375

יהוה


INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA
ANDOVERI FVNDATA MDCCCVII.
Ps. CXIX 169.
כדברך תביבני
JOH. XVII. 17.
ὁ λογος σος αληθεια εστιν
ΑΚΡΟΓΩΝΙ
ΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ

THE LEGENDS

OF

THE OLD TESTAMENT,

TRACED TO THEIR APPARENT PRIMITIVE SOURCES.

BY

THOMAS LUMISDEN STRANGE,

LATE A JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT OF MADRAS.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 57 AND 59 LUDGATE HILL.

1874.

"Man can *invent* nothing in science or religion but falsehood; and all truths which he *discovers* are but facts or laws which have emanated from the Creator."—*Aphorism by Mr Nott, Types of Mankind.*

PREFACE.

THE present work is in continuation of one which I have put forth entitled, "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" I then examined the ordinarily asserted supports to the Bible being a revelation from a divine source, entering into the history of its canon, and sifting the pretensions raised in its pages to that miraculous agency which is offered as the signet of its authority. This led me over the alleged miracles and prophecies, and the superhuman history of Jesus.

The work I now presume to offer is an endeavour to test the assumed revelations by tracing the prominent legends of the old Testament to their apparent true sources. The channel through which these are presented to us is the Jewish people, a race whose nationality, long held down under foreign domination, was put an end to more than 1700 years ago. As far as the records at our command serve us, it is clear that in some remote antiquity the ancient Aryans, occupying it is believed the region of Bactria, were the disseminators of the arts of life and of religious conceptions over extensive portions of the globe. They became specially represented in India, but also deeply influenced other lands, prominently Persia and Europe. After their settlements had become consolidated in India, the commerce exercised by their stock there implanted served to spread the current of

instruction, partially at all events, to Egypt and Chaldea. I discuss the literature, religion, and vast antiquity of this people, and indicate their footprints in the language, mythologies, and customs, of the various nations indoctrinated by them. The Eastern Aryans were apparently in advance of all other known people, not only in antiquity, but in natural acuteness and fertility of intellect. They were characterized by strong religious fervour, which led them ever in pursuit of fresh food for its maintenance. They had also no small sense of poetic feeling. They started fairly, as all must do when their minds open upon the testimonies of the universal architect, undisturbed by human inventions. They saw him as the friend of all, accessible to all everywhere. But on this sure ground, in time, they ceased to retain their footing, and giving way to imaginings, fell at length under the teachings and rule of an astute priesthood. These diverted and misled them with a continual supply of religious fables, and brought them into bondage to themselves by means of a complicated and exacting ritual. With these elements the then corrupted Aryans invaded their less competent neighbours, and the poison set on foot had rapid circulation. Fiction is more attractive to the childlike than sober reality, and in the infancy of nations the eastern stories were readily accepted and took root and flourished.

Such are the facts before us necessary to be understood in judging of the Biblical representations. Whatever is found composed of like materials, shaped into the same forms, must be reasonably ascribable to a like origin. One set of statements can be referable to no

better source than the perversities of the human intellect, and another parallel set of statements, formed upon the same moulds, have reached us by direct transmission from a celestial quarter. And if the human teachings first appeared by a decidedly preponderating antiquity, and were current on all sides round the field from whence the alleged divine revelations have come, it is obvious that the independent origin of the latter cannot be allowed. The appeal to the evidence of the facts in nature, and the universal sense of right and wrong implanted in the human heart, should be equally decisive in leading us to distinguish between the allegations of erring man, and the operations of an infallible Creator.

GREAT MALVERN, *May* 1874.

CONTENTS.

I.—The Contact of Nations, Eastern and Western.

II.—The Eastern Aryans.

III.—The Era of the Indian Epics.

IV.—The Hebrews.

V.—The Legends of the Old Testament.

I.

THE CONTACT OF NATIONS,

EASTERN AND WESTERN.

TOWARDS the beginning of the present century Mr Bryant put forth his well known work on ancient mythology. In the days when he flourished, the study of the classic literature of Greece and Rome engrossed the learned. Bryant was an accomplished scholar in this field, which, through a long life, he diligently explored. In the records of the Greeks he found ample traditionary evidence that they were a people who had migrated from some foreign region, and become mixed in with the races occupying the countries in which they had settled. Solon, Plato, and Herodotus were satisfied that the deities worshiped by their countrymen had been introduced from some other land, and the Egyptian priests, taking advantage of their ignorance, persuaded these inquirers that they were indebted to them for the sources of their religious beliefs. All the rites of the Helladians (Greeks), says Bryant, as well as their gods and heroes, were imported from the East. The Helladians themselves came from some eastern quarter, probably, he suggests, Egypt and Syria, and incorporated themselves with the aborigines; the effect of which was that they gradually lost the knowledge they had brought with them, and sank to the level of their new associates, and in this condition of ignorance they long remained until light dawned upon them in Asia Minor, and afterwards in Athens; and then appeared a group of worthies, whose strides in intelligence and knowledge have been the wonder of the world (I. 187-189).

In the remote times, lost to history, various great personages are said to have traversed the known world as conquerors

and civilizers. Osiris, Hercules, Dionysus, Cronus, Themis, Apollo, Perseus, Sesostris, Ninus, Orpheus, and Cadmus, are all reported to have had such career (II. 330-446). The names are mythical, and several indicate one and the same personage; but a belief so deep-seated and widely-spread that there were such persons in ancient times, who, at the head of conquering hosts, spread knowledge over hitherto unenlightened lands, cannot be destitute of foundation. The movement described is a natural one. The possession of superior knowledge will thus assert itself. The strong will invade the weak, and necessarily leave among them the arts of life in which they are superior; and as populations advance in numbers as well as in civilization, more important and permanent migrations will follow in the wake of the first pioneers. And thus the immigration into Greece is to be accounted for.

The ancient colonists now in question, from whom the Greeks have had their mythological legends and divinities, are known to them as the Pelasgi. This people, says Plutarch, according to ancient tradition, roved over the greatest part of the world, and having subdued the inhabitants, took up their residence in the countries which they had conquered. Strabo speaks of their great antiquity, and says that they overran all Greece. Herodotus describes them as the progenitors of the Hellenes. They are said to have sprung from the foreign divinities Inachus and Poseidon. They were very numerous, and are supposed to have been for a long time in a wandering state. Besides Hellas, they occupied many regions of great extent, where their name was in repute for ages. Strabo speaks of them as a mighty people. These Pelasgi represent the colonies of the Ionians, Hellenes, Argives, Dorians, and Œolians. Herodotus says that all these were Pelasgi. They forced themselves into countries pre-occupied, and were so superior to the natives in ability and science that they easily secured themselves in their settlements. Many have been the inquiries about this ancient people and their language (V. 31-36).

At the time that Bryant was pursuing his researches into Greek literature, Sir William Jones was opening up the way to the knowledge of that of India, and his labours, and those

of his successors in this pursuit to the present day, throw a flood of light upon the field of Bryant's studies. He saw, in the materials at his command, the obvious traces of the occurrence of the migration; the orientalists have come upon, not the fact merely, but its sources. It is interesting to see how inquirers, pursuing their way from independent and opposite points, are found supporting each other on the basis of a common truth.

The traditions of the Hindús, better kept than those of Greece, show their ancestors to have been in exactly the position described as that of the Pelasgi. They were invaders of the soil now possessed by them. They came from some other region, and took possession of the plains of upper India. Superior intelligence, and therewith power, gave them easy ascendancy over the people displaced by them. They were, in fact, the Pelasgi of the east, as the Grecian immigrants were the Hindús, or rather Aryans, of the opposite quarter. All flowed from a common centre for a like purpose; that is, to better themselves by over-ruling and dislodging weaker tribes. These they despised and accounted barbarous, designating them by a term drawn from their common parent tongue. In Greek it was *barbaroi*, and in the Indian or Sanskrit language, *barbara*. We have evidently before us in Greece and India the same people, spreading from their ancestral home in different directions, east and west.

There was a time, says Professor Max Müller, when the progenitors of the Celts, Germans, Slavonians, Greeks, Italians, Persians, and Hindús, were living together (*Hist. of Ancient Sansk. Lit.*, 14). Schlegel, observes Dr Muir, Lassen, Benfey, Müller, Weber, Roth, Spiegel, Renan, Pictet, however differing on other points, agree that the cradle of the Indians and the Indo-Germanic race is to be sought for in some country external to India (*Sansk. Texts*, II. 306). The Hindús, he himself notices, were not indigenous to India, but immigrated from Central Asia, where their ancestors at one time formed one community with those of the Persians, Greeks, Romans, Germans, &c. (II., pref. ix). The parent region is believed to have been ancient Bactria, in the neighbourhood of the Oxus. The hymns of the Rig Veda, says Muir, "show us the Aryan tribes living in a state of warfare with surrounding enemies, (some of them, probably, alien in race and language), and

gradually, as we may infer, forcing their way onward to the east and the south" (III. 217). The Rig Veda is the first and earliest of the Vedas, and the most ancient record that the world possesses. The authors of the Vedic hymns, observes Muir, draw a distinction between their own kinsmen the Aryans and the tribes differing from them in complexion, customs, and religion, whom they designate Dasyus. The South-Indian languages are fundamentally different from Sanskrit, and show, therefore, a non-Aryan source. In Manu's Institutes the limits of Brahmanical India are described. This was the country on the banks of the Saraswati, which was accounted of superior sanctity; and there is an interesting legend in the Satapatha Bráhmana (an adjunct of the Yajur Veda), which narrates how the sacred fire—meaning the sacrificial rites—travelled from the neighbourhood of the Saraswati eastward to North Behar (II., pref. xx., xxi.). Arya means noble, and the term for caste is *varna*, which means colour, expressions indicative of the distinction of races. The Hindús, says Pictet, have a tradition of an earthly paradise to the north, from whence they came. The Zend Avesta, the ancient Persian scripture, says that mankind, when created, were established by Ormuzd (their deity) in the ancient Aryan land. Sogdiana, Merve, Bactria, Herat, appear comprehended in this region, and it was from thence that Djemshid established the kingdom of Irán, or Persia (*Les Origines Indo-Européennes*, I. 3, 36-38).

Community of language is an indisputable sign of community of race, and this mark of a common origin prevails from India to Ireland over the intermediate regions of Persia, Greece, Italy, Slavonia, and Germany. It is evidence depending not on a few isolated examples, which might be due to fanciful resemblances. It is overwhelmingly frequent in occurrence, and extends, not merely to correspondence of verbal sounds, but also of significations for these sounds, with community also of grammatical structure and inflection. The Greek, observes Mons. Pictet, is allied to the Zend and Sanskrit, and the Latin to the Greek. The Celtic approximates to the Latin, then follows the German, and then the Lithuanian-Slave, which again approximates to Iranian, or ancient Persian (*Ind. Eur.*, I. 49). Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, German,

Celtic, and Slavonic, says Max Müller, had all one and the same origin. The radical elements of all these languages, their numerals, pronouns, prepositions, and grammatical terminations—their household words, such as father, mother, brother, daughter, husband, brother-in-law, cow, dog, horse, cattle, tree, ox, corn, mill, earth, sky, water, stars, and many hundred more, were identically the same (*Lectures on Science of Language*, 2d Series, 404, 405). Sanskrit and Greek, the same authority informs us, correspond not only in words, as *mátar*, mother; *pitar*, father; *duhitar*, daughter, which are met in Greek by *métér*, *patér*, *thugatér*, but in grammatical terminations. For example, *pitá(r) dadáti matre duhitáram*, would be in Greek *patér didósi métri thugatera*, "the father gives to the mother a daughter." Numerals, he remarks, are a safe criterion of relationship between languages; and he instances the correspondence between the Sanskrit and the Latin from two to ten (*Survey of Languages*, 9, 13). This, he elsewhere says, extends in Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit, from one to a hundred. The declensions and conjugations, he observes, in these three languages, exhibit an extraordinary similarity, and in some of the grammatical forms there is an absolute identity (*Lectures on Language*, I. 181, 183). We have, he shows us, the Latin auxiliary verb *sum*, I am; *es*, thou art; *est*, he is; *sumus*, we are; *estis*, ye are; *sunt*, they are, matched by the Sanskrit *asmi*, *asi*, *asti*, *'s-mas*, *stha*, *santi*. In the subjunctive it is for the Latin *sim*, *sis*, *sit*, *simus*, *sitis*, *sint*; and for the Sanskrit *syám*, *syás*, *syát*, *syáma*, *syáta*, *santu*. The Lithuanian peasant, he tells us, expresses I am, *esmi*, "with exactly the same root and the same termination which the poet of the Veda used in India four thousand years ago" (*Survey of Languages*, 87, 92). The Greek goes on in the same manner—*eimi*, *eis*, *esti*, and its terminations for the three genders, *os*, *é*, *on*, occur in Sanskrit as *as*, *á*, *am* (*Lectures on Language*, I. 157, 182),

The first idea naturally formed was that Sanskrit was the parent of its allied western tongues. But further study showed this to be unsustainable. The differences in these languages are found to be even more extensive than the similitudes (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, II. 276). "No sound scholar," Müller warns us, "would ever think of deriving any Greek or Latin

word from Sanskrit." Occasionally the Latin is in more primitive form than the Greek, and the Greek than the Sanskrit. "Sanskrit is not the mother of Greek and Latin, as Latin is of French and Italian. Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, are sisters, varieties of one and the same type. They all point to some earlier stage when they were less different from each other than they now are, but no more. All we can say in favour of Sanskrit is, that it is the eldest sister; that it has retained many words and forms less changed and corrupted than Greek and Latin" (*Lectures on Language*, 2d Series, 407; *Survey of Languages*, 15). A Hindú, observes Dr Muir, might infer that Sanskrit is the source of the other kindred tongues, but the whole grammatical character of Greek and Latin shows them to be independent languages, in this respect differing from the Prakrits (ancient Indian dialects), which have evidently resulted from the decomposition of Sanskrit (*Sansk. Texts*, II., pref. xvi.).

The Aryans of India, naturally, would better preserve the types of the primitive language than would their brethren of the remoter west. Their propinquity to the parent country, enabled them, it is inferrible, to migrate in a compacter and more numerous body than those who spread themselves over wider limits westward. The Indian Aryans could thus keep up their civilization and knowledge, remaining distinguished from the aborigines among whom they settled as a superior race. The western immigrants, fewer in number and more scattered, became absorbed in the masses surrounding them, and eventually, as Mr Bryant has shown, sank to the same low level as those with whom they thus intermixed.

Monsieur Pictet has made a copious collation of words in the cognate languages in question, and has arranged them so as to bring before us the broad characteristics of the parent race from whom the different branches have radiated. From this I have selected prominent examples, but as Professor Max Müller (*Chips from a German Workshop*, II., 50, note) considers the author to be not always reliable in his Sanskrit, I have checked him with Professor Monier Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary.

(1.) *What relates to climate and local circumstances.*

Sanskrit, *Haima,* wintry, cold, hence Haimavat, or the Himálaya mountains; Zend *zima;* modern Persian, *zamistán;* Greek, *keima;* Latin, *hiems;* Bohemian, *zima;* Irish, *geamh,* winter.

Sansk. *snu,* to drip, trickle; Zend, *cniz;* Boh. *snih;* Ancient German, *snéo*; Irish, *sneachd;* Anglo-Saxon, *snaw;* Gr. *nips;* Lat. *nix;* Eng. *snow.*

Sansk. *vásanta,* vernal, relating to the spring; Lithuanian, *wasará,* summer, and *pa-wasaris* before the summer, or spring; Slave, *vesna;* Polish, *wiasna;* Lat. *ver;* Scandinavian, *vár;* Danish, *vaar;* Gr. *ér;* Irish, *errach,* spring.

Sansk. *távisha,* the ocean; Irish, *tabh, taibh.*

Sansk. *dabhra,* the sea; Irish, *dobhar,* water.

Sansk. *gó,* water, Irish, *go,* the sea.

Sansk. *udan,* water, wave; Lat. *unda;* Scand. *unu, unnur, uder;* Anc. Germ, *unda, undja.*

Sansk. *sava,* water; Goth, *saivs,* the sea, or lake; Scand. *siór*; Anc. Germ. *séo*; Eng. *sea.*

Sansk. *mála,* a mountain; Irish, *mull, mullach;* Albanian, *malli;* Lat. *moles.*

Sansk. *kakud,* summit, and *kakudmán,* a mountain; Lat. *cacumen, culmen.*

Sansk. *bhrigu,* head of mountain, precipice; Goth. *bairgs*; Ang. Sax. *beorg;* Scand. *berg*; Irish, *brigh;* Slave, *briegü;* Boh. *breg.* Bhrigu is one of the ten primeval personages mentioned in Manu's Institutes.

Sansk. *ajra,* a plain, a field; Gr. *agros;* Lat. *ager*; Goth. *akrs*; Scand. *akr, ekra;* Irish, *acra*; Welsh, *egr*; French and English, *acre.*

Sansk. *srotas,* a stream, that which flows; Irish, *sroth*; Lith. *sruwa, srowe*; Gr. *rús,* to flow, *rúma,* a stream; French, *ruisseau.* Eng. rus-.

Sansk. *dhruva,* that which is firm, the trunk of a tree; Zend. *dru*; Gr. *drus*; Slave, *drievo*; Illyrian, *deroo*; Boh. *drevo*; Goth. *triu*; Scand. *tré*; Eng. *tree.*

Sansk. *gavya,* pasturage; Gr. *gaia*; Goth. *gavi*; Sax. *gá, gó*; Lith. *gojas*; Irish, *gé.*

(2.) *Animals.*

Sansk. *paçu*, a domestic animal; Lat. *pecus*; Erse, *pasgan*.

Sansk. *gó*, a cow; Zend. *gaó*; Armenian, *kov*, *gov*; Scand. *kú*; Eng. *cow*.

Sansk. *ukshan*, *vakshas*, a bull; Zend. *ukshan*, *vakhsha*; Lat. *vacca*; Goth. *aushan*; Anc. Germ. *ohso*; Scand. *oxa*; Eng. *ox*. The Vedic divinity *Vách* is sometimes spoken of as a cow (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, III., 254). Hence, apparently, the French *vâche*.

Sansk. *vrisha*, a bull; Lith. *werzis*; Esthonian, *wars*; Anc. Germ. *fersa*, *furro*; Anc. Sax. *fearr*.

Sansk. *sthira*, a bull; Goth. *situr*; Ang. Sax. *steor*; Anc. Germ. *stior*; Gr. *tauros*; Lat. *taurus*; Irish, *tor*; Eng. *steer*.

Sansk. *balin*, a bull; Lith. *builis*; Scand. *bauli*; Irish, *bulan*; Eng. *bull*.

Sansk. *avi*, a sheep; Gr. *oïs*; Lat. *ovis*; Goth. *avis*; Slave, *ovina*; Lith. *awinas*; Anc. Germ. *awi*; Irish, *oi*; Ang. Sax. *eaw*; Eng. *ewe*.

Sansk. *bukka*, a goat; Ang. Sax. *bucca*; Scand. *buckr*; Anc. Germ. *pocch*; Irish, *boc*; Welsh, *bioch*; Slave, *byku*; Illyr. *bac*.

Sansk. *súkara*, a pig; Ang. Sax. *súg*; Irish, *suig*; Germ. *sau*; Eng. *sow*.

Sansk. *váráhas*, a boar; Kurdish, *baraz*; Ang. Sax. *bearug*, *bár*; Anc. Germ. *barch*, *ber*; Eng. *boar*.

Sansk. *bhíruka*, a bear; Anc. Germ. *bëro*; Ang. Sax. *bere*, *bera*; Irish, *brach*; Eng. *bear*.

Sansk, *çvan*, a dog; Gr. *kuón*; Lat. *canis*; Welsh, *cwn*.

Sansk. *súcaka*, a dog; Illyr. *zuzak*; Polish, *suka*; Irish, *soich*; Pers. *sag*.

Sansk. *músha*, a mouse; Pers. *músh*; Gr. *mús*; Lat. *mus*; Anc. Germ. *mús*; Illyr. *mis*; Germ. *maus*; Eng. *mouse*.

Sansk. *ulúka*, an owl; Lat. *ulula*; Ang. Sax. *ula*; Germ. *eule*; Eng. *owl*.

Sansk. *sarpa*, a serpent; Lat. *serpens*; Irish, *searpan*; Eng. *serpent*.

Sansk. *bha*, a bee; Ang. Sax. *beo*; Scand. *bí*; Anc. Germ. *pía*; Irish, *beach*; Eng. *bee*.

Sansk. *vamra*, *vamraka*, an ant; Pehlavi, *mavir*; Pers.

múr; Gr. *murmos*; Lat. *formica*; Ang. Sax. *myra*; Welsh, *myr*; Illyr. *mrav*.

Sansk. *pulaka*, a parasitical insect of any kind; Lat. *pulex*, genitive *pulicis*; Gr. *psulla*; Slave, *blucha*; Anc. Germ. *flóh*; Ang. Sax. *flaeh*; Eng. *flea*.

(3.) *Objects connected with human uses.*

Sansk. *dama*, a house; Armenian, *dohm*; Gr. *domos*; Lat. *domus*; Iris, *damh*; hence Eng. *dome*.

Sansk. *sala*, a hall; Lat. *cella*; Gr. *kalia*; Irish, *ceall*; Germ. *hal*; Eng. *hall, cell*.

Sansk. *sthala*, a place; Scand. *stallr*; Anc. Germ. *stal*, a stable; Eng. *stall*.

Sansk. *patha*, a road; Gr. *patos*; Slave, *pati*; Ang. Sax. *padh*; Eng. *path*.

Sansk, *dvár, dvára*, a door; Pers. *darwaz*; Gr. *thura*; Lat. *foris*; Irish and Welsh, *dór*; Goth. *daur*; Eng. *door*.

Sansk. *sadas*, a seat; Gr. *hedos*; Lat. *sedes*; Irish, *suidhe*; Welsh, *sedd*; Goth. *sitls*; Slave, *siedalo*; Eng. *seat, settle, saddle*.

Sansk. *vásana*, a vessel; Lat. *vas*; Scand. *vasi*; French and Eng. *vase*.

Sansk. *pátra*, a vessel, cup; Gr. *poter*; Lat. *patera*; Eng. *pot*.

Sansk. *caluka*, a small pot; Gr. *kulix*; Lat. *calix*; Lith. *kullys*, a vase.

Sansk. *kathina*, a cooking vessel; Lat. *catinus*; Goth. *katils*; Scand. *ketill*; Eng. *kettle*.

Sansk. *váha, váhana*, a car; Zend. *váça*; Ger. *oxos*; Lat. *vehiculum*; Irish, *feghun*; Ang. Sax. *waegan, waen*; Anc. Germ. *wagan*; Eng. *wain, wagon, vehicle*.

Sansk. *ratha*, a car; Lat. *rota*, a wheel; Irish, *riad*, do.; Welsh, *rhod*, do.; Sax. *rad*, do.; Lith. *ratas*, do.

Sansk. *yuga*, a yoke; Gr. *zugos*; Lat. *jugum*; Irish, *ughaim*; Goth. *jukuzi, juk*; Germ. *júch*; French, *joug*; Eng. *yoke*.

Sansk. *náva*, a boat; Pers. *náwah*; Ger. *naûs*; Lat. *navis*; Welsh and Irish, *noe*; Anc. Germ. and Polish, *nawa*; hence Eng. *navy*.

Sansk. *plava*, a boat; Gr. *ploion*; Ang. Sax. *flota, fliet*; hence Eng. *fleet*.

Sansk. *kravya*, raw flesh; Gr. *kreas*; Lat. *caro*; Anc. Prus. *krawja*, blood; Illyr. *karv*, do.; Irish, *cruu*, do.; Welsh, *crau*, do. From the same root, Sansk. *krúsa*, cruel; Gr. *krauros*; Lat. *crudus*; Irish, *cru*, *cruadh*.

Sansk. *kalama*, a writing reed; Gr. *kalamos*; Lat. *calamus*; Lith. *kelmas*, trunk of a tree; Prussian, *soloma*, a straw; Illyr. *slama*, a straw.

(4.) *Metals.*

Sansk. *ayas*, iron and metal in general; Lat. *aes*; Goth. *eisaru*; Anc. Pers. *áyan*; Modern Pers. *áhan*; Scand. *eyr*; Ang. Sax. *ore*, metal; hence Eng. *ore*.

Sansk. *varishtam*, copper; Lith. *waras*.

Sansk. *arjunam*, silver, gold; Gr. *arguros*, silver; Lat. *argentum*, do.; Irish, *airgeat*, do.; Albanian, *ergent*, do.; French, *argent*.

(5.) *Connected with Warfare.*

Sansk. *ághnut*, striking, killing; Gr. *agón*, a fight; Irish, *agh*, do.; Lat. *agmen*, an army.

Sansk. *upasad*, a siege; Lat. *obsidio*; Irish, *iomsuidhe*; Welsh, *sawd*, *sád*; Illyr. *obsieda*; Germ. *umbisez*; Ang. Sax. *ymbsittan*, to besiege.

Sansk. *pílu*, an arrow; Lat. *pílum*, a javelin; Welsh, *pilan*, a lance; Gr. *palló*, to throw; hence Eng. *pellet*.

Sansk. *tanka*, a sword; Pers. *tak*; Irish, *tuca*; Welsh, *twca*, a sort of knife; Eng. *tuck*, a rapier.

(6.) *Social Connections.*

Sansk. *pitar*, father; Gr. *patér*; Lat. *pater*; French, *pere*; Goth. *fadar*; Anc. Germ. *fatar*; Eng. *father*.

Sansk. *máter*, mother; Gr. *métér*; Lat. *mater*; French, *mère*; Anc. Germ. *móter*; Eng. *mother*.

Sansk. *putra*, son; Lat. *puer*, contracted from *puter*.

Sansk. *duhitar*, daughter; Gr. *thugatér*, for *duxatér*; Goth. *dauhtar*; Eng. *daughter*.

Sansk. *bhrátar*, brother; Gr. *phratér*; Lat. *frater*; Irish, *bráthir*; Welsh, *brawd*, pl. *brodyr*; Goth. *bróthar*; Polish, Illyr. *brat*; Eng. *brother*; French, *frère*.

Sansk. *svasar*, altered from *svaster*, sister; Lat. *soror*, sister; French, *sœur*; Irish, *sethar*, *siur*, do.; Goth. *svister*; Scand. *syster*; Eng. *sister*.

Sansk. *vidhavá*, a widow; Lat. *vidua*; Welsh, *gweddw*; Goth. *viduvó*; Eng. *widow*; French, *veuve*.

Sansk. *náman*, a name; Gr. *onoma*; Lat. *nomen*; French, *nom*; Goth. *namo*; Eng. *name*.

Sansk. *gana*, a tribe; Gr. *genos*; Lat. *gens*.

Sansk. *dakshina*, the right hand; Gr. *dexios*; Lat. *dexter*; Irish, *des*, *deas*.

(7.) *Connected with Religion.*

Sansk. *déva*, God; Gr. *theos*; Lat. *deus*; Irish, *dia*; Welsh, *dew*; French, *dieu*; hence Eng. *divine*.

Sansk. *yajniya*, holy; Gr. *hagios*.

Sansk. *mala*, sin, dirt; Gr. *melas*; Lat. *malus*, fem. *mala*, bad; Welsh, *mall*, do.; French, *mal*, do.

In Dr Muir's Sanskrit Texts there are similar comparisons, which are arranged according to grammatical order. From these I make the following selections:—

NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES.

Sanskrit.	Greek.	Latin.	English.
napát	aneipos	nepos	grandson, cousin.
pitrivya	patrós	patruus	father's brother.
rajni	—	regina	queen.
jaras	géras	—	old age.
yuvan	—	juvenis	young man.
átman	atmos	—	breath, soul, hence atmosphere.
an (to breathe)	anemos	animus	wind, mind.
hridaya	kardia	cor	heart.
siras	kara	cerebrum	brain.
kapála	kephale	caput	head.
akshi	okos, okkos	oculus	eye.
nás	—	nasus	nose.
dat, acc. dantam	odonta (acc.)	dentem (acc.)	tooth.
asthi	osteon	os	bone.
pad, páda	pús, gen. podos	pes, gen. pedis	foot.
jánu	gonu	genu	knee.
divya	díos	divus	divine.
divasa	—	dies	day.
naptam, naktá	nukta (acc.)	noctem (acc.)	night.
ushás	éós, auós	aurora	dawn.
agni	—	ignis	fire.
más, mása	mén, méné	mensis	month, moon.
star, tára	astér	astrum	star.

Sanskrit.	Greek.	Latin.	English.
uda	hudor	unda	water, wave.
svapna	hupnos	sopor, somnus	sleep.
aksha	axón	axis	axle.
chakra	kuklos	circus	wheel, circle.
svara	surinx	susurrus	sound, whisper.
marmara	mormuro (verb)	murmur	murmur.
phulla	phullon	folium	flower, leaf; hence foliage.
pulu	polus	plus	much, more.
nava	neos	novus	new.
sámi	hémi	semi	half.
madhya	mesos	medius	middle.

PREPOSITIONS, PARTICLES, AND PRONOUNS.

pari	peri	per	round.
upari	huper	super	above.
pra	pro	pro	before.
antar	entos	inter, intus	within.
apa	apo	ab	away.
tar (to cross) tiras	terna (limit)	trans	across.
núnam	nún	nunc	now.
na	né	non	not.
kas, kis	tis	quis	who.
itaras	heteros	alter	other.
kva	kú (Ionic)	quo	where.
itthá	—	ita	thus.
paschát	opisthen	post	after.
anti	anti	ante	opposite, before.
cha	kai	que	and.

NUMERALS.

dvi	duo	duo	two.
trayas	treis	tres	three.
chatváras	tessares	quatuor	four.
panchan	pente	quinque	five.
shat	hex	sex	six.
saptan	hepta	septem	seven.
ashtan	októ	octo	eight.
navan	hennea	novem	nine.
dasan	deka	decem	ten.
vimsati	eikosi	viginti	twenty.
satam	hekaton	centum	hundred.
prathamas	prótos	primus	first.
dvitiyas	deuteros	secundus	second.
tritíyas	tritos	tertius	third.
chaturthas	tetartos	quartus	fourth.
panchathas	pemptos	quintus	fifth.
shashthas	hektos	sextus	sixth.
saptamas	hebdomos	septimus	seventh.
ashtamas	ogdoos	octavus	eighth.
navamas	hennatos	nonus	ninth.
dasamas	dekatos	decimus	tenth.
dvis	dis	bis	twice.
tris	tris	ter	thrice.

(*Sans. Texts*, II. 230-236).

Dr Muir in like manner examines verbs, participles, the declension of nouns, and conjugation of verbs.—(*Ibid.* II. 236-252.)

Professor Max Müller, in his Lectures on the Science of Language, gives some other useful instances, such as Sansk. *dánum*, a gift; Lat. *donum*. Sansk. *mánava, mánusha*, a *man*. Sansk. *marta*, a man, one who dies; whence *mortal*. Sansk. *sarkara*, sugar; Lat. *saccharum*; French, *sucre*. Sansk. *antar*, between, within; whence Lat. *internum*, within, and *antrum*, a cave.—(I. 407-437.) In his Chips from a German Workshop, he further has Sansk. *ar*, to plough; Lat. *arare*; Gr. *aroun*, to *ear*; Slav. *orati*; Goth. *arjun*; Lith. *arti*; Gaelic, *ar*. Hence Gr. *arotron*, a plough; Lat. *aratrum*. Sansk. *vastra*, clothes; Lat. *vestis*; Gr. *esthés*. Sansk. *ve*, to *weave*. Sansk. *siv*, to *sew*; Lat. *suo*; Lith, *siuv*.—(II. 44-46.) Professor Monier Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary also affords a considerable number of similar examples.

With their language the emigrant Aryans would necessarily introduce into the countries where they settled whatever else peculiarly characterized them, and prominently their religious ideas. "It is evident," says Dr Muir, "that at the time when the several branches of the great Indo-European family separated to commence their migrations in the direction of their future homes, they must have possessed in common a large stock of religious and mythological conceptions."—(*Sansk. Texts*, V. 2.) The oldest Greek writers, observes Sir William Jones, allow that their mythologies were not their own invention (*As. Res.* III. 467); and it is now certain that the early divinities and legends of Greece were the same that were possessed by their brethren in India. "If Hegel calls the discovery of the common origin of Greek and Sanskrit the discovery of a new world, the same may be said with regard to the common origin of Greek and Sanskrit mythology" (Max Müller, *Chips*, II., 144): and, as might be expected, it is in respect of the older Indian mythologies that the correspondence is most apparent (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 3). Godfrey Higgins (*Anacalypsis*, I., 201, 360, 361), Faber (*Pagan Idolatry*, I. 344), and Coleman (*Mythology of the Hindús*, 10), come to the same conclusion. "In the Veda we study a theogony of which that of Hesiod is but the last chapter" (Max

Müller, *Chips*, I., 72). "In the Vedic language we have the foundation, not only of the glowing legends of Hellas, but of the dark and sombre mythology of the Scandinavian and the Teuton" (Cox, *Mythology of the Aryan Nations*, I., 52, 53).

The literature of the Hindús exhibits various phases of their religious beliefs. The earliest of their writings extant are the Vedas, which are in Sanskrit (but of ancient form), and belong therefore to their history after their settlement in India. But much of the matter therein that is common in this literature to the western nations, may be concluded to have been current in the parent land before the migration. The Vedas have frequent allusions to times and persons of a period anterior to themselves. The Rishis, or the sages to whom these sacred writings are ascribed, Dr Muir informs us, speak of "the former rishis," "the ancient sages," "the former worshippers," "the ancient poets," "the forefathers of old," "the rishis, born of old, the ancients who showed the road," "the ancient priests," "the earliest born rishis," such as Manu, Bhrigu, Angiras, Atharvan, who are said to have been "the associates of the gods," and "sons of God" (*Sansk. Texts*, III., 219-251). Manu, to whom the Institutes are attributed, is described to have been the first of seven bearing that designation, which is drawn from a root signifying that he was the embodiment of mind, or wisdom. He is distinguished as *Swayambhuva*, or sprung from the self-existing. To him was communicated "the word of the Most High," which he promulgated through his son, Bhrigu (Manu's *Institutes*, i., 58-61, and Sir W. Jones, *Pref.*, xv., xxi.). Angiras is accounted "a god," and "the auspicious friend of the gods" (*Sansk. Texts.*, III., 251). Atharvan was Brahmá's eldest son, and the father of the god Agni (M. Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 17). With characters such as these brought on the scene, it is apparent that the aim is to depict primeval times when the Supreme Being first created the human race, and occupied himself with them. The next observable stage is what are currently called the Vedic times. Temple worship had not then been established. The offerings to the gods, consisting ordinarily of clarified butter, curds, cakes, and the soma, which was a fermented liquor, with occasionally animal sacrifices, were made in the open air, or in the domestic dwellings (Talboys Wheeler, *Hist. of India*,

I., 11). The Vedic hymns express the natural workings of the heart, addressed to a beneficent Creator, for satisfaction of the felt wants of the body and the soul. A further stage is marked by the prevalence of active priestly offices, and a complicated ritual. This is represented in a class of writings termed Bráhmanas, which are adjoined to the several Vedas. Hitherto the social system was of a free and unrestricted sort, such as is depicted in the great epic poems, the Rámáyana and the Mahá-bhárata, but mythological creations were in the advance. A fourth stage is that characterized by the legislation of Manu. It exhibits the ascendancy of the Brahmanical order, with the prevalence of caste, introducing restrictions as to occupations, marriages, and diet, such as exist to this day. After this was the reformation, or that protest against Brahmanism raised by the Buddhists. This movement was at length put down in India; Brahmanism became again the rule, the mythologies were more than ever multiplied, and sectarianism in worship was displayed. The Puránas correspond in type with the religious sentiments of this period. But for the purposes of the examination now contemplated, which is to compare the legends of the Old Testament with the Pagan mythologies, I have no occasion to go beyond the early Buddhist times. After a long life of missionary activity Buddha died, when a general council was held for the consolidation and preservation of his doctrines. The event, according to Lassen, Turnour, and Goldstücker, occurred in B.C. 543, while Professor Wilson places it ten years earlier (Dr Muir in *As. Jour.*, new series, II., 324; do. in *Sansk. Texts*, II., 55, 56; Wilson's *Essays*, II., 329). This brings us to just a century earlier than the time when the Jewish scriptures, but in what form it is not apparent, are said to have been promulgated by Ezra (Neh. viii.), or B.C. 445.

At the outset of the period in view, the primitive Aryans are found migrating to India and to Europe, carrying with them their language and mythologies. The western Aryans lapsed into barbarism; the eastern retained their civilization and knowledge, and their systems underwent the progressive developments I have indicated. It would be singular if an intercourse thus occurring between the east and the west should be limited to the single circumstance of the original

diverging migration. A roadway once opened up is naturally again and again resorted to, and if we perceive a correspondence of mythology in the several regions, embracing features originating in the eastern family only after the migration had taken place, it is apparent that there must have been renewed communication between the separated branches. There are tokens of such intercourse on the part of the enlightened and capable section established in the east. Professor Weber, in his essay on the Rámáyana, expatiates on the acquaintance shown in this poem with the Græco-Bactrian and Indo-Scythic tribes of the Pahlava, the Saka, the Yavana, the Gambhoja, etc. (*Indian Antiquary*, 178, 179), and Manu's Institutes (x. 44) exhibit the like knowledge of these same races. Whenever these writings may severally have been put forth, it is clear that, anteriorly thereto, there must have been contact of some sort, on the part of the inhabitants of India, with these foreign tribes. The earliest of their records exhibits the Indian Aryans quite in a condition, even then, to maintain such intercourse. The Rig Veda says that "merchants, desirous of gain, crowd the great waters with their ships," which were of dimensions to be propelled with a hundred oars (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. India*, II. 346; Talboys Wheeler, *Hist. of India*, I. 21). Professor Lassen, Mrs Manning further informs us, speaks of the rich products of India, in ancient times, being circulated in all directions by caravans, which, it is thought, were met at border stations and out-ports by western caravans and ships communicating with Egypt, Tyre, the Persian Gulf, and the Red Sea (*Anc. and Med. India*, II. 348). She alludes to the evidence of foreign traffic afforded by the nature of the presents brought from other countries at the installation of King Yudishthira, as recounted in the Mahá-bhárata, and concludes that the Hindús were ever a commercial people (*Ibid.* II. 354). Professor Wilson, referring to those remote times, says there was "an active commerce carried on between India and its neighbours, in which the former was supplied with the precious metals, with gems, with aromatics and drugs, with manufactured skins, furs, brocades, woollen and silk cloths, with arms and armour, and various fabrics of iron, wood, and ivory, in return, no doubt, for its staples of rice, cotton, sugar,

salt and cotton manufactures" (*Journal of As. Soc.* VII. 144). The separation of a whole caste to represent the commercial race, proves how considerably the pursuit of commerce must have prevailed. These are legislated for in the ninth book of Manu, and special rules are there laid down for the estimation of sea risks (Sir William Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 428). Whenever, therefore, we hear of the Indian Aryans, from the time of their first Veda to the age of Manu, we find they were a nation addicted to commerce by sea and land, and quite circumstanced to spread their notions to those western regions where, in point of fact, they are seen to have been adopted.

The Vedic gods, as specified by Scholten (*Comparative View of Religions*, 7-9), Talboys Wheeler (*Hist. of India*, I. 9, 10), and Muir (*Sansk. Texts*, V. 21-255), were Indra, Dyaus, Varuna, Prithiví, Súrya, Soma, the Asvins, Ushas, Váyu, the Maruts, Rudra, Vritra, Ahi, Agni, Yama, Mitra, Tvashtri, and Vách, and their parallels are to be found in Greece and Rome.

Indra, the sky, in the Hindú code, is the creator of heaven and earth (*Sansk. Texts*, V. 30). He is represented by *Jove*. He is armed, as is Jove, with the *vajra*, or thunderbolt, and occupies an Olympus which is known as Mount Meru (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 241). "The qualities pride and lust, which are particularly ascribed to Jupiter, are those also by which Indra is peculiarly characterized; and as Jupiter is *theon hupatos*, so is Indra *surapati* (ruler of the gods). Jupiter was also called in Latin *Diespiter*, and Indra is named *divaspati;* the former was denominated *pluvius Jupiter* and *ombrios Zeus*, while the latter presides over and dispenses rain" (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.*, 392). In the Veda "Indra," it is said, "comes loud shouting in his car, and hurls his thunderbolt at the demon *Vritra.*" And as Jove overthrew the Titans, so he destroys the Rakshasas (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. India*, I. 16, 17).

Dyaus, the heaven, is recognised in Zeus. In his form as *Dyaus-pitár*, or father *Dyaus*, he is apparent as *Ju-piter*, standing for *Diu-piter* (Pictet, *Ind. Eur.* II. 663).

Varuna, also the heaven, is revealed in *Ouranos*. Max Müller derives the name from *Var*, to cover, as does the firmament (*Chips.* II. 68).

Prithiví, the earth. *Dyaus* and *Prithiví*, or heaven and earth, says Dr Muir, are ancient Aryan divinities, and in the Rig Veda are described as the parents of the other gods. So Hesiod declares the Greek gods to have sprung from the union of *Ouranos* and *Gaia*, the heaven and the earth. The Egyptians also considered the earth to be the mother of all (*Sansk. Texts*, V. 22-33; Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 40-46).

Súrya, the sun. He courses through the heavens, as does his Greek and Latin representative *Apollo*, in a chariot drawn by horses, which with the Hindús are seven in number (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 263; Moor's Plates.)

Soma, the moon, figures in the Greek mythology as *Selena*, and in the Latin as *Luna* (Coleman, *Myth. of the Hindús*, 131.)

The *Asvins* have their name from *asva*, a horse, and the word signifies a cavalier (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 102). They are twins—young, beautiful, and bright—associated with the sun, and brothers of *Ushas*, the dawn (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 255, 257). They are evidently the same as Castor and Pollux (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 263). The *Asvins* work as healers among mankind (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 255, citing Goldstücher). They enable the lame to walk, the blind to see, and restore youth to the aged (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.* I. 10, citing Wilson's *Rig Veda*). The *Asvins* give us probably the designation of the *Essenes*, known in the Greek form as *Therapeuts*, or healers, who went about ministering to the sick.

Ushas, or *Ushásá* the dawn, is *Eos*, or *Aurora* (*Chips*, I. 360; *Sansk. Texts*, V. 181).

Váyu, the wind, and the *Maruts*, the breezes, are represented by *Æolus*, the ruler of the winds.

Rudra, the hurricane, is figured by the stormy *Boreas*.

Vritra, the clouds, and *Ahi*, the parching heat, are without special equivalents in the western Pantheon, probably because these elements of climate had not the same value in the west as in the torrid east.

