour approached, casting himself to earth, sweating "as it were great drops of blood," and piteously and repeatedly entreating that he might be let off; while the inexorable being who claimed the sacrifice, appointed by him "from the foundation of the world," turned a deaf ear to his cries, and mercilessly, according to his "determinate counsel," handed him over to his destroyers. Could what was thus extorted be looked upon as an offering? and what grace or merit is there to attribute to a victim, praying for his release and carried off by main force by his slaughterers? The reservation on his part that God's will should be done is certainly a saving clause, but what we are looking for is the willingness of the victim. He certainly desired to avoid his fate. What satisfaction could an offended deity find in compassing the death of one thus unwilling to die? And if the death had the import afterwards imputed to it, if Jesus suffered sacrificially for the sins of mankind, surely the circumstances connected with his judgment and execution should have been such as to mark the purpose and the character of his end. But they do nothing of the sort. The narrative is constructed in form to show that there was no such meaning as since alleged belonging to these events. At the trial there was no question of Jesus

answering for the sins of the world. He had simply to answer for himself, according to the accusations raised against him by his enemies. The things laid to his charge involved no moral guilt, such as had to be expiated before the Almighty, even could such guilt be made to expand from Jesus to comprehend others. The aim is to show the nothingness of the accusations. The questions raised merely affected Jewish sentiment. Pilate therefore wished to refer the whole matter to the Sanhedrin, and when the populace clamoured for the execution, the judge, though yielding to them, as the story goes, solemnly pronounced the acquittal of the accused. He was thus not as the scapegoat sent forth burthened with the guilt of those who made him their substitute. He had no guilt whatever to bear judicially for himself or others. The thieves on the cross certified that he died thus guiltless. How we had our sins imposed upon him is therefore altogether inexplicable. Again, as to his death being accomplished sacrificially. Every element of a sacrifice was wanting to give it this character. There was no priest, there was no altar, there was no sacrificial knife, there was no ritualistic or religious ceremonial. Jesus died exactly as the thieves by his side died, on the usual stake appointed for criminals by the Pagan authority. The priests, if there were such, were the Roman soldiers, the altar was their crucifix, and the sacrificial instrumentality the nails driven into him to fix him on the stake. Who is to see in this that great offering to the Almighty now declared to have been enacted? Who is to trace in the agonizing cry of the victim, "My God, my God, WHY hast thou forsaken me?" the consciousness of the victim of the part he is said to have been playing, and in his dying groans "an offering" accepted by the Almighty, and coming up, forsooth, into his nostrils as a "sweet-smelling savour?" (Gen. viii. 21; Eph. v. 2). The dying thief, at his side, looking to him for deliverance, as it is stated, certainly was not relying on his atoning blood. He viewed him, as the evangelist puts it, as a great potentate coming to his kingdom, and asked to be remembered by him as such; and Jesus endorses the hope as thus expressed. And when he himself prayed for those guilty of his death, saying, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," the Pauline terms

become absolutely excluded. How could forgiveness in reliance on the sacrificial death of Jesus be asked for the offenders, while in the same breath it was acknowledged they were ignorant that what they were perpetrating was a sacrifice?

The description offered of Jesus while in the flesh, is a matter surrounded with perplexities. Was he man, or was he God shown merely outwardly as man? Was he also the Jewish Messiah? In what manner were his pretensions supported? The details are so conflicting, that there is no method of threading the way through the tangled meshes of the story woven, but by concluding that the several representations made are due to the growth of advancing doctrines to which the scheme was subjected.

The first aspect we have of Jesus, as I have shown, was that of a mere man in strict Jewish posture. That, I consider, was the original frame work of the story. There were prior histories current, to which, in the main, conformity had to be preserved, as Luke reveals to us. The incongruous details introduced must be attributed to accommodations representing later doctrine, and they come, probably, from the hand of a Gentile in connection with Christianity, while still in its Judaic form. The tables of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke must be of this order. No Jew, as I have already urged, aware of the absence for ages of all knowledge of the tribal distinctions, could have undertaken to trace the family of the carpenter Joseph backwards to David and Judah. Nor would such a one hope to impose upon those around him of his nation with such a statement. It was advanced in a Gentile circle by a Judaising Gentile. In like manner, no Jew would have made the mistake of assigning twelve thrones in the coming heavenly kingdom to the apostles, on which they should sit judging, or ruling over, the twelve tribes of redeemed Israel. To be an appropriate arrangement, the apostles should have been each of a separate tribe. But there is no attempt to show that they were thus distinguished or selected. In fact some of them were brothers, and therefore of the same tribe, if tribe there was, as Peter and Andrew, and James and John.

Jesus enters on his mission as an Essene convert to John,

undergoing baptism by him. Then he is seen apart from John prosecuting his ministry independently. He moves out of Essenism into a freer atmosphere of his own. He does not fast, he is under no restriction of diet, and mixes freely with the world around him in sociability. He proceeds to individualize himself, seeking to draw the regards of man upon himself personally. His people were to abandon all to follow him (Luke xviii. 22); whoever received him received him that had sent him (Mark ix. 37); whoever abandoned relatives or property for his sake and the gospel's, was to receive a hundred fold in this life, and eternal life in the world to come (Mark x. 29); whosoever confessed or denied him before men should be confessed or denied before the angels of God (Luke xii. 8, 9). He ventured to reform upon the Mosaic legislation, including even the decalogue, and proclaimed himself also "greater than the temple," and "Lord of the Sabbath day" (Matthew v. 21-48; xii. 6-8). He was some one standing above Solomon and Jonah (Luke xi. 31, 32).

We see him eventually presented as the Christ (Matt. xvi. 20; xxvi. 63; xxvii. 17-22; Mark ix. 41; Luke ii. 26-30), and, in some sense, the Son of God (Matt. xiv. 33; xvi. 13-17; xxvii. 40-54; Mark iii. 11, 12; v. 7; Luke iv. 3, 9, 41). He professes now that no one can have any knowledge of the Father but through him (Luke x. 22), and asserts that the distribution of the honours in the future state is to be in his hands, the kingdom to be then set up being his (Luke xxii. 30). These great pretensions are supported by the power of dealing with all things around him according to his will. He heals every sickness, remedies every infirmity, restores even life to the dead. He feeds multitudes on food created out of nothing; he subdues storms; walks on the sea as on dry land; is manifested in glory with the long departed Moses and Elias; rises from the dead; and ascends bodily into heaven.

But while all these things are said of Jesus, there are indications that the facts are devoid of any true foundations; that is, we discover in the incidents of the tale, that he could not have proclaimed himself as the Christ, or as the Son of God, or have performed the wonders attributed to him.

At an advanced period of his ministry, he is described as desiring to know whom men said he was. He is told that he

was taken by some to be John the Baptist (risen from the dead), by others, Elias, or Jeremiab, or one of the other prophets. Then he asks his disciples more closely whom they take him to be; and when Peter says, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," he blesses him, and declares, "flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Jesus, therefore, had hitherto never proclaimed himself; and when known, as is alleged, he enjoins it on his disciples, "that they should tell no man that he was Jesus, the Christ." In like manner, when discovered to be the Son of God by the unclean spirits, who had intelligence of the other world, not at the command of man, "he straitly charged them that they should not make him known. He rebuked the devils, and "suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ" (Matt. xvi. 13-20; Mark i. 34; iii. 11, 12; Luke iv. 41). It is apparent, therefore, that Jesus, when in life, never announced himself, either as the Son of God or the Christ, but that the titles were assigned him at a later date, as Christianity, in the hands of his followers, developed itself. The incident connected with Peter is furthermore shown to be an unreal one. The disciples had already recognized Jesus as the Son of God when he walked on the sea, and had "worshiped" him as such (Matt. xiv. 33), and the devils had known him, and said who he was. How then can Peter be declared to have had his information by a special revelation from above?

The account of the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1-9) gives similar results. Jesus is exhibited in glory, with Moses and Elias brought down to earth to attend upon him and do him honour. Then "a voice out of the cloud" says, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." The fact of the divine sonship had already been proclaimed by men and devils, but it is still thought necessary that the divine Father himself should make the enunciation. And when made, "Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the son of man be risen again from the dead." We have to reconcile, as we may, the proclamation of the sonship from heaven with the constant repression of the fact on earth. The real construction to adopt, no doubt, is that here we have the admission that the event of the vision was not known of in the lifetime of Jesus, and came to view only after his death.

"And they kept it close," we are assured, "and told no man in those days any of those things which they had seen" (Luke ix. 36). The pseudo-Peter professes to have been an eye-witness of this "majestic" display, and yet warns us that the light of prophecy, that mysterious and uncertain glimmer presented as a vehicle of information, is a "more sure" testimony than what had passed before his own eyes. No actual witness would thus invalidate his own evidence, and the conclusion must be that the whole tale is one of those "cunningly devised fables" from the imputation of circulating which the writer found it necessary to defend himself.

Jesus had to support his pretensions as a divine emissary with superhuman works. These are given in abundance, but in a manner to defeat their purpose. If Jesus might be viewed as one specially empowered from above, to take the lowest estimate of him, it is natural that Jews, with all the wonderments before them wrought by Moses, Elijah, and others, should have accepted these wonders from him as things of course. If he were of divine origin, or, as the scheme finally requires, on an equality with the Deity himself, these works fell within the compass of his habitual exercises of power, according to the apprehension of the day. But as each act is performed, pursuant to the manner of the narrative, the spectators are always filled with the utmost surprise. The testimony never advances; one miracle never leads to the expectation of the accomplishment of another miracle; the value of the worker never rises, in the estimation of those who behold him, beyond that of a mere man. When Jesus quells a storm, "What manner of *man*," they say, "is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?" (Matt. viii. 27). On his curing the palsied man, the multitude "marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power *unto men*" (Matt. ix. 8). When the dumb spake, "the multitudes marvelled, saying, *It was never so seen in Israel*" (Matt. ix. 33). Even at the close of his career, when he blighted a fig-tree, his disciples "marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig-tree withered away," on which he had still to give them a lesson on the exercise of faith (Matt. xxi. 20, 21). "And they were all amazed," we hear, "insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, what thing is this? what new doctrine is

this? for with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him" (Mark i. 27). On his restoring the maniac, and ejecting the devils that possessed him into the swine, "all men did marvel" (Mark v. 20). On his raising the ruler's daughter to life, "they were astonished with a great astonishment" (Mark v. 42). When he walked upon the waters of the sea, "they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered" (Mark vi. 5). When he cured a deaf man, they "were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well" (Mark vii. 37). At the miraculous draught of fishes Simon Peter "was astonished, and all that were with him," fearing, as a sinful man, to remain in his presence (Luke v. 8, 9). When he cast an unclean spirit out of a child "they were all amazed at the mighty power of God," and "wondered every one at all things which Jesus did" (Luke ix. 43).

It is easy to discern the object with which all this sense of amazement is introduced. The writers have thought to magnify the works, and therewith the workman, not seeing that the continual manifestation of the amazement in all its freshness leaves us with a man always on the threshold of advancing pretensions, and ever failing to establish them. Then we come to just such rebutting evidence as we have had respecting the pretensions themselves, serving to show that these things were never done. Jesus has constantly to enjoin it on the spectators to say nothing about what they had seen. They were to "tell no man;" to "see that no man know it;" he asked "that they should not make him known;" that they should "say nothing to any man" (Matt. viii. 4; ix. 30; xii. 16; Mark i. 44; v. 43; vii. 36; viii. 26). So far from offering such signs as warrants for accepting him, he declared that it was the stamp of "an evil and adulterous generation" to look for them. "Verily," he stoutly said, "there shall no sign be given unto this generation" (Matt. xii. 38, 39; xvi. 4; Mark viii. 11). *We are bound to conclude that no such signs were given.* The writers, conscious that the enactment of such marvels would have spread far and wide, and filled the world with the renown of their hero, and that there really was no such renown to be appealed to, thus smother themselves with a fatal excuse. "A prophet," they tell us, "is not with-

out honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house." That is, where he is intimately known, he is seen through and not believed in. He flourishes best when he is simply reported of in distant lands and remote times. And "there," it is added, in the heart of his own home, "he could do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them." He did, in fact, what he could, and that was but little. And "he marvelled," it is added with simplicity, "because of their unbelief" (Mark vi. 4-6). The naked truth at length comes out. He did nothing worthy of notice, and was not believed in.

I have still to deal with another source of demonstration presented to sustain the idea that Jesus was something more than mere man. He is invested with the power of prophecy. At the date when these narratives were written it was easy to put into his mouth a prediction of the fall of Jerusalem, for the event had taken place; but the catastrophe is coupled with the day of judgment, and that has not even yet arrived. He could say there was such a day, but could not venture to declare when precisely it was to be. "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark xiii. 32). There is an end of the essential divinity here, and even the divine sonship must be questioned. The writers, scheming the narrative, shrink from the test of dates, and thus escape the difficulty, but always at the expense of their hero. They, however, in the height of their enthusiasm, hazard the assertion from his lips that the awful day was near at hand. "Verily I say unto you," he is made to declare, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. xxiv. 34, 35). In truth, the words have passed away, and heaven and earth happily remain.

Jesus is said to have been in the habit of prophetically announcing to his disciples that he was to be betrayed, killed, and on the third day rise again. He could even say that his death was to be by crucifixion (Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 22-23; xxvi. 2, 32). These predictions are avowedly reported after the events pointed to had come to pass. They have never therefore had currency as actually prophetically announced.

The disciples are said to have questioned among themselves "what the rising from the dead should mean" (Mark ix. 10). The resurrection was a doctrine accepted at this time among the Jews, and the disciples, as it is said, had seen Jesus restore the ruler's daughter to life (Mark v. 41, 42). Whence then this difficulty of apprehension, unless thrown in for effect? But we are able to judge there had been no such predictions. Joseph of Arimathea "rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed" (Matt. xxvii. 60), thinking, evidently, that it was all over with the prophet of Nazareth. The female followers brought spices to embalm him (Mark vi. 1), not looking upon the death as other than an ordinary one. When the disciples at Emmaus were met with, their hopes had sunk, the occurrence of the death having utterly overcome them. "And beside all this," they observe with simplicity, "to-day is the third day since these things were done" (Luke xxiv. 21). The very time of the alleged prognosticated deliverance had come, but they were not looking for it. And when the actuality was declared that Jesus was alive again, the disciples one and all absolutely refused to believe the fact. The reports "seemed to them as idle tales" (Mark xvi. 11, 13; Luke xxiv. 11). The disciples never can have overlooked warnings of such stupendous consequence and interest, if really made; and when the events predicted each in succession came to pass, to the completion of the very time laid down for the resurrection, they must necessarily have readily accepted them.

Failing the thaumaturgical displays, we may consider how Jesus, as represented, may have acquitted himself within the legitimate sphere of human knowledge. He may not satisfy us of his capability of predicting the future, but surely he should have been competent to form a right judgment of what had already passed. We find him, however, accepting the legend of Noah and the flood, and the fables of Lot and Sodom, and Jonah and the whale. He has no qualms as to the identity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of Moses as the author of the Levitical legislation. When he uses the inspired writings of his people, he has recourse to the un-inspired, untrustworthy, version of the septuagint. He venerates the temple as the "house of God," not discerning that

the existing building was without the title to be thus estimated, even according to what should have been true Jewish sentiment. It was not the divinely ordained building by Solomon; nor yet that resuscitated by Zorobabel. It owed all its proportions and sumptuous appointments to the iniquitous semipagan Herod, who could equally reconstruct the shrine of Apollo. He had crowned the great gate of the Jewish temple with a golden eagle (*Josephus, Ant. xviii. 1, 2*), under which the infant Jesus must have been borne when there presented. The Roman effigy, however, sustained his presence undisturbed, although Dagon was unable to maintain himself in that of the sacred ark. Jesus furthermore is found, in many respects, on the low level of the ignorant population around him. He believes in a personal devil, and had conflict with him. No human witness was present on the occasion, so that we must take the account as traceable to his own lips. He tells us exactly what was said on either side by the devil and himself, and how the devil poised him on a pinnacle of the temple, and removed him to the top of a mountain so "exceeding high" as to exhibit to him "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them." The earth to him evidently was a mere disc, and of very circumscribed dimensions. The temptations offered him do not appear to us very serious in their character, but he was so shaken constitutionally after the encounter as to require special support. He thought, therefore, that angels had visited him to build him up. The devil with him is a great potentate, having a "kingdom" of his own, peopled with unclean spirits or subordinate devils, with whom he was constantly coming into contact. Ignorant of the true nature of physical disturbances of health, he attributed all maladies to these beings possessing and tormenting mankind, and conceived himself capable of casting them out. The narrators report to us the very words used by the devils on these occasions. The moon has an independent light of her own; the stars are diminutive objects capable of "falling" to earth; and the earth being a disc, he could "ascend" from a particular place upon it, and promise that he should come again, in like fashion, to descend upon it "in a cloud." It is an admissible excuse for the writers of these narratives to say that they depicted things according to the apprehension of

those days, but this is death to their characters as inspired men, and to the personage they describe as clothed with the being and attributes of divinity.

There is much, no doubt, in the teaching attributed to Jesus, which is both beautiful and true. Those precepts that would cast us, in full assurance, upon the Almighty, as our heavenly Father, conscious of our necessities, and caring for all; which exhort us to submit our souls to him in rectification of all evil working in us and around us; which encourage us to throw ourselves on his free forgiveness of our transgressions; which enjoin it on us to be kind to one another as an actual brotherhood—we may gladly profit by; but if they have been taught us as coming from Jesus, he equally had them from others before him, for they are universal truths, recognized in all ages by the reflective and well-meaning portion of mankind. Nor do they constitute Christianity as now held. But that Jesus, as depicted, maintained a perfect standard in himself, so as to present a living exemplar, which we may in all respects conform ourselves to, is far from being the case. "The question arises," a certain writer asks, "in what are we to be like Christ? Are we to be like Christ in *all* that he did, or only in those things we ourselves think good and excellent? Does the Christianity of Christlikeness include cursing fig-trees for not having fruit on them out of their season? Does it include whipping those we think impious, with a whip of small cords? Does it include denouncing the inconsistent as 'whited sepulchres,' 'hypocrites,' and a 'generation of vipers?' Does it include saying to one's mother, when she has failed to appreciate him, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee, mine hour is not yet come?' Does it mean that we are to tell women of other districts, when they ask for our benevolence, 'it is not meet to take the meat of the children and cast it to the dogs'? Does it include that we are to exercise our powers to destroy 2000 swine belonging to an unoffending man? Or does it mean that we are to be so little the friends of temperance as to produce 200 gallons of good wine for our guests after they have already well drunk?"* It is not necessary to suppose that these are blemishes in an actual life.

* "The impossibility of knowing what is Christianity," in Mr Scott's series.

The statements, one and all, it would be easy to show, have been put forward with a purpose in scheming a life which the writers have thought would commend itself as that of a being above our level. But the picture (impossible of realization) is ill drawn, and defeats itself, and the object designed, in several respects, sinks below an ordinary human standard, especially such as would be exacted in the present day.

The exhibition of Jesus in the gospel according to John, differs essentially from that in which he has been presented in the synoptic gospels, as the most cursory perusal discloses. The synoptists, in the primary frame-work of their narratives, give us Jesus as a mere man, tracing out his human descent. The gospel of John has no such element. Jesus is a divinity, on a par in the nature of his being with God himself. He is, therefore, ever alleged to be from above with a heavenly constitution. The Alexandrine Logos is incorporated with this ideal, making of him the actual creator of the world. This brings him into close relations with mankind, and the globe they inhabit. Every thing, therefore, centres in him, and he is occupied in preaching belief in himself, rather than, as the synoptists describe him, pointing to the Father. John indicates him as the Son of God, and does not venture to baptise him; the devil does not presume to tempt him; he meets his end boldly, without the debasing fears exhibited in the synoptics; and his enemies, even when arresting him, retreat and fall to the ground at the majesty of his presence. There was no need for an angel appearing to strengthen him. Nor did he flinch from the cup poured out for him. No man could take such a life as his. It depended upon himself to lay it down, and to take it again. He evinces no symptom of failing spirit on the cross. His course being run, he concludes it with the words, "It is finished," and bowing his head, voluntarily resigns his breath and expires.