Agni, fire, meaning the sacrificial fire. This is represented by the Latin *Ignis*, and the Slavonian *Ogni* (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 199).

Yama, the god of death, is *Hades* or *Pluto*. To reach his

domains a river called the *Vaitarani* has to be passed, which is the *Styx* of the Westerns (Coleman, *Myth. of the Hindús*, 113; Pictet, *Ind. Eur.* II. 520, 521). The way to his abode is guarded by two insatiable dogs, one of which is named *Karbura*, meaning "spotted." These wander about among mankind as the messengers of their master (*Sansk. Texts*, V. 302; M. Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 810). The Greek *Cerberos* corresponds with this description in all essentials, as do the two dogs of the Scandinavian Odin (Bunsen, *God in Hist.* I. 315). The other Sanskrit dog is named *Saramá*, and her son *Sárameya*, whence we probably have *Hermeias* or *Hermes*, the messenger of the gods. The notion that Yama ruled over the dead in regions below, it must be here mentioned, arose only in post-Vedic times (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 302).

Mitra is the Persian *Mithras*, or the sun (*Sansk. Texts*, V. 71), represented by the western Apollo.

Tvashtri, the artificer of the gods and forger of the thunderbolt of Indra. This is Hephaistos of the Greeks and Vulcan of the Latins (*Sansk. Texts*, V. 861).

Vách, speech, evidently the *vox* of the Latins. This is a goddess, the wife of Indra and mother of the Vedas (M. Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 900), being the Logos, or divine word of the Greeks.

I proceed to notice some of the later divinities who apparently were conceived after the true Vedic times.

Ganesa, formed with the head of an elephant, is the god of wisdom. Sir Wm. Jones traces a resemblance to him in the western *Janus*. *Janus* is invoked for all the important affairs of life, and his name is inscribed on the doors of new buildings, which hence are termed *januæ*. And just so *Ganesa* is called upon at all sacrifices, addresses to the Gods, and all matters of moment (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 226-228).

Lakshmí, the goddess of abundance, also called *Srí*, is obviously Ceres (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 240). She is alike, observes Col. Vans Kennedy, in attributes as in name. The Hindú divinity is moreover termed *Devamatri*, or heavenly mother, and in the Greek *Démétér* (*Hind. Myth.*, 394, 395).

Siva, the destroyer, rides on the bull *Nandi*. Jupiter assumed the form of a bull. It was an animal deified as

Apis by the Egyptians, and much used in the sacrifices of the westerns. *Siva* has the *trisula*, or trident, as one of his symbols, which in the western mythology belongs to *Neptune*. Siva is also associated with the Phallic worship which prevailed in Egypt, Greece, and elsewhere.

Káli, the wife of Siva, is apparently *Hecate* or Proserpine, the malignant consort of *Hades*. Human sacrifices were made to her, and she is depicted with a collar or necklace of skulls (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 266).

Saraswatí, the wife of Brahmá, and the goddess of learning, is brought out as *Minerva*. She rides on a peacock, a bird which in the western mythology is alloted to Juno (Coleman, *Myth. of the Hindús*, 9, 10).

Káma, the god of love, is the Greek *Eros* and Latin *Cupid*. He is armed, as in the western representations, with a bow and arrows, and shoots his darts to inflame the passions. Dr Muir informs us that he is associated with the creation of the universe, and in the Atharva Veda (where he is introduced), is said to be the first-born. So Hesiod has it that after chaos, were produced the earth and Eros, who was the first of the gods (*As. Jour. New Ser.*, I. 378, 379).

Vishnu rides on *Garuda*, a fabulous bird of the eagle tribe. The westerns apportion the eagle to Jove (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 248).

Rembhá, of Indra's court, is *Venus*, produced like her from the foam of the sea (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 251).

Visvakarman, as *Hephaistos* or *Vulcan*, forged the arms of the gods (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 264).

Mr Coleman has a list, taken from notes by Sir Wm. Jones, in which, furthermore, *Pavana* is considered to be the same as *Pan*; *Kuvera*, the god of wealth, as *Plutus*; *Skanda*, the god of war, as *Mars*; and *Durga* as *Juno* (*Myth. of the Hindús*, 10).

Dionysus, or *Bacchus*, is universally associated with India. The Greeks believed him to have been born on a mountain in India called Meros, evidently pointing to Mount Meru, the abode of their gods. Mount Nysa is also commonly spoken of as the place of his birth, which may be Naishada in India (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.* I. 258). It is from the latter name that we have the appelative *Dionysus*, or the god of

Nysa. Arian says that Mount Nysa was also called Meros (Maurice, *Hist. of Hindoostan*, II. 122).

Krishna, the eighth incarnation of *Vishnu*, is thought to be an embodiment of Apollo. He slew the serpent *Caliya*, as *Apollo* did *Python*. Both were beautiful, amorous, and warlike. He charmed the shepherds and herdsmen on his lyre, here resembling *Orpheus*. The lyres of *Orpheus* and of *Mercury* were formed out of the shell of a tortoise, an animal sacred to the Hindús, and associated with Vishnu (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 261, 262; Maurice, *Hist. of Hind.*, I. 575).

Orpheus and Herodotus have derived the Greek divinities from Egypt (Cory, *Myth. Inquiry*, 23; Dollinger, *Gentile and Jew*, 69; Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 57; Kenrick, *Anc. Egypt*, II. 311), and certain similitudes have been observed to support such an idea. *Osiris* is, by the common consent of Greek authors, identified with *Bacchus* (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 63). The Orphic *Dionysus*, says Dr Dollinger, is the fac-simile of the Egyptian *Osiris* (*Gentile and Jew*, 146). *Osiris* becomes the judge of the dead, and then receives the title of *Ro-t-amenti*, or king of hell; whence comes the Greek name of *Rhadamanthus*, to whom the same office is attached (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 10, 56). In this office Osiris is associated with the dog-headed divinity *Anubis* (Sharpe's *Egyp. Myth.*, 8, 49, 51), as the Greek *Hades* is with *Cerberus*. *Isis*, the wife of Osiris, is represented by *Démétér*, or the earth (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 132). Sharpe considers her also figured by *Ceres* and *Hecate* (*Egyp. Myth.*, 5, 6). Prichard holds *Horus* to be the same as *Apollo*; *Thoth* as *Hermes*; *Bubastis* as *Artemis* or *Diana*; *Athyr* as *Venus*; and *Neith* as *Minerva* (*Egyp. Myth.*, 82, 126, 134, 149, 173). *Ra* is the Sun God or Apollo; *Thmei* is *Themis*, and *Menes*, the founder of the Egyptian monarchy, is commonly viewed to be the same as *Minos*, the Grecian lawgiver (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 2, 57).

On the other hand, there is much connected with the Grecian system for which Egypt does not present a sufficient source. Mr Layard, Mr Proctor informs us, has ascribed to Niebuhr the following significant remarks:—"There is a want in Grecian art which neither I, nor any man now alive, can supply. There is not enough in Egypt to account for the

peculiar art and the peculiar mythology which we find in Greece. That the Egyptians did not originate it I am convinced, though neither I, nor any man now alive, can say who were the originators. But the time will come when, on the borders of the Tigris and Euphrates, those who come after me will live to see the origin of Grecian art and Grecian mythology" (*Light Science for Leisure Hours*, 316). Niebuhr's anticipation has been realised, but the light reaches us from a point further to the eastward than he had looked for. If there is an affinity between the Greek and Egyptian mythologies, it is also the case that there is such between the Egyptian and the Hindú.

Iswara and *Isi* are considered by Sir Wm. Jones to be the Egyptian *Osiris* and *Isis* (*As. Res.*, I. 253). *Iswara* means the supreme god, and the designation is commonly accorded to *Siva*. The bull was sacred both to Siva and Osiris, and the Nile was said to be an emanation from Osiris, as the Ganges from Siva (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 254; Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 274). The office of Anubis, in attendance on *Osiris* as the judge of the dead, brings before us *Yama* and his dogs (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 273, note). *Isis*, or prolific nature, is figured by *Parvati* (*Ibid.*, 278). The Hindús have a triad composed of Brahmá, Vishnu, and Siva. This is matched by the Egyptian triad, consisting of Kneph, Phthah, and Khem, and at a later time of Osiris, Horus, and Typhon (Cory, *Myth. Inquiry*, 48). Kneph, like Brahmá, the eternal spirit, had no temples dedicated to him, nor did he receive formal worship (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 292). Khem, the third person in the Egyptian Triad, equally as Siva, the third in the Hindú Triad, was worshiped with Phallic symbols, and was attended by a bull (Cory, *Myth. Inq.*, 43-45). In both nations there was the institution of hereditary caste, the doctrine of metempsychosis, and the snake and the lotus in use as sacred symbols (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 52, 53; Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 328; Wilkinson, *Customs of Anc. Egyptians*, Intr. ix.: Kenrick, *Anc. Egypt*, II. 49).

The question then presents itself, to which of these two ancient people the palm of originality, in respect of what is common to them and the Greeks, should properly be accorded.

And here every indication is certainly in favour of the priority belonging to the Hindús. Taking Bacchus and Osiris to denote the same divinity, as the Greek representative is described as drawn in his car by tigers, and clothed in a tiger's skin, it is clear he is traceable to India, and not to Egypt (Maurice, *Hist. of Hind.*, II. 250; Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 272). The tiger's skin, as a personal covering, is in the Indian delineations allotted to Siva (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 272). And as the god of wine, Bacchus is evidently derivable from soma, the deified intoxicating liquor of the Hindús, for which precise feature of an inebriating element the Egyptian mythology presents no analogy. *Osiris*, in his capacity of judge of the dead, is figured, as already shown, by *Hades* or *Pluto*. The dog *Cerberus*, who is in attendance on the Greek effigy, is obviously derived from the Sanskrit *Karbura*, and not from the Egyptian *Anubis*. Mount Nysa, the birthplace of Osiris and of Bacchus, under its Greek equivalent Meros, is identifiable with the Hindú Mount Meru. Then, as between India and Egypt, the lotus, sacred to both people, is indigenous to India, and not to Egypt; and the snake symbol in use with both is in form the Indian cobra. Lastly, the Pelasgi, through whom the Greeks, according to Herodotus, trace the derivation of their mythologies (Dollinger, *Gentile and Jew*, 69), it must now be seen were none other than the migrating Aryans who settled in India as well as Greece.

The Hindú elements found incorporated in the Egyptian and Greek mythologies, which we have now been dealing with, do not belong to the Vedic age. Their passage westward, consequently, is not ascribable to the great Aryan migration, but must have been effected at some long posterior time; and here therefore there is evidence of that continuous intercourse of these nations for which I have contended.

The advance of the Hindús in their mythological conceptions is described by Dr Muir. It is traceable through the various stages of the Vedas, the Bráhmanas, the Epics, and the Puránas (*Sansk. Texts*, IV., 1). Professor Max Müller recognizes that these conceptions passed westward at various times (*Chips*, II., 247), and Mr Cox finds that what is common to the Hindús and Greeks pervades also the Norse and German legends (*Mythology of the Aryan Nations*, I., 164), a result

due of course to a transition of the elements from the one people to the other.

"The commencement of Grecian intercourse with Egypt," says Kenrick, "is hidden by the darkness of ante-historic times." Psammitichus (B.C. 670) gained his kingdom by means of Ionian and Carian mercenaries, and from that time the communication between the two people was constant. He allowed his Greek allies to colonize the neighbourhood of the city of Bubastis. Thales, Pythagoras, and Solon then visited the land (Kenrick, *Anc. Egpt.*, II., 63-67; Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, *Hist. Survey of Astronomy*, 273, 274, 318), as also did Orpheus, Hecatœus, Herodotus, and Plato. The Egyptian temples were stored with ancient literature, said to have been derived from Hermes and his disciples, to which the Grecian explorers had access (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 3-10). Heeren, says Mr Baldwin, speaks of a very ancient connection between India and Arabia, and of the Arabians trading in the Indian Ocean from time immemorial (*Pre-historic Nations*, 220). "There can be no doubt," observes Professor Wilson, "that an active intercourse subsisted between India and Egypt in the early ages of Christianity, by way of the Red Sea, carried on by both Arab and Indian vessels. The ancient fictions, and it may be added, laws of the Hindús, and the vestiges of their race, language, and religion, found in distant countries, particularly in the Eastern Archipelago, prove that there was a time when they were enterprising navigators, and that they were, as Nonnus asserts, accustomed to naval tactics. That they should visit Egypt, that some of them, probably many, were to be found at Alexandria and other cities of that country, is therefore nothing unaccountable, and from them Nonnus, himself an Egyptian, might easily have collected much more valuable accessions to his long and elaborate composition than those which it actually affords" (*As. Res.*, XVII. 620). The work of Nonnus relates to the Grecian tales of the conquests of Bacchus in India, the materials for which the professor thus shows may have been derived from India through Egypt. Major Wilford treats of the same long-subsisting intercourse between the east and the west, which he concludes was maintained till the Mahomedan domination put an end to all such free communication (*As. Res.* X. 116).

Such being the traffic between these nations, subsisting at times now too remote to be historically ascertainable, and continued to a period of which we are properly cognisant, the community of their mythological beliefs becomes quite intelligible. They passed from the earlier, the higher cultivated, the more devotional, and the very imaginative people of the east, to the more slowly developing and heavier witted races to the west. The chief flow was in the direction of the old Aryan migration, and there too the earliest of the myths in common are seen to have taken root. The stream of communication, in later times, embraced also Egypt, and the geographical position of this land, placed between the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean, which washes the shores of Europe, made it a natural channel for the more recent elements. I proceed to notice some of these transmitted religious conceptions.

It is an evident feature in the earliest known deifications that they were representations drawn from the powers of nature. The Vedic gods were of this character. They personified the heavens and the earth, the sky, the sun, the dawn, the winds, the storm, the clouds, the fire, and the phenomenon of death. In a tropical climate, where droughts prevail and the relief of rain is anxiously looked for, the powers of the idealized beings were described as engaged in the struggle of the elements to bring down the grateful shower. Indra, the supreme god, thus smites Vritra, the rain-cloud, with his thunderbolt, and sets free the rain (Talboys Wheeler, *Hist. of India*, I. 16, and note). Vritra became easily convertible into the demon of night and darkness, and we have him in the Persian legend as Ahriman overthrown by Ormuzd (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 155). This imagery passed into Greece as Python smitten by Apollo, and it assumed many a varied form of evil overcome by some divine or heroic agency. We have it in the warfare of the gods with the Titans; in Hercules delivering Hesione from a sea monster; in Perseus effecting the like deliverance of Andromeda; in Feridun overcoming Zohak; and St George the Libyan dragon (Baring-Gould, *Curious Myths*, 2d series, 31-41; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, I. 306). Sir William Jones discovers the tale of Perseus and Andromeda in the Sanskrit legend of Parasica and Antamarda, and the cognomens of Andromeda's parents,

Cepheus and Cassiope, in the Sanskrit Capeya and Casyapi, given by Monier Williams as Kásyapa and Kásyapi, epithets of Aruna, the charioteer of the sun (*As. Res.* III. 467 ; *Sansk. Dict.*, 227, 228).

In the same fanciful manner the clouds are represented by the Hindús as cows, hidden in a cave, which again is a black cloud (Mrs Manning, *Anc. India*, I. 19). Vritra has there bound them, and Indra sets them free (Pictet, *Ind. Eur.*, II. 67). In one legend the Asura Vala is said to have stolen these cows of the gods, and concealed them in the cave, whence Indra liberates them (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 894). The Hindú Saramá, here representing the dawn, is described as searching for these cows, which the night has stolen and hidden in its secret caves (Cox, *Manual of Mythology*, 62 ; *Sansk. Dict.*, 1092), Just so we have Hermes stealing the cattle of Apollo, which are recovered through the intervention of Jupiter, and Hercules rescuing the cattle of Evander, which Cacus had stolen and concealed in his cavern (Pictet, *Ind. Eur.*, II., 69 ; Cox, *Manual of Myth.*, 62).

The Hindús have furthermore the sun enamoured of the maiden Ushas, who is the dawn, and seeking her (Mrs Manning, *Anc. India*, I., 5). The Greeks, in like manner, portray the loves of Kephalos and Eos, or the sun and the dawn. Eos is thus represented as loving Kephalos, or flying from him, and being destroyed or scorched up in his embrace. Or it is Daphne thus flying from Apollo, and so perishing as he closes upon her. (Max Müller, *Chips*, II., 90, 94, 95).

The well-known legend of Venus produced from the foam of the sea is apparently of Hindú origin. The Amrita, or celestial drink of immortality, had, with various other precious objects, been lost at the deluge. The gods churned the ocean with the mountain Mandara for its recovery, and at this time the goddess Lakshmi arose from the foam. The legend is given in both the great Indian epics (Mrs Manning, *Anc. India*, I., 338 ; II., 75 ; Monier Williams, *Epic Poetry*, 66, note ; and *Sansk. Dict.*, 746).

The tale of Prometheus obtaining fire from heaven for the use of man is also seemingly traceable to India. In the Hindú version Mátarisvan brings down the hidden Agni or fire to the Bhrigus, after it had disappeared from earth (Muir,

Sansk. Texts, V., 204, 205; Monier Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 765). Agni, the divine fire, was produced by the friction of two sticks. *Pramantha* is the Sanskrit term for a stick thus employed, and Kuhn naturally traces thereto the name of Prometheus (Cox, *Myth. of the Aryan Nations*, I., 333; II., 208, note; Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 636).

The idea of Orpheus alluring birds and beasts around him with his strains is from a Sanskrit source. Gunádhya, on reciting his poetic effusions, thus entranced the stags, deer, bears, buffaloes, roebuck, and all the beasts of the forest, who gathered round him, weeping with delight (Baring-Gould, *Curious Myths*, 2d ser. 172).

The notion of such a race as the Amazons first appears in India. The Mahá-bhárata describes a tribe of female warriors who would allow none of the opposite sex to remain among them. The Greek tradition locates this Amazonian race in the neighbourhood of the Caucasus (Talboys Wheeler, *Hist. of India*, I., 419.)

The Mahá-bhárata also has a statement of gold being "exfodiated by pippilikas, that is, by the common large ant," which, Professor Wilson observes, "explains most satisfactorily the origin of the extravagant fables related by Greek writers respecting the gold-making ants of the auriferous deserts of Northern India (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, VII., 143).

The poems attributed to Homer are brought by modern criticism to a much lower antiquity than has been commonly accorded to them, and they are found to owe their materials to earlier literary productions. The question is carefully examined by Mr Paley, in a paper appearing in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, vol. XI. part II. The armour described, he observes, is such as is depicted on vases of B.C. 400, and the language that of the Ionic dialect of the same period, with occasional Atticisms incautiously introduced. When Herodotus (B.C. 450) spoke of Homer having preceded him by four hundred years, it was to an earlier writer than our Homer that he referred. The ancient poems relating to Troy were currently styled cyclic, and these, Mr Paley concludes, are drawn from still earlier epics. The older Greek writers, embracing to the time of Pindar, Euripides, and Herodotus, made use of the ancient

Troica, and not of our Homer. The first plainly recognizable quotations from the current Homer appear, B.C. 419, in Aristophanes; and onwards, from that time, in Plato and succeeding writers, the references become numerous. Our Homer, therefore, must be dated from that period, there being no proper evidence of his work having had an earlier origin.

Again we may look to the east for our true models, a conclusion which Mr Paley himself favours. The main action of the Rámáyana is exactly that of the Iliad. As the rapture of Helen occasions the siege of Troy, so the invasion of Lanká is caused by that of Sítá. Lakshmana is to Ráma what Patrocles is to Achilles. Ráma's allies Sugríva, Hanumat, and Jámbavat, find their parallel in Agamemnon, Ulysses, and Nestor. Where sage counsels are required, they fall from the lips of Jámbavat; where skill and stratagem, Hanumat is the agent. The heroic Indrajit, standing on the adverse side as the son of the transgressor Rávana, is represented by Hector (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 45, 46 and note). The same gods, observes Prof. Weber, are invoked by the contending parties Ráma and Rávana, as is the practice of the opposing warriors of Greece and Troy (*Indian Antiquary*, 122). As the Grecian hosts are enumerated to the Trojans by Helen, so Rávana's spies, detected in Ráma's camp, are allowed to return to their employer and report upon the forces brought against him (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 82, note). The final issue is made to depend on a single combat between Ráma and Rávana. The armies cease fighting to watch the result, but the gods and demons in the sky, taking either part, renew their contests; and it is just so, in all respects, when Achilles and Hector engage in their personal struggle for victory. Rávana possesses ten heads, and as soon as one is cut off by Ráma, another appears in its room, as with the Lernœan Hydra slain by Hercules. But in the treatment of the fallen foe the Indian hero stands out in marked superiority to the Grecian victor. Ráma performs magnificent obsequies over his enemy's remains, while Achilles lowers himself by spitefully dishonouring those of Hector. Sítá is then shown by Ráma to his conquering army, as Helen exhibits herself from the ramparts of Troy (*Ibid*, 86, note). Krishna, the hero-god of the other Indian epic, the Mahá-bhárata, is killed by an arrow shot into the

sole of his foot, and Achilles is vulnerable to death only in the heel (Higgins, *Anac.* I. 362). Reverting again to the Rámáyana, Ráma, after abandoning Sítá in the forest, fulfils the ritual requirements of the horse sacrifice regarding chastity, by sleeping with her golden statue, a device introduced into the Alcestis of Euripides (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 175, 176). The portent of showers of blood falling from heaven is common to both the Indian epics, and it occurs in the Iliad and in Hesiod (*Ibid.* 28, note). In both the Indian epics the heroes Ráma and Arjuna win their brides by bending enormous bows, which none but they can wield. A similar incident occurs in the Odyssey when Ulysses reclaims Penelope.

There is a singular support to the connection of the Homeric poems with the Indian epics, in the circumstance that the author of the Mahá-bhárata is called Vyasa, a term signifying "distributor" or "arranger," while Homeros may be derived from *hom* and *ar*, or *homou* and *aró*, meaning "joining together," or compiling, (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 17, 39; Prof. Goldstücher in *Westminster Review* of April 1868). Vyasa is also the name attributed to the compiler of the Vedic poems, which requires for the idea of the designation a very high antiquity.

Mr Cox traces the currency of the Homeric legends over a wide western range. "The complicated action of the Iliad," he says, "is represented in the Edda and lays of the Volsungs and the Nibelungs." "If the war at Troy took place at all, it is, to say the least, strange that precisely the same results should have been waged in Norway and Germany, in Wales and Persia." "The war of Ilion has been fought out in every Aryan land," (meaning the whole region influenced by the great Aryan migration). "The story of Helen and Achilles is the subject of the popular traditions in every Aryan land." "How then do we find in Teutonic or Hindú stories not merely incidents which specially characterize the story of Odysseus, but almost the very words in which they are related in the Odyssey?" (*Myth. of the Aryan Nations*, I., 92, 143, 156, 169, 193).

Of course there can be but one answer to such a question. The parentage of the legends must be accorded to the Hindús, and they have travelled to Greece, and further western lands,

as have other mythological delineations, which are due, so evidently, to the fertile east. An age, astronomically ascertained, is ascribed to Krishna, the deified hero of the Mahá-bhárata, and both epics seem founded on historical data. The Rámáyana relates to an invasion of Ceylon by a prince of the ancient kingdom of Oude, and the Mahá-bhárata to a struggle between two connected families for the rule at Hastinápur, near Delhi. Ráma, when about to be installed as heir to his father's throne, is, through an intrigue, banished for a term of years to wander in the wilds, and his brother Lakshmana voluntarily shares his exile. "How many centuries," observes Prof. Williams, "have passed since the two brothers began their memorable journey, and yet every step of it is known, and traversed annually by thousands of pilgrims! Strong, indeed, are the ties of religion, when entwined with the legends of a country! Those who have followed the path of Ráma from the Gogra to Ceylon, stand out as marked men among their countrymen. It is this that gives the Rámáyana a strange interest; the story still lives: whereas no one now, in any part of the world, puts faith in the legends of Homer" (*Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 68, note). On the other hand, Helen, the heroine and cause of the Trojan war, is no more than a mythological personage. She was sister to Castor and Pollux, born as they were from the egg of Leda, as begotten by Jupiter in form of a swan. Her beauty was her bane, and led to her being carried off by Paris to Troy. Her brothers Castor and Pollux are said to have accompanied the Argonauts in their expedition against Colchis. This is placed at thirty-five years before the Trojan war. Helen must consequently have been at least fifty years of age when she attracted the admiration of Paris, and her charms remained in acknowledged power through the ten ensuing years occupied by the siege (*Anthon's Lemprière's Dict.*) She, in fact, as being of divine parentage, never ages, and never dies (*Od.* iv. 569). The features are thus unhistorical, and the tale found currency in lands beyond Greece as any other myth.

It is common in the creeds of the ancients to have the chief divinities grouped together in triads. The Hindús thus associate Brahmá, Vishnu, and Siva; the Egyptians Osiris, Isis, and Horus; the Greeks Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades; the

Latins Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto; and the Scandinavians Odin, Frigga, and Thor (Christmas, *Un. Myth.* 442). The Hindú triad represents the great processes of nature in creation, preservation, and dissolution. Their imitators have followed their form without apprehending its significancy. "It is in the Hindú religion alone," remarks Col. Vans Kennedy, "that this dogma appears clear, consistent, and intelligible; and from it, therefore, it would seem most probable that the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, derived so singular an opinion" (*Hind. Myth.*, 377).

The parallel between the four *Yugas*, or ages, of the Hindús, called the *Krita* or *Satya*, the *Tretá*, *Dvápara*, and *Kali*, and the golden, silver, brass, and iron ages of the Greeks and Romans, has necessarily struck all who have considered these subjects. The golden age of Hesiod was that primitive time when gods and mortal men were produced together. There was then neither sickness nor death. In the silver age men became mortal, but they were endowed with longevity, a century reckoning for the time of infancy (Faber, *Pagan Idolatry*, II. 13, 21). Just so in the Hindú conceptions in their first age flourished Manu, Bhrigu, Angiras, &c., the "sons" and "associates of the gods," who themselves also at this period were brought into being. And in each age there was a diminution in the length of life accorded to mankind. In the first age they attained 400 years, in the second 300, in the third 200, and in the last and current age the limit has been reduced to 100 (Davidson, *Intr. to the Old Test.*, I. 185).

The Hindú year is of 12 months, consisting of 360 days. It was so estimated originally by the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Greeks, and other nations (Higgins, *Anac.*, II. 316-323). The period having been calculated inaccurately, it is obvious that it is not due to observation, but that one nation has adopted it from another.

Associated with this measure of number is the Zodiac, which in like manner has been divided into 12 sections, each of 30 degrees, giving a total of 360 degrees. The signs are of the same number, and substantially of the same forms, in the zodiacs of India, Persia, Egypt, Phœnicia, Greece, and Italy (Dupuis, *Origine de tous les Cultes*, III., 361). Dupuis has an argument in favour of ascribing the invention to the Egyptians,

but one might be constructed on a like footing to support the claim in behalf of any oriental nation. For the antiquity derivable from the position of the signs, on any particular sphere, I have been unable, after reference to India, to obtain reliable materials on which to found a judgment.

The week of seven days is common to the nations we are occupied with, a division of time which in all instances is associated with what were held to be the planets. But five now recognized planets were then known of, to which the sun and the moon were added in as also planets. The association between the east and the west in this field is readily traceable by comparing the Sanskrit nomenclature and order of arrangement with those of the Scandinavians. *Sansk.* Adityavára, Sunday, from Aditya, the sun; *Scand.* Sön-dag. *Sansk.* Somavára, Monday, from Soma, the moon; *Scand.* Mon-dag. *Sansk.* Mangalavára, Tuesday, from Mangala, the planet Mars; *Scand.* Tis-dag, from the hero This or Tuisco. *Sansk.* Budhavára, Wednesday, from Budha, the planet Mercury; *Scand.* Onsdag, from Oden, or Woden, sometimes written Bodhan. *Sansk.* Vrihaspativára, Thursday, from Vrihaspati, the preceptor of the gods; *Scand.* Thorsdag from Thor. *Sansk.* Sukravára, Friday, from Sukra, the planet Venus; *Scand.* Frej-dag, from Freja, or Freya, their goddess of beauty. *Sansk.* Sanivára, Saturday, from Sani, the planet Saturn, or the god cleansing spiritually; *Scand.* Sondag, derived from loger, bathing (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, II. 303; Björnstjerna, *Theogony of the Hindús*, 199, note; Coleman, *Myth. of the Hindús*, 129-134). The French, being a Latin race, have followed the Roman nomenclature; namely, Lundi, Monday, from Luna; Mardi, Tuesday, from Mars; Mercredi, Wednesday, from Mercury; Juedi, Thursday, from Ju-piter; Vendredi, Friday, from Venus; while we Saxons have adopted the northern divinities Tuisco, Woden, Thor, and Freya.

I am indebted to a correspondent for an ingenious solution of the method by which the names of the so-called planets have, apparently, been adjusted to the days of the week, which I find warranted by the authorities I cite. The planets may be arranged, according to their relative elevation or distance from the earth round which they were supposed to hold their course, thus—Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter,

Saturn; but this is not at all the order of their appearance in association with the days of the week. The Hindûs, to facilitate their astronomical calculations, divided the day of 24 hours into 60 parts, or *gatis*, and to each *gati* appointed one of the planets as regent, going over the planets repeatedly until the 420 *gatis* of the week were fitted with regents (Bailly, *Astronomie Indienne*, 278, 279, 331; *Time and Faith*, by an ex-Editor of the *Westminster Review*, 9, 10, note, citing Colebrooke in *As. Res.*, VII. 287). Applying then the sun, as the most important of the orbs, to the first *gati*, we get the following results:—

Days of Week.	*Gatis* and heavenly bodies.				
1.	1st *gati* ..... Sun.	57th. Sun.	58th. Mars.	59th. Jupiter.	60th. Saturn.
2.	61st ..... Moon.	117th. Moon.	118th. Mercury.	119th. Venus.	120th. Sun.
3.	121st ..... Mars.	177th. Mars.	178th. Jupiter.	179th. Saturn.	180th. Moon.
4.	181st..... Mercury.	237th. Mercury.	238th. Venus.	239th. Sun.	240th. Mars.
5.	241st..... Jupiter.	297th. Jupiter.	298th. Saturn.	299th. Moon.	300th. Mercury.
6.	301st..... Venus.	357th. Venus.	358th. Sun.	359th. Mars.	360th. Jupiter.
7.	361st..... Saturn.	417th. Saturn.	418th. Moon.	419th. Mercury.	420th. Venus.

The difficulty being soluble in India, the nomenclature of the days of the week, it is fair to conclude, must there have originated. And the key thereto being the scale of sixty parts, on which, divided into halves, the divisions of the year and of the zodiacal sphere equally turn, it may also be concluded that the prevailing ancient computation of the solar year, and the arrangement of the zodiac, occurred first in India, and spread thence to other countries.

Decimal notation, in the estimate of Prof. Max Müller, is "one of the most marvellous achievements of the human mind, based on abstract conception of quantity." The correspondence of the Sanskrit and the western numerals, from one to a hundred, shows that this method is traceable to the old Aryan stock (*Chips*, II. 51-53).

The institution of Masonry, in its highest branch, namely

that of the Royal Arch Masons, is common to the easterns and the westerns. The possession of masonic knowledge enabled Mr Ellis, of the Madras Civil Service, a well-known orientalist who flourished at the beginning of this century, to pass into the inner shrine of a Hindú temple (Higgins, *Anac.* I. 767). The same circumstance in later years happened to a gentleman of my acquaintance, who has imparted the particulars to me as far as he was at liberty to do to one not of the craft. Thinking that a Bráhman, in addressing him, had made use of the ineffable name of God, AUM (pronounced Om), he approached him on the subject, and soon came to be acknowledged as a fellow Bráhman. On this he was admitted into the shrine of an ancient pagoda in the south of India, and there saw evident masonic symbols intermixed with some that were idolatrous; and he found that the same observances were used by the Bráhmans, as by the masons, on uttering the ineffable name in question. The western brethren have added two other syllables to this name, expressive of designations of God as obtaining in Phœnicia and Egypt. The Hindús, having kept free of these additions, must be considered to represent the higher antiquity.

The resort to sacrifice as a medium for access to the deity has prevailed from the earliest known times among all nations. It has been carried out everywhere with the same appliances of altar, sacred fire, and priest. In the Rig Veda the sacrificial fire is personified as the god Agni, and to him many hymns are addressed. He was at once "the fire of the hearth and the altar, the guardian of the house, the messenger between gods and men." Those who kept up no sacred fire were accounted barbarous. The Vedic priests had to prepare the sacrificial ground, to dress the altar, slay the victims, and pour out the libations. Then there were invocations, such as this. "O Varuna, accept our sacrifice, forgive our offences, let us speak together again like old friends" (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 9, 33; II. 328, 330). The Greeks, Romans, and Celtic Druids, kept up a sacred fire which was never to be extinguished (Barker, *Aryan Civilization*, 1-4; Higgins, *Celtic Druids*, 185). "Ovid" (*Fasti*, III. 726-730), Prof. Wilson notices, "makes a singular remark, possibly embodying an ancient tradition, that burnt offerings and oblations

originated with Bacchus after his conquest of India and the east" (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, IX. 106). The Rig Veda, in which sacrifice appears as a well-established usage, being the most ancient of extant records, the rite is evidently traceable to the primitive, or the eastern Aryans.

The Hindús figured for themselves an abode for their gods. This was the Mount Nysa of the westerns, as has already been shown. As the Hindú mythologies advanced, Swarga was the heaven of Indra, Vaikuntha that of Vishnu, and Kailása that of Siva. The westerns assembled their divinities in Mount Olympus. There was also in the later Hindú times a region for the dead, with Yama, the god of death, ruling over it. The Egyptians had Amenti, the place of departed souls, presided over by Osiris, then termed Serapis. The Greeks had their Hades, a name derivable from the Sanskrit *Adhas*, below, or the lower regions (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.*, 393). The heavens of the Hindú gods were the abodes of bliss for their followers, which are paralleled by the Elysian fields of the westerns.

The river gods were venerated by Hindús, Persians, Greeks, Italians, and Scandinavians (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 256; Bryant, *Anc. Myth.* I. 239). Among the Hindús the Saraswati and the Ganges were their holiest streams, and were said to be of heavenly origin (Inman, *Anc. Faiths*, I. 238, 239; Max Müller, *Chips*, II. 129), and ablutions for purification from sin were practised by Hindús, Persians, Etruscans, Druids, Romans, and most ancient nations (Prof. Wilson in *Jour. of As. Soc.* IX. 66, 90; Higgins, *Anac.* II. 65-69; Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*, Art. Baptism).

A strong link of affinity between the Hindús and the western nations is presented in their rites for the dead. The ancient Aryans burnt their dead, as do the modern Hindús. The Greeks, Scandinavians, and ancient Irish, had the same practice. The Hindús used a sacred wood for the purpose, and the westerns the oak. The ancient Aryans placed the remains in vessels and buried them, asking, as a hymn of the Rig Veda shows, that the earth might "lie lightly" on the deceased, covering without oppressing him. The westerns dealt with the ashes of the dead in the same manner, and a common funeral inscription among the Romans was "*sit tibi*

terra levis" (Prof. Wilson, *Essays*, II. 273, 279, 292; Pictet, *Ind. Eur.* II. 510, 511; Rájendrála Mitra in *Jour. of As. Soc. of Bengal* for 1870, pp. 254, 255). At the funeral processions of the Vedic Hindús a black cow or goat was led behind the corpse, and sacrificed. The animal was cut in pieces and spread over the body, and burnt therewith, receiving from the process the designation *anustarani*. In this way, it was thought, the passage over the Vaitariní, or the Indian Styx, was secured. The *mantra* for the occasion, referring to the animal sacrificed, says, "Companion of the dead, we have removed the sins of the dead by thee, so that no sin or decrepitude may approach us" (Prof. Wilson, *Essays*, II. 280-286; Pictet, *Ind. Eur.* II. 519, 521; Rájendralála Mitra in *Jour. of As. Soc. of Bengal*, 246, 247). A black cow was in like manner in ancient times led behind the corpse in Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and England, and, doubtless, sacrificed (Pictet, *Ind. Eur.* II. 522). The Hindús provided the dead with food wherewith to satisfy the dogs of Yama, and the Scandinavians made the same provision for the dogs of Odin (Pictet, *Ind. Eur.* II. 523, 524). Probably the sacrificed animal was put to this use. "It was a belief in Northern Europe," says Mr Tylor, "that he who has given a cow to the poor will find a cow to take him over the bridge of the dead, and a custom of leading a cow in the funeral procession, is said to have been kept up to modern times" (*Primitive Culture*, I. 427). The Gauls and Lithuanians burnt horses, dogs, and falcons of black colour, on the funereal piles of the dead, and we have the instance of Achilles sacrificing and burning horses and dogs on that of Patrocles (Pictet, *Ind. Eur.* II. 519, 520).

The Aryans worshiped their dead ancestors. Manu enjoins the oblation of the *sráddha*, when rice, milk, roots, and fruit are to be offered to propitiate the Manes. None but a blood-relation can make the offerings, and it is held impious in the highest degree to neglect them. Cakes are offered to the *Pitris*, the progenitors of mankind; to the domestic genii; the guardians of the dwelling; and the *Viswa devas*, or universal gods. The Greeks and Romans made similar offerings of cakes, fruit, milk, honey, wine, and victims to the dead. The rite with the Romans was called *Feralia*, and the power

of making the offering was restricted to the blood-relations of the deceased (Prof. Wilson in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, IX. 65, 91; the Rev. T. C. Barker, *Aryan Civilisation*, 6-14). The Hindús believe that the spirit after death remains floating about in the atmosphere in the form of air, without support, until ten *srâddhas*, or funeral ceremonies, are performed. The libations of rice and milk then offered are for the support of the souls of the deceased, until they acquire substance to pass to their appointed places (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 38, *note*, citing Carey's *Rámáyana*). The ancient classic superstition, that the ghosts of the dead wandered about as long as their bodies remained unburied, is of the same type (*Ibid.*, 51, *note*, referring to Homer, Virgil, Lucan, and Euripides).

The deliverance of the Manes from their unembodied wanderings being possible only by the offices of a direct descendant, it was important that every Hindú should have a son. This is shown in their name for a son, who is designated *Putra*, as he who delivers from *Put*, or the region of the torment (*Manu*, ix. 138). The possession of a son who might offer the funeral repasts was of equal importance to the Greeks and Romans. Consequently, among all these nations, on failure of a son, a barren wife might be put away; a son might be adopted; or a kinsman on the father's side might raise up offspring to the deceased on his widow (Barker, *Aryan Civilisation*, 17-24). With them community of domestic worship was an index of relationship. With the Hindús, those who offer the funeral cake to the same ancestor are designated *sapindas*, or, if the offering is the lesser one of water and rice, the relationship is expressed by the term *samanodacas*. And as property went with worship, and the worship was hereditary, neither Hindús or Greeks could make wills (*Ibid.*, 26, 41). The ancient Romans could not make wills; nor is there a provision for this power in ancient German law (Sir John Lubbock, *Origin of Civilisation*, 312). The laws of marriage and dower; of property; of contract and capacity for entering into contract; of deposits, loans, sale, and gift, are the same in the Roman as in the Indian code (Jacolliot, *La Bible dans l'Inde*, 33-47). The Hindú families have community of right in property, the sons possessing shares even in the father's lifetime. Such was

also the condition under ancient German law (Lubbock, *Or. of Civ.* 314, 315).

The Devadásás in former times were virgins attached to the temples, who kept up the sacred fire, and danced before the cars conveying the gods in their processions. They are represented in the latter office now by the nautch girls attached to the temples. In Egypt, virgins were in like manner kept to dance before the gods; and in Rome vestals had charge of the sacred fire (Jacolliot, *La Bible dans l'Inde*, 112, 114).

At the *Makara Sankrántí*, or *Perum Pongol* festivals, held by the Hindús during the winter solstice, sons and daughters prostrate themselves before their parents, servants before their masters, and disciples before their teachers; food and alms are given to the poor, and sweetmeats and presents to friends and relatives; and diverse sports and amusements are resorted to. These observances are of very ancient standing, and prevailed also among the Teutonic races. The *Strenæ* of the Romans, now become the *Etrennes*, or presents distributed on New Year's Day in France, as also the feastings and present-givings observed in England at Christmas, are all of the same character, occurring too at the same season of the year (Prof. Wilson in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, IX. 71-73). Mr Sharpe finds the drawing of kings and queens, and the sugared cakes of Christmas and Twelfth Night, occurring among the ancient Egyptians (*Egyp. Myth.*, pref. xi.)

At the feast of the *Pongol*, the Hindús bless their cattle, an observance practised at the same time of the year in Catholic Rome at the feast of St Anthony, and derived, no doubt, from more ancient national usage. "Could a Drávira Bráhman," says Prof. Wilson, "be set down of a sudden in the Piazza, before St Mary's Church at Rome, and were asked what ceremony he witnessed, there can be no doubt of his answer; he would at once declare they were celebrating the Pongol" (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, IX. 74).

The *Holi* is another important festival of the Hindús which has had its parallels among the western nations. On this occasion the utmost liberty of speech and conduct is allowed, masks and disguises are worn, and people pelt each other with comfits and powders. Similar extravagances characterized the *Lupercal* of the Romans, and occur at the carnivals

of the continental nations of Europe (Prof. Wilson in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, IX. 108). The *Saturnalia* of the Romans was of the like complexion. The Latins bound the image of Saturn in chains for a whole year, and at this festival he was let loose with great rejoicings. Plutarch describes the god himself as laid in a deep sleep in one of the British Isles, fast bound and guarded by Briareus and a multitude of demons. In commemorating his liberation, men and women gave themselves up to drunkenness and lasciviousness; slaves changed places with their masters and ridiculed them; friends made presents to one another; all was mirth, riot, and debauchery, during the five days to which the festival was extended (Faber, *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, II. 495-497; Anthon's *Lempriere's Dict.*) One of the diversions of the Holi is to send people on fictitious errands, to raise a laugh at their expense. This custom was followed at the *Festum Stultorum* of the Romans, as it is at our April Fools' Day (Prof. Wilson in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, IX. 108).

The traces of a very ancient, widespread, and long-maintained intercourse between the eastern and western nations is thus quite apparent. A community of language, mythologies, legends, laws, and usages is found among them, which cannot have occurred but from actual contact. It has become plain that an extensive migration over these distant regions, from a parent land, was the first instrument of a dissemination of the elements found in common among them; and the inducements of commerce, by the channels thus explored, would suffice to keep open the relations established. And it is also evident that, in the passage of ideas through these nations, the flow was ever from the east—from the Aryans of India, whose ancient literature we still possess, in demonstration of their high attainments, to the then uninstructed and comparatively barbaric inhabitants of Europe.

II.

THE EASTERN ARYANS.

THE wide-spread influence of the Aryan nation makes it of interest to trace, as far as the means at command may permit, the condition of this people at the time of their great migration, and to endeavour to arrive at some idea of the remoteness of the period when the movement took place. The primitive stock may be judged of by the elements of language prevailing east and west among their descendants after they had left the parent land. Whatever is expressed by terms common to both sections, must, it may be concluded, be descriptive of what belonged to all before their separation. By this means we may discern that the primitive Aryans occupied a land of mountains and streams, with access to some sheet of water worthy of being designated a sea. They had the marked seasons of spring, summer, and winter, the latter cold enough to make them acquainted with snow. Living in a temperate climate, they were of light colour as contrasted with the dark-skinned inhabitants of India, to whom the eastern branch found their way. Bactria, their supposed country, answers the required description, the Caspian being the sea of which they could have knowledge. They had pasturages and domestic animals, cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, and dogs. They had houses, roads, culinary vessels, manufactured sugar, wheeled conveyances, boats, the precious metals, copper, and probably iron. They used the plough, and wove fabrics. They had the ordinary weapons of war, and prosecuted sieges. The kingly office existed among them; and they had imagined for themselves that system of mythological worship which has spread over the western as well as the eastern world.

It is obvious that large sections of this people could not

have left their land, to wander they knew not whither, but under the pressure of a redundant population. The body who invaded India were in strength sufficient to maintain their distinctiveness, and its attendant standard of civilization, among the tribes supplanted by them. The western emigrants, though in each locality not sufficiently numerous to escape absorption in the surrounding peoples, must have been in considerable bodies to have forged their way to the distant limits in which they have left the impress of their language and mythology.

It is, therefore, apparent that the primitive Aryans were a most important nation, whether as respects the strength of their numbers, or their knowledge of the arts of life. They must have long occupied the parent land to rise to the degree of civilization acquired by them, and then to have overflowed the bounds of their own dominions to carry themselves to the plains of Hindostan on the one side, and the utmost limits of western Europe on the other,—an emigration of proportions so vast, and of such solid effects, as never, even to the present time, to have been rivalled.

Of the period when this great people were flourishing in Bactria, we can only form general conceptions. A vast antiquity doubtless belongs to it. We see that they possessed some extinct language which was the parent of the Sanskrit and of the western dialects, so far as these have an analogy with one another. Now, when Alexander the Great invaded India (B.C. 331), Sanskrit was already a dead language. Dr Muir, citing Benfey, supposes it may have begun to decay in the 9th century B.C., and ceased to be spoken three centuries later (*Sansk. Texts*, II. 142). This must be a mere idea, based upon no fixed data. The period, possibly, may have been even a more distant one; and Sanskrit is a form of language so highly developed, and teeming with so copious and advanced a literature, that a very lengthened interval must have elapsed from its first formation out of the primitive Bactrian language, to its ultimate popular disuse. "Ages must have passed before the grammatical texture of the Vedic Sanskrit could have assumed the consistency and regularity which it shows throughout. Every tense, every mood, every number and person of the verb is fixed, and all

the terminations of the cases are firmly established. . . . The Veda presents the most ancient chapter in the history of the human intellect. We find no traces in the Veda, or in any Aryan work, of a growing language. . . . The whole grammatical mechanism is finished," and the only changes admitted of are those of "gradual decay and recomposition" (Max Müller, *Hist. of Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, 526, 528). "Sanskrit is, in one sense, the property of Europe as well as of India. Its relationship to some of our own languages is as clear as to some of the Hindú dialects. It is a better guide than either Greek or Latin to the structure, historical connection, and correlation of the whole Indo-European family. It is a more trustworthy authority in the solution of recondite philological problems. Its study involves a mental discipline not to be surpassed" (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, pref., i.). Professor Williams proceeds to give us some idea of the scope of this ancient literature. It consists of the four Vedas, namely, the Rig Veda, the Yajur Veda, the Sáma Veda, and the Atharva Veda, with their Bráhmanas, Upanishads, and Sútras, the Code of Manu " with its train of subsequent important law-books, and extending through the six systems of philosophy, the vast grammatical literature, the immense epics, the lyric, erotic, and didactic poems, the Níti-Sastras, moral tales and apothegms, the dramas, the various treatises on mathematics, rhetoric, prosody, music, medicine, &c., bringing us at last to the eighteen Puránas with their succeeding Upa-puránas, and the more recent Tantras. . . . . No one person, indeed, with limited powers of mind and body, can hope to master more than one or two departments of so vast a range, in which scarcely a subject can be named, with the single exception of Historiography, not furnishing a greater number of treatises than any other language of the ancient world. In some subjects, too, especially in poetical descriptions of nature and domestic affection, Indian works do not suffer by a comparison with the best specimens of Greece and Rome; while in the wisdom, depth, and shrewdness of their moral apothegms they are unrivalled. More than this, the learned Hindús had probably made great advances in astronomy, algebra, arithmetic, botany, and medicine, not to mention their admitted superiority in grammar, long before any of these sciences were cultivated by the most ancient nations of Europe"

(*Ibid.*, xiii. xiv.) "Now, of all the systems of philosophy I have any knowledge of," observes Jyram Row, a native of Mysore, whose opinion of the productions of his own people must of course be received with some allowance, "whether the systems of ancient Greece and Rome, the Peripatetic, the Sceptic, or the Epicurean; their later developments in those of the schools; or still later forms—the modern systems of Kant, Cousin, and Hamilton—I have no hesitation in pronouncing the Vedantic philosophy of the Hindús the most logical and profound. It makes the nearest approach, I know of any, to the strict requirements of modern scientific thought. In its fundamental aspects, it is enough to add here, it resembles the system of Mill and Bain" (Lecture delivered at St George's Hall, London, 12th Nov. 1871; *see* series of Mr Scott of Upper Norwood).

Much of the more important part of this vast literature belonged to the early pre-historic period of Indian history, when probably Sanskrit was still the spoken language. The modern efforts, it is allowed, for depth of thought, scope of knowledge, and perfection of diction, are not to be compared with the productions of the ancient days. National prosperity and independence are essential to the cultivation of native literature, and the disuse of Sanskrit synchronizes with the decadence of the nation.

The Vedas occupy the earliest place in this literature. The fourth Veda is commonly recognized to be a later production than the other three. Nor do these three stand together in point of time, the Rig Veda having a decided priority over the others. The Vedas consist of hymns addressed to the various divinities, and are the earliest representations extant of the religious ideas of this ancient people. The Rig Veda contains 1028 hymns, every verse, word, and syllable of which had been carefully counted in the theological schools as early as about B.C. 600. It was then looked upon, not only as an ancient, but a sacred work, and its language had ceased to be generally intelligible (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 10, 12). The Bráhmanas supply the ritual of their worship, and also contain matter of an explanatory and illustrative nature; one or more are attached to each Veda. The Upanishads are adjoined to the Bráhmanas, and are for elucidation of the mystic and

secret meanings of the Vedas. They are more than a hundred in number, and are considered to be the sources of the various systems of philosophy, of which there are six. The Sútras are made up of precepts, axioms, and aphorisms in morals, religion, and science. They form a kind of rubric, or directory to Vedic ceremonial, and convey also instruction in philosophy and grammar (Williams, *Sansk. Dict., in loco*). A very considerable period must have elapsed between the Vedas and the Bráhmanas, as is apparent from change of language and misapprehension in the Bráhmanas of Vedic terms (Max Müller and Muir in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, new series, II. 316, 317). The Bráhmanas are in fact the records of still older traditions, put forth long after the Vedic hymns, and by a diversity of hands (Max Müller, *Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, 427-435). "They are based upon a pre-existing, widely ramified, and highly developed system of worship," and "belong to a stage in the religious development of India when the Brahmanical faith was full-blown." (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, II. 182, 183, citing Roth). The Upanishads and Sútras sensibly lengthen the chain of Vedic illustration. The Institutes of Manu, by general consent, also belong to a pre-historic age, as do the great epic poems, whatever the endeavours of some modern critics to lower their antiquity. From the first of these productions to the latest a very long course of time must have passed; and at the very outset of these ancient remains, the language in which they appear was already in a condition of perfect maturity.

Professor Williams has given a brief account of the epic poems which affords the means of forming some judgment of the literary powers and social condition of the people from whom they have emanated. The Rámáyana consists of about 50,000 lines, exclusive of the Uttara-kánda, which is an evident addition to the original poem. The Mahá-bhárata extends to 220,000 (*Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 15, 17), being in excess by several fold of the Iliad and Odyssey put together. "In the whole range of Sanskrit literature," observes the professor, "a more charming poem than the Rámáyana" does not exist. "The classical purity, clearness, and simplicity of its style, the exquisite touches of true poetic feeling with which it abounds, its graphic descriptions of heroic incidents and

nature's grandest scenes, the deep acquaintance it displays with the conflicting workings and most refined emotions of the human heart, all entitle it to rank among the most beautiful compositions that have appeared at any period in any country. It is like a spacious and delightful garden; here and there allowed to run wild, but teeming with fruits and flowers, watered by perennial streams, and even its most tangled jungle intersected with delightful pathways. The character of Ráma is nobly portrayed," and Sítá, his partner, "is a paragon of domestic virtues" (*Ibid.*, 12).

Ráma is unjustly banished from the throne assigned to him by his father, to wander in the forests, subject to privation and danger of every kind. He endeavours to dissuade Sítá from incurring these hardships and perils by accompanying him; but she is resolved to share her husband's lot, and thus nobly breathes her devotion to him :—

"A wife must share her husband's fate. My duty is to follow thee
Where'er thou goest. Apart from thee, I would not dwell in heaven itself.
Deserted by her lord, a wife is like a miserable corpse.
Close as thy shadow would I cleave to thee in this life and hereafter.
Thou art my king, my guide, my only refuge, my divinity.
It is my fixed resolve to follow thee. If thou must wander forth
Through thorny trackless forests, I will go before thee, treading down
The prickly brambles to make smooth thy path. Walking before thee, I
Shall feel no weariness: the forest thorns will seem like silken robes;
The bed of leaves a couch of down. To me the shelter of thy presence
Is better far than stately palaces, and paradise itself.
Protected by thy arm, gods, demons, men shall have no power to harm me.
With thee I'll live contentedly on roots and fruits. Sweet or not sweet,
If given by thy hand, they will to me be like the food of life.
Roaming with thee in desert wastes, a thousand years will be a day;
Dwelling with thee e'en hell itself would be to me a heaven of bliss."
(*Ibid.*, 13.)

Professor Williams also gives interesting specimens from the Mahá-bhárata. Arjuna wins his bride by a feat of arms with an enormous bow, which is thus described :—

"A moment motionless he stood and scanned
The bow, collecting all his energy;
Next walking round in homage, breathed a prayer
To the supreme bestower of good gifts;
Then fixing all his mind on Draupadí,

He grasped the ponderous weapon in his hand,
And with one vigorous effort braced the string.
Quickly the shafts were aimed; they flew—
The mark fell pierced; a shout of victory
Rang through the vast arena; from the sky
Garlands of flowers crowned the hero's head,
Ten thousand fluttering scarfs waved in the air,
And drum and trumpet sounded forth his triumph."

(*Ibid.* 22, 23.)

Here is a battle scene sketched with wonderful spirit, and possessing the true Homeric ring:—

"Soon as he saw his charioteer struck down,
Straightway the Madra monarch grasped his mace,
And like a mountain firm and motionless
Awaited the attack. The warrior's form
Was awful as the world-consuming fire,
Or as the noose-armed god of death, or as
The peaked Kailása, or the Thunderer
Himself, or as the trident-bearing god,
Or as a maddened forest elephant.
Him to defy did Bhíma hastily
Advance, wielding aloft his massive club.
A thousand conchs and trumpets and a shout,
Firing each champion's ardour, rent the air.
From either host, spectators of the fight,
Burst forth applauding cheers: 'The Madra king
Alone,' they cried, 'can bear the rush of Bhíma;
None but heroic Bhíma can sustain
The force of Sálya.' Now like two fierce bulls
Sprang they towards each other, mace in hand.
And first as cautiously they circled round,
Whirling their weapons as in sport, the pair
Seemed matched in equal combat. Sálya's club,
Set with red fillets, glittered as with flame,
While that of Bhíma gleamed like flashing lightning.
Anon the clashing iron met, and scattered round
A fiery shower; then fierce as elephants
Or butting bulls they battered each the other.
Thick fell the blows, and soon each stalwart frame,
Spattered with gore, glowed like the Kinsuka,
Bedecked with scarlet blossoms; yet beneath
The rain of strokes, unshaken as a rock,
Bhíma sustained the mace of Sálya; he
With equal firmness bore the other's blows.
Now like the roar of crashing thunder-clouds
Sounded the clashing iron; then, their clubs
Brandished aloft, eight paces they retired,

And swift again advancing to the fight,
Met in the midst like two huge mountain crags
Hurled into contact. Nor could either bear
The other's shock; together down they rolled,
Mangled and crushed, like two tall standards fallen."
(*Ibid*, 25, 26.)

"There are many graphic passages," observes Professor Williams, "in both the Rámáyana and Mahá-bhárata, which, for beauty of description, cannot be surpassed by anything in Homer," while for diction that of the Indian epics "is more polished, regular, and cultivated, and the language altogether in a more advanced stage of development, than that of Homer." There are, moreover, "indications in the Indian epics of a higher degree of civilisation than that represented in the Homeric poems. The battle-fields of the Rámáyana and Mahá-bhárata, though abounding in childish exaggerations, are not made barbarous by wanton cruelties; and the descriptions of Ayodhyá and Lanká imply far greater luxury and refinement than those of Sparta and Troy" (*Ibid.*, 42-44). It is in the domestic relations especially that the manners and tone of feeling of a people will be expressed, and here the race of whom we are endeavouring to form an estimate will be found to have possessed a high standard. "Nothing can be more beautiful and touching than the pictures of domestic and social happiness in the Rámáyana and Mahá-bhárata. Children are dutiful to their parents and submissive to their superiors; younger brothers are respectful to elder brothers; parents are fondly attached to their children, watchful over their interests, and ready to sacrifice themselves for their welfare; wives are loyal, devoted, and obedient to their husbands, yet show much independence of character, and do not hesitate to express their own opinions; husbands are tenderly affectionate towards their wives, and treat them with respect and courtesy; daughters and women generally are virtuous and modest, yet spirited, and, when occasion requires, courageous; love and harmony reign throughout the family circle. Indeed, it is in depicting scenes of domestic affection, and expressing those universal feelings and emotions which belong to human nature in all time and in all places, that Sanskrit epic poetry is unrivalled" (*Ibid.*, 57, 58).

The Puránas are commonly alleged by western critics to be productions of modern times during the Christian era. Such is not the ordinary sentiment of the people of India themselves, and one western scholar, Col. Vans. Kennedy, maintains that the opinion adverse to their antiquity has been advanced without any true grounds. "I am well aware," he observes, "that the recent composition of Sanskrit works, and particularly of the Puránas, is a prevalent opinion; but as I have never met with it (except in the works of Mr Bentley) under any other shape than that of *bare assertion unsupported by the slightest argument or proof*, I am completely at a loss to understand on what grounds it could have been formed" (*Hindú Myth.*, 153). The italics are those of the author. His judgment, as an individual one at issue with that of other Sanskritists, must be received with caution, but I present it as very boldly made by one who was himself an accomplished scholar, and therefore worthy of consideration. He has come to his opinion, he mentions, after having "most carefully examined sixteen" out of the eighteen Puránas. The designation of these writings, *Purána*, signifies what is "ancient." They therefore profess to represent what relates to times long passed away. Professor Wilson describes them as belonging to the same religious system as the Rámáyana and Mahá-bhárata, or the mytho-heroic stage of Hindú belief, being thus, in some respects, derivable from an old, if not a primitive era; but at the same time embodying a system of worship of a sectarian character of a time posterior to that depicted in the epics (*Vishnu Purána*, pref. iii., iv.). They are "constructed," says Mrs Manning, "according to some ancient model, now lost" (*Anc. and Mediæval India*, I. 244). That there were Puránas of a very remote time is apparent, as they are spoken of in the Upanishads of the Sáma, the Yajur, and the Atharva Vedas, in the Epics, and in Manu's Institutes (Mr Curzon in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, XVI. 179, note). Even then should the western critics be right in ascribing the existing compositions to Christian times, they are filling the place of older records, belonging to the true Sanskrit period, which once were current, but have disappeared.

The general result we arrive at is that there is a vast body of literature, religious, mythological, ritualistic, and scientific,

originating among this ancient people from a period too remote to be even approximately estimated, in a language which ceased to be in colloquial use apparently much about the time when Greece made her earliest advances in the expression of enlightened thought; and beyond the whole we see evidence of a prior language, belonging to a still more ancient race, which fell out of use, to become represented in other tongues, of which that of the said extant literature has been the most important and enduring offset. The period of the emigration of the Sanskrit family from the parent Bactrian land, becomes inconceivably remote, when we find that the Vedas, which are themselves of an age not to be calculated, and which are the earliest of their records, contain no allusion to this movement, which even then must have been lost sight of (Pictet, *Ind. Eur.* ii. 728).

The fourth, or the Kali Yuga of the Hindús, is stated to have begun at a period corresponding to B.C. 3102, at which time Krishna, king of Dwáraká in Guzerat, the last of their mythological heroes, is said to have died (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 133, note). The Kali Yuga is to endure 432,000 years, the sum of the four yugas together being 4,320,000 years. Taking these to be possibly days, Mons. Bailly observes, and allotting 360 days to the year, the period would be reduced to 12,000 years, the time for which the earth is to last according to the Persians (*Astr. Ind. Discours, Prel.* c., ci.). The Kali Yuga, he remarks, has the appearance of denoting real time. Had it, like the other Yugas, been an imaginary period, it would have been thrown back to a remote ideal epoch as they have been (*Ibid.*, lxxxii.). It is used historically in other instances than in that of Krishna. For example, the death of Vikramáditya, the King of Oujein, is expressed as having occurred in the 3044th year of this Yuga (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 911). Mons. Bailly has made a long and careful examination of the astronomical data given as marking the occurrence of the Kali Yuga in tables met with at Tirvalour (? Tirúkovalúr), west of the French settlement of Pondicherry in south India, and has found these approximately correct in respect of the length of the tropical year, the lunar revolution, the obliquity of the ecliptic, the equation of time as measured from the sun, the moon, and Saturn, the conjunction of Jupiter

and Mercury, and the position of Mars (*Disc., Prel.*, xix., xxviii., xlviii., xlix., lxv.). Here are nine elements of calculation in which the Tirvalour tables so approach the actualities, as tested by modern computation, as to make it impossible that the Hindús could have arrived at their results except upon actual observation. Mons. Bailly strongly combats the idea that they could have been obtained by back calculation (xxxvi., xxxvii.), an opinion, however, in the interests of orthodoxy, subsequently advocated by Mr Bentley; but Mr Bentley's conclusions imply a degree of knowledge in the Hindús which they did not possess. One element, which would seriously have disturbed their calculations, is the retardations and perturbations caused by the influences of surrounding orbs on one another, of which they could know nothing. And the attempt to marshal together a variety of astronomical phenomena, so as to give a representation of them as they may have occurred thousands of years back, requires a degree of competency which the modern Hindús, in their degeneracy, have not possessed. Mons. Pictet treats of this subject, and considers that Mr Bentley's adverse criticisms have been effectually refuted (*Ind. Eur.*, II. 729-733). The year of the Kali Yuga, Mr Fergusson observes, receives support from Greek sources. Ossian and Pliny, drawing apparently from Megasthenes, who was sent on an embassy to India about B.C. 300, say that when the Greeks were in India the Pundits gave them lists of kings, to the extent of 153 or 154 in number, who had reigned before the time of Alexander; a statement corresponding with the known lists of kings, of the solar and lunar dynasties, showing that we have now the same lists that were presented to the Greeks. An average of 18 years for each reign would go back, within 19 years, or one such reign, of the year alleged for the Kali Yuga (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, new series, IV. 136). The Chaldeans claim a similar antiquity for their astronomical science. There is the well known incident that Callisthenes obtained at Babylon a set of observations reaching back to 1903 years before the occupation of the city by Alexander, or to B.C. 2234, which he forwarded to Aristotle; and this calculation Sir Henry Rawlinson considers sustained by data in the Sanchoniathon of Philo Biblius, and in a passage in Pliny (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, XV. 221-223). The Chaldean

historical era may in fact, according to Sir Henry's authority, be carried to a time far beyond that now claimed for the Hindús. On the occasion of Mr Smith's paper on the Deluge, as taken from an account on a Nineveh tablet, being read before the Society of Biblical Archæology, Sir Henry observed that there was a recorded date in the inscriptions for the conquest of Babylon by the Medes, corresponding with B.C. 2280, and that the number of kings assigned by Berosus to the dynasty which preceded that event, would place the commencement of the historical era in about B.C. 5150 (*The Record* of the 6th Dec. 1872).

The Hindú sacrificial system is intimately connected with the position of the heavenly bodies. Their rites were regulated by certain conjunctions of the constellations which were to ensure happy results. The study of the calendar was therefore a necessity belonging to them through all time (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 115). One of their observations, made in a treatise called the *Gyotisha*, which is associated with their religious worship, has been found to lay down solstitial time accurately for the year B.C. 1186 (*Ibid.*, I. 114). Mons. Bailly considers the systems of the Chaldeans, Greeks, and Arabians, to have been derived from them, while the Egyptians could claim no position as proficients in this branch of science (*Astr. Ind. Disc., Prel.* lxxi.). In estimating the length of the solar year, and the equation of time, he finds the Hindús arriving at greater accuracy than the Arabians and Hipparchus, the founder of the western system; and he traces knowledge exhibited by Hipparchus and Ptolemy to Indian sources (*Ibid.*, xl.-xliii., clxvii.-clxix.). Seeing the slow advances made in the west during twenty centuries in arriving at a true knowledge of the duration of the solar year, notwithstanding the advantage they had of setting out on the basis of the Chaldean tables, the measure of accuracy reached in the Tirvalour tables for the year B.C. 3102, he argues, could not have been obtained but after successive efforts repeated through many prior generations (*Ibid.*, cxlvii., cxlviii.). And as the beginnings of the civilization of the Hindús date from the time when they were in their Bactrian home, so also, it would seem, their practice of astronomy, bound up as this is with their religious observances, has to be referred back to that

very remote period. "When we examine the claims of the Indians," observes Mr Proctor, "we are met by a singular circumstance. Their systems of astronomy belong to a latitude considerably higher than the latitudes of Benares or Babylon. For the Brahmans teach that the longest day in summer is twice as long as the shortest day in winter, which is not the case in any part of India. Their records of star risings all belong to latitudes certainly not lower than 40° N." (*Saturn and his System*, 189, 190). It is said that the Hindús have the tradition of the constellation called the Southern Cross, now observable at the Cape of Good Hope, having at one time been visible to them in the zenith, a position which I am informed it could not have held in Upper Asia under 30,000 years ago.

Krishna figures as the eighth Avatára or descent of Vishnu, and Ráma as the seventh. Krishna is a hero of the Mahá-bhárata; and the poem, according to the general concurrence of western as well as eastern critics, belongs to a later era than that of the Rámáyana, which recounts the exploits of the earlier hero Ráma (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 65, note). Taking these poems to have a basis of historical reality, it is fair to presume that they may have seen the light at some time reasonably approximate to the events described in them. If the beginning of the Kali age, or about 3000 years before the Christian era, may possibly be near about the time when the Mahá-bhárata, or the germinal tale on which the poem may have been constructed, was put forth, the Rámáyana, and its foundations, would have to be remitted to a still more distant period. It has been observed that the Institutes of Manu show no knowledge of the occupation of India by the Aryans, or Hindús, beyond the Vindhya range, and this work being ordinarily considered to have been current from 900 to 600 years B.C., the fact would militate against that invasion by them of Ceylon, which is the subject of the Rámáyana, at any earlier age. I have, in a succeeding section, given my reasons for attributing to the Institutes a much higher antiquity than is commonly accorded them, and also for placing the Epics before the Institutes, at a still more distant era. But apart from these reasons, it must be remembered that the author of the Institutes, however imperfectly he maintains his position, is in fact acting a part, and associ-

ating his work with the beginning of all things, as a special revelation made by the divinity at the creation. In keeping with this, he ignores the more modern fourth Veda, while recognizing the other three, and he thinks to maintain the character of his work by betraying no knowledge of India beyond the Vindhya mountains, or the limits of the Bráhmanical holy land. If the Tirvalour tables are to be depended on, they place the Hindús, as a settled people, in South India, more than 3000 years B.C.

The Egyptian oblong zodiac of Dendera, as given in Denon's Travels, exhibits Capricorn at the zenith, and the sun's actual place as in Cancer. This involves a passage of about eight signs from the present position of the signs, expressing a past period of about 17,000 years. And if the invention of the zodiac is due to the Aryans, as is inferrible, a still higher antiquity is shown from this source to belong to them.

Whatever records we have of the eastern Aryans places them before us as a people in possession of all that characterizes a race advanced in enlightened knowledge. As far as we can follow the traces they have left behind them, there is not an index of the beginnings of their civilization. At the commencement of the Christian epoch, there is the ascertained reign of Vikramáditya, the king of Oujein, the founder of an era beginning at B.C. 57 (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.* 911). Mr Ward, after describing him and his contemporaries as liberal patrons of learning, says: "Thus the Hindú courts, filled with learned men, who could boast of works on every science then known to the world, presented, it must be confessed, a most imposing spectacle. A people who could produce works on philosophy and theology like the Vedas and the Darshanas; on civil and canon law like the Smritis; whose poets were capable of writing the Mahá-bhárat, the Rámáyana, and the Shri Bhagavata; whose libraries contained works on philology, astronomy, medicine, the arts, &c.; and whose colleges were filled with learned men and students, can never be placed among barbarians, though they may have been inferior to the Greeks and Romans" (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.* 129). At the invasion of Alexander, which occurred about three hundred years earlier, Megasthenes informs us that India was divided into a number of independent states, of

which he enumerates 118 to the north. Alexander crossed the Indus with 120,000 troops. Two of the Indian chiefs yielded to him; but Porus, whose territories stretched to Hastinápur, or the neighbourhood of Delhi, resisted him. Porus was defeated. Alexander then crossed the Chenab and the Ravee, and reached the Sutledge. There he was opposed by a very large force under the King of Mugudu, whose capital was Palibothra (Patna). The Greeks, wearied with their campaigns, would advance no further, and Alexander withdrew by the Indus (Marshman, *Hist. of India*, I. 12-14). Megasthenes describes the troops of Porus as consisting of 20,000 horse, 100,000 foot, and 2000 war-chariots; and he says that the land was full of rich cities, with considerable commerce (Björnstjerna, *Theogony of the Hindús*, 2, 3). The condition of Indian society, as represented by their village governments and Bráhmanical saints, was very much what it now is (The Rev. F. D. Maurice, *Religions of the World*, 38). There were "the same manners, the same customs, and the same form of idolatry, which prevail at the present day" (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.* 122). In fact, nothing more characterizes the people of India than an unchanging persistence in all that pertains to them; and the stages of their national standing have ever to be measured by lengthened periods. Our next indications in the receding stream of time are in the age of the Epics. We find the people still in possession of important and luxurious cities, ruled over by dynastic races of kings, having great armies equipped with chariots and all the usual appliances of ancient warfare, provided with the useful and the precious metals, encased in silks, and with social feelings expressive of considerable refinement. The poetic literature of that day is prolific in the vastness of its bulk, and of the highest merit, whether as respects elevation of thought, fertility of conception, or beauty of diction. It has apparently served as the model for the most admired outflow of Grecian poetic genius. We next pass over some undefinable period to the Vedic times, where there are still ample marks of advanced civilization. They had, says Muir, then kings, rulers, and governors, cities of stone, and fortified places (*Sansk. Texts*, V. 451-456). They had fixed dwellings, villages, and towns; agriculture;

weaving, and working in gold and iron; marine commerce and naval expeditions; and, in astronomy, had seen the need of an intercalary month to bring the solar and lunar years into adjustment (Prof. Wilson, *Rig Veda Sanhita*, I., pref. xli.). They had roads, resting-places, travelling-cars (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. India*, I. 57-59). They had arts, sciences, institutes, golden ornaments, coats of mail, weapons of offence, musical instruments, needles, drugs, antidotes, rajahs, envoys, heralds, serais or places for refreshment of travellers, and laws for governing inheritance and adjudicating between debtors and creditors. The grammatical accuracy and metrical beauty in which the Vedas are conveyed, of itself stamps them as the possessions of a highly civilized race (Wilson, *Rig Veda*, II., pref. xvi., xvii.). We finally pass over another very lengthened and unmeasured space of time to the period of the great migration. The tongue of the original Aryans, in this interval, had to expire, to be replaced by the Sanskrit, and the Sanskrit had to mature itself to the point of perfection in which it is found in the Vedas. And at that interesting period, when the Aryans had outgrown the capabilities of their own land, and spread themselves east and west, we find them possessed of very much the same knowledge of the resources of life that belonged to them in the Vedic age. They had the kingly office, fixed dwellings, wheeled conveyances, weapons of war, and flocks and herds. And judging of the parent by the remnants retained in the offspring, it is presumable they had a language worthy of an enlightened and advanced race. A progress which carried them from upper Asia to the western confines of Europe, there to leave the impress, apparent to this day, of their ancient language and mythologies, speaks volumes for their numbers, energies, force of character, and general resources.

The religious persuasions of a people such as this, in the far off era occupied by them, is a matter of profound interest. The Rig Veda, the earliest of the extant Sanskrit records, must be accepted as an exponent on this head, especially as the ideas therein occurring are traceable over the whole region subjected to Aryan influence.

It is the conclusion of all who have studied these questions that even in polytheistic nations there is at the foundation of

their beliefs the sense of one true universal God, in whose hands the governance of the whole creation centres. "When we inquire into the worship of nations in the earliest periods to which we have access by writing or tradition, we find proofs that the adoration of one God, without temples or images, universally prevailed" (Higgins, *Celtic Druids*, 207). "Pure monotheism is at the bottom of all mythology" (Christmas, *Un. Myth.* 153). "We find everywhere, in the civilized ancient world, a belief in one supreme power, co-existing with polytheism" (Kenrick, *Anc. Egypt*, 365). "All the great gods of the Gentiles ultimately resolve themselves into one deity, known by different names" (Faber, *Pagan Idolatry*, II. 237). "Cudworth admirably shows that all the gods and goddesses of the Gentiles are ultimately one *numen*" (*Ibid.* III. 62, note). And it is in the most primitive nation of whom we know, and in the earliest of their records, that this feature of the ancient faith is made most distinctly apparent. "The key-note of all religion, natural as well as revealed, is present in the hymns of the Vedas, and never completely drowned by the strange music which generally deafens our ears when we first listen to the wild echoes of the heathen worship" (Max Müller, *Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, 538). The religion of the Vedas was not idolatrous. Though many deities are there involved, it is apparent but one is intended (Small, *Handbook of Sansk. Lit.*, 6, 9). The Vedas repeatedly allege the existence of but one supreme spirit the creator of the universe. "It is almost certain that the practice of worshipping idols in temples was not the religion of the Vedas" (Prof. Wilson, *Essays*, II. 51, 54). There is no mention of temples in the Vedas. The worship must have been entirely domestic (Prof. Wilson, *Rig Veda*, pref. xxiv.) Other nations stood originally in a like position. Eusebius informs us that the Egyptians acknowledged one universal creator, called Cneph (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.* 171). The groundwork of the Egyptian theology was a belief in one god (Christmas, *Un. Myth.* 4). The primeval religion of Irán was a belief in one god, and a fraternal affection for the whole human species (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, II. 58). The Parsees, the modern representatives of this creed, have "faith in one god, the creator, the ruler, and the judge of the world" (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 181). The

patriarchal creed of the Chinese displays a sublime knowledge of the true God (The Rev. C. Gutzlaff in *Jour. of As. Soc.* III. 274). "The Druids . . . were firm believers in a supreme being," and had "a hatred of idols" (Higgins, *Celtic Druids*, 283). "The earliest idea we have from Greek sources is of an universal Divinity whose power was the life of all creation" (Prichard, *Egypt. Myth.*, 36). In one of the Orphic fragments it is said, "The sole God is Jupiter (Zeus) . . . In his own person he comprehends all things; and from his ample womb all things are produced" (Faber, *Pagan Idolatry*, IV. 109). Numa prohibited the use of idols, and for 170 years the early Romans were without them (Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, II. 9). The Greeks and Romans had their universal *numen*, the parent of the human race (Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, III. 65). The idea of one supreme being prevailed originally in China, India, and Egypt, in Greece and Rome, in Africa, in the north, and in Mexico (Christmas, *Un. Myth.* 416, 417).

Such would seem to be the faith implanted in all the human race when they have enlightenment sufficient to enable them to study God in his works, and to apprehend him in the inner emotions of the soul. But directly there is a want of satisfaction in the all-sufficiency of these early and alone substantial testimonies, the progress is not an improving one. And of the next and downward stage, among the Aryans, there is clear appearance. The process was that of deifying the powers of nature. The first imagined Vedic divinities, as we have seen, took this shape. They represented the heavens, the earth, the sky, the sun, the dawn, the wind, the storm, the clouds, the fire, and the embodiment of death. "The clear blue sky, the light of the sun, the rosy dawn, the storm that spends itself in fruitful rain, the winds and gales which drive away the clouds, the rivers whose fruitful slime overspreads the fields,—these moved the inhabitants of India to the worship of the divine as the beneficent power of nature which blesses man. . . . Religion, still wholly patriarchal in form, and free from hierarchical constraint and from the later dogmatic narrowness, bore in this earlier stage of its development the character of the still free and warlike life of a nomadic people living in the midst of a sublime nature, where

everything, the clear sky, sunshine, and boisterous storm, mountains and rivers, disposed to worship. As yet the Indian knew no close priestly caste" (Scholten, *Comparative View of Religions*, 7, 8). "The worship is that of the personified elements, and is domestic, not temple worship. Nor was it idolatrous" (Wilson, *Vish. Pur.*, pref. ii). The deification of nature and her powers—the elements, the sun, the heavens, stars, single natural objects and physical phenomena, lay at the root of all heathen religions (Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, I. 65). "We have abundant evidence that the Egyptian theology had its origin in the personification of the powers of nature," these being the heavenly bodies, fire, earth, water, the sun and moon, and the Nile, ideas which were common to the Phœnicians, Babylonians, Indians, and Greeks (Kenrick, *Anc. Egyp.*, I. 435, 436). In following these authors we must be cautious, however, not to accept the idea which some of them seem to present, that the deification of the objects of nature was the expression by man of his earliest religious convictions. It was a process of degeneration from a higher model.

The Vedic worship was sustained to the times depicted in the Epics. "The ritual," says Prof. Wilson, "appears to be that of the Vedas, and it may be doubted that image worship is alluded to" (*Vish. Pur.*, pref. iii.) But as men gave the rein to their fancies, and the power of the priestly order gradually prevailed, open idolatry, with complicated systems of worship, found encouragement and growth. The poison, once introduced, spread; the divinities were multiplied, and took every conceivable shape, to the debasement of the worshipers and their complete enslavement by an interested priesthood. "First of all, the religion of the Veda knows no idols. The worship of idols in India is a secondary formation, a later degradation of the more primitive worship of ideal gods" (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 38). "When we ascend to the most distant heights of Greek history, the idea of God, as the supreme being, stands before us as a simple fact. Next to this adoration of one God, the father of heaven, the father of men, we find in Greece a worship of nature. The powers of nature, originally worshipped as such, were afterwards changed into a family of gods, of which Zeus became the king and father. This third place is what is generally called Greek

mythology; but it was preceded in time, or at least rendered possible in thought, by the two prior conceptions, a belief in a supreme God, and a worship of the powers of nature" (*Ibid.*, II. 151, 152). "Few nations had more idols than the polished and enlightened Greeks, but they did not fall into this error in their early days. It is curious to observe, that the more eloquent, polite, and learned, these people became, in the same proportion they became the more degraded and corrupt in their national religion" (Higgins, *Celtic Druids*, 207). Dr Döllinger (*Gentile and Jew*, I. 110) also speaks of the gradual multiplication of divinities in Greece, increasing as the people advanced in substantial power; and Mr Mitford recognizes the comparative purity of their earlier faith (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.*, 73). The Chinese also, says Gutzlaff, from the conception of the one true God, passed to the fabrication of a formidable host of divinities, to whom they now accord merely nominal worship (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, III. 274). "There are sufficient indications, both in tradition and history, to place it beyond doubt, that all systems of religion were of a simpler and purer nature in their origin than in their subsequent progress, and that in all of them there are the evident traces of a primitive belief in the unity and omnipotence of one Supreme Being" (Vans Kennedy, *Hindu Myth.*, 1, 2, citing also Cudworth).

The Vedas, though their earliest extant records, show us the Aryans at an advanced period of their history, and we find them at this time encumbered with the growing mythologies. Still there remained among them a sense of the primitive faith sufficiently strong to govern their real aspirations, casting the ideal forms with which they indulged themselves into the region of unfelt idealities.

Bhrigu, known as one of the seven primeval Rishis, asks his father Varuna to make known to him Brahmá. Varuna replies, "That whence all beings are produced, that by which they live when born, that towards which they tend, and that into which they pass—do thou seek, that is Brahmá" (Colebrooke in *As. Res.* VIII., 438). "Deities," observes Max Müller, "are invoked by different names . . . but whenever one of these individual gods is invoked, he is not conceived as limited by the powers of others, as superior or inferior in rank.

Each god is to the mind of the supplicant as good as all gods. He is felt at the time, as a real divinity, as supreme and absolute, without a suspicion of those limitations which, to our mind, a plurality of gods must entail on every single god. All the rest disappear for a moment from the vision of the poet, and he only who is to fulfil their desires stands in full light before the eyes of the worshippers. In one hymn, ascribed to Manu, the poet says: 'Among you, O gods, there is none that is small, none that is young; you are all great indeed.' And this is the key-note of the ancient Aryan worship" (*Chips*, I. 27, 28). "They call him," says another Vedic poet, "Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Agni; then He is the well-winged heavenly Garutmat; that which is One the wise call it many ways—they call it Agni, Yama, Mátarisvan" (*Ibid.*, I. 367). Long after the Vedic times a true sense of the one unseen God was still retained among this people. The divinity coming forth to create the universe is thus grandly described in Manu's Institutes. "He whom the mind alone can perceive, whose essence eludes the external organs, who has no visible parts, who exists from eternity, even He the soul of all beings, whom no being can comprehend, shone forth in person" (I. 7). And other nations were able in like manner to recognize him, notwithstanding all surrounding misrepresentations. The ancient Persians designated their Ahura Mazda, Creator, Protector, Nourisher, Holiest, Heavenly One, Healer, Priest, Most Pure, Most Majestic, Most Knowing, Most Ruling at Will (Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II. 321, 322, citing Spiegel's *Zend Avesta*). On the temple of Isis at Sais, Plutarch states was this inscription:—"I am all that has been, that is, or shall be; no mortal man hath ever me unveiled" (Higgins, *Anac.*, I. 310, 311). The Grecian Zeus is described in similar terms as the one "who was, and is, and shall be," "the beginning and chief of all things," "who rules over all mortals and immortals," "the god of gods" (Tylor, *Prim. Cul.*, II. 321, citing Welcker). And we have the following beautiful and comprehensive definition of the Supreme Being which is attributed to Pythagoras. "God is neither the object of sense, nor subject to passion, but invisible, only intelligible, and supremely intelligent. In his body he is like the light, and in his soul he resembles truth.

He is the universal spirit that pervades and diffuseth itself over all nature. All beings receive their life from him. There is but one only God, who is not, as some are apt to imagine, seated above the world, beyond the orb of the universe; but being himself all in all, he sees all the beings that fill his immensity, the only principle, the light of heaven, the Father of all. He produces everything, he orders and disposes everything; he is the reason, the life, and the motion of all beings" (Higgins, *Celt. Druids*, 126, citing the Rev. Dr Collyer; the Rev. T. Wilson's *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, 204). This was said, be it remembered, two thousand four hundred years ago, and for exaltation of thought, truthfulness, and completeness, is still unsurpassable.

Reverting to our earliest known models, the Vedic Aryans, "there never," says Max Müller, "was a nation believing so firmly in another world, and so little concerned about this. Their condition on earth is to them a problem, their real and eternal life a simple fact. . . . Nowhere have religious and metaphysical ideas struck root so deep in the mind of a nation as in India. . . . History supplies no second instance where the inward life of the soul has so completely absorbed all the other faculties of a people." In the Veda we have the exhibition of "a period in the intellectual life of man to which there is no parallel in any other part of the world." The sense of his own wants, and the various objects and operations manifest in creation, fill the poet's thoughts, and lead him to one whom he knows as "his life, his breath, his brilliant Lord and Protector." He idealizes the powers of nature. "He invokes them, he praises them, he worships them. But still with all these gods around him, beneath him and above him, the early poet seems ill at rest within himself. There, too, in his own breast he has discovered a power nearer to him than all the gods of nature, a power that is never mute when he prays, never absent when he fears and trembles. It seems to inspire his prayers, and yet to listen to them; it seems to live in him, and yet to support him and all around." He invokes some deity named, but who still in his own breast "has no real name; that power which is nothing but itself, which supports the gods, the heavens, and every living being, floats before his mind, conceived but not expressed" (*Chips*, I. 67-70).

High though the standard accorded by the Professor to the Vedic Aryans, and eloquent as are the terms in which he recognizes their devotional excellence, the extracts he gives from their writings show that the language he uses is amply warrantable.

The following is from the Rig Veda :—

"In the beginning there arose the source of golden light. He was the only born Lord of all that is. He established the earth, and the sky. Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"He who gives life, He who gives strength; whose blessing all the bright gods desire; whose shadow is immortality; whose shadow is death. Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"He who through His power is the only king of the breathing and awakening world; He who governs all, man and beast. Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"He whose power these snowy mountains, whose power the sea proclaims, with the distant river. He whose these regions are as it were His two arms. Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"He through whom the sky is bright and the earth firm; He through whom the Heaven was 'stablished—nay, the highest heaven—He who measured out the light in the air. Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"He to whom heaven and earth, standing firm by His will, look up, trembling inwardly; He over whom the rising sun shines forth. Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"Wherever the mighty water-clouds went, where they placed the seed and lit the fire, thence arose He who is the only life of the bright gods. Who is the god to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"He who by His might looked even over the water-clouds, the clouds which gave strength and lit the sacrifice, *He who is God above all gods.* Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"May He not destroy us—He the creator of the earth; or He, the righteous, who created the heaven; He who also created the bright and mighty waters. Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?"