The mode in which Jesus might become the Son of God has severely exercised the ingenuity of the early Christian writers. The passage in the second Psalm has obviously suggested the idea of making him a begotten being. How was this to be compassed as between the Deity and the human race to which Jesus in the flesh visibly pertained? That was the difficult question to be solved. When Christianity was in

its primitive Judaic form, the divine generation was made to date from his resurrection. A new life had been imparted to him, and it might be said, on that day when he had it, he was begotten. The words of the Psalmist were accordingly applied to the event in their integrity (Acts xiii. 33). As Christianity assumed further phases, the new birth was put back to his baptism. In Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho, c. 88, the passage in the Psalms is applied to this occasion, as it appears to have been also in the non-extant gospel of the Hebrews (Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, II. 34). Then, as the course of Christianity progressed, came the narratives we now have in Matthew and Luke of the actual procreation by the Holy Ghost. It became necessary thereupon to amend the representation made connecting the birth, as a new birth, with the baptism, and the terms of the Psalmist appear deliberately altered from, "This day have I begotten thee," to the milder and less significant speech, "in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii. 17; Mark i. 11). We have, therefore, in all these efforts, coupled with John's bold declaration of the eternity of the godhead of Jesus, the clearest possible evidence of the fabrication of doctrine, and of the hand of the manipulator shaping the scripture language to his purposes.

In the latest traceable manifestation of the divinity of Jesus, as effected at his nativity, the writers differ seriously in detail, while agreeing in the main circumstance of the parentage. Christianity must have far advanced in taking up Gentilism before a story so exactly framed upon Grecian mythological form could have met with acceptance. If such an union as that depicted wars against Jewish scripture and sentiment, equally is it in violation of what is taught in the Christian scriptures. Seeing that believers may not yoke themselves together with unbelievers, because of inequality (2 Cor. vi. 14), can it be that the Divinity should consort with one of the *fallen* human race in the intimate manner, and with the results stated? In what respect, essentially, would such intercourse differ from that alleged of the sinning angels, who, tempted by the attractions of the daughters of men, visited earth for the unnatural connection, and incurred the sentence of an everlasting doom (Gen. vi. 1, 2; Jude 6, 7)? The thing is the same, though the purpose may differ. Once seen through,

the story becomes tainted with the utmost blasphemy. The account in Matthew is not in the earliest manuscripts (Sharpe, *Egypt. Myth. and Christ.*, 19, 89), and the interpolation must have been made at a period far on in the Christian era. If it were the case that Jesus was thus divinely begotten, many were the occasions when it would have been of consequence to bring forward this important fact; but we never have it even distantly alluded to throughout the remainder of the record. And there is much positively to exclude it. Wherever the mere humanity of Christ is in question, the idea is controverted of his semi-divine origin. If, in the manner alleged, a "holy thing" had been brought to birth, would the circumstance have entailed impurity on the mother, requiring to be removed by an offering, as in the instance of an ordinary birth? And would the issue himself have had to be redeemed from penal consequences in the manner exacted for all the first-born of Israel? And how are we to reconcile the proclamation of the birth by a choir of angels with the reticence as to who he was attributed to Jesus himself?

The outpouring of power at Pentecost is said to have been the fulfilment of a prophecy of Joel relating to "the last days." But these last days have been prolonged now to over eighteen hundred years, and where is the power in question? It was manifested in the ability of the disciples to express themselves in languages foreign to them, and the form of the exhibition was therefore that of "cloven tongues," but "the last days" must have ended that day, for we never hear of the exercise of the gift again. It was replaced by the very opposite one, according to the second Paul, of utterances which no man could understand. The nullity of the vision to Peter is another circumstance, but this I have already dealt with.

That all the thirteen Pauline epistles, observes Baur (excluding Hebrews from the number), "which Christian antiquity unanimously recognized, and handed down as the epistles of the Apostle, cannot make equal claim to authenticity, and that many of them have against them an overwhelming suspicion of unauthenticity, is a result of later criticism, which is still gaining more general acceptance" (*Paul: His Life and Works*, I. 255). Baur, and most critics, following his lead, accepts the Epistle to the Romans, the two to the

Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Galatians, throwing discredit on the rest. "There has never," he says, "been the slightest suspicion of unauthenticity cast on these four epistles; on the contrary, they bear in themselves so incontestably the character of Pauline originality, that it is not possible for critical doubt to be exercised upon them with any show of reason" (*Ibid.* I. 256). The question is, What constitutes "Pauline originality?" Baur assumes that it is expressed in these epistles, which is begging the whole question. If the delineation of Paul in the book of Acts is a correct one, then these epistles cannot possibly be by his hand. I have given my reasons for accepting the statements concerning Paul in the Acts, in his connection with Judaism and his brother Christians, as made naturally and consistently without an apparent purpose, while the aim of the representation of him in the Epistle to the Galatians, which is the leading epistle in this set, is most apparent. In the one instance we have a Jew, holding no doctrines not consonant to Judaism, and practising Judaism in fellowship with the constituted apostles; in the other we have one essentially a Gentile, though calling himself a Jew, repudiating the apostles and their teaching, and setting himself up with an independent gospel of Gentile complexion. In the former account there is nothing at variance with probability. It depicts the well-understood Judaic features of primitive Christianity. In the latter there is the violent presumption to be adopted that a convert should at once have been armed with a matured doctrine of his own, warring with the already current doctrine, and without contact with any other earlier disseminator. If this position may be accepted, then it may be possible to believe in the Paul of the Galatians. If not, his veracity is at once called in question. He seems himself to have felt the need of supporting it with an oath.

The Epistles to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Galatians evidently hang together in scope of doctrine, and possibly in authorship. The Epistle to the Romans stands out distinctively in the mild philosophic tone of the author and his associations with Jerusalem. Assuming Paul to have written it, and that he was of the apostolic age, we are required to believe in a very early establishment of Christianity in Rome.

The "faith" of this church had been exhibited in such power, the writer declares, as to be "spoken of throughout the whole world"—that is far and wide. To whose ministry the planting of this church is due is not apparent. The writer makes it understood that he had not yet been to Rome, and was longing to go thither. We have Paul there in the Acts of the apostles, but at the end of his career, when he was cast into those bonds from which he never, as far as we know, was freed. We learn that he was met as he approached Rome by certain "brethren." These might have been merely Jews, for a few verses onwards we find Paul addressing "the chief of the Jews," whom he had called together, as "brethren." Such, in fact, is the designation given them by the followers of Jesus throughout the book of the Acts. But of the world-renowned Christian community at Rome we can discover nothing. The Jews with whom Paul had foregathered are described as inquisitive on the subject of the movement, and say, "We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for, as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." Had the church of Rome, contemplated in the epistle, been on the spot, could there have been this ignorance of what concerned Christianity? The issue is that a day is appointed when these inquiring Jews come to Paul, who formally addresses them as persons ignorant of the Christian scheme, and some believe, and some refuse to believe; on which Paul turns from them, and tells them that as their hearts had "waxed gross," and their ears were "dull of hearing," they were to know "that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and they will hear it." One must gather from the scene that this was the first occasion when Christ was preached at the Roman capital. The evidence connected with Josephus is of vast consequence here. He is found at Rome as an author till A.D. 93, and quite unconscious of such objects as Christ or Christianity. The epistle therefore clearly is not of the era ascribed to the apostolic Paul; nor is it conceivable how a genuine epistle to the Romans should have been addressed to them in a foreign tongue. Some one belonging to the Greek field of Christianity has schemed it in the name of Paul, and while allowing that he had never been at Rome, is able to crowd a chapter with greetings to persons

as of Rome, of whom he could personally have known nothing. Critics, it may be remarked, and prominently Baur, avoid the difficulty of judging the presumed Paul on this matter, by suggesting that the last two chapters of the epistle are by another hand, and are no part of the epistle as it stood originally. It is a question whether they are right or wrong in their surmise. To me the grounds stated for separating these chapters from the rest of the epistle are far from conclusive. The argument depends on the genuineness of the earlier chapters, which I altogether dispute.

There is a point on which historical evidence to identify Paul with the age asserted for him might have been maintained, had the circumstances represented been what in appearance they seem to profess to be. Paul, when on the point of being subjected to scourging, pleaded that he was a Roman citizen. On this the chief captain, Lysias, volunteers the information, "with a great sum obtained I this freedom;" whereupon Paul rejoins, "But I was free born." In the same chapter (the 22d of the Acts) Paul tells us that he was "born in Tarsus;" "I am a man," he had already said (Acts xxi. 39), "which am a Jew of Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city." Naturally we should infer that he had received his privilege of Roman citizenship by birth in Tarsus, the fact of which is thus reiterated. But, unfortunately, Tarsus did not receive its "jus civitatis" till long after the time asserted for Paul (*Grotius on Acts*, xxii. 28; *Smith, Classical and Biblical Dictionaries*, *Art. Tarsus*), and it is suggested he must have had some other source for his title. How Lysias, a Roman chiliarch, could have had to purchase his, is of course a question. Nor was the title to be acquired openly by purchase. Supposing that through some indirect channel, (the building a ship of a certain burden to carry corn to Rome has been suggested to me), the title had been really obtained by outlay of money, would the chiliarch have confessed the fact, thus baldly, and to a Jew? Altogether, here, as elsewhere throughout the Christian scriptures, where we have a right to look for history, we come upon myth.

That the Paul of the epistles was not of the alleged apostolic era may be inferred from the late date at which the compositions appearing in his name became current. "The

writings of Paul were either not used, or little regarded by the prominent ecclesiastical writers of the first half of the second century. After A.D. 150 they began to be valued" (Davidson, *Introduction to Study of N. Test.*, II. 521). That is, waving the precise periods spoken of, Dr Davidson thinks there has been an interval of about a hundred years between the issue of the earliest of the Christian scriptures and the usage of the Pauline epistles. Clement of Rome is thought to cite Paul, though the fact is one to be disputed, but if there was no Church of Rome in the first century, there was no such bishop of the alleged apostolic age. The epistle of Polycarp is considered by some to quote Paul, but this is not the case. Polycarp is a very mythical personage, and this epistle, which is addressed to the Philippians, seems framed for the very purpose of parading citations from the Christian scriptures, and presents, therefore, very questionable testimony. The authenticity of the epistle is commonly disallowed. The character of the earliest Christian writings is the absence of such quotations, it not being till a late era that the Christian scriptures were accounted authoritative. Dr Davidson, according to his view of the dates of these writings, says that "before A.D. 170, no book of the New Testament was termed *scripture*, or believed to be divine and inspired" (*Introduction to Study of N. Test.*, II. 520); which means that for a hundred years after the issue of the first of them, *they were taken to be mere human effusions*, to be accepted for what they might appear worth. Papias, whenever he may have lived, is certainly described as preferring tradition. "I do not think," he is reported to have said, "that I derived so much benefit from books as from the living voice of those that are still surviving" (Euseb., *Ec. Hist.*, iii. 39). Paul is also held to be cited in the epistles of Ignatius, but these are generally now understood to be spurious productions. On the other hand, the Pauline epistles are unmentioned by Hermas, Barnabas, Papias, Hegisippus, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch, and Athenagoras; while at a later time they are frequently appealed to, as by Irenæus and Tertullian. Christianity as it is, depends for its foundations on these epistles, and upon every ground connected with the progressive growth of doctrine which they unfold, and the usage of the epistles in

the early ecclesiastical writings, it must be concluded that they were brought out at a late era.

There was a vast body of Christian writings, belonging to the earliest times, which, in point of literary titles and pretensions, stood in rivalry with the accepted scriptures. These, by universal consent, are now rejected as apocryphal. This collection, so far as now traceable, embraced thirty-four gospels, twenty-two books of acts, five apocalypses, and various epistles and miscellaneous pieces, the whole known of amounting to ninety-seven (*Ante-nicene Christian Library; Man's Origin and Destiny*, by M.A. of Balliol, 376-379). The Ante-nicene Christian Library gives us those extant, which number thirty-three. Some of these writings are referred to by those who stand first in the field of Christian literature in point of currently accepted antiquity, such as Papias, and Justin Martyr, who show no absolute knowledge of the now accepted scriptures; and they are made use of, more or less, by those apparently of later time, such as Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, in whose days, *whenever they were*, all the recognized scriptures appear to have been current. Thus, certain of the apocrypha, it may be judged, are of prior standing to the accepted scriptures, and these and others are found in use throughout the time when the accepted scriptures saw the light. The period of the recognized scriptures is thus thoroughly enveloped in the current of this now declared apocryphal literature.

The subjects introduced in all this body of writings, accepted and condemned, though the treatment thereof may differ, are of similar complexion; that is, there is the endeavour to build up the character of Jesus, as a super-human agent, with thaumaturgical displays. The resource is one already worked to death in the Jewish scriptures, and in all the Pagan mythologies. It is a species of evidence commending itself to the ignorant, and universally disallowed, outside of Biblical statements, by the well-instructed portion of mankind. The effort, even in the canonical scriptures, is liable to be carried out with the utmost puerility, as in the interview of Jesus with the devil, the stirring up the healing virtues of the pool of Bethesda by an angel, the curing with spittle and clay, the incident of the demon-possessed swine, that of the tribute-

money discoverable in the fish's mouth, and the withering of the fig-tree. The apocryphal gospels teem with such like absurdities. The book of Revelation transcends the whole collection in its enormities.

And how do these writings hang together as the production of one controlling mind, the alleged divine author of the whole? The condition of the synoptic gospels reveals itself. They certainly give evidence of a species of unity, but it is that effected by writers who either lean upon one another for their facts, or are following some common document. Then they exhibit discordances of such a nature as to repel the idea that the writers have been influenced by any one directing mind. The fourth gospel, constructed upon a totally different scheme, introduces a fresh body of variation of historical statement. Then come the Acts, warring sometimes seriously with the gospels on the one side, and in its turn violently contradicted by the epistles on the other. The chief conflict raised by the epistles is on the score of doctrine, wherein they differ from one other; but they also quarrel with the facts of the gospels. In the Pauline epistles, the divine nativity and transfiguration are disallowed by the recognition of Jesus as the son of God being deferred to his resurrection; the miracles are never noticed; Jesus is described as "the first-fruits of them that slept," "the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence" (1 Cor. xv. 20; Col. i. 18), which excludes such events as the restoration to life of the widow's son, the ruler's daughter, and Lazarus; equally are Moses and Elias, who are said to have appeared to Jesus in glory, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, appealed to as existing in life with the living God, left destitute of true resurrection life. Nor is the physical resurrection of Jesus to be admitted. "Behold," he had said, "my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have;" in which body he was exhibited, "carried up into heaven," whence, angels assured his disciples, he "shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven;" whereas, according to the writer of the first epistle to the Corinthians, there is a "spiritual" body distinct from "that which is natural," and "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," nor

"corruption" "incorruption." This epistle moreover gives a scheme of reappearances of Jesus after death materially differing from the several accounts thereof in the gospels, which are also in conflict with one another. On the top of all, the meekness, gentleness, and forgiving spirit, inculcated in all the other writings, is overthrown by the fierce vengeful breathings of the Apocalypse.

The order in which these various writings have been put forth reveals itself to some extent. *The first in the field must have been some of the Apocrypha.* Luke discloses the fact that there were "many" other accounts of Jesus which preceded his own, and Matthew and Mark have a common origin with his gospel. Certain of the Apocrypha, accordingly, are referred to by early writers, who evince no knowledge of any of the canonical scriptures. We arrive thus at the important conclusion, that some of the Apocrypha have led the way in the projection of the Christian scheme, and have afforded ideas and facts for the construction of the canonical gospels. I place the synoptics next in the order of time, and after them the Acts, these being all linked together, and expressing primitive Judaic Christianity. The Epistles to the Thessalonians, and that of James, belong to this category. The Epistle to the Galatians must have been issued after the Acts, since its statements are framed to contradict those of the Acts. The Epistles generally may have occurred in the order in which they exhibit development of doctrine; that is, there came those that preach the sacrificial death, and then those that add in the pre-existence of Jesus. At this time the protest against Gentilism appearing in the Apocalypse must have been made. The last in the order have seemingly been those epistles which declare the divinity of Jesus, and the fourth gospel, which is the crowning of the incongruous edifice. It may be judged that often these writers may not have been cognizant of what others preceding them may have said. In those days the circulation of literary productions was unavoidably defective. In this way the ignorance in the Pauline epistles of the gospel representations may perhaps be accounted for. It must also have been the case that none of these writings had established for itself an authority to control the statements of the others, at the periods when the record was growing into being.

The history of Jesus has been advanced at a time far removed from that alleged for the events described. Contemporaneous evidence was thus impossible. The resource used was either tradition or imagination. The latter ingredient is certainly present, and possibly also the former. When once the scheme was devised of presenting Jesus as a divine agent for the introduction of a new faith, a crowd of writers, apocryphal and canonical, appear to have rushed into the field with a variety of statements more or less independent. They were without restraints in coining their facts. The era was one of deep superstition, limitless credulity, and dearth of true knowledge. There were no impediments from witnesses or information of any substantial kind, the times to be described being sufficiently remote not to hamper the narrators. The aim was a good and encouraging one, the intention being to turn man from evil ways, and direct his heart and conscience to God. The writers were not under the sense of the responsibility of presenting to the world inspired productions, save when they devoted themselves to doctrinal teaching. Even in the latter field the practice of supporting themselves with alleged revelation was by no means universal. Under all these circumstances the multiplicity and hardihood of the writers may be accounted for. That they should borrow from one another was inevitable; and their conflict of representation, whether on allegation of fact or doctrine, shows that they were all writing at a time when no one had as yet established for himself the character of an inspired author. That ambition had in truth not suggested itself to them. As time progressed, and controversies became sharp, the support of authority became a necessity. Then, gradually, from this mass of literature, those writings now relied on were singled out, and incorporated together, and at length became clothed with the attribute of inspiration.

The result of the whole process is the worship of Jesus; but what are we to think of his portraiture? By those who may have followed me thus far, a vast proportion of what has been laid upon him must be considered *absolutely untrue*. The misdescriptions are not due to defective information or error of judgment. They are the fruits of pure imagination, projected by persons seen to be quite unscrupulous in the manipulation

of their materials. The only question, therefore, is what may be the residuum of truth upon which the image of Jesus, as we have him, has been built up? Here we have only surmise to guide us, the writers of his history being unreliable, and there being no independent supports.

It is possible that there may have been such a person known of in Galilee. He is described as the son of a carpenter, himself exercising that calling, of Essene proclivities, entering, it may be judged, that community, and then going about in a fervent spirit to teach natural religion, tainted, however, with the asceticism of the Essenes, in so far as he may have required that all men should abandon worldly occupations, and practise the life of devotees. He may also have laid claim to some measure of wonder-working. Unless there was this basis of truth in the history, it is difficult to understand how the several accounts should centre round one person, and why the hero should have been placed upon the particular low unambitious level selected for him. It is possible also that he suffered death as a condemned criminal under the Roman law; otherwise it is hard to understand why this debasement should have been introduced. But whoever there may have been of this description to have afforded the nucleus for the history in question, it is clear, taking his time to be that alleged for Jesus, that he could not have been one who had created for himself, as a religious teacher and persuader of his fellow men, any marked notoriety, whether from the character of his teaching, or the influence he may have established; else would he assuredly have been noticed in the pages of Philo and of Josephus and other Jewish historians.