(Max Müller, *Hist. of Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, 569, 570.)

This also is from the same Veda :—

"1. Let me not yet, O Varuna, enter into the house of clay: have mercy, almighty, have mercy!

"2. If I go along trembling, like a cloud driven by the wind; have mercy, almighty, have mercy!

"3. Through want of strength, thou strong and bright god, have I gone to the wrong shore; have mercy, almighty, have mercy!

"4. Thirst came upon the worshipper, though he stood in the midst of the waters; have mercy, almighty, have mercy!

"5. Whenever we men, O Varuna, commit an offence before the heavenly host; whenever we break thy law through thoughtlessness; have mercy, almighty, have mercy!"

(*Ibid*, 540.)

"The consciousness of sin," observes Max Müller, "is a prominent feature in the religion of the Veda, so is likewise the belief that the gods are able to take away from man the heavy burden of his sins." "Varuna," they say, "is merciful even to him who has committed sin" (*Chips*, I. 41). The yearning for deliverance from the sense of guilt, and the desire for happy communion with the Almighty, are exhibited in the following hymns:—

"1. Wise and mighty are the works of him who stemmed asunder the wide firmaments. He lifted on high the bright and glorious heaven; he stretched out apart the starry sky and the earth.

"2. Do I say this to my own self? How can I get unto Varuna? Will he accept my offering without displeasure? When shall I, with a quiet mind, see him propitiated?

"3. I ask, O Varuna, wishing to know this my sin. I go to ask the wise. The sages all tell me the same. Varuna it is who is angry with thee.

"4. Was it an old sin, O Varuna, that thou wishest to destroy thy friend, who always praises thee? Tell me, thou unconquerable lord, and I will quickly turn to thee with praise, freed from sin.

"5. Absolve us from the sins of our fathers, and from those which we committed with our own bodies. Release Vasishtha, O king, like a thief who has feasted on stolen oxen; release him like a calf from the rope.

"6. It was not our own doing, O Varuna, it was necessity (or temptation), an intoxicating draught, passion, dice, thoughtlessness. The old is there to mislead the young, even sleep brings unrighteousness.

"7. Let me without sin give satisfaction to the angry god, like a slave to the bounteous lord. The lord god enlightened the foolish; he, the wisest, leads his worshipper to wealth.

"8. O lord Varuna, may this song go well to thy heart! May we prosper in keeping and acquiring! Protect us, O gods, always with your blessings!"

(*Ibid.*, II. 314, 315.)

"Without thee, O Varuna! I am not master even of a twinkling of the eye. Do not deliver us unto death, though we have offended against thy commandment day by day. Accept our sacrifice, forgive our offences, let us speak together again like old friends."

(*Ibid.*, II. 330.)

The Vedic Aryans had also a true apprehension of the future state. "In the Veda passages occur where immortality of the soul, personal immortality, and personal responsibility

after death, are clearly proclaimed" (*Ibid.*, I. 46). There is, for example, this prayer to Soma, that drink of gods and men which was conceived to confer everlasting life :—

"Where there is eternal light, in the world where the sun is placed, in that immortal imperishable world place me, O Soma!

"Where king Vaivasvata reigns, where the secret place of heaven is, where these mighty waters are, there make me immortal!

"Where life is free, in the third heaven of heavens, where the worlds are radiant, there make me immortal!

"Where wishes and desires are, where the bowl of the bright Soma is, where there is food and rejoicing, there make me immortal!

"Where there is happiness and delight, where joy and pleasure reside, where the desires of our desire are attained, there make me immortal!"

(*Ibid.*, I. 46, 47.)

The Vaivasvata above named is Yama, the god of death, so designated as being the son of Vaivasvat. His office, in the Vedic times, was to pass the purified spirit into the abodes of bliss. The Atharva Veda describes the passage. "Convey him; carry him; let him, understanding, go to the world of the righteous. Crossing the gloom in many directions immense, let the spirit (*aja**) ascend to 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" (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 304, note). Dr Muir, drawing from the Rig Veda, gives the following representation of the soul's passage to its final home, through the vast gulf of darkness which was supposed to intervene. "Leaving behind on earth all that is evil and imperfect, and proceeding by the paths which the fathers trod, the spirit, invested with a lustre like that of the gods, soars to the realms of eternal light in a car, or on wings, on the undying pinions wherewith Agni slays the Rakshasas, wafted upwards by the Maruts, fanned by soft and gentle breezes, and refrigerated by showers; recovers there its ancient body in a complete and glorified form, meets with the forefathers who are living in festivity with Yama, obtains from him, when recognised by him as one of his own, a delectable abode, and enters upon a more perfect life, which

* Literally, a goat; also that which exists from all eternity (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 9).

is crowned with the fulfilment of all desires, is passed in the presence of the gods, and employed in the fulfilment of their pleasure" (*Ibid.*, V. 302-305).

It is thus apparent that in the midst of fanciful representations the Vedic Aryans had a conception of the one true universal Creator. They had "the belief in God, the perception of the difference between good and evil, the conviction that God hates sin and loves the righteous" (Max Müller, *Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, 538). "The Hindús have from time immemorial believed in the existence of one Supreme Being, in the immateriality and immortality of the soul" (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.*, 165). To this day they inculcate this knowledge among their children, "the belief in one God" being "the real faith of the Hindú" (*Ibid.*, 191, citing Cudworth). Col. Vans Kennedy justly observes that the very act of deifying an object, involves, however imperfectly, the recognition of a divinity; and he further points out that in the Hindú doctrine of transmigration of souls, ending in absorption in God, the being into whose essence the absorption is looked for as an ultimate expectation is other than any of the imaginary forms habitually worshiped (*Hind. Myth.*, 3, 168). They have made no attempt to ascribe a form to the true divinity, whom they recognize at the back of, and beyond their idolatrous delineations. Their highest act of devotion has ever been the internal contemplation of the Supreme Being, in the desire to be assimilated to him, and identified with his divine essence (*Ibid.*, 21). The great Rishis of old lived apart, cultivating this meditative life; the Yogis and Sunnyásis of the present day practise the same absorption of thought in the desire to promote spiritual growth. These devotees are not occupied with the idol forms, but with what they are capable of conceiving of the true deity. Every educated Hindú, when questioned, will avow that his proper belief is in him. There is an *esoteric* doctrine held by the better instructed, while idolatry and superstitious ceremonials, requiring the artificial support of rituals, temples, and priests, constitute the *exoteric* religion with which the ignorant are taken up (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.*, 21; Jyram Row, *Lecture on Christianity and Education in India*, 13, Scott's series). "It is incredible," observes Max Müller, "in how

exhausted an atmosphere the divine spark within us will glimmer on, and even warm the dark chambers of the human heart" (*Chips*, I. 269). "The feeling of sonship is inherent in and inseparable from human nature. . . . Man, who owed his existence to God, and whose being centred and rested in God, saw and felt God as the only source of his own and of all other existence. By the very act of the creation, God had revealed himself" (*Ibid.*, I. 352, 353). The sense of the oneness of God, sustained by the vast and continuous evidence he presents of his being, has been a conviction strong enough to survive the misrepresentations of idolatry; but the important question of his designs towards the race of man, in the disposal of them after death, depending more upon abstract thought, became seriously affected by the growing corruption. The Vedic Aryans, having still a just sense of his beneficence and resources, pictured to themselves a happy destiny for the whole human family. Yama, their ideality of death, was not in those days the king of terrors, nor was penal retribution for offending man then contemplated (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 302). There was a cure for sin, wide-stretching and universal. The Creator could remedy the aberrations of his creatures. He could remove the stains of guilt, and set the purified soul above the conditions of sin. He was not driven to the miserable resource of destroying the sinner as beyond even his reach for amendment. But as the spiritual apprehensions became weakened by the workings of perverted thought, the Almighty, in the growth of anthropomorphism, was reduced to the functional standing, and the powerlessness, of a human judge. Yama then became the ruler of the dead, and judged and consigned the unworthy to a place of torment. From the earliest record we possess of the human race, in the times when man stood most in contact with the primeval and everlasting testimonies, and furthest removed from the overlayings and distortions of human tuition, passing leniently by the incipient mythologies which were due rather to poetic fancy than wanderings of the heart, we see, in the remotest age, the purest faith—a belief in God, not only as the Creator of all things, but as the universal friend; one who met every want, spiritual as well as temporal, and whose mercies, for the whole human family, were as enduring as himself.

III.

THE ERA OF THE INDIAN EPICS.

It is of considerable importance to the examination of the legends of the Bible, on which I am engaged, to assign to the great Indian Epic Poems, the Rámáyana and Mahá-bhárata, their proper place in the stream of the ancient literature of India. These poems are framed in the interests of the Bráhmans, though depicting the Kshatriyas, or martial class, as still ruling the land. They have taken deep root in the religious sentiments of the people, and could not, it is fair to conclude, have made their appearance at any other time than when the spirit that pervades them was consonant to the national persuasion. They could not, for example, have seen the light when Buddhism was the state religion, and Brahmanism a reprobated and disallowed system. The prevalence of Buddhism in India, as a dominant form, may be considered to have occupied from B.C. 300 to A.D. 400. After this Brahmanism revived, and again effectually prevailed. The question then really is, do these poems belong to a pre-Buddhistic or a post-Buddhistic age? If they are of the post-Buddhistic period, it would be reasonable to expect, with whatever care anachronisms might be avoided, that some trace of the Buddhist movement, some latent evidence of the hatred it had excited, would have forced itself to the surface in the effusions of these Brahmanically-influenced poets; but it is generally allowed that no signs of a consciousness of such a system as that of the Buddhists, of a reliable character, are to be met with in either of the poems, voluminous and discursive as they both are. In one version of the Rámáyana there is a passage which, if genuine, would disturb this testimony. It is where Jábáli tries, by sophistical reasonings, to induce Ráma to abandon his vow of exile and return to his royal position at Ayodhyá. Ráma is then said to have denounced

Jábáli as "an atheist who has fallen from the path of rectitude," adding, "as a thief is, so is a Buddhist; after them are the Nastikas or Atheists" (*Hist. of Ind. from the Earliest Ages*, by J. Talboys Wheeler, II., 215). This passage is of an explanatory nature, and not necessary to the narrative itself. It is also glaringly incongruous, there being no correspondence between Jábáli's openly avowed sensuality and the asceticism of the self-denying Buddhists. It occurs, Dr Muir informs us, in verses of a longer metre than those of the poem, and has been condemned by Schlegel (among others) as spurious (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, xix. 307). There can be no room to doubt that the passage is an interpolation.

Mr Wheeler fancies that he sees traces of Buddhism in these poems such as may warrant the ascribing their origin to a time posterior to Buddhism. The college of holy men at Váranáta, visited by the Pándava princes, he conceives may have been a Buddhist institution; and when the Pándavas, in exile, went about as mendicants, he observes that they were acting just as did the Buddhist priests. Religious communities, however, and religious mendicancy, were not peculiar to the Buddhists, but prevailed from the earliest times; and it is distinctly said that the Pándavas practised their mendicancy in the guise of Bráhmans. The mixed marriages described in the Epics Mr Wheeler thinks mark the abolition of caste which he attributes to the Buddhists. It is not exactly the case that the Buddhists did abolish caste. They recognized the distinctions of caste as a social institution, but considered them merged in the religious life (Prof. Wilson in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, xvi. 248). Mixed marriages, such as occur in the Epics, are a characteristic of the primitive Vedic times, and are acknowledged, though not encouraged, in Manu's Institutes (iii. 13; ix. 22, 23, 149-155; x. 28). Mr Wheeler thinks that the Rákshasas and Nágas represent the Buddhists, while in fact there was nothing in common between the two. The Rákshasas were debased beings, of monstrous forms, addicted to cannibalism, and the Nágas were serpent tribes of equally mythical character. Both apparently represent the aborigines with whom the Aryans warred. Lastly, he considers the presentation of the Argha to Krishna at the Rájasuya, or installation, of king Yudhishthira, to have been a

Buddhist ordinance, whereas it is clearly pointed out that this was an observance inherent to the Kshatriya ceremonial then enacted (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I., 101-114; 148, 149; 169-171). If such laboured efforts are required to discover Buddhism in these poems, it is fair to conclude that no such feature really belongs to them.

Professor Weber has, however, made a more decided attempt to connect the Rámáyana with the Buddhistic age by a formal essay in which he maintains that the poem is derived from a Buddhist legend, and has, moreover, been framed with the covert purpose of disparaging the Buddhists.

Mr Weber notices details wherein the Buddhist tale differs from Válmíki's poem. These are that the cause of Ráma's exile was that his father authorized it in order to protect him from the intrigues of his stepmother, and not that the stepmother herself required it; that the period of the exile was twelve, and not fourteen years; that the place thereof was Himmavant (the Himálayas), and not the forest of Dandaka in the Dekhan; that Sítá was the sister of Ráma, and though she accompanied him in his exile did not marry him till its close; that the rape of Sítá by Rávana, and Ráma's consequent expedition to Lanká (Ceylon), do not appear; and that Ráma's seat of government is Váránasi, and not Ayodhyá (Oude). The Professor, however, is unable to make special use of any of these points for the support of his argument, save the absence in the Buddhist Saga of the expedition to Lanká, which he thinks bespeaks a more primitive form of narrative for the Buddhist version; whereas the natural conclusion to have formed would be, that a Ceylon author, in treating of Ráma, had avoided noticing that invasion and defeat of his own country, in chastisement of its ruler for his offence against Ráma, which redounded so little to the credit of all associated with Ceylon.

The Professor goes on to countenance, as well as he can, Mr Wheeler's attempts to identify Válmíkis Rákshasas with the Buddhists. He makes the distinction that the Rákshasas of Lanká are Buddhists, but not so those of the forest of Dandaka, which is not a little arbitrary. Then, with inconsistency, he differs with Mr Wheeler as to the Rákshasas of the capital of Lanká being Buddhists. "There is nothing," he observes,

"in the representation of the town of Lanká and its inhabitants that can be regarded as having a direct reference to Buddhism" (*Indian Antiquary*, 122). This important admission defeats the whole position as to the Rákshasas. If the capital and its inhabitants are not painted as Buddhistic, would the king and his army be Buddhists? The solitary passage in which Jábáli is said to have spoken of the Buddhists, Mr Weber allows to have been probably interpolated. But what occasion would there be for any such interpolation, if the whole aim of the poem, as the Professor infers, was directed at the Buddhists? He then proceeds to wind up this part of his subject. "Any one, therefore," he remarks, "who may be disposed, notwithstanding the preceding considerations, to adopt Wheeler's view, must be prepared to draw this further conclusion, from the great caution with which the poet has veiled his intention to depict the struggle with and the conquest of the Buddhists of Ceylon—that he himself lived under a Buddhistic power, and therefore found himself compelled to conceal his real purpose—and that besides, to secure his own safety, he just took an old Buddhistic legend, and modified it to suit the object he had in view" (*Ind. Ant.*, 122). The argument for the Buddhistic character of the Rámáyana, never resting upon any assured basis, becomes, certainly, now reduced to a strange dilemma. *De non apparentibus, et non existantibus, eadem est ratio.* We have to suppose that the author, having a particular design to promote, took care so to veil his purpose as to conceal it!

Mr Weber notices the introduction in the poem under consideration of names of foreign tribes who could have been known of in India only in comparatively modern times. But he appears to have overlooked the fact that the most prominent of these tribes—namely, the Sakas, Paundrakas, Odras, Kámbojas, Yavanas, Pahlavas, Cínas, Kirátas, Daradas, and Khusas, have been equally mentioned in Manu's Institutes (x. 44), which is a work universally ascribed to a pre-Buddhistic period. Kallúka, the celebrated scholiast on Manu, considers these people to have been degraded Kshatriyas (Monier Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, p. 985), which points to a past and very ancient Hindú connection with them.

Professor Weber's essay has been ably reviewed by a Hindu

critic, Kashináth Trimbak Telang, in a Bombay paper entitled *Native Opinion*. "I have looked," he observes, "through the whole of his paper once and again; but except in one or two places, where the point is more hinted at than distinctly set forth, I have failed to see the grounds upon which the Professor contends that the Buddhist book is the original of which the Rámáyana is the copy. Why may we not believe that the real relation stands the other way?" He cannot see how a Buddhist hero should be metamorphosed into a Brahmanical one, the very last thing one would think of whose object was to withstand Buddhism, while on the other hand it is quite intelligible that separatists, as the Buddhists were, should make use of traditions current in the parent body from whom they had separated. In support of this position he refers to Sherring's Benares for numerous instances of references to Benares made in the Ceylon Játakas, which are replete with tales of Buddha. He proceeds to notice that Professor Weber has allowed that the subject-matter of the Uttarakánda, which is considered the most modern portion of the Rámáyana, is alluded to in the Karmapradípa Parisishta of that ancient scripture the Sáma Veda, and that the renowned and very ancient grammarian Panini treats of names current in the Rámáyana, such as Aikshváka, meaning a descendant of Ikshváka, a name of Ráma; Kaikeyi, his hostile stepmother; and Kausalyá, his mother.

Professor Weber's essay is also noticed in *Mookerjee's Magazine* for July 1872 by Babu Rajendralála Mitra, who exposes its inconsequential reasoning with much satirical power. The Babu observes how unreservedly the whole body of oriental writers follow Válmíki's tale of Ráma, not one having the conception that it is a garbled version of another and primitive account, such as the Buddhist Saga which the Professor would set up as its original. "To one and all," the Babu observes, "it has appeared in the same light, alike in outline and in all important detail." "We find it in prose and verse; in hymns, odes and epos; alike in the levity of the drama, and the grave sonorousness of the historical composition. Vyása in the *Mahábhárata*, *Kálidása* in the *Raghuvansa*, Bhartrihari in the *Bhatti*, Süta in the *Adhyátma Rámáyana*, and Bhavabhuti in the *Vira* and the *Uttara Charitas*, have each

tried his utmost to enrich it with the choicest stores of poesy, but none has departed from the story of Válmíki, and everywhere it is the Ráma of the Rámáyana that we encounter. In the vernaculars, in Hindi and Marhatti, in Tamil and Telugu, in Bengali and Nepalese, it is the same; and away from India, iu Burmah and Java, we have versions which likewise follow the lead of the Sanskrit original. In Ceylon there is a tale extant, distinct from the Buddhist story, but it differs only in the merest details. In all these different versions, and at the lowest estimate their number must be no less than a hundred and fifty, the most strenuous endeavours have been made to excel, but it must be said to the eternal honour of 'Prachetá's holy son,' that none has approached him in all that is charming, and all that is noble, and all that is sublime."

The Buddhist legend which is in question, the title of which is the Dasaratha-Jataka, has been translated from the Pali by V. Fausboll, and has been rendered into English by Mr D'Alwis, of Ceylon. It is a short narrative, occupying but eight pages, and so devoid of merit that its entire oversight by the eastern writers who have occupied themselves with the same subject of Ráma's career is quite intelligible. Placed by the side of the poem of the illustrious Válmíki, it is ridiculous to suppose that the puerile Buddhist story can have attracted such a writer and inspired his muse, supposing that he lived in an era to allow of his having resorted to such a model. The title of the Buddhist Saga signifies "The Dasaratha-Birth." Its purpose is sufficiently obvious. Dasaratha was the father of Ráma, and the Buddhist writer connects with him "the great king Suddhodana," who was the father of Buddha. The effort to derive Buddha from the renowned Ráma is still more apparent in another Buddhist work, namely, the Parables of Buddhaghosha. In the 26th of these parables is an account of Buddha's family. The building of Kapilavathu, the birthplace of Buddha, by certain princes of the Sákiya race, is spoken of. Ráma is said to have married one of their sisters, and to have founded the city of Koliya, changed afterwards to Devadaka, and from these allied families king Suddhodana, the father of Siddhatha, or Buddha, is said to have descended. That the then modern Buddhists

should seek to ally the founder of their creed with a personage so celebrated and so venerated as Ráma, is intelligible enough, and it is owing to such a design as this, and not as being the repositories of the true tale of Ráma, that these Buddhist writers have issued their productions. In so doing they both bear evidence to the sense of the vast antiquity of Ráma. The author of the Dasaratha-Jataka attributes to him a reign of 16,000 years. By so much, therefore, and more, he is considered to have preceded Buddha. And Buddhaghosha, with like scope of imagination, speaks of a succession of 82,000 kings ruling in Kapilavathu before he introduces the names of Suddhodana and Siddhatha. It is ridiculous to suppose that Ráma, a prince of the northern part of India, to whom a very remote antiquity is thus by common Eastern consent assignable, should be first heard of, historically, in a Buddhist legend.

Professor Weber is apparently one of the many who would be loth to recognize in the hero-gods of the Indian Epics the mould upon which the idea of the divine personage of the Christian scriptures has been formed. When he had no other materials to work with, he conceived the Rámáyana to be destitute of any more substantial character than that of an allegory, representing the introduction of agriculture and civilization into India by the Aryans in their migration thither from the north (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 65, note); and when the Buddhist legend which is now in question came to his knowledge, he eagerly shifted his ground and adopted this as the parent of the Sanskrit poem, casting the poem consequently into Buddhistic or Christian times. Under apparently the force of the same prejudice, in his essay on the Buddhist legend, he deals with the question of the human incarnation of Vishnu which is presented in the Rámáyana. Either it is due to interpolation, as suggested by Lassen; that is, introduced into the poem at a later, and of course a post-Christian age; or, if Mr Wheeler's association of the poem with Buddhistic times may be accepted, this incarnation has ever formed an integral portion of the poem (*Ind. Ant.*, 122). The value of criticisms, thus conducted, should be apparent to every one.

In the Vedic times, the divinity Siva, as such, had not been

conceived. This deity appears in the Epics, and with Vishnu attracts the regards of mankind in a closer degree than do any other of the forms representing the godhead. In post-Buddhistic times the worship of these gods has spread, so as to have embraced, it may be said, the whole Hindú community, who range themselves as the followers of one or other of them. And the worship is now carried on by the two sects under circumstances of intense rivalry. This feature affords a means of judging of the era of the Epics, as, should they be found to stand free thereof, it proves that they belong to those earlier times when the now predominant sectarianism had not arisen.

In the Rámáyana we are told of a trial of strength between the two gods, but it arose in a friendly manner at the desire of the other gods. Vishnu prevailed by relaxing the bow of Siva. On the occasion, Vishnu bestowed a bow on Richíka, which descended to Parasuráma. The latter, subsequently, is jealous for the honour of Siva, when Ráma, at the Swayamvara of Sítá, breaks the bow of Siva. Parasuráma consequently challenges Ráma to try his strength on the aforesaid bow of Vishnu, and Ráma having bent this bow, Parasuráma acknowledges his superiority. Parasuráma's life, it appears, was thereby forfeited to Ráma, but as he was a Bráhman, Ráma spares him (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 147; Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 67). Whatever the rivalry between these gods, the sectarianism of their followers is as yet not displayed. Parasuráma has been endowed with the bow of Vishnu, and is nevertheless jealous for the honour of Siva, and Ráma proves his mastery on the bows of both the gods.

In the Mahá-bhárata Naráyana (Vishnu) is said to have attacked Rudra (who may possibly be Siva), on which a battle ensues. Brahmá reconciles Naráyana to Rudra, whereupon the former says to the latter, "He who knows thee, knows me; he who loves thee, loves me. There is no distinction between us" (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 203, 204). The perfect unity of the two divinities is the ultimate expression of this incident. There is also a conflict between Krishna (the incarnation of Vishnu) and Siva, which ends in the two being identified with one another (*Ibid.*, IV. 236).

In the Rámáyana the Triad composed of Brahmá and these

two gods is exhibited, and therewith the perfect unity of the three is insisted on. "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" (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 309, note). It is the Athanasian Creed of the Hindús.

The subject of the Mahá-bhárata is the great war between the Pándavas and their cousins the Kauravas. When the conflict is imminent, both parties apply for support to their relation Krishna, the incarnation of Vishnu, the Pándavas through Arjuna, and the Kauravas through Duryodhana. Krishna gives them the choice between himself and his army. Duryodhana elects to have the army, while Arjuna prefers Krishna himself (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 108, 109). Here are rival factions both cultivating the same divinity. On a previous occasion the Pándavas are favoured by Siva, through whose instrumentality they receive their much-honoured wife Draupadí (*Ibid.*, 99).

Krishna, in the war, attaches himself specially to Arjuna, becoming his charioteer. Siva presents himself to Arjuna in the guise of a wild mountaineer, and they quarrel and fight. Arjuna, successful on every other occasion, now finds himself overmatched. Siva then reveals himself, on which Arjuna worships him, saying, "Adoration be to Siva in the form of Visbnu, to Vishnu in the form of Siva." Siva then embraces him and confers upon him a divine weapon (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 104; Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 195). Arjuna is here a worshiper of both the divinities, and asserts their unity.

Arjuna and Krishna visit Siva to obtain from him a divine weapon. The two recite a hymn in his honour. Arjuna reverences both Krishna (Vishnu) and Siva, and receives from the latter the required weapon (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 154, 155). In the Rámáyana, Rávana, the opponent of Ráma, worships both Siva and Vishnu (*Ibid.*, IV. 353, note).

Ráma, when he makes his expedition to Lanká, sets up a Linga and worships Siva (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 353); so that the incarnation of the one god is seen adoring the other. Krishna, in the Mahá-bhárata, is said to have repeatedly adored

Siva, at one time having "performed austerity for a full thousand years" to propitiate him. Krishna, it is explained, is here viewing himself as a "mere man" (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 157). Krishna's statement is that when he formerly worshiped Rudra (possibly Siva), he worshiped himself, the two being one essence. "He who knows him," he observed, "knows me; he who loves him, loves me" (*Ibid.*, IV. 226). Brahmá and Vishnu stand on each side of Siva and celebrate his praises (*Ibid.*, IV. 161). Krishna praises Siva, and obtains eight boons from him. He describes him to king Yudhishthira as the greatest of the gods (*Ibid.*, IV. 163, 164, 170).

Duryodhana, the enemy of Krishna's allies the Pándavas, recites a legend in which Mahádeva (Siva) is magnified. Vishnu, Agni, and Soma together form his arrow, and insure the destruction of the Asuras. Brahmá becomes his charioteer. "Vishnu," it is said, "is the soul of Mahádeva of boundless power" (*Ibid.*, IV. 184-190).

Jaydratha worships Siva, and asks for ability to destroy the Pándava princes; but Siva informs him that he has provided Arjuna, the leader of the Pándavas, with an irresistible weapon; and he then magnifies Vishnu as the god of gods, the destroyer and renovator of the universe (*Ibid.*, IV. 244).

The Epic poems show an advance upon the nascent mythologies of the Vedic age. The gods are multiplied in number, and have more distinct individualities. But there still remained the sense that, through and beyond these representative forms, the true deity was to be acknowledged in his unity and supremacy. Either one of the Triad possessed the whole attributes of the godhead in unrivalled perfection, and the whole three were one. Vishnu could adore Siva, or Siva Vishnu, without degradation, for they were the same. By their followers each could be worshiped in the other. Agni and Soma could be joined with Vishnu in forming the arrow of Siva, and the great Brahmá guide him to the warfare with the evil ones as his charioteer, for all in truth were one. "He who knows thee, knows me; he who loves thee, loves me," they could say to one another, the fulness of the godhead being present in all. Still there was a growth continually maintained in the progress of the mythological fancies. In Vishnu

and Siva especially the godships were brought more to the level of the human race in their distinguishing forms and assigned exploits upon earth. They, above all the other divine representations, courted the regards of man as possessed of special interest in his concerns, with capacity for befriending him. There was even an approaching rivalry between them. The other gods singled them out to prove their strength on one another. One hostile faction, seeing Vishnu, as Krishna, openly supporting their opponents, thought to enlist the aid of Siva upon their side. The germ was there of formulated distinctive worships of these two particularly humanistic divinities, and that in a spirit of preference and rivalry. But though the system was ripening for the development which afterwards took place, it is clear that in this epic age no such separatism had actually occurred. The Vaishnuvites and Saivites of the post-Buddhistic Puranic age had not as yet come into being.

Professor Lassen, however, has concluded that in the Mahábhárata an incident is given which shows Vishnu and Siva to have been already in those times the objects of a divided and rival worship. At the installation of their kings it was customary to present an offering, termed Argha, to the most worthy present. At the installation of Yudhishthira the Argha is presented to Krishna, when one Sisupála objects, exhibiting violent hostility to Krishna. Sisupála is a being possessed of three eyes and four arms, which features the Professor considers to designate Siva, and the hatred then evinced by this personage to Krishna he takes to mean religious animosity between the worshipers of the two divinities (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV. 170-180). But in arriving at such a construction the Professor has gone beyond the proper circumstances of the narrative, and has overlooked the many evidences, which I have cited, to show that these gods had then no separate followers, maintaining the worship of them in rivalry. Monstrous forms were then common. This will account for the multiplicity of Sisupála's eyes and arms without requiring them to have been typical of Siva, to complete whose outward structure a triple head would also be necessary. Krishna, on the occasion in question, is honoured in his human, and not in his divine capacity, as the most worthy of

those assembled. Sisupála is also a mere man. Krishna designates him a Súdra, and finally kills him.

Dr Muir considers the worship of the Linga, as mentioned in the Mahá-bhárata, to be a feature descriptive of the last ten centuries (*Sansk. Texts*, IV. 161, 162). There are also instances of this worship in the Rámáyana, as practised by Ráma and the sage Kála-nemi (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 353, 372). Doubtless, in the period designated by Dr Muir, through the uprise and prevalence of the Saivite sect, whose symbol it is, the Phallic emblem has come into extensive use in India, but it would be unwarrantable to infer that it was previously unknown. The primitive idea of the creation, in India and elsewhere, has been that the process has been carried on after the manner of sexual reproduction, the Creator himself being supposed to have been endowed in his own person with the sexual distinctions. It is to this idea that the adoption of the Phallic emblem into the most ancient known religions of the world has been owing, and no individual practice has perhaps been of earlier origin, or more widely prevalent. In the epic times Siva had become a form of the deity, and seeing that the Linga has been associated with him, it is fair to suppose that this may have been ever so from the first time of the conception of his form.

The verdict of the Hindús is, I believe, clear and universal in favour of the pre-Buddhistic origin of the epic poems, and in marshalling the heroes thereof they assuredly give them a position long anterior to Buddha. Buddha himself, or probably the Hindú type upon which he has been moulded—for the great reformer was one of many bearing that designation—stands among the Avatáras of Vishnu, and comes in as the 9th, while Ráma and Krishna precede him as the 7th and 8th of these manifestations. The reformer's time, as we have seen, is in the 6th century B.C., and Krishna ran his course as the *Dvápara*, or third Yuga, expired; that is in B.C. 3102. The age of Ráma is cast back into the unfathomable period when the second or *Tretá* Yuga came to a close (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 133, note). And the poetic narratives and Buddhist literature have also apparently held the same relative course. The Rámáyana is commonly held to be the most ancient of the two epics. The Mahá-bhárata recounts the tale of Ráma,

as therein given, as a then known history (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 16, note 131), while the Rámáyana has no notice of the personages or events of the Mahá-bhárata; and after this have followed the Buddhist writings. Mr Wheeler and Professor Weber, who aim at placing the Rámáyana after Buddha, also give the Mahá-bhárata a prior antiquity over it. But the opinion is a singular one (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 65, note), and not supported by any solid grounds that they have been able to advance.

In an article in the *Westminster Review* of April 1868, which is attributed to the pen of the late Professor Goldstücker, a comparison is instituted between the manners depicted in the Mahá-bhárata and those which are enjoined in the Institutes of Manu, and the conclusion to which the writer has come is that those portions of the poem which stand free of the imputation of having been altered by modern interpolations, belong to an age anterior to Manu. This examination, in respect of both the Epics, had been made by myself with similar, or more decided results, before this essay came under my eye. I am able, therefore, to present my conclusions as independently arrived at, and at the same time to support myself with so good an authority as the reputed essayist.

There could be no better test than the one now to be applied whereby to judge of the era of the Epics. They are voluminous writings, full of action, describing the social institutions and habits of the characters moving in them. Manu's laws go over grounds to govern these at every turn, containing rules of caste, of marriage, and of diet. If the epic personages show a consciousness of regulations such as those enjoined by the great legislator of the Hindús, the authors of the poems would be considered to have written while these laws were extant. If there is no such consciousness, and the conduct attributed to the persons figuring in the Epics is ordinarily other than what these laws would permit, the inference is that the Epics were written before the laws were enacted. The sacred character of the legislation adds cogency to such a conclusion. The Institutes purport to have been communicated by the creator Brahmá to his son or grandson the first Manu, and to have been promulgated by his

son the renowned sage Brighu (Manu, i. 58, 59). They date therefore from the creation, and are of divine origin. Once let such a code be accepted in the light in which it is offered, and no writer would dare to conceive a condition of things otherwise than in accord with the inspired legislation. He would be debarred from making the attempt, not only as involving a sin against the divine authority of the code, but as the code purports to have prevailed from the first dawn of man's existence on earth, there would be no room for the introduction of historical delineations as belonging to a period antecedent to its promulgation.

While it may be maintained that considerations of the above kind would prevent any writer, living under the operation of the code of Manu, from picturing a state of society where the highest personages, and the most devout sages, violated its precepts in evident ignorance of their existence, nothing is more true than that Manu is guilty of a flagrant anachronism in dating his laws from the creation. He is conscious that the three earliest Vedas were anterior to his legislation, as he speaks of them as already in existence (ii. 76), and that there had been on earth renowned characters who had equally preceded him (iii. 16; viii. 41, 42; ix. 23; x. 72, 105-108). Manu, it will be found, becomes a witness against himself, in pointing to an ancient time of freedom from the restraints he imposes, occurring before his day, just such as the Epic poems, in their delineations, describe. With these remarks I pass to the examination of the question, did the Epics precede or follow the Institutes in point of time?

Professor Wilson instances the absence in Manu of all mention of Avatáras, or descents of deities on earth in some terrestrial form, and of such personages as Ráma and Krishna, which he thinks may be evidence that Manu's work preceded the Epics (Preface to Rig Veda Sanhita, xlvii.). This is an argument which assuredly cuts both ways, for if Manu knows nothing of the Epics, they equally show no knowledge of him. Nor can the argument stand at all unless it is to be understood that the idea of an Avátara arose only after the times of the Institutes. The Professor himself shows that the Vedas "certainly do appear to allude occasionally to the Avatáras, or incarnations of Vishnu." Again, "It is possible, though

not yet proved, that Krishna, as an Avatára of Vishnu, is mentioned in an indisputably genuine text of the Vedas" (Pref. to the Vishnu Purána, ii., lxx.). The adjuncts of the Vedas are by all Sanskritists considered to be prior to Manu. Dr Muir says that the fish, tortoise, and boar incarnations are spoken of in the Satapatha Bráhmana; and Krishna, as a mystic personage, appears in the Chhandogya Upanishad (*Sansk. Texts*, I. 53, 54; IV. 152, 153). That the Institutes do not approach the subject of the Epics is explicable under the consideration that their matter would serve to weaken, and not to support, the position of the legislator. He was bent upon establishing a very different rule of society to what belonged to the Epics, and therefore could not be expected to admit their representations into his system.

Professor Monier Williams observes that Bhishma's dying discourses in the Mahá-bhárata on the duties of kings, and other kindred subjects, resemble the precepts of Manu, and may have been derived from them (*Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 125, 126). On a subject so trite as how kings should conduct themselves towards their subjects, two writers might very well express themselves in the same way. This, however, would not show which was the earlier writer.

The Essayist in the *Westminster Review* observes that Bhishma is very much in accord with Manu on the various forms of marriage, but as he is by no means completely so, it cannot be admitted that he was cognizant of that inspired legislation which would have bound him, not partially, but absolutely. Bhishma and Manu have both eight forms of marriage, but are found to agree only as to six. These occur in Manu as 1 Brahma, 3 Arsha, 5 Asura, 7 Rakshasa, 6 Gandhurva, and 8 Paisacha, but are given out by Bhishma in consecutive order from one to six. The Essayist further observes that Bhishma recognizes as "the choicest of all wives the wife who has been carried off by force," while such is far from being the estimate of Manu. That there is a considerable correspondence between what Bhishma says of marriage forms, and what is laid down in Manu, appears indubitable; but this by no means establishes Manu as the prior authority. Manu could not have projected everything afresh on such a subject. He would be bound very much by existing usage,

which he would work upon and solidify into law. And just such usage as is described in the Mahá-bhárata may have been the foundations on which Manu has worked.

There are other features which should lead to conclusions of a more decided nature. Manu asserts that the distinctions of caste were established by the Creator from the time that he planted man on earth. The Bráhman, he says, came from his mouth, the Kshatriya from his arms, the Vaisya from his thighs, and the Súdra from his feet. The germ of this idea appears in the Purusha Sukta of the Rig Veda, where it is said, "the Bráhman was his (Purusha's) mouth, the Rajanya was made his arms, the Vaisya was his thighs, the Súdra sprang from his feet" (Dr Muir in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, XX. 406). Dr Muir considers this only an allegorical representation, while Manu's statement is put forward as absolutely historical. The Vedas have no such historical declaration. The Mahá-bhárata, Dr Muir informs us in the above publication, ascribes the growth of caste to its natural cause. When Brahmá created man, it is observed, there was no such distinction, but differences of occupation led to division of classes. Is it possible that the author of the poem could have had before him the inspired asseveration of Manu, and have thus deliberately negatived it?

According to Manu, a Bráhman may pursue the occupations of either of the two classes below him, namely, first of the soldier, and, should this fail him, of the merchant; provided he is unable to support himself by the sacerdotal office proper to him. In like manner a military man, under similar necessity, may descend to the calling of a merchant, "but at no time must he have recourse to the highest, or sacerdotal function" (x. 81, 82, 95). This is sufficiently specific, but the rule is unknown in the Epics. In the Mahá-bhárata, Drona, who is a Bráhman, is the instructor in arms of the Kaurava and Pándava princes, and the fee he demands is that his enemy, Draupada, the king of Panchála, should be put down. He is actively engaged in the war against Draupada, and eventually becomes king over half the kingdom of Panchála. He also is made commander-in-chief of the Kaurava forces when the post is vacant (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 97, 117; *West. Rev.*). Drona thus falls into the place of a Kshatriya,

clearly without any necessity to press him. His son Asvatthaman is an active combatant in the great war, and plots and carries out a treacherous night attack, when great slaughter of the Pándava troops is effected (*West. Rev.*). On the other hand, Janaka, a Kshatriya, the father of Sítá, himself performs the marriage of his daughter with the divine Ráma (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 59), an office belonging to the priesthood (Manu, iii. 28). To account for the act, Janaka is said to have become a Bráhman, being termed a Rájarshi, or royal Rishi, or sage, an amalgamation common in Vedic times, but not possible under Manu (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, I. 265, 266, 429). Santanu, a Kshatriya, is promoted to the throne, on which Devapi, his brother, becomes his Purohita, or family priest. The explanation in the Mahá-bhárata is that both became Bráhmans (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, I. 272), but then Santanu should not have held the kingly office. In the Vedic times, Visvámitra, a warrior, could attain the position and offices of a Bráhman, and Vasishta, the son of Jamadagni, who was a Bráhman, engage in military pursuits (*West. Rev.*). The Epic freedom was thus consistent with the early usage, before the restrictions dictated by Manu had been prescribed.

In the Mahá-bhárata the Pándava princes assume the disguise of Bráhmans. Yudhishthira did the like at the court of King Virata. Such conduct is viewed in Manu as an offence equal to that of killing a Bráhman (*West. Rev.*).

Manu's rules for the regulation of marriages are complicated, and even inconsistent with one another. It is broadly and repeatedly laid down that the classes should not intermarry, but that each should keep to his own class (iii. 4; viii. 366; ix. 88, 326). Nevertheless it is said one of the superior classes may condescend to a female in a class below him. A Bráhman may take a wife from the Kshatriya or Vaisya caste, but not from the Súdra; the Kshatriya and Vaisya may descend as far as the Súdra (iii. 13). But it is pointed out that the union of any of the superior classes with a Súdra wife entails degradation, and especially on the part of a Bráhman (iii. 16, 17), and that the issues of mixt marriages are impure (x. 24). After this the marriage of a Bráhman with any of the lower classes, including the Súdra, is so far recognized, that the portions of the children of such a marriage are laid

down, according to a sliding scale, varying according to the lowness of the mother's class (ix. 149-155). Then it is broadly stated, in toleration of all such marriages, that the woman of low degree is ennobled by union with one in a higher grade, instances from olden times being given (ix. 22, 23). But a marriage with one out of the pale of caste, as a Chandáli, is discouraged, and even made punishable (viii. 373). "Let no man," it is said, "who regards his duty, religious and civil, hold any intercourse with them; let their transactions be confined to themselves, and their marriages only between equals" (x. 53); and, nevertheless, this limit is overpassed in the recognition of bestial union; the nobility of the father exalting even offspring obtained through such a connection. "But since," it is asserted, "by the virtue of eminent fathers, even the sons of wild animals, as Rishyasringa (and others), have been transformed into holy men revered and extolled, the paternal side, therefore, prevails" (x. 72). Hitherto it has been a question only of the condescension of a male of superior degree to a female of a class below him, as in the instance of occupations, where one of a higher class may, under necessity, enter on the calling of a class inferior to him. And such a principle appears declared in respect of mixed marriages. "A low man, who makes love to a damsel of high birth, ought to be punished corporally; but he who addresses a maid of equal rank, shall give the nuptial present (and marry her), if her father please" (viii. 366). "For a (Súdra)," it is particularly said, "is ordained a wife of his own class, (and) no other" (ix. 157). And yet we hear further on of a Kshatriya with a Bráhmani wife, a Vaisya with a military or sacerdotal one, and even of a Súdra with one of any of the grades above him (x. 11, 12). It is true the offspring of the latter are called "the lowest of mortals."

It is apparent that the rules for marriages, as respected the castes of the parties, were in an unsettled state when the Institutes were projected, and that the legislator put forth his ideas on the subject under circumstances of considerable difficulty. From the Vedic times and onwards there had been great social freedom, which permitted of interchange of occupation, and had extended itself also to the marriage connection, which was entered into without restraint of caste. This state

of things the legislator aimed at putting down, his object being to keep each grade strictly within their own bounds, and to exalt the Bráhman, as the head of the creation, above all others (i. 98; ii. 135, 150, 225; vii. 37-42, 82-85, 133, 134). When, therefore, he sought to prevent the intermixture of classes, he was met by the notorious fact that in past days the most renowned sages had recognized no such trammels, and he had to tolerate, in some measure, a latitude which warred against the principle of exclusiveness which it was his real purpose to establish. We find, therefore, in Manu a transition state as to the laws of matrimony. Gradually, through continuous sacerdotal influence, the rigid rules he projected became enforced, so that, certainly since the revival of Brahmanism after the abolition of Buddhism in India, no pure Hindú would think of allying himself out of his own caste.