We have, then, in the representation of Jesus, something like a picture coming to us from the easel of an artist. The painter may have had an actual model to work from, but all the adjuncts with which he has elaborated his subject are purely ideal. *He puts him into what attitude he pleases, surrounds him with all required accessories, and makes him express the story he wishes to illustrate in the way he thinks most effective.* The paint is of course not spared. The shadows are deepened, the light is thrown in vividly, and the foreground brilliantly coloured. But the picture at length is found defective. It does not meet its ends. It requires fresh colouring to raise its

effects. It then falls into the hands of other painters, such as are the professional restorers, who overlay it with further efforts of art. These may be bold practitioners, and in the end strike out quite a novel representation of their own. We have had recently a notable example of the operation in the altar piece purchased for the National Gallery as the work of Piero della Francesca, the manipulation of which has been proclaimed by Mr J. C. Robinson (*The Times*, 9th June 1874). Of the paint that presents itself to the eyes of the admirers of this precious gem, not an atom, it appears, according to Mr Robinson, comes from the pallet of the original designer. The process affords an illustration of the creation of Christianity, as we have it. The primitive Jewish design is barely perceptible, and for practical purposes gone. The Gentile over-layings predominate, and alone feed the apprehensions. The portraiture of John obliterates the delineations of the synoptics, bringing before us an object of divine proportions in lieu of the mere Jewish teacher who before existed; and the simple doctrines traceable to such a teacher, as unfolded in the synoptics and the Acts of the apostles, are swamped and subverted by the mystic discourses of John, the subtle dogmas of the Pauline epistles, and the terrific imagery of the Apocalypse; and thus we have Christianity.

V.

THE GENTILE MOULDS OF CHRISTIANITY.

CHRISTIANITY, in its primitive form, was necessarily shaped out of the Judaic elements from the midst of which it sprung. These were afforded by the Jewish scriptures, the tenets of the Essenes and Therapeuts, and the Neo-Platonic theories of the Logos, as expounded by such a writer as Philo. When the movement was influenced by a large accession of Gentile converts, it was natural, while the development was in progress, that occasion should be found for admitting those strong currents of belief upon which this class had habitually depended; and thus the doctrines and mythologies of the Greeks, Egyptians, and Hindús, all met with in Alexandria, became laid under contribution to impart form and fixity of character to the nascent faith. Christians, conscious of their higher aims, are loth to acknowledge their obligations to such sources as these, but the similitudes are too frequent, and too striking, to be accounted for as other than due to deliberate adaptation. A vein of powerful sentiment, common to human nature, runs through these imaginings, which has served to give life and solidity to the whole.

The prosecution of sacrifice was a method common to Jews and Gentiles for conciliating an offended deity, and that of human beings ranked above all others for efficacy. The alleged death of Jesus, being an event present in the system, was readily turned to account as an incident to which to attach the value of a sacrifice. His divine sonship also naturally suggested itself to those whose Pantheon teemed with objects raised up from a superhuman parentage. Heavenly beings had been in the habit of consorting with females of earth,

from whom had sprung heroic progeny,* whose deeds had filled the earth with their renown. It was easy to endow the central personage of the new creed with similar attributes.

That it was thus the Gentile accessories modelled the object of their fresh adoration upon forms familiar to their regards, I proceed now to show.

It was a favourite idea that some heroic personage, often of divine mould, should encounter and destroy some determinate form of evil for the benefit of mankind; or that he should devote himself to death for the good of others. Instances of this description were numerous in the Gentile conceptions.

Bellerophon was such a person. He had incurred the jealousy of Prætus, King of Argos, who sent him with a treacherous letter to his father-in-law Iobates, king of Lycia. Iobates, seeking his destruction, commissioned him to destroy the Chimera, a monster with three heads, and made up of the forms of a lion, a goat, and a dragon, and which continually vomited forth flames. With the aid of Minerva, the hero returned victorious. Iobates then required him to put down the Solymi, and afterwards the Amazons, and in both expeditions he was successful. After this the king sought to put an end to him by means of assassins, but these he destroyed. The king was then satisfied of his innocence, and gave him his daughter in marriage, and made him heir to his throne (Anthon's *Lemprière*). The picture is that of an innocent man, charged with guilt he had not incurred, and through enduring persecution acquiring glory.

Perseus was the son of the virgin Danae by the supreme deity Jupiter. Having incurred the hostility of Polydectes, king of the island of Seriphos, he was deputed by him to kill the Gorgon Medusa, an enterprise so surrounded by difficulties as to appear fraught with certain destruction for the hero. By the aid of Pluto, Minerva, and Mercury, he accomplished his task, and cut off Medusa's head. He afterwards saw Andromeda fastened to a rock, destined to be devoured by a sea monster. Perseus went to the rescue, killed the monster, and delivered the victim, who became his bride (Anthon's *Lemp.*). We see the righteous man, with divine aid, overcoming various forms of evil, and receiving for his guerdon the object he had saved from destruction.

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," pp. 202-204.

Theseus, passing for the son of Ægeus, king of Athens, but accounted to be the offspring of Neptune, cleared his country of robbers and pirates, and then undertook to match himself with the Minotaur. The king his father had yearly to deliver seven youths and maidens to Minos, king of Crete, to be sacrificed to the monster, who was half man and half bull. Theseus volunteered to go in the lieu of one of the destined victims, to deliver his country from this onerous tribute. "I know," he said, "that help is of the gods, who preside over mortal men. On them I have called for aid, and my supplications shall not be in vain." The party were taken to the Minotaur, whom Theseus attacked and slew, and they extricated themselves from the labyrinth which led to the monster's abode by means of a gold thread that Ariadne, the daughter of Minos, out of love for Theseus, had adjusted for him. "Seek for the golden thread," he said to his companions, "and they tracked it forward evermore; when it seemed to guide by the most unlikely road, there they trusted in it the more" (Rev. J. M. Neale, *Stories from Heathen Mythology*). Ariadne after this became the hero's bride. He was one who, in reliance on divine help, risked his own life for the deliverance of others. He guided himself through tangled ways by ever adhering to the golden thread of truth. His reward is given him in the partner to whom he united himself.

Hercules was the son of Alcmena, wife of the king of Thebes, by Jupiter, who passed three nights with her. He was sent forth by his divine father to earn immortal life by services on earth. Though of such exalted extraction, he was made subject to Eurystheus, a king of Greece, the meanest and most timid of mortals. Eurystheus, seeking his ruin, required him to undergo his celebrated labours. The gods armed him for his adventures. He went, he said, to do his duty, having been warned that his life in this world would be full of dangers. Among other feats he destroyed the Lernean Hydra, possessed of a hundred heads. When deputed to bring in the golden apples from the garden of the Hesperides, watched by another fearful dragon, he said to Eurystheus that he was ready to undertake the perilous task, "for serving thee, I serve my father. And I never looked, in this mortal life, for ease or rest; it suffices me to labour here, and to

have my portion among the gods hereafter. The Hydra and the dragon are obvious Satanic forms, and the golden apples bring before us the tree of life" (Rev. J. M. Neale). A son of god takes on him the form of a servant to exterminate the devil and his works. He is endowed with power from above, and the goal he sets before him is heavenly bliss. Hercules, Perseus, and Theseus, observes Mr Cox, all had to pass through toil and danger to glory (*Manual of Mythology*, 68).

The Romans have a legend of Metius Curtius which gives an example of devotion. A great chasm had opened in the forum, and an oracle declared that it would not close until Rome threw into it whatever she held to be most precious. Curtius, declaring that there could be no greater treasure than the armed citizen, mounted his horse, clothed in full armour, and leaped into the abyss, which immediately closed over him (Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Myth.*). We have the death of Christ put on a similar footing. "For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. v. 7, 8).

There is a Grecian legend of the same description. When Thebes was attacked by the men of Argos, Teiresius the seer said the victory should be with the Thebans if they should offer a sacrifice to the god of war. Then Menœceus, the son of Creon, answered, "What can a man give better than his life?" and went forth and slew himself outside the city. In the midst of the battle a thunderbolt fell from heaven and destroyed many of the Argives, and the city was delivered (Cox, *Tales of An. Greece*, 342, 343).

Menippe and Metioche were daughters of Orion, a giant sprung from Jupiter, Neptune, and Mercury. Athena taught them the art of weaving, and Aphrodite gave them beauty. "Once the whole of Aonia was visited by a plague, and the oracle of Apollo Gortynius, when consulted, ordered the inhabitants to propitiate the Erinnyes (Furies) by the sacrifice of two maidens, who were to devote themselves to death of their own accord. Menippe and Metioche offered themselves; they thrice invoked the infernal gods, and killed themselves with their shuttles. Persephone and Hades metamorphosed them

into comets" (Smith, *Dict.*). They thus shone in heaven as stars for evermore.

The tale of Admetus and Alcestis gives a touching instance of self-devotion, and also illustrates the doctrine of a future state. At a feast given by Pheres, king of Thessaly, in honour of the marriage of his son Admetus with Alcestis, the name of Artemis (Diana) had been overlooked in the invocations made to the deities. For this oversight Artemis resolved that Admetus should die. Apollo stood his friend, but could do no more than procure the favour that his doom might be averted if another would die for him. Alcestis at once accepted the condition, and offered her life to ransom his. Admetus would not hear of such a sacrifice, but Apollo informed him that the Fates had accepted the offer which could not be withdrawn. Alcestis thereupon died. Hercules, weary and hungry, came to the abode of Admetus for hospitality, not knowing of the catastrophe that had occurred. Admetus smothered his grief and entertained the hero. Hercules came to know that the funeral rites for Alcestis were about to be performed. Just as the fire was to be applied to consume her remains, he descended to Hades, and overcoming Thanatos (death), brought Alcestis back into the world of life (Cox, *Tales of Ancient Greece*, 78, 79). When Admetus overwhelmed him with expressions of gratitude, Hercules said that the thanks were due to his Father (in heaven), who had endowed him with his strength (Neale). The mysterious condition was attached to the recovery of Alcestis that she was not to be spoken with for three days. It is made the period over which death prevailed to seal the lips of Jesus.

Eurydice, wife of the poet Orpheus, was bitten by a serpent, and died. Orpheus descended to Hades, and charmed Pluto with the melody of his lyre, and obtained from him the boon of his wife's life. But he was required not to look upon her till they reached the upper world. In his love for his wife he forgot the condition, and turning round to see her, lost her for ever (Anthon). Christ, it will be remembered, is sent on a similar mission to Hades, or the position of the departed, to redeem his bride (the Church) from the bonds of death.

The legend of Prometheus affords a remarkable type of the

sacrifice of Christ. Prometheus was of divine extraction, the creator of the human race, and the friend of man. He incurred the wrath of the supreme divinity, Zeus, who hurled him into Tartarus. From thence, after a long period, he returned, and was fastened by the still incensed deity to Mount Caucasus, to be tormented by an eagle. From this position Hercules delivered him (Smith's, *Dict.*). Æschylus, in his celebrated tragedy, makes him thus describe himself.

"Whoe'er thou art, a hapless god thou see'st,
Nailed to this crag, the foe of Jove thou see'st.
Him thou see'st, whom all the immortals,
Whoso tread the Olympian threshold,
Name with hatred; thou beholdest
Man's best friend, and, therefore, hated
For excess of love.

Soon as he sat on his ancestral throne
He called the gods together, and assigned
To each his fair allotment, and his sphere
Of sway supreme; but, ah! for wretched man!
To him nor part nor portion fell: Jove vowed
To blot his memory from earth, and mould
The race anew. I only of the gods
Thwarted his will; and but for my strong aid,
Hades had whelmed, and hopeless ruin swamped
All men that breathe. Such were my crimes: these pains
Grievous to suffer, pitiful to behold,
Were purchased thus; and mercy's now denied
To him whose crime was mercy to mankind:
And here I lie, in cunning torment stretched,
A spectacle inglorious to Jove."

(Bunsen, *God in History*, II. 47).

We have here a god-man, the actual creator of mankind, intervening between the supreme being and mankind, averting his wrath from them, saving them from destruction, and on their account himself stretched out fastened on a rock to perish, as Jesus was on the cross. And the whole scene is dramatized five hundred years before the Christian era.

Æsculapius, Pythagoras, and Plato, were all supposed to be sons of Apollo by human mothers (Smith's *Dict.*; *Anthon's Lemp.*). Æsculapius was a type of Christ in his miraculous cures, including the raising the dead to life. Pythagoras and Plato are associated with him in doctrinal teaching.

A belief in the resurrection of the dead was current in the Greek mythologies. We have already had the instances of Alcestis and Eurydice brought from Hades to life, and there are others. Dionysus, or Bacchus, recovered his mother Semele from Hades. His own body was cut to pieces by the Titans, and he was restored to life by Rhea or Demeter (Smith's *Dict.*). Persephone was carried off by Pluto to Hades. Her mother, Ceres, or Demeter, searched for her in vain, but Hermes brought her back to Eleusis (Smith's *Dict.*). Adonis after death was restored to the upper world by Persephone; but every six months he had to return to her, the intervening six months of liberty being passed with Aphrodite (Smith's *Dict.*). Mystic rites were established in commemoration of these several events.

The Eleusinian mysteries were organized to inculcate the doctrine of a future life. It was taught that the body brought sin into the soul which underwent reward or punishment according as it had resisted or yielded to the bodily inducements. The mysteries embraced three stages, that of Purification, Initiation, and Perfection. The Neophyte had to divest himself of worldly concerns, and to cultivate communion with the divinity. The profane were kept at a distance. These were the lesser mysteries. Having learnt therein what were the miseries of the soul while under subjection to the body, the recipient was initiated and introduced to the greater mysteries. The passage of the soul through Hades is then enacted before him, after which he is accorded a vision of Elysium. The descent of Hercules, Ulysses, and others, into Hades, and the fables of Bacchus and Persephone, are here made use of. Apuleius thus describes his initiation. "I approached the confines of death, and treading on the threshold of Persephone, and being carried through all the elements, I came back again to my pristine situation. In the depths of midnight I saw the sun glittering with a splendid light, together with the infernal and the supernal gods: and to these divinities approaching near, I paid the tribute of devout adoration." Plato, in the *Phædrus*, says, "In consequence of the divine initiation, we became spectators of entire, simple, immoveable, and blessed visions, resident in a pure light; and were ourselves pure and immaculate, and liberated from this

surrounding vestment, which we denominate body, and to which we are now bound like an oyster to its shell." On this passage Proclus observes, "That initiation and inspection are symbols of ineffable silence, and of union with mystic natures, through intelligible visions." Proclus gives vent to his aspirations in a beautiful hymn addressed to Minerva :—

"Great goddess, hear ! and on my darkened mind
 Pour thy pure light in measure unconfined ;
 That sacred light, O, all-protecting queen,
 Which beams eternal from thy face serene.
 My soul, while wand'ring on the earth, inspire
 With thy own blessed and impulsive fire :
 And from thy fables, mystic and divine,
 Give all her powers with holy light to shine.
 Give love, give wisdom, and a power to love,
 Incessant tending to the realms above ;
 Such as unconscious of base earth's control
 Gently attracts the vice subduing soul :
 From night's dark region aids her to retire,
 And once more gain the palace of her sire.
 O all-propitious to my prayer incline !
 Nor let those horrid punishments be mine
 Which guilty souls in Tartarus confine,
 With fetters fastened to its brazen floors,
 And locked by hell's tremendous iron doors.
 Hear me, and save (for power is all thine own)—
 A soul desires to be thine alone."

(Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries. Anon.).

With all those associations of sin with the members of the body ; with the struggles to "keep under the body" by "subjection ;" with the ideas of heaven and hell, and the judgment of the dead before a Pluto or a Rhadamanthus ; with the groanings "in the earthly house of this tabernacle," "earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven," "that mortality might be swallowed up of life," occurring in the Christian scriptures, earnest and enlightened Greeks were already familiar ; with the image (in many a varied form) of a Saviour of mankind, divinely born, God and man together, lowering himself for the sake of man, undergoing toil, peril, and even death, to effect their deliverance, the Greeks were provided equally as the Christians. The religions, in these great characteristics, were the same, and it was not difficult that

the one form of faith, in the progress of development, should pass into the other. The constituents were essentially identical; all that had to be effected was a change of scene, of name, and of historical incidents, for which the Jewish creed gave the necessary indications.

The early Christian writers of Gentile stock necessarily were well acquainted with the legends of the Grecian divinities. Justin Martyr, Tatian, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, Theophilus of Antioch, and Clement of Alexandria, all evince this knowledge in their writings. The conclusion was inevitable that the Christians had delineated Christ from Pagan models. This was an accusation constantly raised against them, and prominently by Celsus, and they felt themselves under the necessity of rebutting it how they could. "Nor is sentence upon us passed by Minos or Rhadamanthus" (observes Tatian), "before whose deace not a single soul, according to the mythic tales, was judged; but the Creator, God himself, becomes the arbiter." He thereupon lowers the attributes of Zeus, Rhea, Aphrodite, Artemis, Athene, Æsculapius, Apollo, and Kronos. "Such," he says, "are the demons." "Prometheus," he observed, "fastened to Caucasus, suffered punishment for his good deeds to men," on which he charged Zeus with envy (*Address to the Greeks*, Cap. vi., viii., x., xxi.). "We have been taught," Justin stated, "that Christ is the first-born of God, and we have declared above that He is the word of whom every race of men were partakers; and those who lived reasonably are Christians, even though they have been thought Atheists; as, among the Greeks, Socrates, and Heraclitus, and men like them; and among the barbarians, Abraham, and Ananias, and Azarias, and Misael, and Elias, and many others." "This, then, to speak shortly, is what we expect and have learned from Christ, and teach. And Plato, in like manner, used to say that Rhadamanthus and Minos would punish the wicked who came before them; and we say that the same thing will be done, but at the hand of Christ." "And when we say also that the Word, who is the first-birth of God, was produced without sexual union, and that He, Jesus Christ, our teacher, was crucified and died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, we propound nothing different from what you believe regarding those whom you esteem sons of

Jupiter. For you know how many sons your esteemed writers ascribe to Jupiter; Mercury, the interpreting word and teacher of all; Æsculapius, who, though he was a great physician, was struck by a thunderbolt, and so ascended to heaven; and Hercules, when he had committed himself to the flames to escape his toils; and the sons of Leda, the Dioscuri; and Perseus, son of Danae; and Bellerophon, who, though sprung from mortals, rose to heaven on the horse Pegasus. For what shall I say of Ariadne, and those who, like her, have been declared to be set among the stars? And what of the emperors who die among yourselves, whom you deem worthy of deification, and in whose behalf you produce some one who swears he has seen the burning Cæsar rise to heaven from the funeral pyre?" "And if we assert that the Word of God was born of God in a peculiar manner, different from ordinary generation, let this, as said above, be no extraordinary thing to you, who say that Mercury is the angelic word of God. But if any one objects that He was crucified, in this also He is on a par with those reputed sons of Jupiter of yours, who suffered as we have now enumerated. For their sufferings at death are recorded to have been not all alike, but diverse; so that not even by the peculiarity of His sufferings does He seem to be inferior to them. . . . And if we even affirm that He was born of a virgin, accept this in common with what you accept of Perseus. And in that we say that He made whole the lame, the paralytic, and those born blind, we seem to say what is very similar to the deeds said to have been done by Æsculapius." Then the apologist has to account for the similitudes, while maintaining that Christianity is derived from a divine source, and he does so thus. "Those who hand down the myths which the poets have made, adduce no proof to the youths who learn them; and we proceed to demonstrate that they have been uttered by the influence of wicked demons, to deceive and lead astray the human race. For having heard it proclaimed through the prophets that the Christ was to come, and that the ungodly among men were to be punished by fire, they put forward many to be called sons of Jupiter, under the impression that they would be able to produce in men the idea that the things which were said with regard to Christ were mere marvellous tales, like the things

which were said by the poets. And these things were said both among the Greeks and among all nations where they (the demons) heard the prophets foretelling that Christ would specially be believed in; but that in hearing what was said by the prophets they did not accurately understand it, but imitated what was said of our Christ, like men who are in error, we will make plain." In this manner features connected with Bacchus, Bellerophon, and Perseus, held to be applicable to Christ, are accounted for (*1st Apol.*, viii. xxi., xxii., xlv., xlv., liv). "When they tell that Bacchus, son of Jupiter, was begotten by (Jupiter's) intercourse with Semele, and that he was the discoverer of the vine; and when they relate, that being torn in pieces, and having died, he rose again, and ascended to heaven; and when they introduce wine into his mysteries, do I not perceive that (the devil) has imitated the prophecy announced by the patriarch Jacob, and recorded by Moses? And when they tell that Hercules was strong, and travelled over all the world, and was begotten by Jove of Alcmena, and ascended to heaven when he died, do I not perceive that the Scripture which speaks of Christ, 'strong as a giant to run his race,' has been, in like manner, imitated? And when he (the devil) brings forward Æsculapius as the raiser of the dead and healer of all diseases, may I not say that in this matter likewise he has imitated the prophecies about Christ" (*Dial. with Trypho*, lxix). Truly a cause must be desperate when it is to be thus defended. And the misery of the defence is that not only do the Greek mythologies precede the alleged prophecies in point of time, but that the Christ of the Christians is more closely shaped after the Greek mythologies than after the Jewish prophetic scriptures.