The Epic age, in respect of the marriage tie, belongs clearly to the times of freedom from social restraints which existed before the Institutes of Manu were enacted. Parásara, a famous Rishi, or sage, comes in contact with a fish girl, and has by her a son. Here there was not even the matrimonial ceremony, and the damsel, by the power of the saint, has her virginity restored to her. The fruit of this adventitious intercourse was no less a personage than Vyása, the reputed author or compiler of the Mahá-bhárata, as also of the Vedas (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 61; Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 92 and note). The mother's name was Satyavati, and notwithstanding her low origin, and blemished virtue, she was married to the Kshatriya prince Sántana, and became the progenitrix of the Kauravas and Pándavas, the heroes of the great poem (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 91, 92). Her legitimate son, Vichitravírya, died childless, leaving two widows. On these, who were Kshatriya females, she induces her illegitimate son, the aforesaid Vyása, who ranked as a Bráhman, to raise up offspring to his half-brother. Vyása thus became the father of the Kshatriya prince Dhritaráshtra, from whom sprang the Kauravas, and of Pándu, from whom came the Pándavas (*Ibid.*, 91, 92). One of these widows afterwards substitutes for herself a Súdra slave girl, by whom the sage Vyása had a third son, who was named Vidura

(*Ibid.*, 91, 92). This issue of a Súdra female by a Bráhman father is termed in the poem a Kshattri; whereas, as Professor Williams points out, the designation, pursuant to Manu, belongs to one whose parents are in the inverse order; namely, where the father is a Súdra and the mother a Bráhmani; and progeny so raised, and so named, are stigmatised by Manu as "the lowest of mortals" (x. 12). The author of the Mahábhárata would assuredly not have perverted the meaning of the word in question, and have applied a term of opprobrious import to the son of the renowned Vyása, had Manu's work been before him.

The Swayamvara form of marriage was common in the time depicted in the Epics, but it is not among the eight forms described by Manu (*West. Rev.*). It implies "self-choice," the girl choosing from her assembled suitors the one for whom she has preference. Commonly the decision was made to depend upon competition, some great feat being proposed, and the girl being assigned to the successful aspirant. It is after this manner, by the bending of huge bows, that Ráma, in the Rámáyana, wins Sítá, and Arjuna, in the Mahábhárata, Draupadí. Besides these two instances, the Swayamvara is practised at the marriages of Pándu with Pritha, of Yudhishthira with Devaka, of Sahadeva with Vijaya, of Sini with Devaki, and of Nala with Damayanti (*West. Rev.*), all princely or royal personages. Manu lays it down that on a girl, of whatsoever caste, becoming marriageable, if, after waiting three years, her father does not provide her with a husband, she may choose one for herself; but the Swayamvara of the Epics is under no such limitation, and is represented as an institution peculiar to the Kshatriya caste, and this is no part of the arrangements in Manu (*West. Rev.*).

At the Swayamvara of Draupadí, Karna presents himself as a candidate. Draupadí is a king's daughter, and she objects to Karna entering the lists as one of low occupation, he being a charioteer. Karna is also of doubtful extraction, but this objection is not taken against him. Arjuna finally obtains her, not in his proper position as a Kshatriya prince, but disguised as a Bráhman (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 121).

Arjuna having succeeded in winning Draupadí, she is made the joint wife of himself and his four brothers, the remaining

Pándava princes. Her father objects to the arrrangement as contrary to usage and the Vedas, but Yudishthira, the eldest of the brothers, replies, "The law, O king, is subtle; we do not know its way. We follow the path which has been trodden by our ancestors in succession." Then he cites instances, and Vyása meets the difficulty by explaining that since the five Pándavas are incarnations of Indra, (Draupadí being an incarnation of Lakshmi,) they in fact represent but one husband (*West. Rev.*) Polyandry exists among certain tribes aboriginal to India and not of Aryan extraction. But here it is spoken of as an established usage in a high family of Kshatriyas. In the times of Manu and onwards, the practice would be viewed with so much abhorrence, that no writer, living in these times, would have imputed it to the heroes of his narrative.

Bhima, one of the Pándava brothers, had already a wife of his own. She was named Hidimba, and was the sister of a giant Rákshasa (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 98), and thus out of the pale of caste altogether. Arjuna afterwards married Ulúpí, a serpent-nymph, and daughter of the king of the Nágas, or serpents (*Ibid.*, 101); and the divine Krishna allied himself to the daughter of Jámbavat, the king of the bears (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 476). These are instances of bestial connection, such as Manu has felt himself forced to recognize (x. 72), the parties, however, probably indicating aborigines merely.

The instances hitherto cited are of males marrying females of a lower order to themselves, but the Mahá-bhárata gives us one where the female is of the higher order, in the marriage of King Dushyanta with Sakuntalá, the daughter of a sage or Bráhman (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, I. 47).

The well known tale of King Nala would make it appear that in those days the re-marriage of widows was permissible. Nala withdraws himself, giving himself out for dead. His wife Damayanti has the feeling that he is still alive, and to tempt him to disclose himself prepares for a second Swayamvara (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 56 note). Such a practice Manu declares to be "fit only for cattle" (v. 161, 162; ix. 65, 66).

Manu permits a brother, or near relation, to raise up seed to his deceased childless relation, but the act is restricted to

the propagation of one son only. Vyása, as has been seen, begets two sons off the widows of his half-brother Vichitravírya, and a third son on one whom he took at the time to be still one of these widows (*West. Rev.*) The law of Manu, therefore, at this time could not have been extant.

Manu recognizes twelve manner of sons, who are all accounted kinsmen, but of whom six are not competent to inherit. In the Mahá-bhárata Pandu explains to his wife Pritha that there are twelve sorts of sons, but that six of them are neither kinsmen nor heirs (*West. Rev.*) . The divergence indicates that Manu was not then in force.

"A woman," says Manu, "is never fit for independence" (ix. 3). He places them, therefore, under the continual tutelage of their male relatives. Professor Monier Williams comments on the measure of free will and liberty they enjoyed in the Epic times, as contrasted with the restriction and seclusion which Manu had managed to impose upon them. Sítá, he notices, exhibits herself to the army; Sákuntalá appears in the public court of king Dushyanti; Damayanti travels about by herself; Ráma's mother comes to the hermitage of Válmikí; and the institution of the Swayamvara brought them openly to view, in vast assemblages, for exhibition before the rival suitors. They could attend sacrifices, marriages, and dramatic performances, where all the world might look at them, as Ráma explains to Vibhíshana (*Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 55-57 and notes).

The unrestricted usages of former days also evidently embarrassed Manu when he proceeded to legislate for the regulation of diet. His object was to abolish the use of animal food, as involving the taking of life. "He who gives no creature willingly the pain of confinement or death, but seeks the good of all (sentient beings), enjoys bliss without end. He who injures no animated creature shall attain without hardship whatever he thinks of, whatever he strives for, whatever he fixes his mind on. Flesh meat cannot be procured without injury to animals, and the slaughter of animals obstructs the path to beatitude; from flesh meat, therefore, let man abstain" (v. 46-48). "Me he will devour in the next world, whose flesh I eat in this life" (v. 55), is his appalling supposition. But, conscious that in the past times flesh meat had been freely

indulged in, he felt obliged to afford some opening for the practice. He therefore tolerated its use, as not involving sin, provided it was associated with offerings in sacrifice to the gods (v. 23, 31, 32). He pointed out, however, that avoidance was the better part. "In lawfully tasting meat, in drinking fermented liquor, there is no turpitude; for to such enjoyments men are naturally prone; but a virtuous abstinence from them produces a signal compensation" (v. 56). Such abstinence brought with it greater merit and reward than the annual performance for a hundred years of the Aswamédha, or horse sacrifice (v. 53, 54), the most costly and difficult of all the sacrifices. And yet on the score of necessity, the legislator had to justify the readiness of Vámadeva to eat even the flesh of dogs for preservation of his life, and to uphold the act of Visvámitra, who, when perishing with hunger, devoured "the haunch of a dog," presented to him by so low a creature as a Chandála, or outcaste (x. 106, 108). The Epic personages are found under no such restrictions. They freely partook of animal food and spirits as their ordinary diet. A marked instance is the miraculous feast, obtained from the heavenly abode of Indra, by the sage Baradwája at his hermitage, for the entertainment of the army of Bharata, as recounted in the Rámáyana (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 189). This was no religious ceremonial, but a convivial meal provided for the army, wherein the guests, according to the language employed by Manu, were, "without oblation to the manes or the gods," guilty of seeking to "enlarge their own flesh with the flesh of another," acting "like bloodthirsty demons." "Not a mortal," he observes, "exists more sinful" than such a one (v. 50, 52).

The practice of widows burning themselves on the funeral piles of their husbands, called Satí, has been thought by some writers to be a modern innovation not countenanced by the authority of the Vedas. It has been put down by the British Government by law, and at the time the view was held that it formed no part of the true religious observances of the Hindús. Professor Monier Williams, seeing that there was a knowledge of the rite in the Mahá-bhárata, and observing none in the Rámáyana, concluded therefrom that the Rámáyana was the more ancient poem (*Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 8, 131).

Babu Rajendalála Mitra has found allusions to the practice in both the poems, but as in the Aranyaka provision is made for the removal of the widow from the funeral pile of her husband, he concludes that Satí had not arisen at the time of the composition of this work (*Jour. of As. Soc. for Bengal* for 1870, p. 249). Manu makes no mention of Satí, and lays down rules for the governance of females after the demise of their husbands (v. 156-158), implying that they might survive him. Consequently, on the supposition that Satí is a modern innovation, it might be held that Manu, who manifests no acquaintance therewith, is an earlier production than the Epics, which have it.

It is apparent that from the earliest times the widow was laid upon the funeral pile by the side of the corpse of her husband. Professor Wilson is one who considers that the burning of the widow is unauthorized by the Vedas, but he recognizes the antiquity of the usage of laying her down by her husband's body. He finds this process described in the Gríhya Sútras, a collection of writings respecting domestic and family observances, the authority of which he accepts as little inferior to that of the Vedas. It appears, he informs us, in the Sútra of Asvaláyana (*Essays on the Religion of the Hindús*, II. 277, 287). Babu Rajendralála Mitra, before cited, says the usage of so laying down the woman, is described in the work he has referred to, namely the Aranyaka, a production he thinks to be of the eighth century B.C. The custom was to place something of value in the hand of the deceased. If a Bráhman, it was a piece of gold; if a Kshatriya, a bow; if a Vaisya, a jewel. The Gríhya Sútra of Asvaláyana, and the Aranyaka, both contemplate the removal of the woman from the side of the corpse, together with the object placed in its hand. The process is involved in a hymn of the Rig Veda, in which the widow, as thus circumstanced, is addressed:—

"Rise up, woman, come to the world of living beings, thou sleepest nigh unto the lifeless. Come; thou hast associated with maternity through the husband by whom thy hand was formerly taken.

"Taking his bow from the hand of the dead, that it may be to us for help, for strength, for fame, (I say) here verily art thou, and here are we: accompanied by our valiant descendants, may we overcome all arrogant adversaries" (*Wilson's Essays*, II. 272).

Professor Wilson infers that as the woman might be removed from the pyre, it was not designed that she should undergo cremation; but it has to be asked with what other purpose could she have been laid there? The ceremony could scarcely have pointed to an empty unreality. Rája Rádhakánta Deva, who examines the Professor's argument, observes that the address in question made to her in the hymn of the Rig Veda, was for the sake of testing her resolution, and he informs us that such was in effect the custom to the latest days. The relatives had to endeavour to dissuade the woman from fulfilling her design, in order to make it apparent that the sacrifice to which she devoted herself was one of entire free-will on her part, uninfluenced by them. Then the Rája gives us a distinct authority for the cremation, drawn from the Taittiriya Sanhitá, as cited in the Náráyaníya Upanishad, where the woman makes the following invocation to the god of fire :—

"Oh Agni, of all Vratas (vows), thou art the Vratapati (lord of vows), I will observe the vow (vrata) of following the husband. Do thou enable me to accomplish it.

"Here (in this rite), to thee, oh Agni, I offer salutation; to gain the heavenly mansion I enter into thee; (wherefore) oh Játadevah, this day, satisfied with the clarified butter (offered by me), inspire me with courage (for sahagamana, "patient, suffering departure"), and take me to my lord."

The Rája concludes that unless the rite had had Vedic authority, its practice would not have been introduced as prevailing in times such as the Mahá-bhárata is occupied with, when great sages, deeply imbued with Vedic learning, are placed habitually on the scene (*Wilson's Essays*, II. 295-304).

Professor Wilson, in defence of his own opinion, observes that in the Upanishad in question we have a citation purporting to be from the Veda, but not the Veda itself, and that the copy of this Upanishad in the library of the India House does not extend to the passage quoted by the Rája, being short thereof by some twenty verses (*Essays*, II. 307, 308). This cannot be considered a satisfactory mode of meeting the direct authority on which the Rája has relied. An Upanishad would not deliberately fabricate, as Vedic, a passage which had no such origin, and an incomplete copy of the Upanishad in the India House library of course proves

nothing. The authority cited by the Rája is supported by all surrounding circumstances. The woman, it is allowed, was from of old laid by the side of her husband's corpse on the pile erected for his burning, and entreated to leave it. Why the position, or the solicitude expressed on her behalf, unless her cremation with the body was in view? Such burning certainly ensued, as we have witnessed in modern days, and there is room to believe, as the Upanishad testifies, that the woman lays herself by her husband with the serious purpose of undergoing it. Manu was obviously an innovator, introducing a system of his own, and it is possible that he may have said nothing of the rite from not desiring to encourage it.

The treatment of the dead is a circumstance marking the growth of the religious systems of the Hindús. The Vedas have not the doctrine of metempsychosis, or provision for visiting the departed with penal retribution. Yama's office, as I have already pointed out, was to bear the purified soul to the regions of bliss which he himself occupied. It was only in a later day that he was transplanted to an infernal abode, where he was set up as the ruler of the dead, subjecting them to torment. The Rig Veda has, however, an advertence to a "deep abyss," for the "wicked, false, untrue," into which Soma "hurls the hated and irreligious." At a period when the earth was supposed to be occupied by demons as well as men, it is possible that the abyss may have been designed for the former. Dr Muir is not satisfied that this was a place of punishment. I presume he means for human sinners. Still it seems safer to believe that even in these early days the germs were laid for the opinion prevailing in succeeding times, that sin was to be visited with strictly penal consequences. In the next class of Sanskrit literature, namely the Bráhamanas, there was the clear apprehension that the dead were to be judged for their deeds, and visited accordingly. These writings also teach the doctrine of metempsychosis, which involves the idea of penal retribution, the dead having lots appointed to them correspondent to their conduct when in life (Dr Muir in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, new series, I. 296, 297, 304 and note, 306, 311; *Sansk. Texts*, V. 302, 313, 314, 322).

It is a distinguishing feature in the Epics that they do not exhibit judgment passed upon the dead. Those who are depicted, while on earth, in the most repulsive aspect, are translated after death to happiness and glory. The Rákshasa Virádha is of monstrous form, "as tall as a mountain top." He is seen with a spit before him, on which were tigers, wolves, deer, and the head of an elephant, which he was about to devour. He seizes upon Sítá, the bride of the divine Ráma. Ráma and Lakshmana attack him, but he is invulnerable. They therefore bury him alive. Then he ascends in a heavenly form, thanking them for having disenchanted him (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 243, 244). Ráma overcomes a huge Rákshasa named Kabandha. At his request he burns his body in fire. This disenchants him, and he ascends to heaven in a celestial car (*Ibid.*, II. 310). After a terrific fight, occupying seven days and seven nights, Ráma kills the demon king Rávana. On this he performs magnificent obsequies over his body (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 86), which would have been out of place at the hands of his divine conqueror, had not Rávana's passage to a blissful region been assured. So far as to the Rámáyana. In the Mahá-bhárata, the Pándavas, and especially the most prominent of them, Arjuna, the pupil and associate of the divine Krishna, are clothed with attributes of virtue and honour. The right to the inheritance in dispute is theirs, and finally they succeed in wresting it from their unscrupulous opponents, the Kauravas. The latter are represented in an odious light, vicious, fraudulent, overbearing, tyrannical, and bloodthirsty, in evidently designed contrast to the Pándavas. The head of this party is Duryodhana, who surpasses them all in his evil dispositions and acts. When he falls in action, killed by Bhima, one of the Pándavas, flowers are showered upon him from heaven, and celestial music greets his ascending spirit (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.* I., 341). Drona and Bhishma, two renowned leaders of the Kauravas, who fall in this war, as they expire are visibly translated to heaven (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 117, 126). The whole of the usurping Kauravas are at length disposed of, and the conquering Pándavas are installed at Hastinapúr in triumph. Years afterwards, they assemble on the banks of the Ganges, together with the

widows and families of the slain. There a wonderful vision is accorded them. The dead are exhibited before them. All who had fallen on either side in the long sustained and fierce quarrel, both friends and enemies, arise from the waters of the sacred river. The vast armies of the hitherto rival parties appear in the full panoply of war, resplendent in brightness, with their horses, elephants, chariots, banners, and martial music, bards and eulogists attending upon them, and singing their praises. But every shade of hostility has been removed, and every evil passion has been quelled. All are in perfect amity—love, friendship, and joyousness characterizing the scene. The bereaved females—mothers, widows, sisters, and daughters—are comforted in renewed intercourse, for the time, with those for whom they have mourned (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.* II., 440-443). Here there is the healing and purification of the human soul, and not penal retribution. Yama, as the king of terrors, was as yet unknown.

The Epics have instances of magical transformations, but not of judicial metempsychosis. But the Mahá-bhárata speaks of places such as heaven and hell. The Pándava brothers close their career by abandoning the world with all their earthly possessions, setting their faces heavenwards. Yudhishthira, the head of the family, has a vision of the celestial abode of Indra on Mount Meru. There he sees Duryodhana and his other Kaurava cousins, but not his brothers and the beloved Draupadí. Then he is taken to a dense wood, gloomy and dark, where hideous forms flit by and hover over him. The wicked are seen burning in flames, and he hears the voices of his brothers and companions imploring him for help. This is his last trial. He bids the conducting angel leave him to share the fate of his brethren. On this the scene changes. He enters the real heaven, where he joins his brethren and Draupadí, and finds with them that rest and happiness which were unattainable on earth (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 29-31). The hell depicted to him is a mere illusion. The true place of the human family, purged of all taint of sin, is seen to be in heaven.

The representations in Manu concerning the disposal of the dead belong to the modern phase of Hindú religious belief.

He has the transmigration of souls, those of offenders passing into the lower forms of renewed life in visitation of their transgressions. And Yama, with him, occupies a region of darkness, where he judges all departed spirits, and consigns the wicked to suffer torments in a place appointed to them (vi. 61 ; ix. 307 ; xiii. 16, 17).

The Epics have thus all the characteristics of the most ancient times. Whether from the art of the composers in so shaping their representations as to avoid anachronisms, or as being really modelled upon then existing realities, they introduce us to the Vedic times in their social usages, ceremonials, and measure of religious persuasions. The Kshatriyas, a caste now with few representatives, are everywhere in power as the dominant class. Occupations are not monopolized by cause of birth. Intermarriages of the freest order occur. Females receive chivalrous respect, and are allowed all reasonable liberty. The diet of the hermitage is not enforced upon the great bulk of the people who have made no pretence of having abandoned the world and its enjoyments. Vishnu has become magnified as a divine benefactor of the human race in advance upon the earlier mythological conceptions, and Siva and his worship have been introduced. Otherwise we do not appear to have passed out of the Vedic age in the systems observed. Temples and idols are not heard of. On great occasions the Aswamedha, or horse sacrifice, now long quite obsolete, is practised. The Swayamvara marriages, which are also characteristic of those days, are a usual form; and the future state is one of unmixed happiness for all mankind. When we pass to the Institutes of Manu, we are brought very sensibly to an era in close correspondence with existing times. The Bráhman is at the head of creation, an emanation from the breath of Brahmá. His very birth is "a constant incarnation of the god of justice." As a teacher of the Veda he is "the image of God." The king is "respectfully" to attend to him, and to abide by his advice; otherwise the ruler and the whole land will perish (i. 31, 98; ii. 225; vii. 37-42). Now as the Epics were evidently composed under strong Bráhmanical feeling, had the Bráhmanism of their day been that of the time of Manu, the writers could not, so decidedly as they have done, have gone against the

purposes and spirit of Manu. So divine a system could not have been ignored and even warred against. Nor could the fiction of primeval times, such as those described in the Epics, have been devised, in the face of Manu's declaration (however ill the position was sustained by himself), that his legislation had prevailed from the dawn of the creation. It is far more reasonable to conclude that the Epics stand free of all these difficulties, and represent with fidelity the manners and the spirit of the age described, because put forth in it; and Manu, whatever his purposes, helps us to understand that there was such a period, when the highest personages failed to observe the restrictions he aimed at enforcing in respect of occupations, marriages, and diet. "In the Mahá-bhárata," observes the Essayist, "all the leading characters are raised beyond the sphere of ordinary human life. Their birth is miraculous, and their acts defy the standard of human acts. They constantly associate with gods; their palaces are of divine grandeur; their armies count by millions; their wealth is inexhaustible; time and distance vanish before their deeds; . . . a supernatural halo surrounds every personage of consequence" (*West. Rev.*). The earlier poem, the Rámáyana, is on the same exalted platform. In both Epics the gods intermix with the human race, and generate offspring among them who form the heroes on the stage depicted. Incarnations of the gods themselves, together with demigods, rishis of superhuman power, demons, magical transformations, illusions of every sort, are freely introduced to give effect to the scenes described. At the basis of all are veins of what appear to be true historic representation, carried out by personages, who still live in the apprehensions of the people as having had positive existence and action, but cast into times when the mind revelled in the wildest imageries, and when the infancy of the race enabled it to digest and realize the most wondrous fancies. When we turn from these elements to Manu, we pass into another atmosphere, and descend at once into the sober realities of daily life, and the actualities and experiences of modern times. The miraculous may have since been enunciated, but it is an inheritance derived from the remoter epoch.

It is a customary resource with some to suggest that, whatever may be the antiquity of the Indian Epics, the incarna-

tions of Vishnu in the form, in the one epic, of Ráma, and in the other, of Krishna, are modern interpolations. As the objection affects the Christian scriptures, and not the Jewish, I do not now enter upon it. The Buddhist era was one distinguished by very marked consequences, and it places us in possession of chronological data whereby to form some estimate of the prior Brahmanical times. At the outset of the movement certain great Councils were held in order to assure and consolidate its action. The first is considered to have sat in B.C. 543: a second in B.C. 443; and a third in B.C. 309 (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, II. 55, 56). The last occurred in the reign of Asoka, when Buddhism became the state religion of India. Edicts issued by him still exist on pillars at Delhi, Allahabad, &c., and on rocks at Guzerat, Orissa, and near Peshawur (*Ibid.*, II. 104). The early Brahmanical literature has consequently to be kept within the period of the prevalence of Buddhism, and has therefore arisen in times not more recent than 600 or 500 years B.C. At what prior times the various branches of this literature were actually produced there is no positive means of judging. All that can be said is that it exhibits distinct successional stages, each occupying some lengthened space of time; and the order of occurrence may also, with more or less certainty, be laid down.

The Buddhist doctrine was a protest against Brahmanism, such as was promoted by Manu's Institutes. The devout life was held to be open to all mankind, and to level all distinctions. Thus proselytism could be exercised towards the whole human race. The Brahmanical system fixed every one in the grade in which he was born. The Bráhman alone could be a teacher of the Vedas, and there could be no possible opening for religious association with those who were by birth outside the pale of Hinduism. The protesting party, the Buddhists, dominated in India for about seven centuries, after which the Brahmanical section gradually prevailed, and finally supplanted them. There must have been a long era of Brahmanism to account for these phenomena. The evil of the system would have to ripen, and would be submitted to for a considerable length of time, before such a protest as that of the Buddhists could be successfully initiated; and the Brahmanism must have been deep-rooted which could stand the interruption of

so many centuries, and then re-spring to life and flourish, never again to be interfered with. Of this phase of Brahmanism the Institutes of Manu are the exponents, and there is room, on the grounds before us, to believe that this Code must have been long in operation, to produce such effects, before its overthrow by the Buddhists.

But the Code itself is not with us in its primitive condition. It has been subject to much curtailment or alteration. Sir William Jones, in the preface to his translation thereof (xvi., xvii.), informs us that at one time it consisted of 100,000 slócas or couplets, which became reduced to 12,000 verses, and then to 4000, while now it has shrunk to 2685. A considerable period must have occurred ere such changes, in such a work, could have been effected and submitted to. And then we have looming in a still remoter distance that age of social liberty, existing in Vedic times, of which Manu himself repeatedly manifests a consciousness. Very gradual must have been the alterations in the sentiments of the Hindús, a people ill disposed to change, to have allowed the free privileges of those days to be overridden by their priestly teachers to the extent of permitting such a Code as that of Manu to be projected and accepted; and at some time in that distant era of happy freedom stands the action of the Epics.

IV.

THE HEBREWS.

THE people we have now to occupy ourselves with present a marked contrast to the Eastern Aryans, whether as regards antiquity, refinement of manners, or intellectual enlightenment; but, through the force of circumstances, they have exercised an influence as deep-rooted and wide-spread as that traceable to the Aryans. The Hebrews have been looked upon by the western nations as a race peculiarly under the eye of the Almighty, though for the present in temporary estrangement. The Divinity has selected them, it has been thought, as the medium of his manifestations of himself to the world at large. If he has ever displayed himself in special form, it is to these that the exhibition has been made; if he has uttered a word for the edification of mankind, it is through them that the communication has passed; if he has opened to man a stated way of escape from surrounding evil, and given him a declared passport to his favour, it is from this people that the instrumentality has been drawn. Had the Almighty not taken this peculiar course for the help of mankind, they were all irrecoverably lost. The Jew has elicited the divine regards towards man, for which, otherwise, there would have been neither inducement or channel; and through the happy circumstance that there was a people, such as they are, to excite his attention, the countenance and helping hand of the Deity have been directed to an otherwise benighted and abandoned world. "I will bless them," he assured their progenitor, "that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xii. 3). In their lowest, which is their existing state, we are told the children of Israel are "the riches" of us "Gentiles," and in their highest will be to us as "life" to "the dead" (Rom. xi. 12-15).

We have seen the position occupied by the early Ayrans as the most ancient people of whom any trustworthy records exist; able, as a civilized and organized nation, to turn the resources of the world to account; with cultivated minds, and souls exercised in seeking at the hands of the Supreme Being purification from sin, contact with him in the spirit, and admission to his presence in an eternal home. The lapse of ages has shut these people from our sight till modern scholarship unlocked the ample stores of learning and religious travail they have left behind them. We can therefore contrast them with those whom the western world have accepted as the elect of God; and the comparison is a most instructive one in estimating the pretensions of the latter.

The Aryans recede from view, beyond all definable limits, in the remoteness of their origin. They belong to those very early days when the recognition of the Almighty stood upon the purest and most natural foundation. The first and the surest testimonies at that time alone existed. Man had then no method of judging of the divine originator of all things, but through the study of the operations of nature, and the emotions of his own inner consciousness. The overlayings of the inventive faculties had not then been indulged in to any material degree. Inherited dogmas were wanting. The conception formed of God was, that he was the friend of all, to whom every one had the freest access. But in process of time props of human device were resorted to for support of the spiritual faith. The foundations became ricketty and insecure. The workmen had to redouble their efforts. The fancies of man raised fresh and denser clouds, which served to shut out the more completely from view the image of his maker. Other and distorted forms took the place of the Deity in their imaginations. His attributes sank as his ideality was debased. Gradually he was brought down to the level of humanity, and even lower. His figure was multiplied and localized; his knowledge and power became divided and limited; his aspect towards man was such that his favour had to be purchased by offerings, and his wrath averted by continual sacrifices. The worshiper could no longer approach him in simple earnestness, as in the old Aryan days, wherever he might happen to be, in his field, or

in the privacy of his dwelling place. He had to erect sumptuous temples to find him there; he had to construct altars by means of which to draw near and propitiate him; he had to organize and employ a priesthood, through whom all worship had to be conducted with ostentatious ceremonial. The devotion was expressed mechanically; forms took the place of feelings; the worshiper was thrust to a distance from the object of his adoration by the very means taken, ostensibly, to facilitate his access to him. The need of priestly services induced the assertion of priestly power. Holiness and nearness to God were yoked to official position. The privileged ones felt their advantage, and exercised it. They enlarged their inventions, and magnified everything that could render more constant and absolute the occasions for dependence on themselves, and gradually hood-winked and enslaved the multitude. Taking them according to their own account, it was in an era far down in the depths of these deep debasements, and from the centre of a circle of the most tainted description, composed of Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Phœnicians, that the Jewish people came nationally to view as the chosen of God. We have to see how they fulfilled the rôle; what the manifestation made to them of the Deity and his ways; and what the influence upon themselves,—they being their own witnesses.

The Jewish claim is made through a collection of writings, said to have come from God under his direct inspiration. The thought that God might thus communicate with man was not a new one. The Eastern Aryans had fallen into the like persuasion as respects their early records. "The idea of revelation," says Max Müller, "and I mean more particularly book-revelation, is not a modern idea. . . We find the literature of India saturated with this idea from beginning to end. In no country, I believe, has the theory of revelation been so minutely elaborated as in India. . . . According to the orthodox views of Indian theologians, not a single line of the Veda was the work of human authors. The whole Veda is in some way or other the work of the Deity" (*Chips*, I. 17, 18). The western world are convinced that the Jewish scriptures are of this type, while they absolutely dissallow any similar claim raised in any other quarter. Under this asserted divine

medium the history of this God-selected, and God-directed people, is unfolded to us, and we are to judge of the results.

The Jewish history begins from the very germ of time. The Jews are able to trace themselves in descent, step by step, from the first human couple whom God created. The data are given for the very year when this important act of creation took place. It happens, however, that there are three versions of the record, all claiming attention; namely that of the Hebrews, that of the Samaritans who seceded from them, and the Septuagint translation when these scriptures were first made accessible to the world at large. We may distinguish as the first stage in the history the period given from the creation to the deluge, when the stock of Adam was put an end to, but renewed in Noah. The interval, according to the Hebrew text, was 1656 years, according to the Samaritan 1307, and according to the Septuagint 2262 (Speaker's Com.* *on Gen.* v. 3). On a very material point, therefore, where we have a right to certainty, the reverse is presented to us. In England we have an authorized version, constituting the Englishman's Bible, to which he has to take, like the land he lives in, with all its faults. This places the creation at B.C. 4004, and the deluge at B.C. 2349. Accepting this, there is an end to the speculations on which I have ventured to embark in favour of the remote antiquity of the Aryan stock. In the short compass of 2000 years from the deluge to the time of Alexander, we have to account for their growth into a nation in the Bactrian land; for the maturing of their language in that region; for the measure of civilization there acquired by them; for their increase in population, forcing them to pass over their bounds and spread themselves east and west to distant lands; for the gradual obliteration of their language; for the development from it of the Sanskrit; for the high perfectionizing of that language; for the enormous mass of literature thereupon ensuing, and of which we have such copious relics; and for the decay and disuse of that tongue to be replaced by other dialects. To keep to our authorized chronology, we necessarily must do the utmost vio-

* The Holy Bible, with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter.

lence to the natural ordering of these events, which are traceable through the unmistakeable indications they have left behind them.

The first parents commit a transgression for which they are ejected from Eden to the outer world. There they have two sons—Abel, who is a keeper of sheep; and Cain, who tills the land. From the very outset the domestication of animals, and the growth of cereals, is known to man. There are but four people upon the earth, but already the need of these two great industrial pursuits presented itself, and the sons betake themselves to them. Abel catches and tames his sheep, and breeds from them a flock. Cain finds implements to break up and fertilize the soil. He has cultivated the wild grasses, and converted their seed into edible grain. Our experiences of primeval man ill accord with these representations. We see him dependent on the wild products of nature, vegetal and animal, for his sustenance. He has no better weapon than stones fashioned rudely for his use. Whatever he captures or subdues in the animal kingdom, he devours. The idea of folding them in herds for future occasion occurs only when growth of population calls for such precautionary supplies; and intelligence, slowly and tentatively acquired, shows what animals may be domesticated, and how. Nor will fields be appropriated, and produce raised thereon, till further increase has been made in numbers, and wants are multiplied beyond the means of the forests, the plains, and the waters, to meet them. The historian, unconscious of a difficulty, offers no explanation. He springs from the first stage in man's existence on earth to conditions belonging to him at a very advanced one, without thought of any occurring interval.

Cain kills his brother, and for this another expulsion is ordained by the Deity. Cain apprehends danger from the people among whom he had to go, and the Deity places on him a protective mark. The historian quite forgets that, according to his narrative, there could be no such people. He had described the human race to consist of the parent couple and their children, of whom Cain alone remained. Cain had no one to be apprehensive of but his parents, and from their presence he was cast out.

Suddenly we perceive that Cain had a wife. Who she was we

are not told. Keeping to the original narrative, she must have been a sister, whose birth was unreported. The race, according to the narrative, could only be perpetuated through incest.

Cain then becomes a father, and directly he has his son Enoch, he proceeds to build a city, calling it after his son's name, as if to distinguish it from other existing similar settlements. Considering that at this time there were in the region in question but one man and his wife and child, the act is an incomprehensible one. The historian has, however, no qualms in putting it before us as a consistent fact.

The fifth in descent from Cain is Lamech. He had three sons, Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal Cain. We hear that the first was the "father of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle," the second "the father of all such as handle the harp and organ," and the third an "instructor of every artificer in brass and iron." The advance in these early days in the knowledge of civilized arts is certainly marvellous. With us necessity is the mother of invention, but then invention evidently took the lead. The city of Enoch at the time contained but five males with their wives. One would think there was room enough and to spare within its precincts. But the desire for the nomade life arises. Weaving is accomplished, tents are made, the patriarch Jabal collects his flocks, quits his relatives, and goes forth to the wilds to be henceforth a rover. The family were, under pressure of the still recent curse, to earn their livelihood in the sweat of their brows. But Jubal could command leisure to indulge a talent for music, and he was capable of inventing and putting together so complicated and refined an instrument as an organ. His brother Tubal-Cain could accomplish greater things. He observed in the interstices of the rocks veins of copper and zinc, and extracted, fused, and composed of these metals a substance surpassing either of them in their separate state in hardness and utility; and he was even able to detect in the earthy or rocky ingredients around him the presence of the unseen iron, and constructed furnaces with power to smelt and turn the ore to account. The ages that we are conscious of, as having occupied long successional periods, of stone, bronze, and iron, overtake each other at a gallop in the city of Enoch.

After these details connected with the banished stock of Cain, we are taken back to the circle of the first parents, Adam and Eve. Eve again becomes a mother, and has Seth, whom she accepts from God as replacing to her Abel; and Seth has Enos. "Then," we have the marvellous statement made, "began men to call upon the name of the Lord." The circle consisted of Adam, Seth, their wives, and the child Enos. The Deity had had personal dealings with Adam and Eve, and Eve had recognized his hand at the birth of Seth. But the picture puts before us men, or races of men, then, for the first time, brought to the sense of their dependence on God; and there is the further anachronism that they knew him as "Jehovah," or rather "Jahveh," could our translators have ventured to let out the fact,—a name the proclamation of which had been specially reserved to be made to Moses 2384 years later (Exod. vi. 2, 3).

We have then the line of Enos, and on comparing it with that of Cain it is evident that there has been some strange intermixture and confusion of the names, depriving either genealogy of title to reliability. The descent stands as follows:

Adam.	Enos.
Cain.	Cainan.
Enoch.	Mahalaleel.
Irad.	Jared.
Mehujael.	Enoch.
Methusael.	Methuselah.
Lamech.	Lamech.

The Lamech of Cain's stock is the father of Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cainan, while that of the stock of Enos is the father of Noah.

In the time of Noah we have the distinction between clean and unclean beasts, and the patriarch's sacrifice is carefully restricted to the former. The historian inadvertently anticipates the divine discrimination of animals proper for food and sacrifice, revealed to Moses 859 years afterwards.

The ages of the patriarchs are spread over periods far in excess of the known limits of human life. Seven generations, reaching to the birth of Noah, are made to cover 1056 years, being at the rate of 150 years for a generation, against the

current estimate of 30 years; then 500 years are cleared at a bound to the generation beyond Noah. This remote and dark era is thus accounted for with a very economical array of persons to figure on the scene.

We now pass from a necessarily legendary period to one of possible history. The 10th chapter of Genesis gives the descendants of Noah in the lines of his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Sir Henry Rawlinson, while looking upon this "fragment" as probably "of the very greatest antiquity," sees in it traces to associate it with an advanced stage of Jewish history. He points to verses 9 to 12, giving a popular saying respecting Nimrod, and describing the geography of Babylon, subjects which would interest the Jews, and be known to them, only when they came into contact with this region after the Babylonian captivity; and speaking of Nineveh and its cities, which were of modern origin, one of these cities, Calneh, for example, not having been founded till about B.C. 1000 (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, XV. 215, 216, note). We have also notice of just those petty tribes with whom the Israelites were concerned after their settlement in Palestine, namely Philistines, Jebusites, Amonites, Girgasites, Hivites, &c., and an explanatory geographical paragraph respecting "the border of the Canaanites from Sidon, as thou comest to Gerar, unto Gaza; as thou goest unto Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, even unto Lasha" (ver. 14-19). This therefore is no primitive record of pre-Jewish times, but just what these people would put together when they began the compilation of their history, a task accomplished after the captivity.

We are then furnished with a list of nine patriarchs from Shem to Abraham's father Terah. Shem is said to have lived 600 years; the next three averaged 445 years; the three after them averaged 243; the eighth, Nahor, lived 148 years, and Terah lived 205. The lives of men are becoming gradually reduced, so as to bring them at length to the normal standard.

We now arrive at the histories of the three important patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the centre and source of all blessing, to the Jews primarily, and through them to the world at large. Mr Bernstein, in a pamphlet in Mr Scott's series, the design of which is to prove the legendary character

of these histories, remarks on the evident fabrication of the names of these patriarchs. Abram, he points out, means "high father," and Abraham, to which the name was converted, "father of many nations;" designations which could only have suggested themselves when there was the population for which the headship was sought. Isaac means "he laughs," "jokes," or "sports," and accordingly when Abraham heard he was to have this son, he fell on his face and "laughed" (Gen. xvii. 17); when Sarah got the promise she "laughed" (Gen. xviii. 12); when the son was born, she said, "God hath made me to laugh, so that all that hear will laugh with me" (Gen. xxi. 6). The laughter is of very various character. In the instance of Abraham it expresses joy, in that of Sarah, on one occasion scepticism, and on the other gratitude. The same Hebrew word is used to represent Ishmael having "mocked" Isaac (Gen. xxi. 9), and Isaac being seen "sporting" with his wife (Gen. xxvi. 8), two actions again of a very dissimilar sort. It is impossible that Isaac should have been named at birth in anticipation of these circumstances. The events have been imagined to support the fancy of the name. The name of Jacob means "imposter," or "supplanter." In token that this was to be his rôle he is introduced into the world, at birth, having hold of his twin-brother Esau's heel. Dr Inman professionally assures us that such a birth as this is "a physical impossibility;" "an arm presentation is death to both mother and child, unless the position is altered" (*Ancient Faiths*, I., 600). When he grows up, Jacob imposes upon his father, and defrauds his brother of the paternal blessing. He had also managed to deprive him of his inheritance for a very inadequate consideration. He furthermore defrauds his uncle Laban of an undue portion of his flock, through an impossible device. The character of Jacob could not have been foreseen from infancy, so as to allow of the choice of a name for him expressive thereof. The combination of name and circumstance so exactly is explicable if we may refer both to the creative faculty of the writer, but not otherwise. Had these been real personages, names so entitled to veneration would have been current among the Jews. But during the thousand one hundred years that occurred from the death of the last of the

alleged patriarchs to the captivity, not once does it appear to have occurred to any parent to adopt one of these memorable names for his child. The same is the case as to the names of Joseph, Moses, and Aaron, which in like manner should have been commemorated. Accepting the account of the exodus as given by Manetho, the name of Moses, or Moyses, might have come into use. That such was not the case, is evidence that the career of this leader failed to command sufficient attention to secure the survival of his name. That he did not actually lead the people into Canaan appears even from the Jewish narrative. His presence among them may really have been very short-lived, and his influence not lasting. In the case of Joshua it is otherwise. He entered the land, and long commanded the people there. His name was consequently perpetuated (1 Sam. vi. 14; 2 Kings, xxiii. 8; Hag. i. 1; Zech. iii. 1), and it appears also in Jeshua (Ezra ii. 2), and Jesus (Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8), as derivatives. After the captivity the names of the patriarchs, etc., abound among the Jewish people and continue in common use. It was then that the histories attached thereto were promulgated (Neh. viii. 7, 8), and what conclusion is to be drawn than that previously the names and the histories were unknown?

The incidents in these patriarchal histories are furthermore wanting in the characteristics of true facts. The age of Abraham is a matter of considerable moment. The idea inculcated is that when he was too advanced in years to have a son, God, to show the speciality of the gift, gave him one, from whom the Hebrew race have descended. "Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude" (Heb. xi. 12). His father Terah, we are informed, was seventy years old at his birth, and died at Haran at the age of two hundred and five (Gen. xi. 26, 32); so that at that period Abraham was aged one hundred and thirty-five years. From Haran, after his father's death, he proceeded to Canaan, and at this time we are told his age was but seventy-five (Gen. xii. 4). When in Canaan the promise of the son is impressed upon him, on which he is represented to have been much astonished, and to have "said in his heart, shall a child be born unto him that

is an hundred years old" (Gen. xvii. 17). After this Sarah dies, and Abraham takes to himself another wife. The marginal chronology makes his age at this time to have been one hundred and forty five, and the superannuated man has six more sons. He reaches the age of one hundred and seventy-five, or double the usual limits of human life. Noah survived the flood by three hundred and fifty years (Gen. ix. 28). Abraham was at this time, according to the chronologies, fifty-eight years of age. Shem actually survived him by thirty-five years, Salah by three years, and Eber by sixty-four. At the death of Arphaxad Abraham was one hundred and twelve years old; of Peleg, forty-eight; of Reu, seventy-eight; and of his great-grandfather Serug, one hundred and one (Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch, IV. 282). Abraham was thus contemporary with the old patriarchs who ordinarily began to procreate offspring at the age when he had Isaac. Of this, even tradition would have assured him. Jacob was well aware of the feature in the family histories (Gen. xlvii. 9). Abraham might have had it from the very lips of Shem that he was one hundred years old before he had a son, or from those of Noah that he had none till he was five hundred (Gen. v. 32 ; xi. 10). The miraculousness of Isaac's birth, before these representations, fades into a thing of nought.