Besides drawing from the models presented to them in their own proper mythologies when building up their new faith, the early Greek Christians found ample resources in the Egyptian beliefs, of which they also availed themselves. The intercourse between the Greeks and the Egyptians is traceable to the time of Psammitichus, or B.C. 670, and the Greeks, who, in respect of their religious exhibitions, were a copying rather than an originating race, embellished their mythological system with Egyptian elements.* Both creeds,

* "The Legends of the Old Test." 21-24.

moreover, flourished in Alexandria, where the early Gentile Christians propagated their faith and possessed themselves of all surrounding ingredients for its development.

The Egyptians held the doctrines of mediation and atonement. Their kings were also endowed with the priestly office, and were thus types of Christ, who is presented in this two-fold aspect. Like him, "they were mediators between their subjects and the gods." A common sculptural representation is that of a king "presenting his gift to the god as an atonement for his own sins and the sins of the people" (Sharpe, *Egypt. Myth.* 21). It is the exact position of the Jewish high priest said in the epistle to the Hebrews to be fulfilled in Christ.

The dead were subjected to trial after death. Mr Sharpe gives a picture of the scene as taken from an Egyptian painting. The judge is on his throne; before him are the offerings made to conciliate him; the deceased is in prayer with four lesser gods interceding for him; on the other hand Typhon, the accuser of mankind, is demanding his punishment. His soul is weighed in scales against an image of truth, and judgment is pronounced upon him (*Ibid.* 50, 51). "The four lesser gods are themselves supposed to offer themselves as an atoning sacrifice on behalf of the sinner." Mr Sharpe gives a copy from a funeral tablet in the British Museum where the deceased is seen making this offering (*Ibid.* 52). Here is the very model of Christ as at once the mediator and the offering.

The Egyptian hopes and fears in the future state were described pictorially and in hieretic writing on a roll of papyrus, extending from five to as far as sixty feet, which was buried with the deceased. It spoke of his resurrection, the various trials and difficulties he had to meet with in his passage in the world to come, the garden of paradise in which he had to await the day of judgment, the trial on that day, and the punishment to be incurred by him if found guilty. The lake of fire prepared for the wicked is depicted, and also the tree of life in the paradise which the deceased enters if acquitted. In the branches of this tree is seated the goddess Neith, who is sometimes represented pouring the waters of life into an emancipated soul (*Ibid.* 20, 64-66). The early

belief was in the resuscitation of the natural body, which was preserved for this end by embalming. At a later time, but still long in advance of the Christian epoch, they held that there was a "spiritual body" distinct from that which is "natural," as taught in the 1st of Corinthians xv. 44 (*Ibid.* 45, 54). In the Egyptian Book of the Dead "very touching are some of the expressions in which the departed calls on Osiris to save him from his accusers, from the lake of fire, and from the tormentors" (Stuart-Glennie, *In the Morning Land*, 370).

The Trinity was a doctrine entertained by the Egyptians. "The gods were very much grouped in sets of three, and each city had its own trinity." "At Philæ the trinity is Osiris, Isis, and Horus, a group, indeed, common to most parts of Egypt." Mr Sharpe gives a representation of such a trinity, and says, that there is "a hieroglyphical inscription in the British museum as early as the reign of Sevechus of the eighth century before the Christian era, showing that the doctrine of Trinity in unity already formed part of their religion, and stating that . . . the three gods only made one person" (*Egypt. Myth.* 13, 14).

But transcending all their varied mythological representations, the Egyptians are found to have possessed a belief in the unity of God, as the author of everlasting life. In the Book of the Dead it is declared, "The Lord is God, there is but one God for me." "I do not die again in the region of Sacred Repose." "Whosoever does what belongs to him, visibly (individually?) his soul participates in life eternal." "Plait for thyself a garland, . . . thy life is everlasting" (Stuart-Glennie, *In the Morning Land*, 369, 370).

A leading feature in the Egyptian creed was a centralization of all hopes in their great divinity Osiris. He affords, in all essential particulars, a thorough representation of the central personage in the Christian creed, and was to the Egyptians all that Christ is to the adherents to Christianity. "Osiris was called the 'Manifester of Good,' or the 'Opener of truth,' and was said to be 'full of goodness (grace), and truth.' He appeared on earth to benefit mankind, and after having performed the duties he came to fulfil, and fallen a sacrifice to Typho, the evil principle, (who was, at length,

overcome by his influence, after his leaving the world), he rose again to a new life, and became the judge of the dead in a future state. The dead, also, after having passed their final ordeal, and been absolved from sin, obtained in his name, which they then took, the blessings of eternal felicity" (Stuart-Glennie, 358, *citing Wilkinson*). "I will write upon him," it is said, "the name of my God" (Rev. iii. 12), a figure already realized by the Egyptians.

The doctrine of the incarnation, "God manifest in the flesh," exhibited prominently in the god-man Osiris, was also displayed in lower forms. The bull Apis was believed to be born from a ray which darted from heaven on his mother. He was considered to be an image of the soul of Osiris, which migrated from one Apis to another. He was not the god, but the living shrine in which the divine nature had become incarnate (Kenrick, *Ancient Egypt*, II. 22, 25). His birth was thus ever miraculous, without an earthly father. "Every king of Egypt, even while living, was added to the number of the gods, and declared to be the son of Ra." "He denied that he owed his birth to the father from whom he inherited the crown; he claimed to be born, like the bull Apis, by a miraculous conception." The author gives us an illustration of the birth of King Amunothph III., taken from the temple of Luxor, which he thus explains. "First, the god Thoth, with the head of an ibis, and with his ink and pen-case in his left hand, as the messenger of the gods, like the mercury of the Greeks, tells the maiden queen Mautmes that she is to give birth to a son, who is to be King Amunothph III. Secondly, the god Kneph, *the spirit*, with a ram's head, and the goddess Athor, with the sun and cow's horns upon her head, both take hold of the queen by her hands, and put into her mouth the character for life, which is to be the life of the coming child." The process of the delivery is indicated. "Lastly, the several gods or priests attend in adoration upon their knees to present their gifts to this wonderful child, who is seated in the midst of them, and is receiving their homage" (Sharpe, *Egypt. Myth.* 17-19). The models for the annunciation of the birth of Jesus, the miraculous conception of his virgin mother, and his adoration by the eastern Magi, are thus exactly supplied in the Egyptian figurations.

The Egyptian Book of the Dead, in which so much appears illustrative of Christian doctrine, is considered "to have been written with the finger of Thoth himself." One of its hymns, not in its original simplicity, but already mixed up with glosses and commentaries, has been found inscribed on the coffin of queen Mentuhept of the eleventh dynasty, the era of which is placed by Bunsen at 2782 B.C. "This hymn implies not only the worship of Osiris, but the whole system of doctrines connected with his redeeming life on earth and judicial office in heaven." Thus, "in ancient Osirianism, as in modern Christianity, the Godhead is conceived as a Trinity, yet are the three Gods declared to be only one God. In ancient Osirianism, as in modern Christianity, we find the worship of a divine mother and child. In ancient Osirianism, as in modern Christianity, there is a doctrine of atonement. In ancient Osirianism, as in modern Christianity, we find the vision of a last judgment and resurrection of the body; and, finally, in ancient Osirianism, as in modern Christianity, the sanctions of morality are a lake of fire and tormenting demons, on the one hand, and, on the other, eternal life in the presence of God" (Stuart-Glennie, 366, 367, 371).

The task of the Christian delineators in the atmosphere of Alexandria was not a difficult one. There was not much left to them to create by efforts of the imagination. The materials to be worked upon were all at hand, rampant and greedily believed in by the surrounding population. They had merely to make their selection, and represent them in their newly-devised religion. The facts were all prepared; a change of names was all that was requisite to make the appropriations their own. No one, in the days of the projection, ventured to pass off those fanciful exhibitions as original and inspired; but as time progressed, and the believers became more and more separated and alienated from the period and the sources of the first beliefs, the character was given to the whole, which it has now borne for many centuries, of solid primitive truth, not derived from any field of human knowledge, but due to direct communication from above.

We have to turn now to the true masters in the art of developing religious beliefs, namely the Orientals of India, from whom, in all early ages, through an unfathomable anti-

quity, have flowed those currents of artificial doctrine and imaginative representation which have sown themselves, in varied forms, among the nations westward of them. I will begin with what relates to the Buddhist movement, as standing nearest to Christianity in point of time, and as known to have touched the field of Christianity in Alexandria.

The death of Buddha is considered to be an era of a properly historic character, and is placed ordinarily at B.C. 543.* Buddha is held to have lived till over the age of eighty, and to have passed the last forty or fifty years of his life as a religious reformer. His ministry, therefore, may be safely said to have begun fully six hundred years before that alleged for Christ. The creed prevailing in his name matured itself in a manner corresponding very exactly to that in which the doctrines of Christianity became fixed and established. Buddha adopted the ascetic principles that had long prevailed around him among the devout Hindús. The flesh was seen to be in warfare with the spirit, and had to be kept down by abstinence from whatever fed its desires. He called upon all to devote themselves to the religious life, protesting against the domination of the Hindú priestly class, and the exclusiveness of Hinduism. He threw the door open to all to follow him in the path he offered them, and vast portions of the eastern nations in time adopted his views and called themselves after his name. While the reformer was in life there was no necessity felt for recording his teachings. They were of a simple order, inculcating practical godliness to be exhibited chiefly in acts of goodwill towards mankind. After his death his followers complicated the system with elaborate theories and mystical imaginings. Discussions and dissensions ensued, and the need of authoritative records was felt. Then, about three hundred years after the founder's death, the secular power interposed. King Asoka, who had adopted the reformed faith, convoked a council for ascertaining the doctrines to be accepted as those of the great teacher, distinguishing between the heretical and the genuine, and thus the Buddhist canon was settled (Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Religion*, 29-31). We have all this repeated in the story of the Christian movement. Jesus is represented as appearing on

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," 15.

the scene as a reforming Essene ascetic, calling on men to deny the flesh and the world in order to cultivate their relations with God. He entered his protest against scribes and Pharisees; his faith led on to break down the exclusiveness of the Jewish creed, and to make a free way of acceptance before God, equally for all nations; his followers spread widely around, and called themselves after his name; his teachings were simple, directed to the moral guidance of mankind, free of abstruse theory or dogma, and did not require to be recorded. After his death elaborations and additions were made, which led to incessant questionings and discord. Then, also at an interval of about three hundred years after the alleged death of the founder, came the intervention of the secular authority, and through the means of the council of Nicœa (A.D. 325,) Constantine sought to put down what was viewed as heresy, and establish the true faith.

Primitive Buddhism was "absorbed by one thought—the vanity of finite existence, the priceless value of the one condition of Eternal Rest." It was "a revulsion from a degraded and unsatisfying ceremonial worship to a moral conviction that life and its pleasures are insufficient to satisfy the cravings of the heart; and that virtue is the only road to happiness." The abandonment of worldly goods, and the vow of mendicancy, was the way enjoined to promote virtue. Meditation was considered effectual in uniting man to the Divinity (the Rev. S. Beal, *A Catena of Buddhist scriptures from the Chinese*, 143-146, 150). Such was also, in its essentials, primitive Christianity.

The Dhammapada, or Path of Virtue, which is a chief Buddhist authority, has the following descriptive precepts:—
 "The man who is free from credulity, but knows the Uncreated, who has cut all ties, removed all temptations, renounced all desires, he is the greatest of men." "Let us live happily then, *not hating those who hate us!* Let us dwell free from hatred among men who hate!" "Let us live happily then, *though we call nothing our own!* We shall be like the bright gods, feeding on happiness!" "He who calls nothing his own, whether it be before, behind, or between, who is *poor*, and *free from the love of the world*, him I call indeed a Brâhmana." Then we get an exhibition of the ultimate aims of the faith.

"He who knows his former abodes, who sees *heaven and hell*, has reached the end of births, is perfect in knowledge and a sage; he whose perfections are all-perfect, who has *overcome this world*, him I call indeed a Bráhmāna" (Max Müller, on Capt. Rogers' Translation of *Buddhaghosha's Parables*; Bunsen, *God in History*, I. 347, 353, 354).

It has been unjustly imputed to the great Hindú reformer that, whatever his merits as a teacher of godliness, he had no better aim to put before mankind, as the ultimate end of all his aspirations, than the attainment of Nirvána, understood to mean the extinction of his entity. Professor Max Müller has discoursed copiously on this theme, but has now come to see that the word Nirvána bears a very different construction. Mr Colebroke, a great Sanscritist, appears always to have held that it implies merely "profound calm" (Beal, 172). Baron Bunsen has also kept clear of the erroneous interpretation of the term. Nirvána, he says, is "the annihilation of our desires, not of our perceptions;" it is "not that which befalls the wise and righteous man after death, but that which is to be the aim of his effort for this life and in this life, viz., the absence of desire, or, in other words, inward peace" (*God in History*, I. 338, 348, note). Max Müller, in his later view of the subject, says that he agrees with Burnouf that Buddha did not teach extinction as the ultimate end of man. Nirvána, he observes, certainly means a blowing out or passing away, but it occurs in Brahmanic writings as synonymous with Moksha, Nirvriti, &c., meaning the highest stage of spirit-liberty and bliss, but not annihilation. Nirvána is applicable to the extinction of selfishness, desire, and sin. Moreover, Buddha was still on earth after he had seen Nirvána, and appeared to his disciples after death (*Intr. to Buddhaghosha's Parables*, xl., xli.).

The Khuddaka Patha, a Páli text, treats of this subject. "Nirvána," it is said, is "sin-destroying, passionless, immortal, transcendent. There is nought like this doctrine." "They have entered on the way of Nirvána, they have *bought it without price*, they enjoy perfect tranquillity, they have obtained the greatest gain." "He who is blest with the knowledge of Nirvána, and has cast off these three sins, vanity, and doubt, and the practice of vain ceremonies, the same is delivered from the four states of punishment, and cannot com-

mit the six deadly sins." "Concealment of sin is declared to be evil in one who has gained a knowledge of Nirvána." "As the tree tops bloom in grove and forest in the first hot month of summer, so did Buddha preach, for the chief good of men, his glorious doctrine that leads to Nirvána." Then the treatise proceeds to show that the Buddhist is taught to look forward to the joys of a heavenly home when he leaves this life. "The spirits of the departed are declared to be around us." "The hidden treasure" to be desired is "a treasure of charity, piety, temperance, soberness;" "*a treasure secure, impregnable, that cannot pass away.* When a man leaves the floating riches of this world, this he takes with him after death." "A treasure unshared with others, a treasure *that no thief can steal.*" "All human prosperity, every pleasure in celestial abodes, the full attainment of Nirvána, all these this treasure can procure." "This is what should be done by him who is wise in seeking his own good, who has gained a knowledge of the tranquil lot of Nirvána. Let him be diligent, upright, and conscientious, meek, gentle, not vain-glorious." Then follow a number of ethical rules to make a man harmless and benevolent in this life (R. C. Childers, in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, New Series, IV. 315-325).

Professor Max Müller observes that it is clear that extinction is not taught in the Dhammapada. Buddha is therein described as calling reflection the path to immortality. Nirvána is termed "the highest happiness," and is contrasted with destruction. "Some people," says Buddha, "*are born again* (on earth); *evil-doers go to hell*; *righteous people go to heaven*; those who are free from all worldly desires enter Nirvána. Buddha speaks of the uncreated and eternal, synonymously with Nirvána. "When you have understood the destruction of all that was made, you will understand that which was not made," by which, the Professor points out, "Buddha spoke of what is imperishable and eternal" (*Intro. to Buddhaghosha's Parables*, xli.-xliv.).

Buddhism, it is apparent, has nothing to learn from Christianity in the cultivation of those thoughts which lead men out of themselves to God. It regulates with the utmost care the course they should take to keep out of evil in this life, and presents them with the highest hopes in the futurity. Prof.

Max Müller cites in Bishop Bigandet, the Vicar Apostolic of Ava and Pegu, an unwilling witness to the strong similarity of the Buddhist precepts to those of the Christian scriptures. "The Christian system," the Bishop observes, in his *Life of Buddha*, "and the Buddhistic one, though differing from each other in their respective objects and ends as much as truth from error, have, it must be confessed, many striking features of an astonishing resemblance. There are many moral precepts equally commanded and enforced in common by both creeds. It will not be considered rash to assert that most of the moral truths prescribed by the gospel are to be met with in the Buddhistic scriptures" (*Intro. to Buddhaghosha's Parables*, xxv.).

In the passages quoted by me from Buddhist texts have occurred various sentiments which the Christian student will recognize as embellishing his scriptures. These I have distinguished in their places by italics, and will now repeat. "Not hating those that hate us;" "though we call nothing our own;" being "poor and free from the love of the world;" able to "overcome this world;" "bought without price;" having "a treasure secure, impregnable, that cannot pass away," and which "no thief can steal;" one who is "born again." "Evil-doers," it is said, "go to hell; righteous people go to heaven," so that the conditions for the just and unjust, apparent in the Christian scheme, were equally before in the Buddhist. "Between the language of Buddha and his disciples," observes Max Müller, "and the language of Christ and his apostles, there are strange coincidences. Even some of the Buddhist legends and parables sound as if taken from the New Testament, though we know that many of them existed before the beginning of the Christian era. Thus, one day Ananda, the disciple of Buddha, after a long walk in the country, meets with Mátangé, a woman of the low caste of Kándálas, near a well, and asks her for some water. She tells him what she is, and that she must not come near him. But he replies, "My sister, I ask not for thy caste or family, I ask only for a draught of water." She afterwards becomes herself a disciple of Buddha" (*Science of Rel.*, 243, citing Burnouf). Buddha, it was said, performed miracles, and spoke in parables (*Beal*, 135, 136). In the sculptures of the cave temples of Ajunta, he is seen "healing the sick and giving sight to the

blind" (Prof. Wilson in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, XIII., 209). But, in singular parallelism with what is stated of Christ and his alleged miracles, while these performances are ascribed to him, he is said, when "challenged by the multitudes, who required a sign that they might believe," to have interdicted the exhibition; that is, he must have refused to give the sign (Max Müller, *Science of Rel.*, 27).