Wherever Abraham wanders in Canaan or in Egypt, he is represented to have been "a stranger and a pilgrim" (Heb. xi. 13); but with only eight generations between himself and the sons of Noah, he was really everywhere among his own kindred. And with so many of this renowned ancestry living in his day, strange to say he never comes across one of them.

When Sarah has reached the mature age of sixty-five she excites the admiration of Pharaoh, king of Egypt; and at ninety, when supernaturally pregnant of Isaac, Abimelech, king of Gerar, becomes enamoured of her (Gen. xii. 14 ; xx. 2). On each occasion the divinity interferes, and harasses those who are coveting the patriarch's wife. Ninety-four years later the same incident befalls the wife of Isaac, Abimelech, king of Gerar, strangely enough, at this long interval, being again concerned with the occurrence. In all three instances the patriarchs lead to the temptation offered,

by passing their wives off as their unmarried sisters. The historian's object is to exalt the personages of his narrative, by putting kings in risk because of the marvellous attractions of the patriarchal wives, and he arrives thereat in the face of all consistency.

Four kings ruling on the Euphrates and Tigris place the princes of the valley of the Jordan, five in number, under tribute, and eventually make war upon and overthrow them. Lot, with his family and goods, falls into the hands of the conquerors. Abraham arms his own people, who could only have been herdsmen, to the number of 318, and with a few others of neighbouring tribes, who are referred to slightingly, follows up the victors over the mountains of Libanus to the vicinity of Damascus, a distance of some 200 miles, and wrenches from them Lot and his belongings. The feat is an unparalleled one, especially for an old man of then eighty-five.

Abraham afterwards meets with Melchizedek, described as the king of Salem. The name imports him to have been Melech or king Sydek, who figures in the history of Sanchoniathon apparently as Noah. He is called "the priest of the most high God," and as there could have been no such priesthood then in operation, the event has an entirely mythical aspect. That it was such is supported by the later teaching, which represents Melchizedek to have been one "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life" (Heb. vii. 3), and thus not of human origin.

Though abounding in wealth, being "very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold," and accounted by his neighbours "a mighty prince" (Gen. xiii. 2; xxiii. 6), Abraham banishes the innocent Hagar and Ishmael into the desert with no better provision than some bread and a vessel of water (Gen. xxi. 14). In like manner Isaac, who had largely increased the paternal possessions (Gen. xxvi. 12-14), sends forth his elect son Jacob, on whom he had showered all his blessings, to seek his fortune far off in Chaldea, with no other endowment than the staff he had in his hand (Gen. xxxii. 10).

When Hagar is thus thrust forth, Abraham gave her the vessel of water, "putting it on her shoulder, and the child." "And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the

child under one of the shrubs." The picture is that of a young child in arms. An angel visits and comforts her, and says, "Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand." The historian appears to have forgotten, in painting this scene, that this infant had six years previously undergone circumcision at the age of thirteen, and was then a full-grown youth of nineteen (Gen. xvii. 25; xxi. 14-18), about to become a wild warrior and hunter (Gen. xvi. 12; xxi. 20). The mother, as observed by Mr Wilson in his commentary on the passage, would have been the first to succumb.

There is the revolting story of Lot and his daughters. They had just escaped from a judgment which had overtaken a very circumscribed region, and yet are made to suppose that there was "not a man in the earth" remaining with whom they could propagate their species; on which they make use of their father for their purposes. In a state of insensibility, induced by drink, when he would be incapacitated for the act, the old man is represented to have accomplished it on two successive nights, too much inebriated, on both occasions, to know what had taken place. And where in the cave, on the mountain's side, in which the party had taken refuge, with no creature near them to resort to, the necessary wine could have been obtained, the narrator omits to consider.

In these wondrous days a patriarch's blessing carries with it solid results, even when bestowed on one for whom it was not designed. The words from his lips have magical power, if only they can be drawn from them, and may be directed to any quarter whatsoever with substantial effect. Rebekah lays her plans to turn the channel of the blessing from Esau, for whom the father intended it, to Jacob. Jacob has thus to personate Esau. Isaac is blind, but sufficiently in possession of his senses to detect the voice of Jacob, and the smell of Esau's raiment in which Jacob had clothed himself. But though capable of discerning into the far off future, and to direct the flow of what was then to happen, he mistakes the skins of kids for Esau's hairy hands.

According to the marginal chronology, Jacob left Laban in the year B.C. 1739, "and pitched his tent before the city" of Shalem (Gen xxxiii. 18). His daughter Dinah had been born seven years before (Gen. xxx. 21). Shechem, the son of the

prince of the place, sees her and defiles her. To give Dinah adequate age for such an occurrence, the marginal chronologist here adds in seven years to his record. But the course of the narrative shows that Jacob's party were mere passers by, and had made no such halt. Two of her brothers avenge Dinah by slaughtering all the males of the city, who are supposed to have been incapable of offering any resistance, from soreness after circumcision. The name of Dinah, points out Dr Inman, signifies "avenged" (*Anc. Faiths*, I., 450). We have, therefore, another instance of a narrative shaped to suit an imaginary name.

The tale of Joseph is replete with features of dramatic effect. Sold into bondage by his own brethren, he passes through prison to receive at the hands of "Pharaoh" the supreme direction of the affairs of his empire. He husbands the resources of the country in a time of unexampled plenty, and distributes them in seven continuous years of famine, during the course of which he acquires for his sovereign the title to the whole arable land of Egypt, and one-fifth of its revenues. But not a word respecting this foreign administrator, the remarkable circumstances of his time, and the important fiscal changes brought about by him, appear in the well kept records of Egypt. Nor will the details of the narrative bear examination. Joseph's brothers sell him to a party of merchants who are called indifferently Ishmaelites and Midianites. Ishmael and Midian were half-brothers of Isaac, the one being his senior by twelve years, and the other his junior by fifty. And here the descendants in the second generation have dealings with one another as entire strangers; and while Isaac's grandchildren represent a mere family circle, his grandnephews have swollen to tribal proportions. We hear much of the wealth and importance of the patriarchs. The possessions of Abraham pass to Isaac; in his hands they are vastly increased; Jacob becomes endowed therewith, and had made extensive acquisitions of his own. But when the family, in the alleged famine, have to draw supplies from Egypt, the brothers twice proceed thither, without a single attendant, each driving an ass before him, which is brought back, with its burden of grain; and these few loads are a sufficient supply, for a considerable measure of time, for the whole

household and their animals. The very asses had to be fed on the way from these sacks (Gen. xlii. 27).

We have now before us the twelve tribes of Jacob. Twelve is a favourite scripture number. The descendants of Ishmael, similarly to those of Jacob, divide themselves into twelve branches, prophetically as well as actually (Gen. xvii. 20; xxv. 16). In later days we have twelve apostles, who in the future ages are to rule over the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. xix. 28). The number has a mythological aspect. The day is divided into twelve hours (John xi. 9), the year into twelve months, and the arc of the heavens into twelve zodiacal sections. Kircher, Dupuis, and Drummond, associate the tribes of Israel with the signs of the zodiac, and say that they were painted upon their standards (Œdipus Judaicus, 3, 4). And when we look for the reality of the tribes, it is wanting. We have the people among us, but without their tribal distinctions, which, as I have it from more than one reliable Jewish source, have been unknown from the Babylonian captivity. Since that remarkable epoch no Jew can say of what tribe he is. He can point only to the Levites, or an hereditary priesthood. The ten tribes that are said to have formed the divided kingdom of Israel were carried away into captivity by the Assyrians. These are currently called the lost tribes, and many have been the efforts to identify them with some existing people. One writer shows them to be the Afghans, another the Nestorians, a third the ancient Sacæ, and thus they are even brought home to ourselves as Anglo-Saxons. But none of these ingenious writers is able to do more than present them to us in the aggregate. The effort to distinguish their tribal sections is not attempted. The Assyrian captives being removed, there remained the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which are said to have constituted the kingdom of Judah. Their captivity in Babylon lasted less than seventy years. Is it conceivable that they entered Babylon knowing the tribes they belonged to, and came out of it, without any such knowledge remaining to them? They were able, with few and specified exceptions, to trace their family descent (Ezra ii., viii.; Neh. vii.), and yet had lost the broader and more solid distinction of the tribe; and there were but two tribes connected with them between

which to hesitate! The distinctive progeny are evidently as purely ideal as the patriarchal parentage from which it is sought to derive them.

The bondage in Egypt was to endure 400 years, and yet was to occupy but four generations (Gen. xv. 13, 16). Not four, but fourteen would be requisite to span the period. Levi was one of those who originally entered the land, and Moses and Aaron led the expedition out of it. They verify the impossible limitation, being fourth in descent from Levi (Exod. vi. 16-20). And then, as if with a note of triumph at the accuracy of the consummation, we are told that as 430 years expired, "even the self-same day it came to pass that all the hosts of the Lord went from the land of Egypt" (Exod. xii. 40, 41). Why the 400 years became 430 is not explained. The 400 years, certainly, were not to represent the entire time of the predicted sojourn, but only that portion thereof when the "servitude" and the "affliction" were to prevail; but this difference of 30 years does not suffice to cover the period of the sojourn in ease, while Joseph was still alive, for he survived the migration by 71 years.

During the alleged four generations, the males of Israel increased from 70 to 600,000 adults (Exod. i. 5; xii. 37), which represents, according to Horne, a population of three millions, and according to Kalisch of two and a half (Colenso on the Pentateuch, I. 35). And for this stupendous number the offices of two midwives, who are carefully named, sufficed (Exod. i. 15). Dr Inman estimates that each midwife would have had to attend to 800 births daily (*Anc. Faiths*, II. 92). And so we obtain the "great nation" that was to spring from Abraham (Gen. xii. 2).

In the occurrence of the exodus we may believe, because here we have the independent testimony of Manetho's annals which record it; but it was made under circumstances ill befitting a people who were the favoured of God. They are described by Manetho as outcasts, who, after rebelling against the king of Egypt, were defeated and driven out, and fled to Judea. Their leader is said to have been Osarsiph, a renegade Egyptian priest, who put down the worship of the gods of Egypt, and took up the name of Moyses.*

* The Bible; is it the Word of God? 129-134.

It is remarkable in how many respects the Jewish narrative lends support, of course undesignedly, to the account of Manetho.

The Israelites are described to have been put to coerced labour in the district of Goshen. Manetho states them to have been thus employed in a region called Avaris, which Josephus has recognised as Goshen (Higgins' *Anacalypsis*, I. 56, note).

Manetho says they were mostly lepers, and the legislation ascribed to Moses has many minute rules for the control of leprosy. Moses was miraculously made a leper and healed, and might repeat the miracle himself as a token to the people of his divine mission (Exod. iv. 6-8).

The mode in which the Israelites made their actual exit consists exactly with Manetho's statement that they were put to flight. "They were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victual." Their haste was such that they "took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading-troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders" (Exod. xii. 34, 39). It was a disastrous retreat, and by no means a triumphant deliverance "with an high arm" (Acts xiii. 17); and it was followed up by immediate pursuit.

The name of the leader, as given by Manetho, identifies him absolutely with Moses. He is said to have been a priest of Heliopolis, with which position there is a Jewish association. Joseph bore the Egyptian name of Zaphnath-paaneah, and married the daughter of a priest of On, or Heliopolis (Gen. xli. 45). His wife's name was Asenath, or Asneith, "the devoted to the goddess Neith" (*Types of Mankind*, 114). According to Chœremon, who as well as Manetho was an Egyptian priest learned in the antiquities of his country, Joseph was contemporaneous with Moses, and accompanied him in the exodus (The Rev. G. Rawlinson's *Hist. Illus. of the Old Test.*, 58, 59). The Jewish account (Exod. xiii. 19) is that the body of Joseph was taken away with them by the exiles, a form of statement altogether irreconcileable with the precipitate character of the retreat. Joseph is described as an interpreter of dreams and addicted to divination (Gen. xliv. 5, 15); he had his father embalmed, and was embalmed

himself (Gen. l. 2, 26), which was an expression of faith in the Egyptian doctrine of the re-inhabitation of the body by the departed soul (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 45-48). The process in the instance of Jacob occupied forty days, "and the Egyptians mourned for him threescore and ten days." The entombment of these patriarchs was thus in strict conformity to Egyptian usage, and their bodies must, with the Egyptian agency used, have been committed to the grave with the customary ornamentation and inscriptions, assigning them to the guardianship of Osiris, as members of the Egyptian faith (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 45-47). Moses was involved in the same Egyptian element. He was brought up in the household of "Pharaoh," and became "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts vii. 22). The learning of Egypt was monopolized by the priests. "They were the only learned or educated people in the kingdom, and consequently they filled every post and office which needed any education. Not only every clergyman, sexton, and undertaker, but every physician and druggist; every lawyer, writing-clerk, schoolmaster, and author; every sculptor, painter, and land-measurer; every conjuror, ventriloquist, and fortune-teller, belonged to the priestly order" (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 26). Joseph, the conjuror and fortune-teller (Gen. xl.; xli.; xliv. 5, 15), was therefore of the priesthood, and the "physicians" who embalmed his father and himself were in like manner priests. Joseph's marriage to the daughter of the priest of On is therefore quite intelligible. Moses also was a conjuror, and matched himself in the art with "Pharaoh's" magicians; and having been inducted into all the learning of the country, he too was necessarily of the priesthood, as is alleged of him by Manetho. He showed his priestly affinities when he became a renegade from the Egyptian order, by marrying into the family of a Midianitish priest (Exod. iii. 1).

The spirit of Moses is said to have been roused by witnessing the oppression of his people, and seeing an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, he slew him. "He looked," it is said, "this way and that way, and when he saw that there was no man, he slew the Egyptian, and hid him in the sand" (Exod. ii. 12). The act was purely one of conscious murder, and it involved rebellion against the authorities of the land. The

criminal fled, taking refuge with the Midianites, among whom he remained domiciled for forty years (Acts vii. 30). He could not have ingratiated himself with this people, married their priest's daughter, and have remained among them thus long, had there been any want of accord on his part with their religious practices. He passed, it may be inferred, from the Egyptian to the Midianitish faith. The priest of Midian eventually visits the Jewish camp, and there performs, acceptably, a sacrifice in the presence of Moses, Aaron, "and all the elders of Israel" (Exod. xviii. 12). The incident was an impossible one under the institutions afterwards ascribed to Moses. It is intelligible only on the understanding that Moses had adopted the religion of his father-in-law. The whole episode of the murder, and the consorting with the Gentile tribe, wars against the divine mission to which it was introductory, according to the Jewish account; but it presents us exactly with Manetho's rebel and renegade Egyptian priest.

Circumcision prevailed in Egypt, but was confined to the priestly order. It was an initiatory rite, to be conformed to before any one could be admitted to the knowledge of their mysterious learning, and Pythagoras is said to have undergone it in order to instruct himself among them (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 395). Moses, consequently, as possessed of the learning of Egypt, must have received the Egyptian circumcision. Very remarkably he omitted to apply the rite to his own son (Exod. iv. 24-26), and to all the Israelites born during the forty years' pilgrimage in the wilderness (Josh. v. 5). This is consistent with Manetho's account of him as an Egyptian priest who had set himself against the religion of his country, but it is quite out of accord with the Jewish representations that circumcision was the token of the covenant established with Abraham, to be neglected under the penalty of death (Gen. xvii. 10-14), and Moses the appointed agent to enunciate and carry out the law.

There is the worship of the golden calf in the desert, and the indignation which the act excites in Moses. The surrounding circumstances, as narrated, give no possible room for such an occurrence. The Israelites had just been brought out of Egypt with marvellous testimonies of the god who had elected them, and to the complete dishonour and overthrow of

the divinities of Egypt. They had reached the foot of the holy mountain from whence they were to receive the laws of their god. There were thunderings and lightnings with "the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled" (Exod. xix. 16). In the midst of the revelations made to Moses he was allowed to bring Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, to the mount, and introduce them to the presence of "the God of Israel," who was openly exhibited to them seated on a throne (Exod. xxiv. 9-11). Then Moses is admitted to exclusive communication with the deity, and "the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel" (Exod. xxiv. 17). Moses was thus engaged for forty days, in the course of which the people, despairing of his return, are said, with the aid and offices of Aaron, to have made and set up the molten calf, and sacrificed to it; saying, "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (Exod. xxxii. 1-6). Such conduct, under the conditions described, is absolutely inconceivable in any people, nor do idolaters manufacture their idols in this undisguised manner and forthwith worship them. But the incident is explicable when taken as an exhibition of the hostility of Moses to Apis, illustrative of the character Manetho gives him of a renegade priest.

It has been ever a subject of wonderment, and reproach to the doctrinal teaching of the Pentateuch, that it should apportion rewards and punishments in this life as the appointed way of inculcating godliness, and of controlling the alleged divinely elected and governed people of God, without a hint that beyond this life there was a future one awaiting them, with the far more serious ordeal attaching thereto. The resurrection of the dead, and their judgment before Osiris, was a deep-seated sentiment of the Egyptian people (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 45-56); and the doctrine was, of course, well known to Moses as one who was imbued with all their learning. That he should deliberately exclude all considerations and hopes connected with a futurity from his followers, is consistent with the position that Manetho gives him of a priest who had abjured the religious persuasions of his own country, and was introducing a new system among a race of the lowest and

most degraded type; but it is impossible to reconcile the method taken of abnegating the most solemn appeal which could be presented to man in cultivating his relations with the deity, with the character assumed in the Pentateuch for the Jewish people, and their divinely appointed instructor.

Modern explorations have served to sustain the reliability of Manetho's account of the Egyptian dynasties. The narrative now in question has been preserved from his writings by Josephus, a very unwilling witness against his own people. He gives a description of the wars conducted by Moses in Ethiopia which must have been drawn from some secular source, and corresponds with his being a man "mighty in words and in deeds," as stated in Acts vii. 22, and says he married the daughter of the king of the country, which accounts for his having an Ethiopian wife, as mentioned in Num. xii. 1.

The Jewish scriptures, in the features on which I have touched, are, in fact, properly intelligible only through the light thrown thereon by Manetho's representations. Chœremon, Diodorus Siculus, and Lysimachus, adopt similar statements (Cory, *Anc. Fragments*, 182-187), as do Hecatœus and Tacitus (Rawlinson, *Hist. Illus.*, 62, 63). There is an extensive papyrus deposited in the British Museum by Capt. Harris which may refer to the event described by Manetho. It purports to be a discourse by Ramses III., in which he recounts how the country had been oppressed by a "Chal" (a Syrian), who overthrew the images of the gods, and put down their worship, and how he (Ramses) obtained the mastery and re-established and purified the land. Ramses III. was of the XXth. dynasty, and it was in his reign, as suggested by Brugsch, that the Israelites passed into Palestine (*Speaker's Commentary, Summary of events on Egyptian Monuments*). On the other hand, the Jewish narrative is drawn up with the evident purpose of exalting the nation in a degree quite at variance with their further history, and is built up with elements impossible to have had any foundation in truth, whether as judged of by the ordering of the laws of nature, or the commonest estimate of the attributes of the deity.*

The transit of the Israelites to Judea is replete with the like unhistorical features. It occupies forty years. The

* The Bible; is it the Word of God? 119-124.

leading and concluding years are supplied with incidents; the intermediate eight and thirty years present an almost total blank. The journey to be prosecuted from the Red Sea amounted to about two hundred miles. What held the people in the desert during all this time, and prevented their passing into Canaan, as they eventually did, is not explained, and is in fact inexplicable. The number forty is a favourite one in these delineations. The rain at the deluge falls for forty days (Gen. vii. 4); Isaac and Esau both marry at the age of forty (Gen. xxv. 20; xxvi. 34); Moses was twice on the mount receiving the commands of God for forty days and nights, on both occasions fasting (Exod. xxiv. 18; xxxiv. 28; Deut. ix. 9; x. 10); his history is divided into three periods of forty years each (Acts vii. 23, 30; xiii. 18); the spies are forty days spying out the land (Num. xiii. 25); Eli judges Israel forty years, and the first three successive kings, Saul, David, and Solomon, severally reign forty years (1 Sam. iv. 18; 2 Sam. v. 4; 1 Kings xi. 42; Acts xiii. 21); the judgment of Nineveh is suspended for forty days (Jonah iii. 4); Elijah and Jesus, as Moses, both fast "forty days and forty nights" (1 Kings xix. 8; Matt. iv. 2); and Jesus exhibits himself alive after death for forty days (Acts. i. 3). The sojourn in the desert is evidently thus prolonged in order to exhibit the marvel of the support of the people with food from heaven for such a time, the narrator overlooking that equal provision had to be made all this while for the sustenance of the flocks and herds, which are described to have been very numerous. And this heaven-dependent people are able, in the desolate region of their wanderings, to find the means of setting up a gorgeous tabernacle, embellished with gold, silver, brass, fine linen, dyes, and supplied with an ark, candelabrum, and utensils, all of gold, together with spices, incense, and oils required in the ceremonials; the whole of which was, like the provender for the cattle, earth-drawn.

From the entry of the Israelites into Palestine to the death of Saul is a period of 395 years, according to the marginal chronology. In this interval we are warranted to expect that there would be the fruition of the great promises made to Abraham. His seed had been marvellously multiplied, and led with a triumphant hand out of Egypt. In the desert

they had been fed with heavenly food, and were divinely guided in all their journeyings. The sinning generation had been cut off; even Moses had been considered unworthy of the portion in store. The elect stock were brought to the borders under their appointed leader. At his command the Jordan divided itself to give them passage; "the Lord of all the earth," he assured them, "passeth over before you;" a divine personage, sword in hand, appeared to him, announcing that he had come as the "captain of the host of the Lord;" the walls of Jericho fall at the sounding of the trumpets of the people; the sun is stayed in his course to give them time to slaughter their enemies, the divinity assisting them by crushing them with "great stones from heaven." Never were there more assured signs of a coming triumph. Never were there a people supplied with such irresistible aid. The iniquity of the existing inhabitants had become fully ripe for judgment (Gen. xv. 16). No terms were to be kept with them. They were to be cleared off root and branch by extermination. The heirs, with their divine support, had, one would think, only to go in and assume the possession. The area to be acquired measured but about 180 miles by 60, and yet, even in the long period of the four centuries before us, the people of God were unable to effect the ejection of the condemned races, or assume, in its proper limits, their inheritance. Joshua, the divinely ordained leader, selected to replace the unworthy Moses, passed twenty-four years in the struggle without compassing his aim. At length, worn out with old age and decaying frame, he had to admit that there was still "very much land to be possessed." The five lords of the Philistines, the Canaanites of Gezer, the Giblites, the hill tribes of Lebanon, and the Sidonians, the Jebusites, and the occupants of the lots of Ephraim and Manasseh, are named as having successfully resisted him (Josh. xiii. 1-6; xv. 63; xvi. 10; xvii. 12, 13); and we subsequently find that Zebulon, Asher, Nephtali, and Dan had equally been unable to clear their portions (Jud. i. 27-36). Two and a half tribes had taken up their lots outside the promised border. The centuries occupied by the book of Judges shows us no advance made in accomplishing the required conquest. During all this time the people

are presented to us in disunited bands, struggling for existence with the tribes around them, and under frequent subjugation. During the same period the great empires of Assyria and Egypt were in contest together, and their forces crossed this promised land to carry on operations beyond it in Syria. Syria then fell under the sway of Egypt, and was so held from the time of Joshua to that of Saul. But the heirs of the promise are not in a position sufficiently distinctive to be recognized as a people by either of the struggling powers in their well preserved annals. Supposing, observes the Rev. G. Rawlinson in his Bampton Lectures for 1859 (p. 90), Assyria and Egypt were in the habit of traversing Palestine with their forces in the time of the Judges, still as both powers were then weak, it is not surprising that neither should mention the Jews. Nor had the Jews sufficient hold upon the country to lead them to notice, in their histories, these invasions of their formidable neighbours (*Speaker's Commentary*, I. 458-468). At length we reach the reign of their first divinely-appointed king at the close of the four centuries under consideration, when we find them hiding in holes for fear of the Philistines, not having an artificer among them competent to set in order their agricultural implements, and with but two spears and two swords, in the whole camp, which their king and his son Jonathan possessed (1 Sam. xiii. 19-22; xiv. 11). The unimportant position of the Jewish race to this advanced period of their history, is entirely inconsistent with the magniloquence with which they paint their origin and divine mission for the assumption of Palestine; but it quite accords with Manetho's representations that they were a poor band of outcasts who had escaped from Egypt and taken refuge in Judea.

David, according to the marginal chronology, died in the year B.C. 1015, having attained the age of 70 (2 Sam. v. 4). His birth would then have been in the year B.C. 1085, or 406 years after the exodus. The genealogy in Ruth iv. 18-22 gives nine generations from Judah to David. Four of these belong to the sojourn in Egypt, and five remain for the period now in question. This involves over 80 years, or nearly threefold the normal rate, for each generation, and this after a time, when, according to the narrative of the exodus, forty

years sufficed to bring to a natural end the lives of the hundreds of thousands who left Egypt as adults of twenty years and upwards, and died off in the desert (Num. xiv. 29). We have then here an obviously unreliable account of the family origin of this important personage David, and as his pedigree sets out with the imaginary Judah, we are warranted in concluding that we are once more presented with fiction, and not history.

The reign of the first sovereign, Saul, though a divinely selected ruler for the elect people of God, ended in disaster. After constant struggling with his neighbours, the Philistines, who, notwithstanding the divine appointments, still held possession of their important section of the "land of promise," he met with a final overthrow, and reduced to the last verge of despair, put an end to his own existence. David is introduced to us as a better selection, one so favoured by the divinity that "the sure mercies of David" is a phrase expressive of the highest spiritual blessings (Isa. lv. 3; Acts xiii. 34). He was in rebellion against the sovereign who had passed away, and for seven years and a half maintained a civil war with his heir (2 Sam. v. 5). David's general, Joab, managed treacherously to assassinate Abner, the commander on the other side, and the unfortunate son of Saul was murdered by other adherents of David (2 Sam. iii. 27; iv. 5-8). David then secured the throne. For about five years, according to the chronology, he ruled in peace; then there was constant warfare till within three years of his death. There were battles with Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, and Syrians, which occupied ten years; then there was the rebellion of his son Absolom who seized the capital, David flying ignominiously in terror. A great battle ended this struggle for the crown. After this Israel rebelled, headed by Sheba, and then there was again war with the Philistines. This troubled reign in no way realized the national blessing for his stock promised to Abraham. At the close of David's wasting wars his army was numbered, and was found to consist of "eight hundred thousand valiant men that drew the sword" of the men of Israel, and of those of Judah "five hundred thousand men" (2 Sam. xxiv. 9), being an armed host of 1,300,000 men, when, in the early part of the reign of the preceding

king, there had been, as we have seen, but two swords and two spears in the whole camp, and no means of manufacturing more. David's army would represent a population of about five millions and a half, supposing every adult male bore arms. The area of Palestine is estimated at about 11,000 square miles (Colenso, *On the Pent.*, I. 82, citing Kitto). There would thus be 500 persons to the square mile, a rate of population much in excess of that of England and Wales in the present day, which is estimated at 350 to the square mile, and surpassing even that of Belgium, the most densely populated country on the globe, which is rated at 440 (Greg, *Enigmas of Life*, 292). And if but half the adult males bore arms, as it would be fair to assume, then the population of Palestine, in those remote days, and after centuries of desolating warfare, would rise to the enormous scale of 1000 persons on each square mile, or close upon three persons to be maintained upon every two acres, supposing every corner of the land to be arable.

David had eighteen sons, of whom Adonijah was the fourth, and Solomon the tenth. Of Adonijah's seniors, Amnon had been killed by Absolom's orders, and Absolom himself had met with a violent end. What became of the remaining senior Chileab is not apparent. Adonijah therefore may be looked upon as the senior surviving son at the death of David. The divine law, whenever that may happen to have been put forth, enjoined the rule of primogeniture (Deut. xxi. 15-17). David, however, is inspired to prefer the son of the adulteress Bathsheba to the legitimate heir. Adonijah openly asserted his claim while his father was on his deathbed, but David, instigated by Bathsheba, has Solomon proclaimed. Adonijah succumbs, and claims his brother's protection. After the father's death, Solomon, on various pretences, puts Adonijah and his supporters Joab and Shimei, severally to death, and deposes Abiathar, who had also sided with Adonijah, from the priesthood. Thus a second time the succession is secured through civil discord.

Then, at length, the nation attains that peace and prosperity for which they had been continuously struggling for upwards of four hundred years. "Judah and Israel were many, as the sand which is by the sea in multitude, eating and drink-

ing, and making merry." The territory also suddenly expands to meet the promise made to Abraham that his seed should possess the land "from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates" (Gen. xv. 18). "And Solomon," it is said, "reigned over all kingdoms from the river unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt" (1 Kings iv. 20, 21). How he so spread his rule we are not told. David's conquests extended to the north to the Syrians of Damascus, and to the south to Edom (2 Sam. viii. 6, 14), but were still far short of reaching to the Euphrates and the Nile. Solomon made no wars. How then did he meet with so much submission from the tribes around him? How did the great potentates situated at these two important rivers brook this encroachment of the Jews to their borders? Of all this the historian tells us nothing, nor does he explain how the extended frontier, after this prosperous reign, shrunk back to its old dimensions. These are all consequences without causes, and must be viewed as introduced for effect. And it is a complete defeat of the position sought to be maintained that the hated Philistines still held their own. David's last operations were against this people, and he fought four successive battles with them, but with no results (2 Sam. xxi. 15-22). Solomon's border extends "unto" their land, but not over it, although it lay within the promised "inheritance." The Hittites also, a northern tribe, had remained unsubdued from the time of Joshua. So potent were they at the period that the kingdom of Israel was brought to an end, that Samaria, in the Assyrian annals, was currently known as "the land of the Hittites" (Rawlinson, *Hist. Illus.*, 91, 118, 129).

During all this time the Israelites were without any national temple. This exhibits them, in an important feature, on a lower footing than the surrounding tribes. Their consolidation was due to David, and had but just begun. They were also without any recognized code or ritual, it being apparent, from the conduct of the most eminent personages of the community, that the laws of the Pentateuch were not then extant.* David had it in his mind to build a temple, but his engagement in incessant warfare prevented his accomplishing his purpose (1 Kings v. 3). He however dedicated to the

* The Bible; is it the Word of God? 8-13.

work the booty he had obtained in his wars (2 Sam. viii. 11, 12), and otherwise collected abundant materials. Thus provided, Solomon proceeded with his arrangements, and these were on a stupendous scale. He made a levy of 30,000 men, of whom 10,000 were employed at a time on the mountains of Lebanon. What their particular duty was is not said. Then he had there 70,000 to bear burdens, and 80,000 hewers, with 3,300 overseers. The labour thus employed was for quarrying and squaring the stones, and cutting down and preparing the timber required for the proposed building, and transporting the same (1 Kings v. 13-18). When we come to learn the dimensions of this edifice (1 Kings vi. 2-6), we see how utterly disproportionate it was to the labour and materials alleged to have been expended on it. Taking the cubit at a foot and three-quarters, the building, with its porch, measured but 122½ feet by 35, with small chambers against its outer wall running from 8¾ to 12½ feet in width (Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, I. 208). The mighty arrangements spoken of, therefore, resulted in a moderate-sized conventicle. But it was gorgeously decorated. Its walls were lined with cedar richly carved, and the whole overlaid with pure gold; the altar, the colossal cherubims within the sanctuary, the doors, and even the floor, were covered with the same precious metal (1 Kings vi. 15-35). The bullion was what David had amassed in the course of his struggles with the petty tribes around him, of Syrians, Moabites, Ammonites, and Philistines. The Chronist ventures to calculate the value which the king is modestly made to say he had collected "in his trouble" for "the house of the Lord," and it proved to be of gold 100,000 talents, of silver 1,000,000, and of brass and iron "without weight," or beyond calculation, besides timber and stones (1 Chron. xxii. 14). Dr Davidson estimates the gold at 500 millions, and the silver at 353 millions pounds sterling (*Intro. to Old Test.*, II. 113), forming together, in days when the precious metals represented a far higher value than they do at present, more than four times the weighty sum with which Germany has taxed so seriously the resources of capacious France. The German tribute has had to be gathered out of the savings of the French people, and through foreign loans. David's spoils consisted of solid

accumulations found ready to his hands in the treasuries of his enemies. That Solomon was not thus richly endowed by his father is apparent from the tenor of the vision with which he was favoured when he came to the throne. The divinity said to him, "Ask what I shall give thee," and because he modestly only asked for wisdom sufficient to govern his people, the deity promised him likewise "both riches and honour" (1 Kings iii. 5-13). It is clear that he could not have been already provided with precious metals to the amount of the whole national debt of England. Nor do we ever hear again of all these plates of gold with which the walls and floor of the temple are said to have been overlaid. Just thirty years after the divinely appointed edifice was erected, in the reign of the succeeding king, it was plundered by Shishak, king of Egypt, who carried off, we are told in general terms, "the treasures of the house of the Lord" (1 Kings xiv. 25, 26). Had the booty been of the magnificent proportions the building is said to have contained, something more would assuredly have been said on the occasion.

At the dedication of the temple Solomon is said to have sacrificed 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep (1 Kings viii. 63). The modern explorations show the dimensions of Jerusalem to have been 1300 yards in length, by, on an average, 775 in width. It was thus but a small town, not four-fifths of a mile in length, and less than half a mile in width. Much of its area was occupied by the courts of the temple and the palace, and the streets and open spaces, according to Dr Inman's estimate, would not have afforded standing room for more than two-thirds of the animals in question (*Anc. Faiths*, II. 759), while the slaughter of the victims would have deluged the whole place knee-deep in blood.

The peace and prosperity which the country is said to have enjoyed in Solomon's time was by no means of a perfect order. Hadad the Edomite, who had fled to Egypt from the persecutions of David, no sooner heard of David's death than he returned to harrass Solomon. "The Lord," it is said, "stirred" him up as "an adversary" to him. "Another adversary" was Rezon, who re-conquered Damascus. "He was an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon, beside the mischief that Hadad did; and he abhorred Israel, and reigned

over Syria" (1 Kings xi. 14-25). These were on the borders of the land south and north, and with these enemies intervening, there is an end of the frontiers as spreading from the river of Egypt to the Euphrates. Nor was Solomon's administration governed by the wisdom said to have been divinely conferred upon him. His successor was no sooner on the throne than ten out of the alleged twelve tribes fell away from him and set up a separate and hostile kingdom. The instrument was Jeroboam, an Ephrathite. He was occupying a threatening position already in the time of Solomon. "Even he lifted up his hand against the king." Solomon looked to the defences of the city, and sought to pacify his formidable opponent with a command. But the disruption was already imminent, and is veiled in the guise of sundry prophetic enunciations; and it was Solomon's heavy imposts which led thereto (1 Kings xi. 11-13, 26-37; xii. 4).

No sooner was Solomon's heir on the throne than the threatened catastrophe took place, and the representative kingdom dwindled to the possession of two out of the alleged twelve tribes. The distinction between Judah and Israel was not then for the first time asserted. They appear to have been always well recognized divisions. David was king "over Judah" for seven years and a half, and at length reigned "over all Israel and Judah" (2 Sam. v. 5). During his reign, although united under one king, they were still known as distinctive divisions (2 Sam. xi. 11; xxiv. 1); and equally so during that of Solomon (1 Kings iv. 20, 25). When they became separate kingdoms, bitter animosity, which must have been ingrained in them, at once showed itself. Their warfare was incessant, and often carried on with the support of Gentile allies. On one occasion, according to these obviously exaggerated accounts, the king of Judah, with 400,000 "chosen men," met the king of Israel with 800,000 "chosen men," of whom 500,000 were slain by the victorious men of Judah (2 Chron. xiii. 3, 17). On another, 120,000 "valiant men" of Judah fell, and 200,000 of the population were carried off by Israel into captivity (2 Chron. xxviii. 6-8). "No two nations," says Dean Milman, "ever hated each other with more unmitigated bitterness" (*Hist. of the Jews*, II. 13). From this time there can be no more question of

the national blessing promised to the seed of Abraham. The family were utterly broken up and bent upon destroying one another. And thus they continued for 254 years, when the kingdom of Israel was put an end to by the Assyrians; which was followed, 133 years later, by the destruction of that of Judah by the Babylonians.

The period from the revolt of the ten tribes to the Babylonish captivity, observes Mr Rawlinson, is a space of time which "passes from the cloud-land of myth and fable into the sober region of reality and fact." A juster distinction could not have been drawn, and it is the more valuable as coming from an unwilling witness. "We shall now," he adds, "be able to produce confirmatory proof of almost every important event in history" (*Bampton Lectures* for 1859, 114, 115). During the mythical portion of these records names of Assyrian rulers occur (Gen. xiv. 1) for which more or less close resemblances are found in the genuine annals of Assyria (Rawlinson, *Hist. Illust.* 37, 38); but the contact of the Jews with the Chaldeans in later times will amply account for their possessing themselves of such information. Excluding these, we have uniform vagueness as to the actors on the scenes during the mythical period, and definitiveness when we pass over that border to the field of history. Abraham visits a king of Egypt, and is richly endowed by him; two hundred years later Joseph is taken to Egypt, introduced to the king, and raised by him to power; upwards of two hundred years afterwards the family of Joseph are persecuted, and Moses appears before the king and effects their deliverance; nearly five hundred years afterwards Solomon marries the daughter of the then king of Egypt. We wish to know who these potentates were, but not a name is given us. They are one and all referred to as "Pharaoh, king of Egypt," which simply indicates nothing. The word is supposed to be a titular designation of the kings of Egypt, but even that much is not certain. Nor are the learned at all agreed as to the nature of the title so expressed. Some conceive it to mean "the sun-god," but the kings of Egypt were supposed to be descendants of this deity, and not the deity himself, and as descendants they might be called Si Ra, but not Pa-Ra. Others again suppose the word signifies "the great house,"

being equivalent to "his highness" (*Speaker's Com.*, I. 477-479). The discussion is unimportant as it leads to nothing. The kings with whom these very remarkable passages in the Jewish legends are associated are not to be ascertained. But no sooner is Solomon dead than we hear of a king of Egypt invading his dominions, and he comes before us as "Shishak, king of Egypt," recognizable as "Sheshonk," whose exploit is, moreover, recorded in an inscription at Karnak (Rawlinson, *Hist. Illus.*, 108, 109). We have done with the undefinable Pharaohs, and henceforth have before us real personages, with solid names, such as So, Necho, and Hophra, kings of Egypt, and Tirhakah, king of Ethiopia, all of whom are identifiable in the Egyptian annals; besides various sovereigns of Assyria, Babylon, Syria, and Persia, who are traceable in the histories of their lands (Rawlinson, *Hist. Illus.*, 137-145). We measure the divinely elected Jews with these Gentile potentates, and at once find the hollowness of their pretensions to be a people whom the deity especially honours with his favour and support; and we obtain materials whereby to estimate the exaggerations with which the Jewish historians have sought to magnify and exalt their race. At the time that Jehoshaphat, ruler of the petty kingdom of Judah, possessed the fabulous array of 1,160,000 men ready to take the field, besides the garrisons in his numerous "fenced cities" (2 Chron. xvii. 12-19), his contemporary, Ahab, king of Israel, we learn from an Assyrian inscription, joined a league against the formidable power of Assyria with a contingent of no more than 10,000 footmen and 2000 chariots (Rawlinson, *Hist Illus.*, 113). Sargon, and not Sennacherib, is considered by Mr Rawlinson to have been the depopulator of Israel, and the number removed by him was but 27,280 persons (*Ibid.*, 129-131). Then we find from Jewish sources that when Nebuchadnezzar in like manner invaded Judea, the men of might, or armed force, he met with to carry off, amounted to but 7,000 (2 Kings xxiv. 16). On the return from this captivity the sum of the population led back by Zerrubabel is said to have been 42,360 males, but the details in Ezra give but 29,818, and in Nehemiah 31,119, added to which there were 1,675 brought in by Ezra. And the people must have been few in number, and scattered, during their captivity, to have lost, in the course of sixty-three years,

or two generations, familiarity with their own language, so as to require to have the meaning explained to them when they heard their scriptures read out (Neh. viii. 7, 8).

The election of Abraham, which was to be the instrument of blessing to his lineage, and through them to the world at large, was one strictly in the flesh. The promises were assured to him by what is called a "covenant." And the "token" of this covenant was a mark affixed by operation "in the flesh" (Gen. xvii. 11, 13). The "flesh," at a later date, we are told, "profiteth nothing" (John vi. 63); but here it profited everything.

Abraham resided at Ur of the Chaldees, a member of a family of idolaters (Josh. xxiv. 2). His great merit was that he obeyed a divine call to come out from them and serve the true God elsewhere. "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went" (Heb. xi. 8). If this constituted Abraham's title to the divine acceptance, its voidness is made very apparent. It was pursuant to no divine call that he quitted Ur, but in obedience to his idolatrous father; and he very well knew whither he was going, for the father's purpose was that they should proceed to Canaan (Gen. xi. 31).

Then if there was an election in the flesh, it was of importance that the lineage should be kept pure. But in Abraham's marriage with his half sister Sarah (Gen. xx. 12), the whole stock is laid down in incest, punishable, according to the divine mind, as afterwards expressed, with death (Lev. xx. 17). His act entailed a special curse (Deut. xxvii. 22), and therefore could not have brought in blessing. Abraham also sinned against the "covenant" in allying himself to Hagar and Keturah. Jacob equally sinned against it in consorting with his wives' maids. In the instance of Abraham the stock irregularly raised up were not allowed to inherit. In that of Hagar's son the rejection has been doctrinally worked upon. "What saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman" (Gal. iv. 30). The legitimacy of the mother was thus of no less consequence than that of the father in the production of

the appointed family. Equally, therefore, should Jacob's sons by his wives' maids, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher, have been cast out, but they were admitted to be tribal heads in the nation of Israel, and their progeny are to be distinctively recognized as such in the eternal ages (Matt. xix. 28). Joseph, the saint of the family, marries the daughter of an Egyptian priest, and from this tainted source came the tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim, who are specially blessed (Gen. xlviii. 14-20). Six, therefore, out of the twelve tribes, were thus out of the line of promise, even if we may pass over the incestuous origin of the whole. Judah and Simeon married Canaanitish wives (Gen. xxxviii. 2; xlvi. 10), females of the very race on whom the Israelites were to execute the divine judgment, and who were ripening for it. Moses and Aaron were the fruit of an incestuous alliance, their mother being their father's aunt (Exod. vi. 20), an offence for which, under his inspired legislation, Moses had to provide an award of death (Lev. xviii. 12, 29). He himself, the exemplar of this people, marries the daughter of a priest of Midian (Exod. iii. 1), and also a Kenite female (Jud. iv. 11). David is a peculiarly important member in the passage of the divine blessings through alliance in the flesh. One of his progenitors was Pharez, the offspring of the incestuous (Lev. xviii. 15; xx. 12) intercourse between Judah and his daughter-in-law. Another was Rahab, the Gentile harlot of Jericho, who became the mother of Boaz (Matt. i. 5). Boaz married Ruth, a Moabitess, a stock due to the incest of Lot with his daughter. And finally, we have Solomon, in whom the glorious promises made to the founder of the line were realized, who was the son of the adulterous Hittite Bathsheba, one of the denounced race.