"It may be said," remarks Bishop Bigandet, "in favour of Buddhism, that no philosophico-religious system has ever upheld, to an equal degree, the notions of a Saviour and deliverer, and the necessity of his mission for procuring the salvation, in a Buddhist sense, of man. The rôle of Buddha, from beginning to end, is that of a deliverer, who preaches a law designed to procure to men the deliverance from all the miseries he is labouring under" (Max Müller, *Intro. to Buddhaghosha's Parables*, xxv., xxvi.). He laid open a "way of salvation" to all men, and called himself comforter and saviour, and his writings are designated "Holy Scriptures" (Rowland Williams, *Christianity and Hinduism*, 27-35).

The personal history of Buddha resembles that of Christ so closely as to leave room for no other conclusion than that the incidents of the one life have been used to illustrate the other. Buddha's career long preceded that ascribed to Jesus, and the recognized history of his life, entitled the *Lalita Vistara*, is considered to have seen the light about B.C. 150. The particulars have been often recounted. The great reformer was called Sakya Muni, denoting, as it is thought, that he was a Scythian by extraction. The Scythians invaded Western Asia about B.C. 625, which corresponds with the era alleged for the birth of Buddha. The Buddhist topes or stúpas are considered to be Scythian in character, and the reformer's instructions for the disposal of his remains after death are said to have been in conformity with the Scythian rites. This origin may account for his independence of Brahmanism, and for the zeal and spirit with which his reforms were instituted. It was the invasion of the established faith from a fresh and foreign source as when Greek Gentilism in Christianity overthrew Hebrew Judaism. Buddha, like Christ, had a pre-existence in heaven before he condescended to be born on earth. "By the constraining power of his great love" he made this advent for the

deliverance of mankind from sin and its consequences. The Dévas, or divinities, selected Suddhódana, King of Kapilavastu, to be his father. His mother was a virgin. He miraculously entered her womb, and was born from her side, without the intervention of a human father. As an infant he was presented at the temple of Mahéshwara, when all the figures of the gods rose up and did him obeisance. As an adult, he passed his first years in his father's palace, leading a life of enjoyment. Then the vanity of a worldly existence was impressed upon him by his observing four sights, that of a worn-out man, a leper, a corpse, and a religious mendicant with a joyous countenance. On this he gave up his royal position, and for six years practised austerities, and lived as an ascetic. "Though he was rich," for the sake of others "he became poor, that they, through his poverty, might be rich." He followed, in fact, the Essenism of his day, as Jesus is represented to have done. In the Sanchi Topes near Bhilsa, he is depicted "giving away his whole possessions, his children, and his wife, so that there might be no remnant of selfishness left in his nature, and thus he might be fitted to undertake the salvation of men." Then he was assailed with temptations by the demon Mára, but he resisted them, and the tempter withdrew defeated. The corresponding temptation of Jesus by the Devil, at the outset of his ministry, will of course occur to every one. His spiritual victory being thus established, he entered upon his mission (Prof. Wilson in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, XVI., 242-248; Wilson, *Essays on Rel. of the Hindús*, II., 335-340; Beal, *Catena of Buddhist scriptures*, 5, 127-134).

Buddhism made rapid advances, even during the life-time of its founder; and about the middle of the third century B.C., when it had become a state religion, in the reign of king Asoka, it began to spread all over India. It so flourished till the fifth century of the Christian era, when the Bráhmans succeeded in obtaining the ascendancy and extirpated it from India; but it has retained its hold to the present day in Ceylon, Burmah, and the Eastern Archipelago, and from the Caucasus to Japan, including Asiatic Tartary, Tibet, Nepal, and China. It is supposed still to number 340,000,000 of adherents, being in excess by about 5,000,000 of the estimated number of Christians (Schlagintweit, *Buddhism in*

Tibet, 9-14; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, I, 58). By a faith thus attractive, and thus successfully propagated, it is not to be supposed that Alexandria, an emporium of commerce, and on the highway between the nations of the east and the west, should have failed to become influenced. We find, accordingly, in just the time of the activity of the Buddhist missionaries, namely, in the two centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, a sect in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, who, in all essential respects, represented the Buddhists; and they occurred also in Palestine. I refer, of course, to the Therapeuts and Essenes. These sectaries maintained their connection with Judaism, but, like the Buddhists, gave up the world, and its enjoyments, to cultivate the aspirations of the soul. They devoted themselves to the good of their fellow creatures, and were active propagandists; they abstained from eating flesh, practised ablutions for spiritual purification, and purified themselves, especially for their meals, or when they happened to come in contact with those of another or a lower denomination than themselves—features all betraying the oriental origin of their system. They furthermore had an unnamed “law-giver,” and “sacred scriptures,” the character of which has not been divulged. There seems nothing to attribute to them, in view of all the specialities that distinguished them, but that they may have recognized Buddha as their founder, and possessed his “holy scriptures,” of which circumstances, being still in Jewish connection, they made a mystery.

But we are not left to inference in this matter of the access of Buddhism to the Christian field. There is direct evidence that the legend of Buddha found its way to Alexandria in the earliest times that can be alleged for Christianity. In the controversies that arose between the first Christians and the Manicheans, the doctrines of the latter were traced to one Scythianus. The name associates him with that Scythic nationality to which Buddha also apparently belonged. This Scythianus is said to have been a man of literary habits, a merchant trading with India, married to an Egyptian slave girl, domiciled in Alexandria, versed in the philosophies and learning of India and Egypt, and a contemporary of the apostles. In this manner he is said to have constructed those

peculiar views expressed in Manichœism, and it is alleged that, in order to test his doctrine, he went to Jerusalem and disputed with the apostles. Shortly after this he died, when his slave and disciple Terebinthus is said to have possessed himself of his effects and papers, armed with which he went to Babylon, and there gave himself out to be Buddha, and born of a virgin. Mr Priaulx gives the account as obtained from Archelaus' disputation held in A.D. 275-9, the Catacheses of Cyril of Jerusalem of A.D. 361, and the work on heresies of Epiphanius of A.D. 375 (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, XX. 269, 270). Professor Wilson notices that Clement of Alexandria, accounted to have been of the second century, and Porphyry, who was of the third, exhibit a knowledge of the Buddhists and their ways; also that Jerome, who lived at the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth, knew of the birth of Buddha from the side of a virgin; as also did Hieronymus, according to Mr Priaulx, who was of A.D. 420, and had the fact as a tradition of the Gymnosophists, whom Major Cunningham considers to have been Buddhists (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, XIII. 113; XVI. 231; XX. 271; Wilson, *Essays on Rel. of Hindûs*, II. 315). Mr Beal notices a remarkable instance of the manner in which the legend of Buddha obtained currency among the Westerns. "In the middle ages," he states, "there was a favourite legend known throughout Europe, and generally accepted as genuine, under the name of Barlaam and Josaphat. This history is at present widely circulated in the modern edition of 'The Lives of the Saints, by Simeon the Translator.' But on examination we find that the life of Josaphat, who has somehow crept into the Roman Martyrology, was but a copy of the well-known history of Sakya Buddha, and was appropriated doubtlessly by the early Christian hagiographers, as being in itself a very touching and natural account of the struggle of a sensitive conscience with the temptations of a wicked and ensnaring world" (*Catena*, 5).

On the whole, if we are satisfied, as we must be, of the identity, in many respects, of the doctrinal aims of Buddha and those of the Christians, and of the correspondence of Buddha with Jesus in the grand outlines of character and work, as well as in several important personal particulars and associated incidents, we need be under no difficulty in assuring

ourselves that the early Christians, in scheming out their new faith, had ample opportunities of building it up with the tempting materials afforded them by the corresponding movement, instituted, in a prior age, by the great Indian reformer. Their contact with Therapeuts and Essenes, those essential Buddhists, from out of whom their founder, according to the details given of him, must have taken his path, will alone account for much of these similitudes; and the sphere of Alexandria, with its intercourse with the East, and aptitude for cultivation of Eastern philosophies, explains the rest. Proofs existing of the knowledge of Buddhistic history among renowned Christian writers of very early periods, it may readily be concluded that there was such knowledge, in the same circle, from the first.

The traffic maintained between India and Alexandria, the interest taken in Alexandria in the mystical doctrines flowing in from the East, and the operations of Buddhist missionaries actively propagating their beliefs in this field, amply suffice to account for the appearance in the Christian creed, newly developing in Alexandria, of those Eastern religious elements which so largely pervade and influence it. The presence of the Buddhist missionaries and their literature, of which such decided traces are found in association with Alexandria and the early Christians, of itself explains the introduction to the knowledge of the Christians of whatever was current in mythical form in Hinduism. The Buddhists, while discarding the ritual of the Bráhmans, acknowledged the various divinities of the Hindú pantheon, and in the *Lalita Vistara* occur the names of several of the famous heroes of the *Mahábhárata* (Prof. Wilson in *Journal of As. Soc.*, XVI. 243, 248), while Mr Weber's attempt to trace the other great Brahmanical epic, the *Rámáyana*, to a Buddhist Saga,* indicates that they were equally familiar with the tale of Ráma. The analogies themselves between the religious notions of the Hindús and the Christians, are in many respects so striking, as to make it apparent that the one body have copied their representations from the other. Christian advocates admit the circumstance, but endeavour to comfort themselves with the idea that the earlier race have been the imitators and not the instructors of

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," 69-73.

their primitive brethren. It is a device with a transparent motive, and easily capable of exposure.

Sir William Jones, who was the first, in modern times, to open out the religious lore of the East to the nations of the West, suggested this solution of the difficulty before him, and others have only been too ready to adopt the explanation. Unwilling that the "adamantine pillars" of his faith should be "moved" by the Christian elements being found traceable to a Hindú origin, he had no other resource than to reverse the position by assuming that the copying, the occurrence of which was unmistakably evident, had been on the part of the Hindús from the Christians (*Asiatic Researches*, I., 272). But he had a better knowledge of the races he was studying, which should have preserved him from so unwarrantable a conclusion. When the question was one of the derivation of science, and not religion, he was able to acquit the ancient Asiatics of being beholden to more modern peoples. The "Bráhmans," he observes, "who were always too proud to borrow science from the Greeks, Arabs, Moguls, or any nation of Mlechch'has, as they call those who are ignorant of the Vedas, and have not studied the language of the gods, have often repeated to me the fragment of an old verse, which they use proverbially, *na nicho yávanátparah*, or *no base creature can be lower than a Yávan*; by which name they formerly meant an Ionian, or Greek, and now mean a Mogul, or generally a Musselman. When I mentioned to pundits, at several times and in several places, the opinion of Montucla" (that the Indian zodiacs had been obtained from the Greeks and Arabs), "they could not prevail on themselves to oppose it by serious arguments, but some laughed heartily, others, with a sarcastic smile, said it was a *pleasant imagination*, and all seemed to think it a notion bordering on phrenzy" (*As. Res.*, II., 302, 303). What would have been the feeling had Sir William's inquiry related to the possibility that this god-descended people had, in comparatively modern days, illustrated and embellished their sacred writings from those of the outcast, despised, and foreign race of Christians? Every one conversant with the inhabitants of India should know that such an adaptation is an impossibility. However readily, in primitive times, the Aryan invaders may have taken

to divinities and usages in favour among tribes with which they came in contact, when their systems became consolidated and antiquated by the conserving influence of their priestly teachers, it is not to be believed that they would go westwards, among those who were wholly alien to them, and held of no account, in order to draw from them fresh religious exhibitions. The tide of thought and superstition has always, in ancient times, flowed the other way, from the East to the West, and never, as far as we can discern, from the West to the East. Many of the corresponding constituents are moreover of an acknowledged antiquity, such as to remove them from the possibility of owing their origin to a Christian source. Nevertheless, the fiction is cherished that the Christians have introduced to the Hindús certain important features found common to both bodies.

In support of this allegation, the assumption is made that the gospel found its way to India in the first days of the Christian era. There have been from remote times Christian settlements at Cranganore, in the province of Travancore, and there is a suburb of Madras called St Thomé, inhabited for some considerable period by Christians. The churches of Travancore are of the Syrian denomination. They owe their origin to Nestorians fleeing from persecution to this coast at the earliest in the fifth century. Cosmas, one of the first travellers who has given any account of Christians in India, states that in A.D. 522 Christianity was there successfully preached. The Travancore Christians are mentioned in the Kerul Oodputtee, a famous historical record of the province of Malabar, in about the sixth century. Their first bishop was Mar Thomé, a name highly revered and still kept up among them. The Portuguese, landing in this neighbourhood at the beginning of the sixteenth century, imagined, or chose to say, that the Thomé in question was the apostle Thomas (Mr F. Wredé, in *As. Res.*, VII., 365-368, note; Cap. C. Swanston, in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, I., 171-173). St Thomé is also said to have been a scene of the apostle's labours, and where he suffered martyrdom. But the whole of these allegations simply depend upon the confusion of the names, that of the Syrian bishop of the sixth century being taken for that of the alleged apostle of the first. St

Thomé, in non-Christian circles, ever bears its primitive name of Mylapúr. The Christians there are either Portuguese or Romanists. Litigation is frequent among them for church property, and no higher antiquity is ever claimed by either of the contending parties than would associate them with the Portuguese immigrants of the sixteenth century.

Thus, when we seek for historical supports whereon to frame a sufficiently early period for the settlement of Christianity in India, the whole is dispersed into thin air. But even could the required date be accorded to the Christians, we have still to imagine what means the converts could have had for influencing the Brahmanical literature. The supposed Christians, if we may judge according to existing experience, would be the uneducated portion of the people. "It is a notorious fact," observes Jyram Row, a native of Mysore, in a lecture delivered at St George's Hall, London, in 1871, "that, notwithstanding the unremitting operation now nearly for a century of a vast machinery, specially designed for this purpose, and worked under the most favourable auspices, Christianity cannot name its proselytes from any part of the more intelligent and educated classes of our community whose total number at any time could not be counted on one's fingers. Not less notorious is the fact that nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of the converted Hindús are from the very dregs, the Parias, of our population." "It is a significant fact, the missionary ever avoids an educated Hindú" (*Scott's Series*). If such is the character of the converts of the present day, what must it have been, in the period claimed, eighteen hundred years ago? And the geographical difficulties must also be remembered. The Christian agents would be people of the southern coasts, while the region to be operated upon, the centre of the Brahmanical literature, was far north in the interior—Benares, Oude, Agra, &c.—at a distance of a thousand miles. And how were the poor outcasts of these coasts to act upon the astute Bráhmans so removed from them, even if they could get at them? What was there to induce the Bráhmans, remaining wholly uninfluenced by the doctrines of Christianity, to pick up scraps from the machinery or skeleton of Christianity, and introduce them surreptitiously, into their own matured and revered scriptures? The proposition has only to be fairly stated to be seen to be untenable.

The similitudes between what has been taught by the Orientals in connection with their religion, and what the Christians teach, are numerous and striking. In judging thereof it is not always necessary to suppose that there has been actual plagiarism. Occasionally the figures are such as might occur to the mind of men in various places and at various times, naturally and independently. But these equally enter into my argument, for if the Hindús have had conceptions through the process of ordinary human thought, it cannot be conceded that the Christians have received theirs from a supernatural source.

The use of sacrifice to appease and propitiate the governing divinities is a system of universal occurrence among Pagan nations, and it forms the very groundwork of matured Christianity. "Without shedding of blood is no remission of sins" is a precept the Pagans have all known of from the remotest ascertainable times. The institution of sacrificial rites among the Hindús, the most ancient people of whom we have any records, long preceded the existence of the Jewish nation, on the foundation of whose scriptures the Christians have constructed their scheme. In this chain of practice there is no break at which it is possible to see that there was a reestablishment of the usage on the basis of a special revelation. Jews and Christians follow the system on the same grounds that the Pagans have had for it all along. The usage proceeds from the laudable desire to satisfy and conciliate the Almighty, but upon the grossest misapprehension of his real attributes and of our position towards him. Nor would any but those who are steeped in ignorance, or blinded by long-maintained prejudice, think of transferring their guilt and its consequences to another, or suppose that the production of a material substitute could serve to atone for or remove the stains of spiritual transgressions.

The theory of the Hindús is that their gods are actually supported by the offerings of food made to them (Mr Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 52, note). They assume thus that there is the same life in their divinities as in themselves, and that it requires the same sustenance. The Jews appear to have had a similar idea. A portion of the offering was burnt and went up "for a sweet savour before Jahveh," and a por-

tion was assigned to Aaron and his sons—that is, to the priests, representing the people, as their share (Exod. xxix. 25, 26). God and man thus partook together the same supporting food. The making such offerings to dead ancestors is a very ancient custom. There have been found in a cave at Aurignac, in the south of France, evidences of its observance among the people of the immeasurably remote stone age.* The Hindús, from the earliest days, have thus paid honours to their deceased ancestors. The rite is called *Sráddha*, a word meaning faith, confidence, reverence. It consists in making the deceased offerings of rice-meal, water, &c. Here is the same theory, namely the establishing communion with the dead by devoting to them food such as the offerers themselves subsisted on. The sentiment is strongly expressed in the Christian scriptures. “I am the bread of life,” Jesus is represented to have said. “Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.” As Hindús offer cakes and water in memory of their departed ancestors, so the Christians commemorate the death of the founder of their faith, and the head of their family, their second or “last Adam,” by partaking of bread and wine. Jesus, in the capacity of a sacrifice, goes up to the nostrils of the Deity “for a sweet smelling savour” (Eph. v. 2). The offerers are ever identified with the offering. The believers in Jesus are those who have been “planted together (with him) in the likeness of his death” (Rom. vi. 5). They also reach the nostrils of the Deity as “a sweet savour of Christ” (2 Cor. ii. 15). The participating together the bread and wine, representing his flesh and his blood, is their sacrificial communion, effected in the same fashion and spirit as in all the Pagan and Jewish sacrifices; and it embraces also an expression of the ancestral rites, such as have occurred in the cave of Aurignac, and been ever kept up in their *Sráddhas* by the Hindús. It is fellowship of life avowed by maintaining life with elements of sustenance common to all concerned, the object commemorated, and those who commemorate him.

The Soma of the Hindús, which is the Haoma of the Zoroastrians, illustrates the same idea. It is an exhilarating beverage.

* “The Development of Creation on the Earth,” 51, 52.

age, drank by the gods, and conferring on men immortal life. (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, v. 258, 262). The plant producing it "is spoken of in the Zend Avesta as the word of life, the tree of life, and the source of the living water of life" (Barlow on *Symbols*, 115). Jesus is said to have spoken of dispensing "living water;" "rivers of living water" were to flow out from his followers; he is to "lead them unto living fountains of waters;" he is to "give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely;" "a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeds out of the throne of God and of the Lamb." There is also by the river "the tree of life" in the heavenly Jerusalem. And Jesus holds out to his followers the expectation of drinking with him the fresh juice of the grape, the Christian Soma, in his Father's kingdom (Matt. xxvi. 29; John iv. 10; vii. 38; Rev. vii. 17; xxi. 6; xxii. 1, 2).

Fire also is a potent religious element. Agni, the god of fire, is an agent for conferring immortality (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, v. 284). Fire, in the Hindú estimation, purifies all things (T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.* I. 397, note). Sítá, the bride of Ráma, having been in other hands than his, has to be tested by fire, and the god Agni leads her out of the flames, uninjured by the ordeal, and delivers her as attested pure to Ráma (M. Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 87). At the last day "the eternal Vishnu assumes the character of Rudra the destroyer, and descends to reunite all his creatures with himself." The earth, "the region of the atmosphere, and the sphere of the gods," are all consumed by fire (Wilson, *Vishnu Purána*, 632). It is the same in the Zoroastrian creed. The earth is fused with fire, and with all its inhabitants is thus purified (Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, I. 412). Even Ahriman is to be in this manner purged by fire, and with all the evil as well as the good genii, will sing the praises of the author of all good (Mr Ravenshaw in *Jour. of As. Soc.* XVI. 101). "Every man's work," say the Christians, "shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." The works may be all burnt up, and the man himself saved, "yet so as by fire" (1 Cor. iii. 12-15). "The heavens and the earth" are "reserved unto fire" against this great day of judgment. "The heavens shall pass away with

a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works therein shall be burned up ;" after which " new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness," will be established (2 Pet. iii. 7-13).

The Hindús conceived that union with God was effected for man by means of a new birth. The three superior classes, the Bráhmans, Kshatriyas, and Vaisyas, are accounted twice born men, the privilege not being accorded to the Súdra. A form was gone through to enact this divine birth. The gods were asked to grant Dikshá, or new birth, to the sacrifice, consisting of rice cakes presented to them. " Agni, as fire, and Vishnu, as the sun, are invoked to cleanse the sacrificer, by the combination of their rays, from all gross and material dross." He is then covered with a cloth and an antelope skin, and after the utterance of specified prayers, " the new birth is considered to have been accomplished, and the regenerated man descends to bathe." He has then been united with the deity, and has attained an immortal life (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Mod. India*, I. 92, citing Haug and Max Müller). Jesus, in like manner, warned Nicodemus, that unless one underwent this divine birth he could not see the kingdom of God. He must, he said, " be born again," " of the Spirit." " Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." With him " old things are passed away ; behold all things are become new." He is thus a " new creature ;" and he " cannot sin, because he is born of God" (John iii. 3-7 ; 2 Cor. v. 17 ; 1 Pet. i. 23 ; 1 John iii. 9).

Among the divine instrumentalities established for the benefit of mankind, the goddess Vách holds a prominent place. The name represents " speech," or the word of God, turned in Latin into *vox*. Prajâpati is said to have produced her, and through her to have created all things, including the Vedas. She is said to be " an imperishable thing," " the mother of the Vedas, and the centre-point of immortality" (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, III. 9, 10). She is the supreme and universal soul ; the active power of Brahmá ; proceeding from him ; upholding all things ; the source of all wealth, power, and knowledge ; pervading heaven and earth ; above the heaven, beyond the earth (Colebrooke in *As. Res.* VIII. 392). The Christians also are pro-

vided with a Word of God, which they have personified and deified. This is Jesus, the centre and root of their system. He was "in the beginning," and "the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men." The word is repeatedly called "the word of life." The universe was created by this power. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God." "By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water." And "by the same word" they "are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment." For the benefit of the human race this word "was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and which our eyes have handled of the word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us)." "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high." He is to be revealed hereafter in terrific majesty, when "his name is called the Word of God." The word is "the sword of the Spirit." It is "quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit," discerning "the thoughts and intents of the heart." The believers are "cleansed with the washing of water by the word." They "receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save their souls." Thus are they "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (John i. 1, 3, 4, 14; Eph. v. 26; vi. 17; Phil. ii. 16; Heb. i. 3; iv. 12; xi. 3; Jas. i. 21; 1 Pet. i. 23; 2 Pet. iii. 5, 7; 1 John i. 1, 2; Rev. xix. 13).

I have already had occasion to treat of the views prevailing among the Hindús relative to the future state, heaven and hell, the offices of Yama as the god of death, and the

disposal of the dead.* It is most instructive to know that in the early days the conception the ancient Aryans had of the Supreme Being, connected with their hopes in the futurity, was accordant with the highest estimate we can form of his infinite goodness and almighty power. They had not attributed to him any hostile designs towards the human race; they had no sense that any of them had incurred his endless wrath; they did not anticipate for any, at his hands, a doom of irremediable woe. That they were liable to the invasions of sin they knew, but they could trust him for a remedy in the instance of every sinner, whatever his measure of guilt. The sin was to be purged out, and the purified soul accepted. They dreaded no failure here. The omnipotent resources covered and secured the whole family of man. None were to be placed beyond his reach for help. There was no such thing as a lost soul towards whom the Almighty himself could extend no help, but had to put away as beyond redemption. In the great Indian Epics, as I have shown, the worst characters, through a divine reformation, obtain a passport to heaven. Ahriman himself, according to the apprehension of the Zoroastrians, is to be thus made pure and accepted; and the demon Ravana, the Satan of the Indian Epic, is evidently reserved after death for a glorified fate. The combatants on each side in the great war of the Mahabharata, the vicious and the good, are equally found participants of celestial happiness. Their hostilities are assuaged, their evil passions subdued, their sins are taken away, and they are exhibited in happy fellowship in realms of bliss. It was the office of Yama to bear the souls of the departed to their final resting-place. He "was the first of mortals who died, and discovered the way to the other world; he guides other men thither, and assembles them in a home, which is secured to them for ever. . . . He grants luminous abodes in heaven to the pious, who dwell with him in festive enjoyment" (Dr Muir, in *Jour. of As. Soc., New Ser.*, I., 296). Jesus is presented in the like capacity. He also was a mortal who had attained immortality. He is "the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence" (Col. i. 18). And being so, he undertakes for the rest of the human family. "Let not your

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," 18, 19, 63, 64, 92, 94.

heart be troubled," he is made to tell them: "ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (John xiv. 1-3).

As corruptions advanced, and fresh fictions were brought in, the aspect and offices of Yama became changed. The happy feeling of the universal friendship of the Deity for the creatures with whom he had peopled the earth was at an end. Sin had to be atoned for, and where it had prevailed in magnitude, it crushed the sinner's hopes and overwhelmed him with judgment. The "hand" of the divinity, to use the language of Isaiah, became "shortened that it could not save, and his ear heavy that it could not hear." A place of torment was prepared for the unrecoverable sinner, and Yama stood over him as the judge of the dead (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 302; do. in *Jour of As. Soc., New Ser.*, I. 306; M. Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 31). Jesus has a similar office. He has been specially appointed to judge the dead (John v. 22; Acts x. 42; xvii. 31), and he consigns the wicked to suffer unending torment in the flames of hell.

The aspect of the heavenly regions is the same in the expectations of the Hindú as of the Christian. "The sun shines not there, nor the moon, nor fire." "Hunger, thirst, weariness, cold, heat, fear, are unknown;" "there is no sorrow, nor lamentation;" "there the blessed are clothed with glorious bodies;" there "the righteous shine by their own light;" "the stars are the lights of the righteous who go to heaven" (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 320-324). Just so the heavenly Jerusalem has "no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." Jesus is "the bright and morning star;" he gives the saved "the morning star;" as "one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead." "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat." "When Christ, who is their life, shall appear, then shall they also appear with him in glory." "As they have borne the image of the earthly, they shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Their "vile

bodies" shall be "changed" to be "fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." "When he shall appear, they shall be like him; for they shall see him as he is" (1 Cor. xv. 41, 42, 49; Phil. iii. 21; Col. iii. 4; 1 John iii. 2; Rev. ii. 28; vii. 16; xxi. 23; xxii. 16). In these glorious celestial bodies the redeemed Hindús are subjected no more to decay or death, and griefs are at an end (Muir in *Jour. of As. Soc., New Ser. I.* 312-315). And there is the like provision for the Christians. "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (1 Cor. xv. 54; Rev. xxi. 4).

The Hindús conceived that there were various spheres in the celestial regions, and they allotted one specially for the disembodied souls of mankind. "Convey him," it is said in their fourth Veda, "convey him; let him, understanding, go to the world of the righteous. Crossing the gloom, in many directions immense, let the goat (*aja*, meaning also spirit) ascend to the third heaven. . . . Crossing the gloom, gazing in many directions, let the goat (*aja*) ascend the third heaven" (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 304, note). The writer of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians represents himself to have been translated to such a place. "I knew a man in Christ," he says, apparently speaking of himself, "above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth); such an one caught up to the third heaven. . . . How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."

The Hindú divinities are provided with material dwelling-places of enormous magnitude, shining with gold and sparkling with resplendent gems. Brahmá, Varuna, Vishnu, and Siva have severally such palaces varying from 800 to 80,000 miles in circumference.* The Christians have in like manner a

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," 234, 235.

heavenly Jerusalem, measuring 1500 miles on each side of a square, and as much in height, composed of gold and precious stones (Rev. xxi. 10-21).

From the supernal regions celestial beings appear, and messages and tokens are transmitted thence to favoured ones on earth. When Yudhishtira was born, "a heavenly voice was heard, which said 'This is the best of virtuous men.' " "On the birth of Arjuna auspicious omens were manifested; showers of flowers fell, celestial minstrels filled the air with harmony, and a heavenly voice sounded his praises and future glory." When Prithá, the mother of Karna, informed him of his divine paternity, "a heavenly voice, issuing from the sun, confirmed her story." When Duryodhana fell in the war of the Mahábhárata, "flowers fell from heaven upon his head, and celestial music was heard in the sky." When the army of Bharata arrived at the hermitage of the sage Bharadwája, heavenly beings displayed themselves, showers of flowers fell from heaven, and celestial music was heard. When Ráma killed Khara "the sound of the divine kettle-drums was heard in the heavens, and flowers fell from the sky upon the head of Ráma." Sakuntalá, when reclaiming her husband, was "strengthened by a voice from the sky." When Ráma and Sítá, at the conclusion of all their trials and perils, were enthroned, "celestial music was heard in the sky, and the gods showered down flowers upon the head of Ráma." (M. Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 96-114; Talboys Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.* I. 341; II. 184, 275, 392; Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.* II. 94). In like manner, at the birth of Jesus, suddenly there was with the angels a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." When he was baptized, "Lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." When he had undergone his temptation by the devil, "behold, angels came and ministered unto him." When he was agonized in the garden of Gethsemane, "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him." On his disciples, after his death, being assembled at Pentecost, "suddenly there came a sound

from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them" (Matt. iii. 16, 17; iv. 11; Luke ii. 13, 14; xxii. 43; Acts ii. 2, 3).

Luxmana was translated bodily to the heaven of Indra when his career on earth was closed (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 408); an incident which is paralleled by the bodily ascension of Jesus. The mode in which mankind, after the close of their mortal existence, should be raised to life, created a question. Ormuzd, in reply to the difficulty, "points to his almighty powers of creation, and as he is the creator of the grain of corn, which, after corruption, springs up afresh, so by his power also shall the resurrection take place" (Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, I. 411). The author of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians suggests the same idea of a questioner, and solves his difficulty in identically the same manner. "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body" (xv. 35-38).

All evil creatures, poisonous serpents, beasts of prey, crawling things, and vermin, are considered to be the work of Ahriman. He also administers death (Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, I. 387, 410). The same idea is put into the mouth of Jesus. "And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven. Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you." Jesus is said "through death" to have "destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Luke x. 18, 19; Heb. iii. 14).

Vishnu is stated to have descended to the infernal regions to recover the souls of six Brahmans and restore them to life on earth (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 249). There is a touching tale in the Mahá-bhárata which reminds us of the Grecian legend of Admetus and Alcestis, relating to Sávitré and Satyaván. Sávitré knows that her husband Satyaván is

doomed to die within a year. She sees him die, and a terrific form, who is Yama, the god of death, comes for his soul, and bears it away. Sávitré follows him persistently, until Yama relents and restores to her her husband (M. Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 37-39). Christ, it appears, after death, visited these lower regions, his mission being to preach his gospel to departed spirits there imprisoned, of course for their renovation (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20 ; iv. 6).

The dogs of Yama are insatiable, and wander about among mankind as his messengers (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.*, I, 38 ; Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 302). After a similar manner the great "adversary" of mankind, "the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet. v. 8).

The heavenly regions have been polluted and disturbed with warfare raised by evil spirits. The Surs and Asurs of the Hindús have thus measured their strength, and Ahriman and his Divs, in the Zoroastrian legends, have come into open conflict with Ormuzd and his Amshapauds (Mr E. C. Ravenshaw in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, XVI. 101, 102). The victory is of course with the holy ones. The Christians make a like representation. "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon ; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not ; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world : he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him" (Rev. xii. 7-9).

I turn now to those models for the portraiture and acts of Jesus, which are furnished so remarkably in the Hindú conceptions and delineations.

Miraculous births from a divine parentage occur frequently in the Hindú mythologies. I have already had occasion to notice the births of Agasti, Kardama, Palastya, the seventh Manu, Ráma and his three brothers, Sítá, the Pándavas and Kauravas, Karna, Nahula and Sahadeva, and Draupadí, as thus effected.* Vasishta and Visvámitra had a like superhuman origin (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, III. 247, 249). In the instance of Karna the mother was a virgin, and had her vir-

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," 203.

ginity restored to her after the birth. The mother of Vyasa was in like manner made a virgin again after his birth (T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 61, 94). The divine birth of Jesus is of similar order, produced by contact of the deity with a human female, whose condition as a virgin is dwelt upon.

At the outset of his ministry, Jesus underwent a fast of forty days and forty nights, after which he experienced hunger (Matt. iv. 2). Among the ascetics who visited Ráma during his exile, were some who fasted for eight months of the year, and some who never eat at all (T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 247).

While he showed that he could thus do without food himself, Jesus created food to satisfy multitudes. He fed "about five thousand men, beside women and children," on five loaves and two fishes, and "four thousand men, beside women and children," on seven loaves and a few little fishes; and on both occasions the fragments apparently exceeded in quantity the original stock (Matt. xiv. 15-21; xv. 32-38). The sage Bharadwája feasted the army of Bharata with a sumptuous provision of food of every description, and with spirituous liquors, created out of nothing by his prayers (M. Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet*, 70).

Jesus converted six stone jars of water into wine (John ii. 6-10). The Aswins drew forth a hundred jars of wine from the hoof of a horse (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.*, I. 10).

Jesus went about healing the sick, curing lameness, deafness, and blindness. The Aswins did the like, enabling the lame to walk, the blind to see, and the aged to become young again (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.*, I. 10).

Jesus paid the tribute money demanded of him by directing Peter to open the mouth of the first fish he might hook in the sea, where the sum required he was told would be found (Matt. xvii. 24-27). The king's signet ring, which Sakuntalá had dropped into the water, is recovered from the maw of a fish (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.*, II. 188; T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 47).

Jesus assured his disciples that if they had "faith as a grain of mustard seed," they should be able to move mountains from one place to the other (Matt. xvii. 20). The writer of the first epistle to the Corinthians contemplated the exercise

of such power, saying, "and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains" (xiii. 2); but, fortunately for the stability of things on earth, no one has yet disturbed the condition of its surface in the manner indicated, and the idea has never gone beyond the phase of expression in words. The Hindús, however, being bolder practitioners, have asserted the occurrence of the feat itself on more occasions than one. When Indra, in wrath, sent down a deluge of rain, Krishna raised the mountain Govardhana with his little finger and held it up over the heads of his people, and sheltered them (T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 467). Hanumat flew to the Himálaya mountains, wrenched off the crest of a hill, and brought it bodily, with all its contents, to Ráma's army in Ceylon, and from the healing virtue of the plants on this mountain the dead and wounded of the army were instantly restored. He, in a similar manner, took up the whole mountain Gandha-mádana for the sake of a plant with which to heal Lakshmana, who had been desperately wounded by the demon Rávana (M. Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 84, 85).

Jesus washed the feet of his disciples in token of his power to cleanse them from sin. "If I wash thee not," he said to Peter, when the latter objected to the act as one of undue humiliation on his master's part, "thou hast no part with me." "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit" (John xiii. 4-10). Dr Muir shows that the Hindús thus provide for the purification of the dead on their passage to heaven. The fourth or Atharva Veda describes the action. "Convey him; carry him; let him, understanding, go to the world of the righteous. Crossing the gloom, in many directions immense, let the *aja* (spirit) ascend the third heaven. Wash his feet if he has committed wickedness: understanding, let him ascend with cleansed hoofs. Crossing the gloom, gazing in many directions, let the *aja* ascend the third heaven" (*Sansk. Texts*, V. 304, note). At the Rajasuya or installation of king Yudhishtira, the divine Krishna is appointed to wash the feet of Bráhmans (T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 166). Bali, whom Vishnu subdues in his dwarf Avatára, washes his feet, taking him to be a Bráhman (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 122).

Jesus is described as "a lamb" led "to the slaughter," and

"as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth." "I, as a deaf man," it is presumed of him, "heard not; and I was as a dumb man that openeth not his mouth." "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it." In this manner he was carried off and crucified between two thieves, thus fulfilling the prediction applied to him, that he should be "numbered with the transgressors." Ere he died, he is said to have prayed for those who put him to death, saying, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Ps. xxxviii. 13; xxxix. 9; Isa. liii. 7, 12; Mark xv. 28; Luke xxiii. 34). The whole position is realized in the tale of Mándavya, as recounted in the Mahá-bhárata. This personage was an illustrious Bráhmaṇ who had been long practising austerity under a vow of silence. Some robbers, pursued by the emissaries of justice, took refuge and hid themselves in his hermitage. The pursuers came and questioned the anchorite, who, under the vow he had placed himself under, did not answer them. They thereupon searched, and discovered the robbers with their booty; and considering the holy man to be an accomplice, carried him off with them. The king condemned the whole to death, Mándavya still maintaining silence. In this manner he was impaled with the rest, but as he remained many days without expiring, the spectators were convinced of his saintly character. The king thereon came to ask pardon of the holy man "nailed upon the stake," pleading that what he had done had been done in ignorance. On this, the anchorite spoke and pardoned him. Afterwards he expired, having, as it is said, "by his sufferings, conquered the worlds" (Fauche's *Trans.*, 459-462).

The Christians, in the maturity at which their doctrinal system has arrived, have to realize the idea of a divine being suffering death on earth. The Hindús have not hesitated to declare the actuality of such an event, but they attribute the power to take the life to the divinities, and not to man. Purusha, a "supreme god," the creator of all, and termed "the lord of immortality," was laid hold of by the other gods, bound, and sacrificed. Vishnu himself had his head cut off with a bowstring through the action of rival deities, when it was said of him that he "was indeed a sacrifice" (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.* I. 40; Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, I. 10, 11; Do. in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, XX. 34, 35).

An important type of the sacrifice of Jesus is afforded by the well known legend of Sunehsepha, which I have had occasion to give in a former work.* The king, Harischandra, is under an obligation to Varuna to sacrifice to him his son Rohita. By sundry bargains, a sage named Ajigarta gives up his son Sunehsepha to be sacrificed in his stead, and undertakes himself to perform the sacrificial act. Varuna accepts the substitute, a Brahman being more worthy than a Kshatriya. Sunehsepha, when bound to the stake, claims permission to intercede with the gods. He addresses himself to the supreme deity Indra, who refers him to Agni, saying, "He is nearer to thee than I am." Finally his prayers are heard, and the bonds miraculously fall from him. The end is that he is highly exalted. His own father, who had sold him for the sacrifice, is considered unworthy of him, and he is adopted by the renowned divinely born Visvámitra, and raised by him above all his sons (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, I. 355-359). Here we have not only human, but vicarious sacrifice, the innocent brought up to suffer in fulfilment of the incurred doom of another. The superior worthiness of the victim is insisted on, and through his patient endurance, as in the instance of Jesus, he becomes highly exalted. In the reply of Indra to the sufferer we have the very essence of the Christian theory. The value of Jesus to mankind is that his assumption of the human nature has brought him into fellowship with them, and given them confidence in the action of his sympathies (Heb. ii., 14-18; iv., 15, 16). They use him as an intercessor and mediator in approaching the Supreme Divinity reigning in some other form in heaven. Jesus is a being who is "nearer to them," and on him, consequently, they are called on to rely.