The election of the Israelites constituted them "a peculiar treasure" unto God "above all people" (Exod. xix. 5); "a special people unto him, above all people that are upon the face of the earth" (Deut. vii. 6). It involved the repudiation of all other races as unworthy of his notice. The elect stock alone attracted his attention, whether for favour, or for the discipline of judgment. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities" (Amos iii. 2). "He showeth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not

dealt so with any nation: and as for his judgments, they have not known them" (Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20). In the later teaching this exclusiveness in the divine dealings is fully recognized. A poor woman of Canaan besought Jesus for help, but he rebuffed her, saying that he had not been sent "but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and that "it was not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs" (Matt. xv. 24-26). If he finally yielded to her importunity, he did so in violation of his avowed mission. And when he sent his disciples out to preach godliness, he enjoined them to confine themselves to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and not to go "into the way of the Gentiles," or to enter "any city of the Samaritans" (Matt. x. 5, 6). The rest of the world were left to their "ignorance," God "winking," or closing his eyes, at their ways (Acts, xvii. 30). Such is the theory of the election in the flesh, but the narratives, in the events described, ill support the principle which is the foundation of the doctrine. Lot was not in the line of promise, but yet was recognized as "just" and "righteous" (2 Pet. ii. 7, 8), and made the subject of a special salvation through the intervention of angelic messengers sent for his deliverance. In the instance of Sodom the "winking at," or suffering the course of evil, was not maintained. The place was visited in judgment, as if fully instructed in righteousness, and sinning against revealed knowledge. Balaam, a Moabite, is used to announce blessing, prophetically, on Israel. The tale of Ruth, a Moabitess, is admitted into the sacred records. The history of Job, an Edomite, finds a place in the same collection; and Job himself, in the court of the divine ruler of the world, is singled out as the most perfect man on earth. He undergoes a course of special discipline, which is crowned with abounding divine compensation and blessing. The prophet Elijah is sent to minister to a widow of Sarepta, a city of Sidon. Her provisions are miraculously multiplied, and her son restored to life. Naaman, a Syrian, is healed of leprosy by Elisha, another honoured prophet. Elijah is deputed to anoint Hazael king over Syria. Elisha visits Damascus, where the king consults him as a prophet. Jonah is divinely commissioned to denounce judgment on Nineveh, and on their repentance the inhabitants are forgiven. The divine eyes open in judg-

ment upon Canaan, Egypt, Edom, Moab, Damascus, Tyre, Assyria, and Babylon, equally as upon the elect people.

The dispensation for the Jews, nationally, according to the representations made, culminated in Solomon. The race were miraculously multiplied in Egypt, miraculously delivered out of the power of the Egyptians, miraculously sustained in the desert, and then passed into the land of promise, for the extermination of the Canaanites and the assumption of the inheritance, with wonderful demonstrations of active divine co-operation. After that, judging by their condition, the people must have been left to their own unaided resources for the ensuing four centuries, to the time of David. Then there was on the scene one who to human perceptions was stained with guilt of the deepest dye, but who yet is painted as a man after God's own heart. The nation then became consolidated in power, overcoming their enemies, and spreading their dominions towards the limits assigned to Abraham. The kingdom is thereupon vested in David's elect heir Solomon, the frontiers expand to the prophetic bounds, (always excepting the presence of the impracticable Philistines), and peace and prosperity, for the first time in the history of the nation, are said to have characterized the reign. But Solomon proved a gross sensualist and idolater, and broke the "covenant," and the kingdom was to be rent from him (1 Kings xi. 11). The history passes into a new phase. The family of the patriarch are divided into two sections, which are thoroughly disunited in worship and in politics, and war upon each other incessantly, until in turn both are exterminated by foreign foes. This is a period of over four hundred years, during which the promises to Abraham cannot be said to be in process of fulfilment. In fact, the divine being may be concluded to have performed his part in setting up and endowing Solomon, whose estrangement from him put an end to the "covenant." And yet, during these centuries, the historian represents him watching the fortunes of the nation, and governing them, through his commissioned agency, as if the "covenant" remained in undisturbed force. And the stock of Abraham having really become two nations, the divine being is described as operating with each disunited section. This brings the doctrine of an "election," exercised in behalf

of a "peculiar" people, into a condition of irremediable confusion. The position assigned to the electing divinity is remarkable when judged of in respect of Judah, who, in the midst of habitual idolatries, sometimes showed a recognition of the deity said to be controlling their interests; but it is wholly unintelligible when judged of in respect of Israel, who maintained their worship at shrines never recognized as those where the deity was to be met with, and addressed it, without variance, to the false divinities who were an abomination to him. The prime offender was Jeroboam, the son of Nebat. He effected the schism between Israel and Judah, and set up the golden calves in Dan and Bethel, to which his division of the nation ever after paid their adorations. And yet the sectional crown is said to have been assigned to him by a special act of the deity (1 Kings xiv. 8), and, through the agency of a "man of God," he was visited specially, first with judgment and then with mercy, in respect of his withered hand (1 Kings xiii. 4-6). The deity finally passed condemnation on Jeroboam, resolving to raise up a king who should cut off his house (1 Kings xiv. 14). Jeroboam was succeeded by his son Nadab, on whom the sentence was executed. Baasha conspired against him, killed him, seized the throne, and then destroyed the whole family of his predecessor (1 Kings xv. 27-30). A prophet was divinely commissioned to assure the successful conspirator that it was "the Lord" who had made him "prince over his people," and that as he too had sinned, his house was to be cut off (1 Kings xvi. 1-4). For the first twenty years of this divided empire both Judah and Israel were plunged in idolatries. Then Asa mounted the throne of Judah, who is reported to have done "right in the eyes of the Lord." Till the death of Baasha, being forty-five years after the disruption, there was incessant war between the divided members of Abraham's family (1 Kings xiv. 30; xv. 16, 32). The sentence passed upon Baasha was carried out upon his son Elah, who was conspired against and killed with his whole family (1 Kings xvi. 8-12). The throne of Israel at length fell to the pre-eminently wicked Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 25, 26). During his reign was the ministry of the renowned prophet Elijah, and the monarch, at his hands, and at those of other prophets, received various mani-

festations of the divine attention to him in his ungodly career, sometimes in displeasure, and sometimes in favour (1 Kings xx. 13, 22, 28, 38; xxi. 17-22, 28, 29; xxii. 6-8). His son Ahaziah, like the father, was an open worshiper of Baal (1 Kings xxii. 51-53), and yet was expected to address himself in time of need to the "God of Israel." For his omission so to do sentence is passed upon him through the mouth of Elijah (2 Kings i. 1-4). We have now the ministry of the prophet Elisha. Jehoram, the son of Ahab, and his successor on the throne of Israel, is said to have given up the worship of Baal, but to have clung to the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat. That is, he worshiped the golden calves set up in Bethel and Dan; and in the terms in which every king of Israel is condemned, he is said to have "wrought evil in the sight of the Lord." Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, who is one of those who is described as having "done that which was right in the eyes of the Lord," entered into a close alliance with the idolatrous Jehoram. "I am," he said, "as thou art, my people as thy people, and my horses as thy horses;" and the Gentile, and of course idolatrous king of Edom, was admitted into the confederacy, the object being to coerce the king of Moab. Elisha, though a subject of the king of Israel, openly contemns him, but for the sake of Jehoshaphat, though found thus hand in hand with the ungodly, by a miracle saves the forces of the confederate kings from perishing from want of water (2 Kings iii.). Elisha after this befriends the king of Israel himself. He more than once enables him, through his perceptions as a prophet, to avoid ambuscades laid for him by the king of Syria (2 Kings vi. 8-12); and when Samaria is beseiged by the Syrians, and put to sore strait for want of provisions, Elisha, notwithstanding that his life was then threatened by the king, who considered that he was the instrument of the divine visitation, effects a miraculous deliverance (2 Kings vi. 24-33; vii.). Elisha, strange to say, is next found in ministry in Syria, after which he directs that Jehu should be anointed king of Israel, as being a divine appointment (2 Kings ix. 1-3, 12). Jehu thereupon kills Jehoram, and takes his place (ver. 24). Jehu is a worshiper of the golden calves of Jeroboam, and his reign is condemned as evil (2 Kings x. 31; xiii. 2); but, nevertheless, the deity is described as "the Lord

God of Israel;" and because Jehu had carried out the divine vengeance on the house of Ahab, the throne is assured to his line for four generations (2 Kings x. 30, 31). Jehoahaz, the son of Jehu, beseeches the Lord for assistance against the Syrians, "and the Lord gave Israel a saviour, so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians;" and yet, at this very time, Jehoahaz and his people, it is noted, were persistently worshiping the calves of Jeroboam (2 Kings xiii. 1-6). Joash, his son, continued in the evil course of his father. Nevertheless Elisha, as a prophet, accords him divine aid against the Syrians (2 Kings xiii. 10-25) This king made war upon his brethren of Judah, and took the king of Judah captive, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and plundered "the house of the Lord," as well as his rival's palace (2 Kings xiv. 11-14). His son, Jeroboam the second, maintained the idolatries of his ancestors, and the Lord, seeing the low condition into which Israel had fallen, "saved them" by his unhallowed hand (2 Kings xiv. 23-27). A century later Israel were swept away by the Assyrians, which closes their history.

The prophets were very important functionaries in the divine demonstrations. Imbued with the spirit of God, they were charged with the annunciation of his intentions, through all time, towards those whom they addressed. The fate of nations was committed to their lips. There could be no greater evidence of the deity, present and in action, than the ministrations of these men. And yet they are one and all brought upon the scene after the nation are broken up, and the elect and peculiar people, favoured of God, no more recognizable. They spring up in Judah, or in Israel, indifferently, and their missions, therefore, are out of place as associated with national standing. Egypt was as much entitled to produce such agency as idolatrous and disjointed Israel. Two of the prophets, namely Ezekiel and Daniel, profess to be of the captivity, after Judah had been disallowed; and three—Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, come of a still later time, when Gentile powers were dominant in the "promised land."

The great purpose of the Jewish dispensation was to make manifest the true God, of whom they were to be the witnesses (Isa. xliii.). But the divinity who was the subject of their conceptions is not to be distinguished in being and attributes

from those of the surrounding heathen. Like them he is personified, localized, and fitted with a name. "Jehovah is as clearly a proper name as Jupiter or Vishnu. *Elohim* and *Jehovah* are therefore as distinguishable as *Deus* and *Jupiter*" (*Speaker's Commentary*, I. 24). To introduce a nomenclature into heaven, observes Dr Inman, involves the idea that there are more gods than one (*Anc. Faiths*, I. 620). The Jewish faith, in fact, amounted to no more than the exaltation of Jehovah; or, as the name would more properly be expressed, Jahveh, above all "other gods." Their test of godliness was their fidelity to him, and their error the going after "strange gods." It was a pitiful rivalry constantly expressed between Jahveh and other local deities. Jahveh to them was "the God of Israel" (Judges xi. 21), "the God of the land" (2 Kings xvii. 26). They held their possessions of him just as the Ammonites held theirs of Chemosh (Judges xi. 24). He was "the holy one of Israel" (Isa. xii. 6), "the God of Jerusalem" (Ezra vii. 19). The "nation" was "holy" (Exod. xix. 6), and the "land" was "holy" (Zech. ii. 12). Jacob was "the lot" of the deity's "inheritance" (Deut. xxxii. 9), and Israel "his peculiar treasure" (Ps. cxxxv. 4). But Jerusalem was the site of his "throne" (Jer. iii. 17), the place "chosen" by him where his name should be (2 Kings xxiii. 27). "The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob" (Ps. lxxxvii. 2). "The Lord dwelleth in Zion" was the summing up of one prophet's teaching (Joel iii. 21); "the name of the city" is to be "The Lord is there," are the concluding words of another (Ezek. xlviii. 35). A prophet of the exile habitually threw open his windows "in his chamber toward Jerusalem," and there offered his adorations to the god of the locality (Dan. vi. 10). It was in this place that David had it on his heart to erect "an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob" (Ps. cxxxii. 5), which Solomon accomplished. "I have built," he said, "an house of habitation for thee, and a place for thy dwelling for ever." He asked that his "eyes" might "be open upon this house day and night" to hearken to all prayer offered "toward this place" (2 Chron. vi. 2, 20, &c.). The temple was to be "the place of his throne, the place of the soles of his feet," where he should "dwell in the midst of the children of Israel" for ever (Ezek. xliii. 7).

Isaiah in vision sees him there enthroned, "his train" filling "the temple" (vi. 1). He said he would ever meet his people, as they sacrificed, "at the door of the tabernacle;" "there I will meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory" (Exod. xxix. 42, 43). But "the holy place within the veil" was the true region of his presence. "Between the two cherubim" which decorated "the ark of testimony," "above the mercy seat," was the exact spot occupied by the divinity (Exod. xxv. 22; Lev. xvi. 2). Accordingly, when the tabernacle was completed for his reception, "a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. And Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation, because the cloud abode thereon, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle" (Exod. xl. 34, 35). And so also when the more solid edifice was erected for him by Solomon. "And it came to pass, when the priests were come out of the holy place, that the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord" (1 Kings viii. 10, 11).

The name Jahveh, says Ewald, "has no clear radical signification in Hebrew." "All philologists," adds Bishop Colenso, "find a difficulty in deriving the word," whence the possibility arises that it is "of foreign origin" (*On the Pentateuch*, V. 271, 276). This name, we are given to understand, was unknown to the people, till revealed to Moses, as they were about to be inducted into "the land of Canaan" (Exod. vi. 3, 4). The text, undesignedly, leads us to the right association, and it is evident that the Jews took up this name of Jahveh, or Jah, as it is also put (Ps. lxviii. 4), for the object of their worship, after they had passed into Palestine. And there, among the Phœnicians, was the divinity Yakhveh, or Yahveh, written in Greek ΙΑΩ (Colenso *On the Pent.*, V. 279), to serve them for a model. Speaking of recently discovered Assyrian inscriptions, Mr Cooper, Secretary of the Society of Biblical Archæology, in his Lecture "on the Corroborative Evidence of Old Testament History from the Egyptian and Assyrian Monuments," delivered in connection with the Christian Evidence Society, says that "The incommunicable name

of the Great Jehovah (Yahveh) Himself, has been found as the name of a Syrian deity of extreme antiquity, probably not in its spiritual character far remote from the God of the Hebrews" (32), a correspondence for which he does not venture to offer a solution. It is very observable that while naming, and denouncing, all the false gods around them, Baal, Moloch, Ashtaroth, Chemosh, Rimmon, &c., the Hebrew scriptures pointedly abstain from noticing the Phœnician Yahveh (Colenso *On the Pent.*, V. 281, 282). Why is this but that they were conscious that he in fact was their Jahveh? It is also noticeable that the name is never introduced in the christian scriptures as the designation of the Supreme Being of whom they speak. In the authorized translation of the Old Testament, made under the auspices of James I., it was kept out of view as much as possible "by His Majesty's special command." It has been introduced nine times, and suppressed 6,846 (*Types of Mankind*, 592).

The representation is that the ideal founder of the Jewish race worshiped Jahveh, but without knowing him under that name (Exod. vi. 3). Abraham came of an idolatrous family (Josh. xxiv. 2), and we hear nothing of his abandonment of their ways of worship, to turn to a truer form. Merely he accepted Jahveh, we are to understand, in preference to the paternal divinities. He kept up his alliance with the old stock, undeterred by their being idolaters. His wife Sarah was of them; he drew a wife from that region for his son Isaac; and Isaac made similar provision for his elect son Jacob. Jacob was for twenty years domiciled in that quarter, without any sort of protest on his part against the idol worship by which he must have been surrounded. His favourite wife Rachel is seen interested in her father's idols, which she purloins, obviously for her own use. Jacob, not knowing who was the delinquent, is prepared to put to death the guilty appropriator of these "gods;" and, eventually, after Laban had been baffled in his search, when Jacob discovers them, he hides them reverentially under a particular oak, probably a sacred tree (Gen. xxxv. 4). To this time he was conscious that his household were occupied with "strange gods," but as he had devoted himself to Jahveh, within whose limits he had arrived, he feels it incumbent on him to keep true to his

professions. The act however involves no more than a transfer of allegiance from the Chaldean divinities to the Phœnician deity he had elected to serve. That the patriarchs practised any purer form of worship than what prevailed around them, we are not to suppose. Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and there called on the name of Jahveh (Gen. xxi. 33). The Speaker's Commentators, in dealing with Exod. xxxiv. 13, explain what the term "grove" really indicates. "The groves. The *ashērāh* could not have been a grove since it was set up 'under every green tree' (1 Kings xiv. 23; 2 Kings xvii. 10). A carved image of it was set up by Manasseh (2 Kings xxi. 7), which was stamped to powder by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 6). According to the most probable derivation of the name the ashērāh represented something that was upright, which was fixed, or planted, in the ground; hence, if it was not a tree, it must have been some sort of upright pillar or monument" (I. 416). The Hebrew word for Abraham's grove is "ashal," a tree, apparently denoting the same object as the "ashar" of which the Commentators treat. It is obviously an idolatrous symbol, and though not named by the Commentators is of course the Phallic emblem. With this then the patriarch was concerned. We find Jacob twice carrying out his worship in a similar way. In places sanctified by divine manifestations made to him, he erected stone pillars, which he anointed, pouring out "a drink-offering" thereupon, and designating these spots Bethel, or the house of God (Gen. xxviii. 17-19; xxxv. 14, 15). It was a religious ceremonial, with use of a Phallic emblem. And the symbol was one peculiarly appropriate to the god served, his Phœnician name יחוה "Jachveh," signifying "cause of life," and his Hebrew designation יהוה "Jahveh," "cause of being." Furthermore, Abraham's design to sacrifice Isaac is not to be distinguished from the action of a follower of Moloch.

The family are said to have migrated to Egypt, where they were held in bondage for four hundred years. It is not to be supposed that they could have stood free of the idolatries of the land. Pharaoh's bond slaves were not likely to have maintained a protest, all this time, against the national faith. Nor did they do so. Joshua describes "the gods of their fathers," while they were "in Egypt," as other than Jahveh

(Josh. xxiv. 14). And when Jahveh called them to himself, he showed how they had hitherto been occupied. "Then said I unto them, cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt: I am Jahveh your God" (Ezek. xx. 7). When Moses has to introduce the newly revealed deity to them, he demands special instruction. "Behold," he says, "when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?" (Exod. iii. 13). The dilemma clearly reveals to us that of Jahveh, in any form, the people knew nothing. To Moses himself he had in fact to announce who he was by name (Exod. vi. 3). The readiness of the people, when on their pilgrimage, to place themselves under the protection of Apis (Exod. xxxii. 4), demonstrates their previous practice.

The forms of worship appointed for Jahveh in no way differed from what were in use by the idolatrous Canaanites. They had similar altars, sacrifices, and priestly offices. In the alleged contest on mount Carmel between Elijah, in behalf of Jahveh, and the priests of the great rival god Baal, these identities are made transparently clear. The issue was simply which was the potential god, Jahveh, or Baal. The circumstances of the worship were precisely the same for both.

The protests against the habitual idolatries of the Israelites while installed in "the land of promise," are frequent and vehement. And yet, here and there, are indications of an allowed complicity with idolatrous forms, which brings the worship of Jahveh to a level very different from what is ordinarily asserted for it.

Phallic worship, serpent worship, and human sacrifice, have been of nearly universal prevalence, and are found associated together. In the instance of the patriarchs, as has been shown, we have indications of the Phallic worship and of human sacrifice. And in the last days "shall there be an altar to Jahveh in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to Jahveh" (Isa. xix. 19), which last, it may be presumed, is a Phallus. Serpent worship occurs in the wilderness. Moses, unconscious of the legislation subsequently attributed to him, set up an image of a

brazen serpent to which he taught the people to look as to a deliverer. With this symbol, Joshua leading them, they marched into the "holy land," and are found paying their adorations to it seven hundred years later (2 Kings xviii. 4). Of human sacrifice, Jepthah's immolation of his daughter, and David's execution of seven descendants of Saul whom he "hanged in the hill before Jahveh" to avert a famine, are instances. For these, equally as for Abraham's thought to sacrifice Isaac, the divine sanction is claimed. "The Spirit of Jahveh," it is said, "came upon Jepthah," on which he entered into his incautious vow (Jud. xi. 29-31); and Jahveh having performed his assigned part, Jepthah had to fulfil his. The vow and its accomplishment could not have occurred but for the support of prevailing usage. In respect of the famine, after it had endured three years, David "enquired of Jahveh," when he was told, "It is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites" (2 Sam. xxi. 1). The Gibeonites demand the execution, which David carries out. The bones of the victims, together with those of Saul and Jonathan, are buried, "and after that God was intreated for the land" (verses 13, 14). The redemption of the first-born can be based on no other consideration than that otherwise their lives should be offered up to the deity. The Christian dispensation, which purports to be the ultimate expression of the divine mind, is founded upon the appeasement of the deity with a human sacrifice.

Moses made further provision of idol forms in the sacred ark surmounted with cherubim, with whose effigies he also profusely decorated the tabernacle. Solomon repeated the same imagery in the temple, on its walls, doors, and utensils, setting up two huge statues of these objects, measuring seventeen feet and a half in height, and spreading with their wings across a space of thirty-five feet, which he placed in the holy of holies.

From Moses to Saul, the pretension is that the Israelites were under a theocracy. This is made apparent when Samuel, displeased with the threatened change of government when the people demanded to be placed under kingly rule, is assured by Jahveh, "they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them" (1 Sam.

viii. 7). The career of Moses is one continued display of Jahveh ruling through his medium. That of Joshua is introduced with the same exhibitions. On his death the people ask Jahveh to say who should now lead them to battle, and Jahveh appoints Judah for the moment (Jud. i. 1, 2). Afterwards "Jahveh raised up judges, which delivered them out of the hand of those that spoiled them" (Jud. ii. 16). During this era are repeated divine manifestations in support of the agency thus introduced (Jud. i. 22; ii. 1-5; xi. 21; xiii. 2-22; xx. 18-28; 1 Sam. i. 19; iii. 3-21). The people are said to have been true to Jahveh during the time of Joshua and his contemporaries, after which they "followed other gods" (Jud. ii. 7-13). If an appointed judge wrought them deliverance from their enemies, he was no sooner dead than they returned to their idolatries (ver. 16-19). Their normal condition was that of idolatry (Jud. iii. 7; v. 8; vi. 27-30; viii. 33; x. 6). One of their most renowned leaders is Gideon. An angelic messenger is deputed to inform him that Jahveh had raised him up as a deliverer (Jud. vi. 11-26). After marvellous successes over the Midianites, the people elect him to be their chief. Gideon replies, "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: Jahveh shall rule over you." On this he proceeds to make an ephod of gold, designing apparently to use it as a method for holding communication with the deity. The people, however, worship it, and eventually it became a snare to Gideon himself and his house (Jud. viii. 22-27). There is the remarkable episode of Micah. He had a graven and a molten image of silver made, which he set up in his house, and he had "an house of gods, and made an ephod, and teraphim." At first he "consecrated" one of his own sons to be his priest, but meeting with a Levite he "consecrated" him. . Then he comforted himself that his appointments were all in order. "Now know I," he said, "that Jahveh will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest" (Jud. xviii). In the midst of this narrative, at verse 6, is introduced that remarkable admission, with which also the book of Judges closes, "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." It was anarchy socially, politically, and as the position of the sentence

occurring in the midst of Micah's idolatrous ways shows, also in religious practices. At times dating 150 years antecedently, there was no safety on the highways, and travellers resorted to by-paths, the villages were deserted, and the people, surrounded by hostile races, unarmed. They took refuge in dens in the mountains and in caves, and were sunk, as such a debased population might be expected to be, in absolute idolatry (Jud. v. 6-8; vi. 2). A party of the tribe of Dan hear of the means of worship with which Micah had provided himself, and they forcibly carry off the whole to their "city," where "they set them up Micah's graven image, which he made, all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (Jud. xviii. 11-31). This brings us to the era of Saul, more than three centuries later (1 Sam. xiv. 3). The ephod and the teraphim thus associated with the service of idols, are found also in use in the recognized service of Jahveh. The "ephod," in one form, was a vestment of the high priest (Ex. xxviii. 4-6), but the term is also applied to the very different object found with Gideon and Micah, and which was made, as we see, of the precious metals. The teraphim were images, apparently in human form, and used for worship, probably of a domestic nature. The priest Ahimelech had one of the ephods which are in question, behind which he had deposited the sword of Goliah, which David obtained from him (1 Sam. xxi. 9). Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech, flies to take refuge with David who is then involved in his contest with Saul, and brings the ephod with him. David demands it of him, and thereupon puts sundry queries for his direction to Jahveh, and obtains his answers (1 Sam xxiii. 6-12). In another special strait David again obtains the ephod of Abiathar, and therewith holds renewed intercourse with Jahveh (1 Sam. xxx. 7, 8). Teraphim are found in David's household equally as in that of Jacob. When in peril from Saul, who sought to slay him, his wife Michal places one in a bed to personate him (1 Sam. xix. 13-16). There is an important passage in Hosea (iii. 4), descriptive of the constituents of the worship of Jahveh. The Jews were to fall under judgment, and then the prophet declares that they shall be stripped of all the elements of their polity, ecclesiastical as well as civil. "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince,

and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim." The word rendered "image" is given in the margin as also meaning "a standing, or statue, or pillar." It is מעכה, and has a Phallic significancy; and it is the same employed to denote the "pillar" twice used by Jacob in his adorations, as also the one which is to be set up in Egypt, in the last times, when that land is brought to the recognition of Jahveh (Isa. xix. 19). The practices of Abraham, Jacob, Gideon, Micah, and David, whether in magic oracular communication with the divinity through the ephod, or in absolute idolatry with the Phallic symbol and the teraphim, are thus statedly supported, as consonant to the followers of Jahveh, by Hosea, to whom, equally as to the Jewish rulers up to the time of Ezra, the Mosaic legislation must have been absolutely unknown.

The religion of the Jews consisted in their allegiance to Jahveh, and circumcision was the mark by which they were to be distinguished as his peculiar people. Jahveh, we have seen, was apparently a Phœnician divinity adopted by them after they had entered Canaan; and circumcision, there is room to conclude, came to them from the same source. "Moses, therefore," it is declared, "gave unto you circumcision (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers)." (John vii. 22). From this it may be gathered that the institution, originating in the time of the patriarchs, fell into disuse during the bondage in Egypt, and was re-enforced by Moses. Being the initiatory rite of the Egyptian sacerdotal order, it is impossible to believe that the practice could have been tolerated among "Pharaoh's" bond slaves. That Moses enforced it we see was not the case. It was resorted to by Joshua after the people had crossed the Jordan. And as it was practised by the Syrians of Palestine, according to the authority of Herodotus (Inman, *Anc. Faiths*, I. 129), it is evident that the Jews took it up with their divinity Jahveh from them. There also in Canaan, the Jews, there is ground to conclude, obtained their Hebrew tongue (Colenso *On the Pent.*, V. 277). The classification of languages is now an understood science, and Hebrew being Semitic, belongs to this region.

The temple, and its prototype the tabernacle, resembled the

shrines in use in most Pagan lands, and of course were repetitions of what came under the eyes of the people in Egypt and Palestine. "The temple, on the whole, was an enlargement of the tabernacle, built of more costly and durable materials. Like its model, it retained the ground plan and disposition of the Egyptian, or rather of almost all the sacred edifices of antiquity; even its measurements are singularly in unison with some of the most ancient temples in Upper Egypt. It consisted of a propylæon, a temple, and a sanctuary; called respectively the porch, the Holy place, and the Holy of Holies" (Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, I. 208). To withdraw the deity from human gaze, and to enshroud him with appropriate mysteriousness, darkness was considered to be his resort. "He bowed the heavens also, and came down, and darkness was under his feet." "He made darkness pavilions round about him, dark waters, and thick clouds of the skies" (2 Sam. xxii. 10, 12). It was thus that he revealed himself on the mount to Moses, who "drew near unto the thick darkness where God was" (Exodus xx. 21). "Clouds and darkness are round about him" (Ps. xcvii. 2). Solomon recognized the feature in making the arrangements of the shrine which he erected for his habitation. "Then spake Solomon, Jahveh said that he would dwell in the thick darkness. I have surely built thee an house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in for ever" (1 Kings, viii. 12, 13). Such a provision had been made for the deity in the tabernacle, and it was repeated in the temple. "A solemn gloom, unless when the veil was partially lifted, prevailed in the Holy of Holies" (Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, I. 86). And there was the like feature in the Egyptian sanctuaries (*Ibid.* I. 95). The temple of Solomon corresponded in shape with those in Egypt (Sharpe, *Historic Notes*, 293). They had outer court-yards, and an inner shrine, or Holy of Holies (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.* 22). Mr Sharpe gives ground plans of two which are of this character (*Ibid.* 22, 24). The celebrated temple of Diana at Ephesus had similar arrangements, as is delineated in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. It is, in fact, the common type of the existing Hindú shrines.

The ark, surmounted by its cherubim, expressed the highest sentiment of the Jewish worship. In it were deposited the

tables of the law, and above the "mercy seat," between the cherubim, the deity was invisibly installed (Exodus xxv. 22). The Speaker's Commentators allow that these implements were drawn from Pagan models. "The existence of composite winged emblematical figures amongst nations more or less connected with the Hebrews is now well known. The Sphinx and the Griffin have long been familiar to us, but it has been remarked as singular that Mr Layard should have discovered in Nineveh gigantic winged bulls with human heads, winged lions, and human figures with hawk or eagle heads, corresponding so nearly with the winged cherubim of the visions of Ezekiel and St John. These gigantic figures, too, are generally placed as guards or sentinels at the entrances of temples and palaces, like the guarding cherubim of holy writ." But they refer the symbols of the temple preferably to an Egyptian origin. "Far more likely is it that some Egyptian type should have been followed; and we find in the Egyptian sculptures, and in the eighteenth dynasty, which was probably the dynasty of the Exodus, examples of a shrine or ark wonderfully calculated to remind us of the ark of the covenant made by Moses. It is carried by persons of the sacerdotal race, by staves, as the Levites carried the ark. In the centre is the symbol of the deity, and two winged human figures spread out their wings around and over it" (I. 51, citing Lepsius' *Denkm.* III., Bl. 14). "God," they are driven to conclude, "had dictated" to Moses "the carving of figures like those which he had seen in Egypt" (*Ibid.* 51, 52). This very delicate subject is dropped in the later teaching with significant reserve. "The cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy-seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly" (Heb. ix. 5).

The Jewish ordinances for the priesthood are also traceable to Egyptian models. The Egyptian priesthood was by inheritance (Herod., II. 37); so was the Levitical. The Egyptian priests shaved their whole bodies (Herod., ib.); so the Levites were to shave all their flesh (Num. viii. 7). The Egyptian priests had to bathe continually (Herod. ib.); so the priests and Levites had to purify themselves by bathing (Exod. xl. 12-15; Num. viii. 7). The priest wore none but linen garments (Herod. ib.); so it was with the Israelitish priests

(Exod. xxviii. 39-42; xxxix. 27, 28; Lev. vi. 10); and there is no known example of any other priesthood of antiquity clothed only in linen (Hengst., p. 145-149). The anointing of Aaron (Lev. viii. 7-12, 30) when in his priestly robes has an exact parallel in the Egyptian sculptures, where the king is anointed, clothed in royal robes and with cap and crown on his head (*Speaker's Commentary*, I. 16). The mitre of fine linen (Exod. xxviii. 39); the golden plate imposed thereon (Exod. xxviii. 36, 37; Lev. viii. 9); "the breastplate of judgment," with its Urim and Thummim; and the embroidery of pomegranates and golden bells on the hem of the garment (Exod. xxviii. 30, 33, 34), were all of Egyptian origin (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 31). "The distinction of clean and unclean meats is eminently Levitical, but it is eminently Egyptian also" (*Speaker's Commentary*, I. 16).

With the calling and election "in the flesh," the scheme of rewards and punishments, as confined to the wants of this life, was assuredly consistent; but at the same time the system presents us with a low idea of the people who were to be so governed, and of their sense of the divinity thus governing them. Nor were they taught to be scrupulous in helping themselves to their sources of blessing. Cain the murderer, and his offspring, are depicted as the first of the human race endowed with worldly advantages. They had their city, their works in metal, and even their musical appliances. How the world stood as to earthly prosperity onwards to the time of Abraham we are told nothing. Abraham suffered in a famine, and took refuge in Egypt, we may assume, in a state of destitution. There the beauty of his wife attracts attention, and she is commended to "Pharaoh" and taken possession of by him. Abraham favours the act by passing her off as merely his sister, but when the more noble-minded king discovers the mistake into which he had been betrayed, he "entreated Abraham well for her sake," bestowing on him "sheep and oxen, and he asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she asses, and camels." Thus trading on his wife's charms, the patriarch became richly endowed. This happened a second time. The king of Gerar takes a fancy to Sarah. Abraham says she is his sister, and the king takes her, and when he sees his error, compensates Abraham with "sheep, oxen, and

men-servants, and women-servants." A precisely similar occurrence is alleged to have taken place in the instance of Isaac and his wife, in connection apparently with the same king of Gerar; and under the shadow of his wing Isaac's wealth is largely increased (Gen. xxvi. 6-13). Jacob, according to these strange delineations, by a gross fraud, robs his brother of the divine blessing, and draws it down on his own head. He thus becomes the elect progenitor of the favoured race. As he takes his departure from his uncle Laban, who had sheltered him for twenty years and given him both his daughters in marriage, he defrauds him of his flocks through an impossible artifice, divinely suggested. He had bargained with his god to serve him, preferably to any other god, for value to be received. This was in strict keeping with the calling in the flesh and its governance by worldly considerations, and it was, we find, through the perpetration of repeated frauds that the divine endowments were showered upon this worthy progenitor of the Jewish race. Then comes the redemption of the "holy people" out of their bondage in Egypt. The divine mouthpiece gives out that their intention is to absent themselves for but three days to sacrifice to their god in the wilderness (Exod. iii. 18; v. 3; viii. 27), on the basis of which misrepresentation they are able, through the divine suggestion and favour, to borrow jewels of silver and jewels of gold and raiment of the Egyptians (Exod. iii. 22; xi. 2; xii. 35, 36); with which stolen goods they decamp, and set up and decorate the tabernacle for the worship of their deity, according to his appointments. Finally they enter the "holy land." It belongs to others who are peaceably occupying it. But the elect robber bands rush upon them without provocation, and in greed of their possessions exterminate them and seize upon the promised "inheritance." Out of the plunder obtained from these sources by David, the temple is constructed and decorated, and the glories of the kingdom are established in Solomon, the greatest profligate and idolater of whom even this history has any record.

Such is the direction of the earthly rewards conferred by Jahveh. They flow ordinarily through vile channels to the unworthy. On the other hand, it is impossible to trace, in these ill-managed histories, that acknowledged virtue drew

down material prosperity. The patriarch Abraham is represented as "the father of the faithful." The blessing promised to him as well as to his seed was the holy land of Palestine, but he left the earth without obtaining "so much as to set his foot on" (Acts vii. 5.) No one ever received so high a mission as that entrusted to Moses. Jahveh admitted him to personal intimacy as his friend (Exod. xxxiii. 11). Twice he was on the point of exterminating the Israelites and centring all blessing in him, as the alone worthy (Exod. xxxii. 10; Num. xiv. 12). He was matchless in all Israel (Deut. xxxiv. 10), and yet was excluded from "the inheritance." Joshua was specially honoured to lead the people to their possession, but old age overtook him and he expired without accomplishing his task. Samuel, the greatest and most devout in the line of judges, is displaced by the carnally minded Saul. David, "the man after God's own heart," leads a life of continual trouble, from civil contention, foreign wars, and conspiracies. His dying bequest to his son is to put an end to domestic enemies he had found too formidable to deal with himself (1 Kings ii. 5-9). After the disruption of the kingdom into two sections, the chosen family, so far from inheriting blessing, are made a curse to each other. We have a chain of nineteen kings and one queen ruling in Judah, and nineteen kings in Israel. Of the latter the whole are reported ill of; of the former, eight are represented to have done "that which was right in the sight of Jahveh." The first of the godly kings was Asa. Baasha, the king of Israel, during the whole four-and-twenty years of his reign, was continually at war with him. Asa had to devote the treasures of the temple and palace to seduce to his side Baasha's ally, the Gentile king of Syria. The last we hear of Asa is that in his old age he was afflicted with diseased feet (1 Kings xv. 18-23). The next was Jehoshaphat. He formed an alliance with the godless Ahab, king of Israel, and turned upon the Syrians. But the allies were totally defeated. Ahab was killed, and Jehoshaphat only saved his life by suing for mercy. His last act was to fit out vessels to trade with Ophir for gold, but they were wrecked (1 Kings xxii. 1-48). We have then four godly kings in succession, namely Jehoash, Amaziah, Azariah, and Jotham. These held the throne from father to son for one hundred and thirty-six years. Jerusalem

being in jeopardy from the king of Syria, Jehoash had to buy him off with treasures taken from the temple and palace. Finally he was slain by a conspiracy among his own people (2 Kings xii. 17-21). Amaziah was first insulted and then defeated by the king of Israel, who took him prisoner and plundered the temple and palace. He, too, was killed by conspirators (2 Kings xiv. 8-19). Azariah, during the course of his reign, was struck with leprosy, and had to end his days, as an unclean person, "in a several house" (2 Kings xv. 5). In the days of Jotham, Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the king of Israel, entered upon their formidable combined attacks on Judah (2 Kings xv. 37). The seventh of the godly kings was Hezekiah. He was the most zealous supporter of the worship of Jahveh who had yet appeared. In the fourth year of his reign Shalmanezer, king of Assyria, swept Israel off into captivity. Ten years later Sennacherib attacked Judah and reduced all the fortified towns. Hezekiah humbled himself before him, and the Assyrian king laid him under a tribute which Hezekiah met by making over to him the treasures of the temple and palace. The gold plates on the doors and pillars of the temple, which he himself had supplied in honour of Jahveh, had to be stripped off and assigned to the Gentile oppressor (2 Kings xviii. 13-16). The Assyrian account of the campaign, which corresponds in all essentials with the Jewish, paints more particularly the pitiable condition to which the king of Judah was reduced. "Because Hezekiah, king of Judah," says Sennacherib, "would not submit to my yoke, I came up against him, and by force of arms and by the might of my power I took forty-six of his strong fenced cities, and of the smaller towns which were scattered about, I took and plundered a countless number. And from these places I captured and carried off as spoil 200,150 people, old and young, male and female, together with horses and mares, asses and camels, oxen and sheep, a countless multitude. And Hezekiah himself I shut up in Jerusalem, like a bird in a cage, building towers round the city to hem him in, and raising banks of earth against the gates to prevent escape. . . . Then upon this Hezekiah there fell the fear of the power of my arms, and he sent out to me the chiefs and the elders of Jerusalem, with thirty talents of gold and eight hundred

talents of silver, and divers treasures, a rich and immense booty. . . . . All these things were brought to me at Nineveh, the seat of my government, Hezekiah having sent them by way of tribute, and as a token of submission to my power" (Rawlinson, *Hist. Illus.*, 132, 133). Truly Jahveh was of small service to this his devoted follower. Hezekiah was indiscreet enough to exhibit what treasures remained to him to emissaries of the king of Babylon, whereupon the prophet Isaiah denounced upon his kingdom that final destruction which came upon it at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xx. 13-18). The last of the godly kings was Josiah. He was a child of eight years of age when he attained the throne. For the first eighteen years of his reign nothing is said of him. He then became a zealous reformer, putting down the worship of Baal with a high hand. The shadow of the doom impending over his country was nevertheless more than once prophetically brought before him, as what was not to be averted (2 Kings xxii. 16; xxiii. 26, 27). He engaged in war against the king of Egypt as an ally of the Assyrians, and fell in action (2 Kings xxiii. 29, 30).

The institutions of the Jews were such as might be expected in a race so barbarous. Their religion was maintained by terrorism. Jahveh was subject to "fierce anger" (Num. xxv. 4). He might at any moment "break forth upon them" (Exod. xix. 22), as when he "made a breach upon Uzzah," and smote him dead for merely, in his zeal, endeavouring to prop up the ark (2 Sam. vi. 7). The remedy for error was not correction, but atonement. Jahveh had continually to be appeased. Nothing satisfied him but blood. For every transgression some innocent victim had to suffer. Among themselves the rule was, "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" (Exod. xxi. 23-25); a revolting system of retaliation, without a thought of discrimination or mercy. The portion for their enemies was extermination, the plunder of their goods, and the appropriation of their females for the basest uses (Num. xxxi. 17, 18; Deut. xx. 13, 14). They might even sell their own daughters into concubinage (Exod. xxi. 7, 8). Over all is thrown the false glow of a holy people, with a divinely conferred inheritance, singled out from

the whole world as alone attracting the regards of the deity. That there were among the psalmists and the prophets those who attained a much truer conception of the attributes of the divinity, and who could express sentiments of exalted piety, is indubitably the case; but these were not types of the nation at large, nor did they derive their persuasions from the national creed. They, in fact, rise above Judaism, having satisfied themselves that sacrificial ordinances were void of any true effect, and that the regards of the deity were not monopolized by the Jewish nation (1 Sam. xv. 22; Ps. xv. 1-5; xxiv. 1-6; xl. 6-9; l. 8-15; li. 17; lxix. 30, 31; Isa. lviii. 6-11; Jer. vii. 3-10; xxii. 16; xxxi. 31-34; Hos. vi. 6; Mic. vi. 6-8).