The most important representations occurring in the Hindú delineations are those which have served apparently as models for the portraiture of Jesus, namely, the histories given of the divine personages Krishna and Ráma. These are chiefly afforded in the great Indian Epics, the Mahábhárata and the Rámáyana. It is not within the bounds of any reasonable probability that these productions were issued at a date posterior to the time of the Christian

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," pp. 222, 223.

gospels. The epics represent Brahmanism, and it is fair to conclude were put forth before Buddhism prevailed in India. This would place them at least three or four hundred years before the asserted Christian era. There is room to believe that they appeared before the age of Manu, of whose legislation they show no knowledge. This would take them back, according to the ordinary estimate of the date of the Institutes, to over eight or nine hundred years before Christ. I have examined the whole question to the best of my ability, and feel convinced that a much higher antiquity should be accorded to them.*

Not being able to assert the priority of the gospels to the Indian epics, the ordinary resource of Christian advocates has been to suggest, for they can do no more, that the divinity asserted for Krishna and Ráma is an afterthought, interpolated at some comparatively modern time in these writings. The opinion would be entitled to more consideration could it be said that the doctrine of an incarnation became current only at so late an age as to be possibly traceable for its origin to the Christian scriptures. But it is acknowledged that there were ideas of incarnations in the incalculably remote period of the Vedic literature, and that the incarnation of Krishna himself, it may be suspected, is therein adverted to.† The placing gods on earth in human form, and ascribing to them human action, was common to all ancient mythologies from the earliest known times. The gods of the Grecian Pantheon are of this complexion, and the Osiris and Apis of the Egyptian faith convey the idea of incarnation as absolutely as any such exhibition is ascribed to Vishnu, the prolific god of Avatáras, by the Hindús.

The idea, then, that the incarnations of Vishnu in the forms of Krishna and Ráma, as given in the Indian epics, are due to interpolation, is an objection taken specially against these particular forms; and it is apparent that the reason thereof simply is that unless it can be shown that these characters, as divine personages, have been drawn from the model of the Christian scriptures, it must follow that the Christian portraiture has been drawn from them, so close and so frequent are the correspondences involved. The whole

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," chap. iii. † Ibid, pp. 80, 81.

structure of the Epics, it appears to me, makes it a most unwarrantable assumption that there has been such interpolation. The action of the Epics depends throughout upon the supernatural. They are the produce of times when the sense of the marvellous predominated. The poems teem with this element, and, were it eliminated, they would be torn to shreds, and but little of them would remain. The gods are clothed in outward forms, and appear visibly to mortals. It is not Vishnu only who is incarnate, and involved in human action. Siva twice appears veiled in mortal flesh, and does battle with mortals.* Rishis are repeatedly met with constituted with powers so as to be able to coerce the divinities. Rákshasas, or demons, abound, of monstrous shapes. Snake populations, bears, monkeys, and vultures, with human speech and superhuman capacity, enact marvels. Enchantments and disenchantments occur, the relieved beings having figured as Rákshasas or animals. Weapons of war are endowed with the powers of their divine donors. Many are the personages whose parentage is traced to divinities. To single out Krishna and Ráma from this crowd of miraculous beings, and to say that their deification is no part of the thought of the original composers, is therefore most arbitrary, and it is an assertion wholly without warrant. The multiplicity of Christian delineations evidently formed upon Pagan moulds; the absence of all originality in whatever there is of Christian sentiment or doctrine; the drafts liberally made by the Christian writers from all around them,—pure Jews, Essenes, Neoplatonists, Greeks, Egyptians, Buddhists, and Hindús, certainly prepare us to believe that where further correspondences of a very marked nature occur between the Asiatic and the Christian records, the copying that alone can account for them has been by the latter from the former. When it is considered that the life of Jesus, as exhibited in the Christian narratives, is apparently a mere portraiture, destitute of true historical materials, it becomes easy to accept, from similar sources to those already used for the composition of the picture, further additions for it of features of the like pictorial complexion; and when it becomes clearly apparent that there were no Christians in

* "The Legends of the Old Testament" 224.

India at an age sufficiently early to have possibly influenced the composition of the Epics, and that those who first appeared upon the arena of India were so circumstanced, socially, intellectually, and geographically, as to have been totally incapacitated to act upon the centres of learning where the Epics were current—the conclusion appears inevitable that the similitudes, the origin of which is in question, have been caused, as have all such other traceable similitudes, through the free adoption by the early Christian writers of whatever they thought might strengthen their system, and impart lustre to their elected hero, from whatsoever source the supply may have reached them. I introduce thus, without hesitation, the last and the most important moulds I have for the Christian Jesus, as derived from Hindú fictitious delineations.

Krishna figures in the Mahábhárata, where he is introduced as the friend and instructor of Arjuna, the chief hero of the poem. His history is given with fuller detail in the Vishnu and other Puránas, works of a much more modern time, though representing, as the name Purána denotes, ancient records.* Professor Wilson concludes that the tale of Krishna must have been complete when the Mahábhárata was compiled (*Vishnu Purána*, 492 note). We may consequently accept the representations made of this divine personage as belonging to a pre-Christian era.

The authorities I follow for what I give of the life of Krishna are Sir William Jones in *As. Res.* I. 273 ; Professor Wilson's *Essays*, II. 66 ; Professor Wilson's *Vishnu Purána*, 440, 493, 500—515, 550, 607—617 ; Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 242 ; T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 386—391, 414, 445—449, 462—464, 470 ; Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.*, I. 219, 229—232, 237, 239.

The great deity Vishnu, the second person in the Hindú trinity, undertakes to be born incarnate as Krishna, to deliver the earth from iniquity, and open out the path of righteousness to mankind. Especially was he to put an end to Kansa, an incarnate Daitya or Titan, who figured on earth as king of the sacred city of Mathura (Muttra). The Christian parallel here is Herod as king of Jerusalem.

Kansa, as Herod, is prophetically informed of the fate he is

* "The Legends of the Old Testament" 48

to meet with at the hands of the son of Devaki, Krishna's mother, and it rouses him to just such action as is taken by Herod. A voice from heaven proclaims to him that he was to be put to death by the son of Devaki. As Mary, when selected to be the mother of Jesus, is greeted by an angelic messenger, who says, "Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women,"—so is Devaki honoured at her conception of Krishna. "The gods, invisible to mortals, celebrated her praises continually from the time that Vishnu was contained in her person. "Be proud," they said, "to bear that deity by whom the universe is upheld." The birth takes place at midnight, when "the quarters of the horizon were irradiated with joy, as if moonlight was diffused over the whole earth." "The spirits and the nymphs of heaven danced and sung." "The clouds emitted low, pleasing sounds." The birth of Jesus is, in like manner, celebrated by a heavenly choir.

The parents, fearing the designs of the threatened tyrant, exchange their son, at his birth, with the daughter of Nanda, a cow-herd. There is thus a removal of the infant from the reach of the tyrant, as in the case of the infant Jesus; and, singularly enough, the Hindú legend, as the Christian, brings in an incident of tax-paying associated with the period of the birth; for Nanda is met with when on his way to pay tribute to Kansa. And after paying his taxes he returns to his own home, as the parents of Jesus do to Nazareth. Kansa, on seeing Nanda's child substituted for Krishna, attempts to lay hands on it, but the babe ascends to heaven. It is as in the book of Revelation where "a woman, clothed with the sun," brings forth a child, "who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron," whom "the dragon" endeavours to seize upon and devour as soon as it was born; and the child escapes by "being caught up to God, and to his throne" (xii. 1-5). Kansa, on this, to destroy Krishna, orders that all the male infants shall be put to death.

The usual Hindú initiatory rites are performed upon Krishna, as the Jewish rites are fulfilled in respect of Jesus.

The divinity of Krishna is most fully acknowledged. He is termed "the Holy one," "the God of gods, and Lord of all," "the Lord himself," "the very supreme Brahmá," "the eternal

righteousness," "the supremely pure among the pure, the holy among the holy, the blessed among the blessed," "the eternal God of gods," "the supreme Lord," "the protector of the world." He proclaims himself to Arjuna as "the whole sacrificial rite," "the parent of the universe," "the mystic Om," "the origin of all." Arjuna acknowledges him as "the supreme universal spirit," and asks him to reveal himself to him as he is. On this, Krishna displays himself to him with types of omnipotence and infinitude, and Arjuna is overwhelmed with awe. The corresponding exhibition in the Christian narrative is the transfiguration of Jesus, when Moses and Elias appear with him in glory.

Krishna explains to Arjuna that the highest devotion he can manifest is the recognition of him in his infinitude; but as it is difficult with mortals to maintain such a conception, he recommends him to worship him in his *vyakta* or manifested form. The revelation of Jesus in the flesh has the same use of bringing him down to the senses of mankind. And, like Jesus, Krishna refers his disciple to "Holy Writ," and tells him to place his affections on him, and so unite himself to him.

As the mission of Krishna is to destroy evil, he engages with the great serpent Kaliya, and tramples upon and bruises his head. His own end is that he is shot by an arrow on the sole of his foot, the whole tallying remarkably with the passage in Genesis currently applied as prophetic of Jesus.

Krishna preached nobly; while surrounded by attractive females, he was personally pure and chaste; though conducting a terrible war, he evinced benevolence. He forgave sins, and prominently those of a notorious female sinner; he washed the feet of Brahmans, cleansed lepers, and raised the dead. A female crooked in person anointed him, and he restored her figure, removing her infirmity. The son of Duhsala, a widow, died. Krishna, laying hold of the dead man's hand, said, "Arise!" on which he came to life again. He descended to the region of the dead, and restored them to life. The parallels in the history of Jesus are too apparent to require pointing out.

The gods sent a messenger to Krishna, saying, "The demons have been slain, and the burden of the earth has been removed; now let the immortals once again behold their

monarch in heaven." Krishna promised to "abandon his human body," and return directly he had completed his work by extirpating the Yadavas. When he had accomplished this task, he seated himself in the attitude prescribed for meditation, resting his foot upon his knee, and thinking of his coming end. A hunter, mistaking the sole of his foot for part of a deer, shot an arrow into it. Then, seeing what he had done, the man prayed for forgiveness. Krishna told him not to fear, and promised to translate him to heaven. A celestial car thereupon appeared, and the hunter, placing himself upon it, ascended to heaven. Then Krishna "having united himself with his own pure, imperishable, and universal spirit," "abandoned his mortal body," and passed to heaven. Vyasa consoled his disciple Arjuna, telling him that his master having finished his work in the destruction of evil beings had departed, "his ends being all fulfilled." "Now," he added, "all is done." Dwaraka, the earthly abode of Krishna, is at the time destroyed in the midst of fearful portents. The manner of the death differs, but in other respects the correspondences with what is ascribed to Jesus are here frequent and close. Krishna, like Jesus, "was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil," and he did not take his departure from earth until it could be said of him, as Jesus is said to have borne testimony of himself in his work, "It is finished." Krishna appears to have courted his own end, anticipating it, and placing himself in the way of the occurrence that brought it about, as Jesus is made to say of himself, "I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." Before he died, he forgave the man who had ignorantly caused his death, as Jesus sought forgiveness for those who had brought about his end, not knowing what they were doing. He translated his slayer to heaven, as Jesus gave a passport to heaven to the thief dying at his side. The portents at Dwaraka are paralleled by those at the death of Jesus. Finally, Krishna, at the solicitation of the other divinities, ascends to heaven, and returns to his pristine glory, just as Jesus ascended to be "glorified with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was."

At the death of Krishna, the third or Dwápara age of the Hindús is said to have closed, and the Kali age, in which the world now stands, set in. The period has been astronomically laid down as the year 3102 B.C.* The era of Ráma occurs at a still more remote time. The Hindús signify the successional order of their illustrious personages in marshalling them as Avatáras of Vishnu. Ráma is the seventh, Krishna the eighth, and Buddha the ninth. Whatever the true periods of Ráma and Krishna, it is obvious that their histories belong to a time long antecedent to Christianity, since their successor, Buddha, it is known, flourished about six hundred years before the asserted Christian era.

My authorities for the following history of Ráma are Monier Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 13, 63, 64, 67, 68, 71-75 and note, 87-90; T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II., 25, 58 note, 85 note, 112, 113, 118-121, 145 note, 237, 246, 272, 287 note, 308, 309 note, 383, 384, 389, 392; Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 408; Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.*, II. 8.

The great demon Rávana, who represents the Satan of the Christian scriptures, had laid Brahmá under an obligation to confer upon him any boon he might demand. Being too powerful to apprehend risks from man, his request was that he might be invulnerable to any god. Armed with this privilege, he so harrassed the celestial beings, that they assembled in consultation to decide how they might put down Rávana. His power is described as so mighty that "where he is, there the sun does not give out its heat; the winds, through fear of him, do not blow; the fire ceases to burn; and the ocean, crowned with rolling billows, becomes motionless." On this Vishnu comes forward, and as Rávana, though invulnerable to gods, is not so to man, he says that he will be incarnate as man for the purpose of destroying Rávana. It was a special characteristic of the work attributed to Christ that he should carry it out in human form. By man sin had entered into the world, and by man was to be wrought the deliverance. So the Christian prophet represents himself to have mourned when the seven-sealed book was produced, that "no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon." The

* "The Legends of the Old Testament," pp. 49-52.

book, it has been thought, is the title-deed of man's lost inheritance. The work to be executed of opening its seals was one not suitable to either God or angels. It needed that a man should perform it. Accordingly, Jesus, in his human capacity, as "the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David," comes forth and opens the seals. Just so Vishnu must appear as man to put an end to Ravana.

Dasaratha, King of Ayodhya (Oude), possesses three wives, but has no son. He performs a great *aswamedha* or horse-sacrifice to propitiate the gods and obtain a son. In the midst of the sacrificial fire a supernatural being, tall as a mountain, rises, and presents to the priest a cup of divine *páyasa*, or nectar, to be given to the queens of Dasaratha to drink. On these they all conceive and bear sons, the eldest of whom is Ráma, who is the incarnation of Vishnu. Ráma, therefore, as Jesus, is born without the intervention of a human father.

In the *Adhyátma Rámáyana*, which is an abridgement of the tale, and spiritualizing the whole, a work which may be "regarded as the testament of the Vaishnavas, or worshipers of Vishnu," Ráma is termed "the Lord of all," who had "assumed the human form to punish the evil doers;" a "Saviour" and a "Deliverer." He is also called the "sinless one." "If any man," it is declared, "who may have committed during any of his lives the most heinous crimes, shall at his death with sincerity pronounce the name of Ráma, his sins, of whatever nature they may be, shall be forgiven; he will be absorbed into the divinity." His "sins will be remitted, and he will obtain everlasting salvation." One of those for whom Ráma intervenes thus addresses him:—"Thou holdest, O Lord! a bow in thy hand (Rev. vi. 2), and therefore art thou distinguished by the title of the Archer—such I worship thee. Thou extendest thy mercy towards the oppressed, thou art the protector of the defenceless, as such I adore thee. . . . Before all things thou wert (Col. i. 17), the creation, the preservation, and the destruction of the world are in thy hands (John i. 3; Heb. i. 2, 3; Rev. xx. 11); thou art the first among the gods, the first among mankind (Rev. i. 8, 11; Col. i. 15; 1 Tim. vi. 15)—as such I praise thee. Thou art the sole object of adoration to the gods, to the saints, to the serpents, to the gandharvas, to the heavenly spirits, who prostrate themselves

at thy feet (Eph. i. 21 ; Phil. ii. 9—11), as such I worship thee. . . . In taking refuge at thy feet, the terrors of future birth, regeneration, and death, are done away (Rom. viii. 2 ; 1 Cor. xv. 26 ; Rev. xx. 6 ; xxi. 4)—as such I worship thee. Thou art Brahmá, thou art Vishnu, thou art Siva, but thou art One ; the universe is comprehended in thee as an ant in an elephant. Thou art the foundation of eternal bliss, thou art neither greater nor less ; mankind are thy servants, thou art the lord of all." It is clear that Ráma is everything to his followers that Christ is to the Christians. It is also apparent that the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity receives its explanation, as it has doubtless had its origin, in the Hindú code. There have been, in their apprehension, many manifestations of the deity, but nevertheless his unity is ever recognized by them. And thus stood Ráma walking on earth as the Omnipotent.

At a great assemblage Ráma wins Sítá, the daughter of the King of Mithilá, by bending the enormous bow of Siva. Sítá, like himself, is of divine extraction, being an incarnation of the goddess Lakshmi. Her reputed father Janaka was clearing the ground for a sacrifice, and turning it up with a ploughshare, when Sítá (whose name signifies a furrow) rose up from the furrow. Sítá, the bride of Ráma, is as the church, the bride of Jesus, gathered out of the earth, but yet of heavenly origin (1 Pet. i. 23 ; 1 John iii. 9).

Dasaratha was about to instal Ráma as heir-apparent, when Kaikeyí, his youngest wife, claimed from him the fulfilment of a promise he had made her. He had pledged himself to grant her any two boons she might demand of him, and she now requires that Ráma should be banished to the forest of Dandaka as a devotee, and that her son Bharata should be installed in his room. The father is heartbroken at the fate marked out for his favourite and noble son. Ráma is urged to resist, but he will entertain no thought but to do his father's will (Heb. x. 7). He says he will sacrifice himself rather than allow his parent to break his pledged word. "Devoted by promise to my father's commands, I will neither through covetousness nor forgetfulness, nor blind ignorance, break down the barrier of truth." He turns from the insignia of royalty prepared for him, and, as he passes on, the ancient

men, who see him, say, "May he conquer gloriously." We have him like Jesus who left his father's throne to undergo a life of privation on earth; who, being "rich," "became poor" for the sake of others; who, being "equal with God," "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant."

Sítá resolves to accompany Ráma on his trying pilgrimage. He puts before her all the dangers and privations she will be subjected to from the sharp stones and briars in the path, the serpents and alligators, the lions and wild elephants, the want of food, of water, and of clothing, with torments of reptiles, scorpions, and fierce birds, the exposure to heat, cold, and violent winds; but she replies that she is aware of all this evil in the way, and feels that his presence will convert it into blessing. Life without him was worthless; the desert, with all its evils, she prefers to the pleasures of a palace if to be without him. Ráma yields, and adds on his part that he would not care to attain the exalted position of Brahmá if he were to be without her. "I am persuaded," says the Christian devotee, in the like spirit clinging to his ideal lord and master, "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us." Christ and his church have to tread the thorny path together in loving union, as Ráma and Sítá are said to have done thousands of years before them.

Ráma, like Jesus, "was the expected one," on whose coming the happiness of the human race depended. The sage Bharadvāja says he had passed long years in religious contemplation and worship, and that day, when he had set eyes on him, had at length met with his reward. Another sage, Sarabhanga, had been invited to heaven by the great deity Indra, but declined to go until he had seen Ráma. Then he made his ascent, appearing as a youth "bright as the

fire." In a deserted hermitage, an old woman, Sarvari, was "detained in life to greet him." "She ministered to him, and then entering the fire, ascended to heaven." It is the position of Simeon and Anna in the temple greeting Jesus. "Lord," said the former, "now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation;" it having been "revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ."

The pilgrims pass their time in devotional exercises, Ráma protecting the devotees met with on the way from the Rákshasas, who were demons and cannibals. On one occasion an army of Rákshasas seeing Ráma standing armed before them, "recoiled on one foot from fear;" just as those who came to arrest Jesus, overawed by the majesty of his presence, "went backward, and fell to the ground."

As the allotted period was drawing to a close, the great demon god Rávana, tempted by Sítá's charms, in Ráma's temporary absence, carries her off *through the air* to his dominions in Lanká (Ceylon). "All nature shuddered, various prodigies occurred, the sun's disk paled, darkness overspread the heavens. It was the short-lived triumph of evil over good. Even the great creator Brahmá roused himself, and exclaimed, 'Sin is consummated.'" It is as when mankind incurred sin and fell into the hands of the wicked one, "the prince of the power of the air," from whom Christ redeems them. And thus also Ráma enters the dominions of the evil one, overthrows Rávana, and recovers Sítá.

Then the question occurs of Sítá's purification. She has been in a place of defilement, in the possession of one other than her husband. And she must be brought out pure. She is passed through flames, when the god Agni takes her by the hand and presents her spotless to Ráma. It is just so as between Christ and the Church. The fire is to "try every man's work of what sort it is." "The trial of their faith being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire," is in the end to "be found unto praise, and honour, and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ." Ráma explains that he had consented to the ordeal only that he might establish his wife's innocence in the eyes of the

world. And thus also Christ "cleanses" his church, "that he may present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

Ráma having triumphed over the enemy, and the period of his pilgrimage being over, returns to Ayodhyá, where he and Sitá are raised to the throne long vacant by the death of his father. As they take their seat celestial music is heard in the sky, and the gods shower down flowers upon the hero's head. The sufferings, as in the instance of Christ, are succeeded by glory, and the wife is raised to share the husband's throne (1 Pet. i. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. iii. 21).

After a prosperous reign of more than millennial length, Ráma is at length invited by Brahmá to resume his proper place in the celestial regions. To this he consents, and his brethren and all his subjects elect to accompany him. They one and all desire to leave the existing world to be with him in the heavenly dwelling-places. With abundant manifestations of his divine being, he, with all his followers, enters into glory, and Brahmá appoints to his people, at his intercession, celestial mansions. The God, as in the instance of Krishna's parallel with Christ, lays down his own life, no man taking it from him; and his people are as the people of the Christian leader, who are ever ready "to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better."

Such are the three latest avatáras of Vishnu, in Ráma, Krishna, and Buddha, each affording very striking figurations of Christ, and there is an advent still to come which is called the Kalki Avatára, at the close of the present Kali age. Vishnu is to be displayed in human form, incarnate as a Bráhman, seated on a white horse, for the destruction of the wicked. According to one account, he is armed with a blazing scimitar, and according to another with a sickle. It is just as Christ is figured in the book of Revelation at the opening of the first seal, and when "the harvest of the earth is ripe," and the reaper, seated on a cloud, "thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped" (Rev. xiv. 15, 16). The heavens and the earth, in the Hindú as well as in the Christian imagery, are to be consumed by fire, and in the renovated creation everlasting righteousness is to be established; and

thus concludes the drama (Wilson, *Vishnu Purána*, 484, 632; *As. Res.* I. 236; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, II. 111, 162).

Such are these faiths of the Hindú and of the Christian. They idealize the great power of the Omnipotent, and bring it near to the perceptions and uses of the worshipers in human form; and both races equally reverence the records conveying to them these legendary histories. "Blessed," says the Christian scripture, "is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book." "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the word of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand." "Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." Equally are the Hindús satisfied of the blessedness of dwelling upon the tales they have of their divine deliverers Ráma and Krishna. "He who reads and repeats this holy life-giving Rámáyana is liberated from all his sins, and exalted with all his posterity to the highest heaven." "As long as the mountains and rivers shall continue on the surface of the earth, so long shall the story of the Rámáyana be current in the world." "If a man reads the Mahábhárata, and has faith in its doctrines, he becomes free from all sin, and ascends to heaven after death," (M. Williams *Ind. Ep. Poet*, 16 and note; T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 455).

VI.

CONCLUSION.

It is a common question put to those who have ventured to dispute the authority of the Bible, what they may have to offer for the guidance of mankind in its lieu. Those who make the demand are, however, by no means agreed upon the nature or degree of the authority to be accorded the Bible. Few will be prepared in the present day to allege that every word of its contents is true and divinely inspired. So far, therefore, these, who make the requisition, warrant the task of criticism upon which we embark. If one word in the record may be challenged, any other word, or all words appearing therein, may equally be called in question, and those who give up portions of the Bible have no logical grounds upon which they can object to others giving up the whole.

The test proposed is thus an imperfect one. The Bible is not as one of those great works of the creator, such as the world itself, or any of the heavenly orbs, which may not be impugned. It is fairly impugnable if cause sufficient can be shown for disputing its statements. Its contents have been offered to us for our reasonable acceptance, and we are bound to judge whether they merit this acceptance or not. The condition preliminary that we are not to embark in this inquiry, nor to govern ourselves by its results, without having an adequate substitute to provide for what we part with, is not one that can be admitted into any of the ordinary circumstances of life. I am on a journey, knowing of certain landmarks I should meet with. I pursue a path, and the indications around me prove other than I had to expect. The sun rises, and I find I am going east instead of west. Should

I be warranted in continuing my way until some one might show me a truer path? Should I not stop and retrace my steps, being satisfied that my first duty was to involve myself no further in error? I have a servant whom a friend discovers to be cheating and robbing me. Do I retain him, and resolve not to part with him, until I may meet with a trustworthy person to take his place? The question then of the reliability of the Biblical statements must be dealt with upon its own merits. If we have before us an erring guide, misrepresenting to us the objects described, the first step we have to take, regardless of consequences, is to cease to submit ourselves to its directions. When misinstructed and misinformed, we at once give up the fallacious instructor. It cannot be imagined that any one in his senses, when thus persuaded, should act otherwise. The objection I am replying to is therefore a hollow one. It is taken by those who accept the Bible as an all-sufficient, all-perfect guide. It is merely the expression of their confidence in this guide. They think so well thereof that they imagine there can be none other.

But it is not everything in the Bible that any of us propose to give up. Our adversaries strive to bind us to such an issue, but do so wrongfully. There are universal truths in the record, which we admit equally with themselves. Whatever speaks of the love of God for his creatures, of his wisdom and power as exhibited towards them in all his works and ways, and every precept inculcating good feeling between man and man, meets with as ready acknowledgment from ourselves as from the biblicists. Our opponents choose, moreover, to suppose that because we do not accept the biblical representations of the supreme being, we deny his existence altogether. They wish it to be understood that they have before them the true divinity, and if we do not acknowledge him as described, they allege us to be without God at all. The mistake is of the same description as that I have previously dealt with. The Bible, with its adherents, is so assured a guide that there can be no other; and the God of the Bible is so thoroughly truly described, that no other description of him can possibly be accepted. The whole is a mere asseveration of satisfaction in the accepted views. We still claim a hearing, if this may possibly be granted us.

Then we are said to be abandoning the old paths, and

marking out for ourselves new fangled ways of our own. This is an accusation, like the other objections noticed, depending on what does not affect the merit of the questions to be disposed of. The point is, which is the true path, rather than which is the more ancient one. But it so happens, as the slightest reflection should show, that we stand on an older basis, knowing God without the Bible, than do those who know him only in the Bible. There was an era before Christianity, and before the production of any portion of the Bible, and to the views prevailing in that era we claim to stand allied.

Nor are the Christian advocates warranted in assuming that they possess an unchanging system. According to their own histories, it was a violent alteration of the relations of God to man when the condition of absence of written law for man's direction was exchanged for the precise and detailed code of divine law said to have been enunciated through Moses, and when a system applicable to the world at large, was abandoned by the Creator of all for special dealings with a chosen people, to the shelving and neglect of all other races. It was another violent change when this dispensation was disallowed as effete and useless, to have its place occupied by a new and "better covenant," introducing Christianity. The phases of the Christian system I have exhibited in the present volume. We have first a message to the Jews, exclusively, amounting to nothing at discord with the tenets already accepted by them, and a door closely shut against the Gentiles. Then the door is opened, with a struggle between the leading preachers, and the Gentiles are let in; after which the doctrine undergoes material alteration, and assumes an altogether Gentile complexion. We have in the outset mankind left to make their approaches to the Almighty in any manner they deemed fit; after this they are taught to depend on the blood of bulls and of goats to give him satisfaction; then some more fervent spirits among the elect people thus taught, saw, nevertheless, that the true sacrifice to make to God was that of the inclinations and the heart, and that physical offerings availed nothing, and were not even desired by him; after which there came, what we now have among the Christian community, the astounding requisition repeated, that blood alone can wash out sin, and that this must flow from human veins, the innocent,

moreover, suffering for the guilty. What was odious in the rites of Moloch, becomes very "precious" in what the Christian has to put before the Almighty. Is it possible that a divine director is the author of these ever changing and inconsistent views? Have we not room to conclude that they are due to human brains, scheming out religious practices in various forms, as, from time to time, active and restless minded men have devised? And may we not, with all propriety, turn upon our opponents in their pursuit of the ancient paths, and claim from them the recognition of the primeval, and alone sure, sufficient, and insubvertible testimonies—the consciousness of God manifested in his works, physical and moral, and ever acting as the friend of all?

A third objection taken to us is one that can scarcely be reasonably stated. Our opinions are quarrelled with because they have been arrived at intellectually. Faith, in some way, is to be maintained independently of reason, and yet to be such a faith as can be accounted for reasonably to inquirers. We remain still necessarily in error because we have been reasonably persuaded to what we hold. It is impossible to deal with persons thus disposed. We can only see that we are placed in the wrong because we do not think as our opponents, and that in the apprehension that what they believe will not bear the test of reason, the reasoning faculty itself is to be placed in abeyance. Of course, the battle is at an end, if to be so prosecuted. Each side is warring with weapons the use of which the opposing side disallows. The Christians hold up the Bible as an all-sufficient authority apart from what human thought may judge of it, while we claim to be governed in all our conclusions by the evidences which the perceptive and reflective powers with which we are endowed place before us. One side or the other must eventually give way, and it is happily not difficult to foresee which of the two must, in the nature of things, eventually prevail.

Another difficulty we meet with is to obtain a hearing under any circumstances. There have been objectors to the accepted creed before our time. It is common to allege that we say no more than what has been previously said, and this is ordinarily followed up by the assertion that what has been so said has been already sufficiently answered. I am obliged

to describe this as simply evasive. The statement so resorted to is usually made by persons who do not read a word of what we offer for their consideration, or who are unable to answer us if they have perused what we publish. The refuge, it is transparent, would not be sought in silence, if there was any thing effective to be said in defence of the faith we assail. Many refuse us a hearing from mistrust of results, and all have a sense of danger from lending themselves to the ventilation of our opinions. Is it possible that the side who shrink from the discussion are those who are armed with divine truth, and have with them divine support, and that those whom they fear to meet are persons left merely with human resources, of an erring nature?

But, impeded and avoided as we are, we nevertheless advance, and are thankful for the measure of success which attends the efforts we make to break down surrounding prejudice, and establish truer lines of religious thought. The end we consider to be certain, however long deferred. The task of asserting and defending truth is too easy to miscarry. If we have hit upon the real relations subsisting between the Almighty and the human race, (and without such conviction we have no right to venture to interfere with the faith of others), then it is certain this truth will establish itself in the power of the author of all truth.

After all, whatever the divergences of mankind from one another in the path of religion, it is apparent that all who are in earnest in the pursuit are ever seeking the same ends. The aim is to associate ourselves with the Almighty, to bring every thought in subjection to him, to stay our souls upon him as our ultimate hope. We feel ourselves immeasurably distant from the goal we are striving to reach. We often turn aside from the pursuit before us. Sin obtains ready access to us, and its invasions weaken and alienate us. Still the desire is there to overcome the sin and to re-establish our relations with the acknowledged author of our beings. The whole atmosphere of the discord prevailing is caused by misty views embraced in the endeavour to find the lost path and re-associate ourselves with our maker. The idol is set up to bring God sensibly before the worshiper; the sacrificial blood is poured out to appease him, and wash out the stains of sin;

offerings are devoted to him to express the desire of the offerer to meet personally with acceptance ; mystic rites are performed to unite the soul to its maker ; sensual enjoyments are abandoned in pursuit of devotional exercise of the heart ; mediators and intercessors are cultivated to insure the longed-for access ; edifices and altars are constructed and consecrated to promote the intercourse aimed at ; books are composed to convey ideal divine messages ; and priests and ministers are established to regulate, preserve, and build up the whole fabric of religious exercises. The forms and adjuncts vary, but the end striven for is the same in the breast of every true and earnest devotee.

The great object to be ascertained and kept in view is the character of the being with whom we seek to associate ourselves. If we form a false estimate of this, we shall be led to approach him in some inappropriate manner. The common error has been to attribute to him very much such thoughts and designs as may belong to a human potentate. In some way he has to be made our friend. He is thought to be open to the access of motives such as govern the human heart. If we have offended him, we have to atone for the offence ; if we desire his favour, we have to purchase it with gifts. The Christians entertain and act upon such ideas equally as have done the most ignorant of the idolatrous races. It is this that we strenuously dispute. The estimate currently made of the author of all we maintain is an erroneous and unworthy one. The Being we desire to approach is far above those considerations which may influence earthly rulers, and acts towards us ever in the highest exhibition of creative power. The one who made us is our friend from the beginning, and our friend for ever. His presence is never removed from us, and it is always in action for our advantage. Nothing can raise in him a thought hostile to those to whom he has given being. He has surrounded them with an atmosphere of beneficence. He has placed them in a strong current flowing onwards continuously in exhaustless blessing. Thoroughly intimate with all that pertains to the objects he has created, he has ordered all things for their good. Nothing has been overlooked, and nothing misdirected. The means and the ends are all equally assured, and all are worthy of the great projector. Boundless

wealth of resources, boundless knowledge and power belong to him, and all is exerted for the benefit of those whom he has made. We can bring him no offering out of what is not already his own; we are incapable of compensating him who possesses all things. Nor can we atone to him for our transgressions. We miss his blessings simply by turning out of the course in which they run; we get injured by misusing the means at our command; our remedy is to get into the right course and pursue it faithfully. There is between us and him no Esau whom he has hated, and no Jacob whom he has specially loved. We are all in this aspect Jacobs, towards whom the Almighty has sympathies, the depths of which are unfathomable. Gladly he accepts and restores us when we turn broken and bruised through our own foolish aberrations to him. The hurts we meet with are corrective, not punitive. We learn what are the evil ways from the evil consequences they introduce. And when we have apprehended and profited by the lesson, the reckoning is over. We pass into the true grooves of the creation to further knowledge and more assured stability. There is no judge putting us into scales and weighing our worth. There is no pause or interrupting process of decision to arrest the onward path. Either we are walking with the Almighty and reaping blessing, or we have turned out of the way and are incurring trouble. We are never thrown aside as hopeless and irrecoverable.

Such is the creed to which I have been introduced, and many, I believe, possess it with me. It is based upon a sense of the all-sufficiency of the Almighty. I do not require a written volume to lead me to apprehend him. I do not require to place before him a blood, or any other offering to reconcile him to me. I believe in his unalterable friendship for me, and what I offer him is myself, that he should mould me to his will. There is much to do in me and towards me, but he will do it all unfailingly. Merely I am not to be wilfully self-seeking or rebellious. He has endowed me with free-will, but I am to take the consequences of using it wrongfully. He makes good good to me, and evil evil, and this I am to apprehend. He teaches and controls me through all my experiences. I must walk with him in his ways, and not depart from him. Whatever are my hopes for myself I have

the same hopes equally for others. We may not all know our blessings, but all will surely be introduced to them nevertheless. There is none who can remove himself from the atmosphere of the Almighty, and that gracious influence must prevail over all for their good through time and eternity. The ultimate results for the entire race, I am persuaded, will be such as more than to fulfil the most unbounded expectations we can form of whatever is supremely virtuous and glorious. The accomplishment of blessing may in cases be long deferred, but the end is nevertheless an assured one, because the supreme worker cannot fail. The Almighty has set himself against every form of evil, for the happiness of all whom he has brought into being, and he must triumph.

The Christians, in words, acknowledge the love of God, and his all-sufficiency, but their system is constructed in practical denial to him of these attributes. The first parents are set by them on a fancied pedestal of perfection, from which they fell. The object is to restore the supposed lost image of the divinity. As the parties stand fronting each other, nothing subsists between them but absolute hostility. The Creator frowns upon his creation, and overwhelms it with a curse, and the creatures hate his presence, and flee from it. He calls loudly for blood,—their blood, and has prepared a place where he may feast himself with their torments for ever. Lest there should be a chance left them of personal escape, there is an evil being let loose upon them, gifted with power to reach every soul and pervert it. He can make good appear to them evil, and evil good, and “take” them “captive” “at his will.” Then they have to look about them for a remedy against all this unutterable woe, and they find it in the reputed son of a carpenter, Jesus of Nazareth. He is exalted to be the son of God, and, in fact, is recognized as “equal with God.” He provides the wrathful creator with that blood which he demands. He is “made sin” for the sinful, and the “curse” designed for them falls upon him. Then the creator is satisfied. The eternity of woe designed for man is removed by a few hours passed by the substituted victim upon the cross. But the redeemed must believe in their redeemer. They must not challenge any circumstance of his marvellous history. Mark may contradict

Matthew, and Luke Mark, and John may contradict the other three, but they must unquestioningly believe the whole. The gospel may be formed appropriate only to the Jews, or it may prove specially adapted to the Gentiles. The saints may be long-suffering, turning the other cheek to the smiter, or they may raise, as in the Apocalypse, an impatient cry for vengeance. It is nevertheless to the Christian a consistent scheme, stamped as true throughout by the divinity. There was a time when he satisfied his people with "carnal ordinances," and "beggarly elements," made "to perish with the using," but it is not so now. The Almighty may, in past days, have established dispensations of a delusive nature, not calculated to secure their declared ends, but having Christ as his instrument, he now sets up a work that cannot fail. Unfortunately, however, the benefit is secured for only a "little flock," selected out of the vast multitude of the offenders. The rest are "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction," and for them there is no deliverance. They are the hated Esaus who must perish, or rather linger for ever in excruciating torment. They are the creation of Ahriman, and not of Ormuzd, and when they call upon the appointed saviour, he will have to say to them, he "never knew" them. The "salvation" arranged for is thus a very partial one, suitable for a few devotees, and the world at large are left absolutely uncared for to perish in their iniquities.

We quarrel thus not only with the facts of Christianity, which we find baseless and ideal, copied from Pagan models, but also with the principles of Christianity, which exalt Christ at the expense of the Almighty, and are constructed on too narrow foundations to meet existing evil. We condemn these principles moreover as subversive of substantial and universally recognizable truth. It is impossible that the sin of one man can be imposed upon another. It is by a fiction not to be realized by the mind that the transference is to be made. Nor can blood of any sort wipe away sin. Sin has to be repented of and turned from, and can be got rid of in no other manner. The process is a continuous one, not established in a day. It is vain to say, not I that sin, "but sin that dwelleth in me." The sin makes the sinner, and he must cease to be one. The figment is that there is such an appropriation of Christ by the

believer that when the Almighty eyes look for the sinner they see only Christ. "I am crucified with Christ," the sinner is persuaded. The thing never occurred, but there it is to be believed in and realized; and the next step is, "nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." And by this ideal substitution evil is considered to be disposed of, and the adverse creator converted into a friend.

We seriously object to these artificial and distorted views. Truth is not maintainable by means of fiction, and nothing loses its real character by the alteration of its name. We are jealous for the honour of the Almighty, and wish mankind to know and use him as their friend. We have not to plead Agni to remove our guilt, or to imbibe Soma to obtain immortal life, or to lay hold of Ráma, or Krishna, or any other, to secure salvation. Our God loves us because he has made us, and in him we find never-ceasing remedy and support in all our need. That we should strive to dissipate the mists which hide his true aspect from the eyes of others, appears to us a legitimate and a necessary task, and the desire so to serve the best interests of our fellowmen must be our apology for whatever we offer to their consideration on this momentous subject.