The narratives from Genesis to Ezra are linked together with connecting sentences, as if the work of some individual compiler. The course of the history thus runs on to the time of the return from the captivity. The collection, however, could not have been completed till a considerably later period, as in 1 Chron. iii. 19-24 we have a genealogy extending to several generations beyond Zerubbabel, the leader of the movement; and in Neh. xii. 10, 11, the descendants of the priest Jeshua, who was one of the returning exiles (Ezra ii. 2; iii. 2), are traced out for five generations onwards to Jaddua, who was of the time of Alexander the Great, or B.C. 331 (Davidson, *Intro. to the O. Test.* II. 147). In the ensuing century the Septuagint translation is considered to have been set on foot at Alexandria, but when completed it is not known. It was through the channel of this version that the Jewish scriptures were first made public to the world at large. The collection embraces the Apocrypha, thus including the history of the Maccabæan struggle, which was from B.C. 168 to 135. The completion of the Alexandrian canon, consequently, lies beyond this period. It was a time when the nation made frenzied efforts to regain their independence, under the incitement and leading of their rulers, the priestly family of the Maccabees. Their oppressors, the Greeks, "had rent in pieces the books of the law which they found," and "burnt them with fire, and wheresoever was found with any the book of the testament, or if any consented to the law, the king's commandment was that they should put him to death. Thus did they by their autho-

rity unto the Israelites every month, to as many as were found in the cities" (1 Macc. i. 56-58). There was then occasion for the restoration of the scriptures, and, with the opportunity, strong temptation would arise to retouch them under the inspiration of the priestly influence then predominating. Such a task is in fact attributed to Judas Maccabeus. After premising how Neemias (Nehemiah) "founding a library gathered together the acts of the kings, and the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings concerning the holy gifts" (whatever the latter subject may signify), it is added, "in like manner also Judas gathered together all those things that were lost by reason of the war we had, and they remain with us" (2 Macc. ii. 13, 14). The second book of Maccabees has not the historical value of the first, but may probably be trusted for these traditions. That connected with Nehemiah is borne out by the part he took in the publication of the scriptures after the captivity (Neh. viii. 9), and a restoration of these records by Judas, or some other, was a necessity, after the destruction of them that occurred in his day (1 Macc. i. 56). Furthermore, the 2d, 74th, and 110th Psalms are full of significance if they may be considered as representing the trials the nation underwent in the Maccabæan era, and the triumphant issue then anticipated, and have no real application otherwise. That the 74th Psalm, which speaks of the burning up of "all the synagogues in the land," was composed in those modern times when synagogues were in use, is sufficiently apparent; and if one psalm could be thrust into the collection in those days, others might be. Dr Kalisch, in his able commentary on Leviticus, shows that that branch of the law is of later origin than the legislation of Deuteronomy. In Leviticus and Numbers the priestly regulations and exactions are of a more stringent kind than what characterize Deuteronomy. Just such an influence has dictated the books of Chronicles. As Leviticus and Numbers are an improvement upon Deuteronomy, and not otherwise needed for the code they supplement, so the Chronicles are an improvement upon the books of Samuel and Kings, and not otherwise necessary to the historic portion. The fourth gospel, in the New Testament scriptures, plays a similar part. It is not wanted for the biography which was already complete. It is there for

dogmatic effect. The Chronicles, we see, were not put forth until long after the captivity, and it is no unfair presumption to ascribe a production so redolent of priestly influence to times when the nation were dependent for their existence upon the efforts and energies of their priestly rulers. And what may be true of the Chronicles might equally be true of the Levitical legislation.

The career of the Jews as a people does not profess to begin till their exodus from Egypt. That event appears upon the Egyptian annals, and it is the first circumstance in the Hebrew record that may be accepted as possessing the character of history. Before that, as is common to ancient histories of barbarous races, the foundations are laid in what is purely mythical, stretching back, over an obliterating deluge, to the day-dawn of creation. Stripping the history of the overlayings palpably introduced for the purpose of magnifying the importance of those who are the subject of it, we see this people to have been refugees escaping from Egypt to Palestine. There they seem, as may be judged from their own accounts of themselves, and the absence of all notice of them in Egyptian or any foreign records, to have long remained without attaining anything like national standing. In the time of Deborah they were without shield or spear (Jud. v. 8). One hero slaughtered 600 Philistines single-handed, but it was with an ox-goad (Jud. iii. 31). Another put an end to 1000 with the jaw-bone of an ass (Jud. xv. 15). In the time of Saul the people were still unarmed, Saul and Jonathan, "in the day of battle," alone having sword and spear (1 Sam. xiii. 22); and David, the champion of Israel, meets Goliath with a sling and stone, and was glad, in his early struggles for empire, to arm himself with the giant's sword (1 Sam. xxi. 8, 9). Such a condition speaks volumes for the low condition of a people thus denuded of means, and in the midst of hostile races. It is clear that nothing deserving the name of literature could have existed among them to this epoch. David appears as a successful warrior, able to bring Judah and Israel together and consolidate the kingdom, and to hold down some of the surrounding tribes. The sceptre passes to Solomon, who proves a lavish sensualist, and in his hands the ill-welded sections fall apart, never to recover their unity. The rival kings of Judah

and Israel war against each other, and join hands with neighbouring Gentile nations to strengthen themselves. They become tributary to the Assyrians, by whom Israel eventually is made an end of. Babylon rises to power, and Judah falls under the yoke of that state, by whom she at length is crushed. The annals of David's reign have substantially the character of reality. That of Solomon is conceived for the purpose of fulfilling the prophecies made to the imaginary Abraham, and is clearly so far mythical. The remaining histories are brief notices of petty sovereigns in conflict with one another and with surrounding tribes, and, excluding what there is of thaumaturgy and palpable exaggeration, contain just such features as might be expected in the region and times described. Measured by the antiquities of India, Egypt, and Chaldea, that of the Hebrews sinks into insignificance. Supposing that they may be identified with the refugees from Egypt led out by Osarsiph, their beginning, as such, dates from about 1500 years B.C. Four hundred and fifty years more brings us to the early portion of the reign of David. During this period they were unknown to the world at large, and can be said to have had no national standing. Then they figure in history for some four hundred and fifty years, dating from about B.C. 1040. After this there came a resuscitation, under the patronage of the Persian sovereign, but never of a character to free them from foreign domination. It is at this time that their sacred records see the light, and Ezra, who belonged to the captivity, is the avowed instrument of their promulgation, though the record, as has been pointed out, was not completed, or published, till a much later day.

The portion of the Jewish scriptures upon which their character as a divinely inspired production absolutely depends is the Pentateuch. If its materials can be traced to human sources, there is an end of the people and the book as stamped with the signet of the divinity. Modern criticism has effectually dispersed the idea that this section may be attributed to the pen of Moses. It bears traces of disjointed legends inartistically put together. It is replete with anachronisms which carry it on to the time of the Kings, and even to the crowning catastrophe of the Babylonian captivity.* And it lays down a

* The Bible; is it the Word of God? 16-18, 22, 23.

code of laws of which it is evident, from their acts, that the most important personages in this history, prominently Moses himself, and others such as Samuel, David, and Elijah, knew nothing.* An effort is made in the time of Josiah to show the production of a work called "the book of the law," and it finds the godly king and all his people ignorantly worshiping "other gods," Baal, the sun and the host of heaven, Moloch, Ashtoreth, Chemosh, and Milcom. Even the festival of the passover was a novelty to them (2 Kings xxiii. 21). Then, with greater appearance of probability, Ezra produces such a work, which is called "the book of the law of Moses," and the whole population are seen to be quite unaware of its contents, against which they had been unconsciously transgressing. At this time the feast of tabernacles comes upon them as a hitherto unknown institution (Nah. viii. 14). Every thread of the labyrinth leads to the conclusion that this law of Moses was unheard of till the time of Ezra. The anachronisms, in clearing Moses of the authorship, point onwards to this epoch, or that of the captivity. From Moses to David the condition of the people was such as not to admit of literary effort of any serious character among them. In those days, their history informs us, they were without rule of any sort, "every man doing that which was right in his own eyes." Not only was the Mosaic code not then in operation,—its non-existence may be said to be here involved. Onwards to the time of Ezra the practice was such, even among the godly characters, as to show that no such system of legislation was then prevailing. The avowal of entire ignorance of its commonest contents when it is represented to have been produced to view, proves that previously it was not extant. The return from the captivity gives just the occasion that may have tempted the leaders to build up the people under such a code as the law of Moses. The returned exiles were few and broken-spirited, and needed encouragement. They were ignorant, and under the influence of a strong priestly faction. Their suffering state would make them easily impressible by religious considerations. Their true traditions, never probably of any serious importance, must have been weakened under a bondage which had served to drive even their language out of use. It would give them a

* The Bible; is it the Word of God? 8-13.

great impulse to be assured that the bondage had been a special divine visitation, foreordained, because of a particular course of transgression; that the very closeness and earnestness of the deity's regards towards them had led to the discipline; that they were in truth the favoured of heaven, an elect and holy people. Then it would be easy to fill in the picture, with all the ingredients we find composing it, building up the national records with such legendary matter as was then current in those regions. The time was when the Eastern Aryans had done their work. The Sanskrit literature of the early Brahmanical period had been brought to a close. Its mythologies, over a very long course of years, had influenced Egypt, and had deeply rooted themselves in Europe, and prominently in Greece, then rising to an important position, political and literary. The Chaldeans also had their mythological culture firmly assured. It would be a marvel if the little kingdom of Judea, standing in the very midst of such potent influences, could at any time have resisted their effects in constructing its own system. Still less would it be likely to do so when just resettled on its ricketty foundations, and seeking to sustain itself with a newly conceived religious sentiment. If then the Eastern legends are clearly traceable in the Hebrew records, it is very apparent how the identities have been brought about.

V.

THE LEGENDS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE legends of the Hebrews claim to have reached them from a divine source. "Holy men of God," as it is expressed in the later and current appreciation of them, "spake (them) as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." This would place these lucubrations above dependence on any human source. They should be characterized, therefore, at the least, by originality; and they should be free of all those defects of inaccuracy and inconsistency which are traceable, more or less, in all human productions, and especially in those that come to us from imperfectly informed minds belonging to a remote antiquity. Judged of by these very obvious tests, the true origin of these legends becomes quite apparent.

1. THE CREATION.

It is an ambitious thought, in framing the history of a people, to trace them, in an unbroken line, from the foundation of all things, describing how the universe was constituted, and their first parents brought into being. But the idea is one that has been common to mankind, and it did not originate with the Jews. The Hindús, Persians, Chinese, Egyptians, Chaldeans, Phœnicians, and Greeks, their predecessors in the world's history, have all projected cosmogonies, with themselves springing from the first beginnings of creation. Ignorance is the fertile parent of hardihood of assertion, as has been the case in the instances before us. When little or nothing was known of what it was undertaken to describe, there was great temptation to imagine the required information and advance it boldly. The statements made in these primitive records of the formation of the world and its contents, could never have been

hazarded in days when knowledge existed wherewith to test what was asserted. The Jewish record is here on no better footing than the others, and when brought face to face with the actualities with which modern research has provided us, the true character of its authorship becomes fully exposed.

The Jews give us two distinct accounts of the creation, the one ending at the third verse of the second chapter of Genesis, and the other continuing from that point onwards. This feature indicates compilation from human sources, and is inconsistent with the idea of a revelation from a divine one. The accounts differ in style. In the first, the divinity is referred to as Elohim, and in the second as Jahveh, a circumstance which has satisfied all critics that they are to be referred to different authors. In the first account, the acts of creation are distributed over six separate days. In the second there is no such distinction. In the first account the earth is covered with water, and then the waters are collected together and the dry land appears. The earth, therefore, for a time, must have been saturated with moisture. In the second, its earliest condition is described as that of being parched with drought, so that it was necessary to raise a mist to irrigate it. In the first, the animals are formed before man ; in the second, man is formed before the animals. In the first, the man and the woman are formed together. In the second, the man is first formed, then the animals, and then the woman.

The first, or the Elohistic account of the creation, goes into details which challenge comparison with the facts in nature.

The earth is represented to have been without form and void, and buried under water. There is no attempt to unravel to us the origin of matter, or to show whence came those compositions which we know as earth and water. The standing-point of knowledge displayed is therefore no higher than what would belong to any human narrator.

The separation of the earth from the waters is effected by one complete act on the second day of the creation, after which the various forms of life, terrestrial and marine, were produced. But we know from observation of the effects that marine life, vegetal and animal, was created before any part of the earth appeared above the waters, and that the elevation of the earth to levels above the all-prevailing ocean was

effected slowly and gradually. We also know that the upheavals and depressions of the land have not been at any one time universal, but partial, and of frequent and constant occurrence, so that all portions of the globe have, at different times, been repeatedly submerged and elevated; and the process is still occurring. A solution of this phenomenon would have been of value, but the narrator was not even aware of its occurrence.

The sun being to the uninstructed minds of those days in a position subordinate to the earth, we have the earth enlightened without the sun, so that the ordinary division of day and night existed as well during the days preceding the establishment of the sun in his place, as afterwards. Knowing nothing of the law of gravitation, and of the earth's dependence on the sun for maintenance of its position in space, the narrator has the earth in being for three days before the sun had existence. And in this early time, it not being known that "the vitality of plants is a chemical process entirely due to the sun's light" (Mrs Somerville, *Physical Geography*, II., 96, 97, 101), that the green colour of leaves, and the bright tints of flowers, are effects of sunlight (Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Biology*, I., 33), and that without the vivifying power of the sun's rays there could be neither seed nor fruit, we have the full glories of the vegetable world established without the aid of a solar beam.

The nature of the blue expanse above our heads was not then understood, nor was it apparent how the phenomena of rain were produced. The narrator presents us with a solid firmament, and lodges above it the sources of the rain, thus effectually dividing these waters off from the earth below, so that "the windows of heaven" had to be "opened," or "stopped," to regulate the supply (Gen. vii. 11; viii. 2).

The writer was ignorant of the nature of the heavenly orbs. The diameter of the sun is one hundred and twelve times that of the earth (Guillemin, 23), but this body is made subordinate to the earth, and no higher use for it observed than that it should mark off day and night for the advantage of the earth. The diameter of the moon is but a four hundred and twelfth part of that of the sun (*Ibid.*, 133), and yet the two bodies are placed so far on a par as to be considered a

greater and a lesser light, and the moon is viewed as shining by independent light as the sun. The other orbs, countless in number, filling infinite space, and some exceeding by many fold the sun in dimensions (*Ibid.*, 341), are passed over as comparatively insignificant. "He made the stars also," is all that could be said about them. We now know that these are centres of vast systems such as our own, and constituted of material elements as our solid earth (*Ibid.*, 388), fulfilling parts in the great scheme of the creation, respecting which we are greedy of information.

The acts of creation are divided into six periods, each occupying a day. The terms are, "it was êReB (western light), and it was BâKR (early dawn)," (*Types of Mankind*, 562), meaning, obviously, natural days, constituted with evening and morning. All who are versed in the facts of geology, both those who accept the authority of the Bible and those who controvert it, are now satisfied that it has required an inconceivably lengthened time to deposit upon the earth its various strata, estimated to reach to a depth of twelve miles and upwards of its crust, in which lie embedded for our observation the remains of the various forms of life which through these times have been upon the earth. "It would appear, then," says Mr Charles Brooke, a writer for the Christian Evidence Society, "that the surface of our globe has been adapted to the exigencies of its present inhabitants, not by any sudden act of creation, but by a gradual and progressive development, requiring countless ages for its accomplishment" (*Lecture on the Evidence in Nature to the Existence of a God*). The Biblicists, therefore, to avoid their difficulty, ordinarily do not scruple to convert the days of creation into ages, notwithstanding the text, especially as read with the very exact words ascribed to the Creator when he commemorated these days by instituting their succeeding Sabbath day of rest. "For in six days Jahveh made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: Wherefore Jahveh blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it." Language could not more plainly indicate the six days to be just such days as the seventh. Nor is it possible, in view of the creation, to understand them to have been ages, for neither plants nor animals could have survived the alternations of

half ages of light and half of darkness, their systems requiring those short alternations they have in the existing natural days. For example, all vegetation would be burnt up by say 5000 years of continuous sunlight; nor can we imagine the sparrow of the fifth day of the creation maintaining itself perched on one leg, with its head under its wing, without food, through 5000 years of darkness. Biblicists, consequently, probably figure to themselves ages composed of natural days, each with its "western light" and "early dawn," not deterred by the liberty they have to take with the text in converting six days, so marked off with sunset and sunrise, into an innumerable number of days in like manner thus divided. But after doing this they have still to explain how a countless number of successional days, all of the same character, are to be broken up into six distinct periods, each with its sunset and dawn. The real state of the case is that the facts in geology dissipate the idea of any such distinctive periods occurring in the processes of the creation. It has been, as Mr Charles Brooke has allowed, "a gradual and progressive development" from first to last, it being impossible to point to any separations in the links of the unbroken chain. The repetitions of forms, and the interlacings, are endless. Algæ and moluscs, such as belonged to the earliest times, are reproduced even now with but slight variations. Plant life, fish life, and animal life, with constant modifications, have been maintained without interruption to the present day.* To shut up any one order of the creation into any one specific day or age is altogether impracticable, and the idea of the six periods of the creation, when examined by the hard facts of nature, is reduced to myth.

The scripture narrative commits the further error of placing seed bearing and fruit bearing terrestrial vegetation first in the field of the organic forms, the true fact being that marine products, vegetal and animal, were eliminated in the bed of the universal ocean long before the dry land appeared, and that the earliest of the terrestrial growths, themselves occupying long ages, were the inflorescent products of the carboniferous era. The narrator has obviously marshalled the various objects of creation in successional order, according to their

* "Development of Creation on the Earth."

seeming relative importance, and vegetation appearing to be the lowest in the scale, is, therefore, represented to have been the earliest formed. It is an evidence that he was drawing from his own untutored mind in the days of ignorance in which he stood.

The creation being completed, grain and fruit are assigned to man for his sustenance, and green herbage for that of the beasts, birds, and reptiles, indiscriminately. The idea evidently was that life should not be taken for the supply of food, a prohibition removed subsequently, by special edict, after the deluge (Gen. ix. 3). The writer overlooked the fish, or perhaps saw that they could do nothing but devour one another. He knew not that air and water teem with invisible insect life which has to be destroyed at every inhalation and at every draught. And he was of course quite unaware that many animals are so physically constituted as not to be sustainable on herbage, and have propensities and powers inevitably propelling them to take life. The tiger's talons and stealthy step are not required to scratch up the grass. To what purpose would be the poison in the serpent's fang, or the fascination in its eye, or the skill of the spider to weave its glutinous web, if herbage was all the temptation before them?

After this, we are told of a day of rest for the Creator which has certainly in no sense had place. Creation would perish without the outflow of his constant power sustaining it; and animated forms, with endless variations, have come forth from his great laboratory incessantly, from the first day that life has been evolved to the present moment.

The second, or Jehovistic account, presents fewer points on which the statements advanced may be tested by the facts in nature, but where the comparison can be made the record will be found in error.

The first man is said to have been formed of the dust of the earth, after which Jahveh breathed into him the breath of life, and he became a living soul. "Dust thou art," it was subsequently declared to him, "and unto dust shalt thou return." The birds and the beasts are also stated to have been formed "out of the ground." The reptiles, insects, and fishes are overlooked. In saying what he has done, the

narrator was not aware how little the animal organisms are indebted to the materials of the earth for their composition, and how largely their constituents are drawn from the gases of the atmosphere, so that it would be warrantable to designate them, as Dr Bastian has done, "the offspring of the air." The appearance of the solid fleshly bodies naturally deceived the narrator, leading him to suppose that they were built up of equally substantial ingredients, which, to his senses, could be derived only from the earth. He was equally unaware that life is first imparted to the formless protoplasm, from which, through the vital action, the perfected form is gradually shaped out, the process in nature being exactly the reverse to that described as taking place in the formation of Adam. The narrator has also misstated the method in which plant growth is conducted by the gradual repetition and development of its cellular substances. He says that Jahveh Elohim made "every plant of the field *before it was in the earth*, and every herb of the field *before it grew*;" meaning that, as in the case of the human species, the plants were miraculously formed, irrespective of natural materiality and manner of growth.

Adam being established in his garden, it occurred to Jahveh that it was not good to leave him in solitude. He thereupon created the beasts and the birds, and brought them to him that he might name them. The narrator was ignorant of the various centres of animal life, and the corresponding constitutions of their occupants, unfitting them to stand together in the same locality and climate. The chamois would not tread on the same soil as the antelope, nor could the polar bear reconcile himself to the habitat of the tiger. And if it was of importance that man should name the various birds and animals, why should the fishes be passed over unnamed? The end of the experiment was that Adam could find no fitting consort for himself among the brute creation, whereupon Eve was created for him.

Allowance may be made for the reception of statements such as we have had before us in times when no better knowledge existed; and even when truer light began to be presented, it is not to be wondered at that those who were accustomed to reverence the Jewish scriptures as of divine

origin, should have struggled hard to maintain the integrity of the record against the advancing tide of scientific observation. But from those days of ignorance, or unsettled doubt, we have passed into times of clear and wide-spread certitude, and are entitled to expect that known facts, connected with the phenomena of nature, should be accorded their proper value.

One of the latest apologists is Dr J. H. Gladstone, a champion of the Christian Evidence Society. In his lecture entitled, "Points of Supposed Collision between the Scriptures and Natural Science," he seeks to shake his cause free of the efforts of the early writers in this controversy, who had aimed at the reconciliation of what he terms the two records, namely that of nature and that of the Jews. "Many of these productions," he observes, "had better never have been written; for, to bring about a premature correspondence, they wrest either the facts of nature or the words of Scripture." The battle would in fact be over were this process of forced accommodation given up. Dr Gladstone's own policy seems one of retreat rather than of warfare. "The history," he says, "is related not so much to teach a cosmogony, as to show that one God was the maker of all things." If the history had been a satisfactory one, there would of course have been no proposition thus to shelve it. "I do not at all imagine," adds the learned doctor, quite conscious, evidently, of the nature of the history, "that the prophets of old had any special illumination in regard to the material universe." The idea that the defective record is the expression of divine truth being abandoned, the doctor shows himself ready to sound his retreat. Of "the two records" before in question, he says, "should it prove that they are contradictory, we shall have to put aside, not the Bible, nor even Genesis, but that ancient and sublime fragment which forms the first thirty-four verses of that book." The doctor will not retire further than he is compelled to do. The workings of his own thoughts are not to influence him. It must be an adversary forcing him to withdraw step by step. He will not even attempt to examine the quagmire below his feet. If it will not bear me, he says, I will leave it, but he will do so with admiration on his lips. He can still say

how sublime the position, though, alas, how baseless! The record may be unreliable to the thirty-fourth verse, but all true beyond it, though strung together by the same hand. The *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus,* is not an axiom that he would here apply.

Dr Gladstone must not be permitted to enjoy at ease the refuge he has marked out for himself. The great aim of the possibly-to-be-abandoned account of the creation, he represents, is the proclamation that "one God has been the maker of all things." But is it so clear that there is such a proclamation? The "Elohim," in the plural number, give us no assurance of such unity, nor does the speech attributed to the creating power. We appear to have more personages than one taking counsel together over their proceedings. "Let us make man," they say, "in our image." And again, "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." And as we advance to the later record, we find that there were at least two divinities concerned on the occasion, the Jewish god apparently dictating the work, and the Christian god executing it (John i., 1-3).

A recent article in the *Edinburgh Review* upon Dr Strauss's last work, "The Old Faith and the New," affords an astounding instance of the lengths to which the orthodox may be driven in the process of excision, when resorted to in view of preserving the more valued portions of their sacred record from the pressure of objections felt to be too absolute to be met or evaded. The writer is conscious that the Jewish scriptures teem with these insuperable difficulties, and he thinks to save the Christian scriptures from the weakness of an alliance with the more ancient record by severing the connection between the two, and parting with the latter totally. "Why," he demands, "should Christian churchmen think it necessary to burden their cause, and to hamper every movement of their strategy by undertaking the perfectly gratuitous task of making Gentile Christianity responsible for the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures? We are not Jews, and there is no reason in the world why we should be weighted with this burden of understanding and defending, at all risks, the Jewish Scriptures. It is a burden that was never laid upon us either by Christ or by his Apostles. Our German race, in

particular, as a matter of simple fact, was not trained by them. They were not our 'schoolmasters to lead us to Christ.' We affirm what appears to us to be a simple historical fact, viz., that the Jewish Scriptures do not belong to us, and that we are in no way responsible for them." Then the writer proceeds to inform us on what his faith is really based, and though we find him further on clinging to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead as his sheet-anchor for futurity, he presents himself here as a mere student of nature, not depending on any so-called inspired record. "It was not," he says, "by the Old Testament that the Gentile nations were trained; it was not by the Mosaic law that our heathen forefathers were prepared for the reception of Christ. It was by quite another agency. It was by that magnificent Book of God, in which we have read ever since and are reading to this day, the ever-opening revelations of his wisdom and his power. It is the realm of nature which is our own proper inheritance. It is physical science which has hitherto led us —why should it not lead us still?—through nature up to nature's God."

The writer thinks to disarm his opponents by professing to come over to their side. But he nevertheless still clutches the distinctive banner of his proper party, and his device is easily seen through. He secures no other result than to expose his individual consciousness of the weakness of his trusted foundations, and were such avowals ordinarily prevalent, a work such as the present, aimed at the exposure of the Jewish scriptures, would assuredly not be called for. But the generality of the Reviewers' denomination will utterly repudiate his strategy, and therefore my task must be prosecuted to its end.

I have to meet now the common position to which Dr Gladstone is apparently an adherent, against, I should have thought, his better knowledge, that to the revelations in the Jewish scriptures we owe acquaintance with the fact that the universe is indebted for its creation to a divine author. It will be found, against this supposition, that cosmogonies projected by other nations long before that of the Jews saw the light, are founded upon this very obvious idea.

In the Orphic theology occur these remarkable positions:—

"I. Before the creation of the world God was united with

matter in such manner that in him were contained all things that are, or have been, or shall be; and thus from all eternity did all forms remain concealed in his essence.

"II. At a fixed time God separated matter from himself; and thus gods, goddesses, the sun, moon, stars, and all that is, were produced.

"III. By the laws of emanation, therefore, all things participate in the essence of God, and are parts and members of God, and nothing is devoid of the divine nature.

"V. The essence of God, thus proceeding from him, and being present in all things, is the sole power which governs this world.

"IX. Since all things have proceeded from God, they will all return unto him, and this re-union will be the highest state of beatitude which the pious can attain" (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.*, 77, 78, citing Brucker).

Varuna's definition of Brahmá, which I have already had occasion to give,* is that by him all beings are produced, and live, and move.

"Wise and mighty are the works of him who stemmed asunder the wide firmaments (heaven and earth). He lifted on high the bright and glorious heaven, he stretched out apart the starry sky and the earth. . . . Without thee, O Varuna! I am not master even of a twinkling of an eye. . . . Thou, O wise God, art the king of all, of heaven and earth, hear me on my path" (Max Müller, *Chips*, II., 314, 330, quoting from the Rig Veda).

"In all the sacred books of the Hindus it is the Supreme Being who is uniformly represented as being the primary cause of creation, and the sole originator of the elementary atoms and qualities, from the reciprocal action and combination of which all things were produced." (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.*, 214).

The truth that Dr Gladstone traces to the Jews is thus found to have been expressed by much more ancient nations, and with at least equal force and sublimity. It is a truth, moreover, so stamped upon the works created as to have revealed itself, inevitably, in all times, to every reflective mind.

* Page 59.

The Jewish record comes to us at a much later day than is commonly supposed. The first, or Elohistic narrative of the creation, is obviously allied to the observance of the sabbath; and there is room to conclude that this institution had not been established among the earlier Jews. Excluding the Chronicles, which all critics disallow as a modern and unreliable record, framed in the interests of the priesthood, the sabbath is not mentioned till we arrive at the time of Jehoshaphat (2 Kings iv. 23), or six hundred years after the exodus. David, for example, appears to have had no knowledge of such an ordinance. When among the Philistines, Ziklag was allotted to him for his domicile (1 Sam. xxvii. 6). Thence he proceeded to join Achish in an expedition against the Israelites; but being mistrusted, he was sent back, and it occupied him three days to return with his party to Ziklag (1 Sam. xxx. 1). Six days, to and fro, would thus be accounted for. When he reached Ziklag, he found the place plundered and burned down by the Amalekites, and he went at once in pursuit of them. On his way he came upon one of the party who had been abandoned ill on the retreat, and who had been without food for three days (1 Sam. xxx. 12). David made use of him as his guide, and till the following evening was occupied in taking vengeance on the enemy, after which he returned to Ziklag (verses 17, 26). In these continuous expeditions one or more sabbaths must have been passed over unheeded. Solomon equally paid no attention to the sabbath. At the dedication of the temple he held a feast occupying fourteen days (1 Kings viii. 65), during which two sabbaths must have passed by unobserved (Inman, *Anc. Faiths*, II., 617). The Jewish writers, during the whole course of their sacred literature, show no acquaintance with the details of the creation as given in Genesis, and the inference is that these legends were introduced after the close of their sacred history; that is, after the captivity, when in fact their records and institutions, it is to be concluded from every known indication, began to see the light.* They had then been in contact with Greeks, Chaldeans, and Egyptians, and had the opportunities, which they will be found to have used, of propping up their scriptures from foreign sources.

* "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" pp. 16-18.

When taken up to be dealt with in creation, the condition of the earth is described as chaotic, water and earth mixed together, and darkness prevailing over the confused mass. The spirit, or breath of Elohim, moves upon the waters, and the creation is evolved.

The môt or mud of Sanchoniatho, with the windy air acting upon it (Bishop Cumberland's version), describes the exact position, from whatever quarter Philo Biblius may have derived his materials.

"The Egyptian's opinion of the creation was the growth of his own river's bank. The thoughtful man, who saw the Nile every year lay a body of solid manure upon his field, was able to measure against the walls of the old temples that the ground was slowly but certainly rising. An increase of the earth was being brought about by the river. . . . Hence he readily believed that the world itself had been formed 'out of water, and by means of water,' as described in 2 Pet. iii. 5. The philosophers were nearly of the same opinion. They held that matter was itself eternal, like the other gods, and that our world, in the beginning, before it took any shape upon itself, was like thin mud, or a mass of water containing all things that were afterwards to be brought forth out of it. When the water had by its divine will separated itself from the earth, then the great Ra, the Sun, sent down his quickening heat, and plants and animals came forth out of the wet land, as the insects are spawned out of the fields, before the eyes of the husbandman, every autumn after the Nile's overflow has retreated" (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 67).

The Chaldean account, as handed down by Berosus, in association with many gross absurdities, is, that "there was a time in which there existed nothing but darkness and an abyss of waters. . . . The whole universe consisted of moisture, animals being continually generated therein. . . . Belus, who signified Jupiter, divided the darkness, and separated the heavens from the earth, and reduced the universe to order. . . . Belus formed also the stars, and the sun, and the moon, and the five planets" (Cory, *Anc. Frag.* 23-26).

The Hindu account is the same, and of course has been the parent of the others.

"The Supreme Being alone existed; afterwards there was

universal darkness; next the watery ocean was produced by the diffusion of virtue; then did the Creator, lord of the universe, rise out of the ocean, and successively frame the sun and moon, which govern day and night, whence proceeds the revolution of years; and after them he framed heaven and earth, the space between, and the celestial region . . . Waters (alone) there were; this world originally was water. In it the Lord of creation moved, having become air" (Colebrooke in *As. Res.* VIII., 397, 436, drawing from the Rig Veda).

The Satapatha Bráhmana, a much later record, has a similar statement. "This (universe) was in the beginning waters, only water." And so also the Atharva Veda:—"In the beginning, the waters . . . protected (? covered) the universe" (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, IV., 15, 16). The very phrase, "In the beginning," into which Biblicists import so much beyond its expressed meaning, has, it will be observed, travelled to Judea from the East, to form the opening phrase of their sacred scriptures.

In Manu's Institutes the universe is stated to have existed in darkness, as if immersed in sleep. The self-existent dispelled the gloom, and having willed the production of various beings, he with a thought created the waters, and placed in them a productive seed. This became an egg, in which he was himself born as Brahmá. The waters are called *Nara*, because the production of Nara, or the Spirit of God; and he is named *Narayana*, or moving on the waters. By his thought he caused the egg to divide itself, and from its two divisions he framed the heaven above and the earth beneath; and in the midst he placed the subtil ether, the permanent receptacle of waters (i., 5-13).

This permanent receptacle of waters is expressed by the Sanskrit word *sam-udra*, composed of *sam* "with," and *udra* "water," an expression applied to "the waters above the firmament, the aerial ocean or sky," (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.* 1079), an idea which the Hebrews have adopted.

The Greeks framed their cosmogony from those of the Eastern nations. "It was a most ancient, and in a manner universally received, tradition amongst the Pagans, that the cosmogonia, or generation of the world, took its first be-

ginnings from a chaos; this tradition having been delivered down from Orpheus and Linus by Hesiod and Homer; acknowledged by Epicharmus; and embraced by Thales, Anaxagoras, Plato, and other philosophers who were theists" (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.* 82, citing Cudworth).

The Orphic account is this.

"First I sung the obscurity of ancient Chaos,
How the Elements were ordered, and the Heaven reduced to bound;
And the generation of the wide-bosomed Earth, and the depth of the sea,
And Eros (Love) the most ancient, self-perfecting, and of manifold design;
How he generated all things, and parted them from one another."
(Cory, *Anc. Frag.* 291.)

Hesiod followed with similar statements.

"Chaos was generated first, and then
The wide-bosomed Earth. . . .
And Eros, the fairest of the immortal gods.
. . . . . .
From Chaos were generated Erebus and black Night,
And from Night again were generated Ether and Day."
(*Ibid.* 292, 293).

Aristophanes, in his Comedy of the Birds, has the same representations.

"First was Chaos and Night, and Black Erebus and vast Tartarus;
And there was neither Earth, nor Air, nor Heaven; but in the boundless bosoms of Erebus,
Night, with her black wings, first produced an aerial egg,
From which, at the completed time, sprang forth the lovely Eros,
Glittering with golden wings upon his back, like the swift whirlwinds.
But embracing the dark-winged Chaos in the vast Tartarus,
He begot our race (the birds), and first brought us to light."
(*Ibid.* 293, 294.)

Thus far the Hebrews, it is apparent, have been indebted to the Hindús and their imitators for their ideas of the primitive condition of the earth and the first processes of creation. The representation that six periods were occupied in the creative action, it is equally clear, is traceable to the ancient Persians. The Zend Avesta so divides these acts into six portions, occupying in all a year, making the last of the acts, as in Genesis, the formation of man (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 155). The Chaldeans also described the creation as effected

in six periods (Higgins, *Anac.* I. 61). The Etruscans likewise adopted this idea, making the periods, however, extend each to a thousand years. In the first, the planets and the earth were made; in the second, the firmament; in the third, the sea and waters; in the fourth, the sun, moon, and stars; in the fifth, living creatures; and in the sixth, man (*Ibid.*, I. 181). The Tyrrhenians had precisely the same cosmogony (Cory, *Anc. Frag.*, 309). It required the ignorance of the Hebraic mind to conceive it possible that the whole of these vast operations might be limited to the compass of six days.

The form in which man was fashioned was that of his imputed creator. "So, Elohim created man in his own image, in the image of Elohim created he him; male and female created he them." Taking this to be the external image, as the language warrants, the divinity appears described with sexual attributes. The same phraseology is used further on. "This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that Elohim created man, in the likeness of Elohim made he him; male and female created he them:" Accordingly, when Cain was born, Eve recognized him as the exact counterpart of the Creator. "I have gotten a man," she said, "even Jahveh himself." Our translators have improperly translated it, "I have gotten a man from the Lord" (Jahveh), but the particle אֵת means "the very one," and does not bear the signification "from" which they have preferred to give it (Parkhurst; Faber, *Origin of Pag. Idol.* III. 604). The Biblicists wish to have it that the divine image in which man was made was the moral, not the physical image. If so, why, both times, should the possession of the sexual forms have been introduced into the description? There is no question of Adam being in the moral image of his maker. On the contrary, it is distinctly stated that he was made lacking the divine attribute of knowing good from evil, a feature of resemblance which, strange to say, he acquired through his transgression, when, according to the Biblicists, he lost possession of the assumed moral image in which he had been formed. The wicked Cain, born after the transgression, could not have been in the moral image of the divinity, and yet Eve sees in him the expression of Jahveh himself. The phrase is used again of Seth, whom Adam "begat in his own likeness, after

his image," meaning evidently here, as elsewhere, the outward lineaments.

When we pass to the masters from whom the Hebrews derived their representations, we see at once that the corporeal image has been here in question. The notion of the ancients was that the production of all animated nature was the result of the procreative process, and thus they ever attributed to the creator the possession of the sexual attributes, in which respect the Hebrews are found to have followed them.

"The fundamental principles of this religion (the Hindú) are, that an invisible and immaterial being cannot manifest himself or exert his power except under a corporeal form, and that the energies of the male must remain inoperative until rendered active by a union with the passive qualities of the female. Hence, on willing creation, the Supreme Being necessarily, in order to effect that object, first gave existence to a male and a female, which are known under the names of *Purusha* and *Prakriti*, and which alone are considered to be the original agents in the formation of this universe. . . . It must likewise be observed, that all males, whether gods or men, are considered to be merely forms of *Purusha*, and all females, whether goddesses or women, to be merely forms of *Prakriti;* and that *Purusha* and *Prakriti* are themselves in reality corporeal manifestations of the essence of the undiscernible Supreme Being" (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.*, 283, 284, and note.)

Dyaus and Prithiví, or heaven and earth, are very ancient Aryan divinities, and in the Rig Veda are described as the parents of the other gods. Heaven is the father, earth the mother. In like manner Hesiod describes Chaos as first arising, and then being enveloped in the starry heaven, from which union sprang Oceanos, Kronos, the Cyclopes, Rheia, etc., and from Kronos and Rheia came Zeus, Here, and others. In the Egyptian cosmogony likewise, earth is the mother of all. The Greek form of heaven and earth is Ouranos and Gaia (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V. 21-33).

"The theology of the ancients recognizes, as the primary elements of all things, two independent principles, of the nature of male and female. And these, in mystic union as the soul and body, constitute the great Hermaphroditic deity,

the One, the Universe itself, consisting still of the two separate elements of its composition, modified, though combined in one individual, of which all things were regarded but as parts" (Cory, *Anc. Frag.*, xxxiv. 299).

"The world appears to them (the Egyptians) to consist of a masculine and feminine nature" (*Ibid.* 286). "We have abundant evidence that the Egyptian theology had its origin in the personification of the powers of nature, under male and female attributes" (Kenrick, *Anc. Egyp.* 435).

That the Creator was endowed with the sexual features has thus been the common imaginative representation of the ancients. The Hindú conception, according to the Vedic account is that Viráj, the primeval being, caused his own self to fall in twain, becoming thus male and female, and by this means procreated mankind and all animals, taking their several forms for the purpose (Colebrooke in *As. Res.*, VIII. 426). Dr Inman gives a similar account drawn from the Sáma Veda, which he illustrates with a figure of the divinity, whose person is represented on one side male and on the other female (*Anc. Faiths*, II. 644, 645). "Having divided his own substance," it is said in Manu's Institutes, "the mighty power became half male, half female; and from that female he produced Viráj. Viráj, by himself, produced me, the framer of this world" (i. 32, 33).

"The Egyptians, even in their cosmogony, could not resist the propensity to material and sensual analogies. Phtha, the framer of the world, the sole parent of all things, was, forsooth, of a double sex. . . . . Thus the demiurgus is represented as becoming the parent of all kinds of beings, rather than as creating them" (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.* 289).

"Cudworth admirably shows, that all the gods and goddesses of the Gentiles are ultimately one numen, described as partaking of the nature of both sexes." The Greeks and Romans had this universal numen, or great androgynous hero-god, the parent of the human race. The moon was represented to be male as well as female, and the sun female as well as male. In one of the Orphic fragments it is said, "The sole god is Jupiter. This being is both male and female. In his own person he comprehends all things: and

from his ample womb all things are produced" (Faber, *Or. of Pag. Idol.*, III. 62-69, 109).

In keeping with these ideas Siva and his consort Parvati are sometimes represented conjoined together, the joint divinity being termed *Ardha-Nari*, "half-male" (Christmas, *Un. Myth.* 61; plates to Moor's *Hindú Pantheon*). Phtha (Cory, *Anc. Frag.* 286), Anubis, Osiris, and Neith, in the Egyptian mythology, are described as hermaphrodites (Faber, *Or. of Pag. Idol.*, III. 74, 76). Also Eros and Demiurgus (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.* 167), Athene, Hephaistus (Cory, 286), the Etruscan Priapus, the Ephesian Diana, the Venus Aphrodite (Higgins, *Anac.*, I. 48, 70), the Venus Urania at Rome, and the Venus of the Cyprians, both of which are represented bearded (Sir William Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 254; Faber, III. 75), Janus, Venus coupled with Adonis, Attis coupled with Cybele, and Mercury (Faber, III. 76-79). It becomes quite intelligible, in view of these ideas held by the surrounding nations, that the Jews, in adopting their cosmogonies, should have followed them in delineating the Creator as of human form, and with the sexual characteristics.

The Creator being thus physically constituted, it was natural to picture him as needing repose after his special exertions in creation. The Jews accordingly represent him as taking a seventh day of rest after the six of his unusual labours. This implies that the task of creation had been brought to a close, that the action of the Creator was over, and that henceforth the laws of nature sufficed, without his intervention, to maintain and renew the objects created. Such, however, modern research enables us to assure ourselves, has not been the case. The geological deposits show us an ever existing development of fresh forms, on land and below the waters, occurring from the first dawn of life upon the globe to the present day. The processes of creation are incessant, and there is no time when they can be said to have been interrupted or closed.

The last form for which Genesis gives place is man. The daily creation of the Infusoria contradicts such a statement abundantly. The presence of parasites, vegetal and animal, infesting all organized objects, is also continuous evidence of after creation.

"Of animal-parasitism we have various kinds: severally

involving their specialities of distribution. We have that kind in which one creature uses another for purposes of locomotion; as the *Chelonobia* uses the turtle, and as a certain *Actinia* uses the shell inhabited by a hermit-crab. We have that kind in which one creature habitually accompanies another to share its prey; like the annelid which takes up its abode in the shell occupied by a hermit-crab, and snatches from the hermit-crab the morsels of food it is eating. We have again the commoner parasitism of the *Epizoa*—animals which attach themselves to the surfaces of other animals, and feed on their juices or on their secretions. And once more, we have the equally common parasitism of the *Entozoa*—creatures which live within other creatures" (H. Spencer, *Prin. of Bio.*, I. 313, 314).

"Plums develop animals we call 'bloom.' Peas are the prey of a white parasite, which looks like filmy wool. All nature teems with life. The tiniest insect, springing from a drop of rain-water exposed to the sun, is replete with others of stranger forms still. The blue beetle has a swarm of parasites between its arms, and they again are the source and prey of others. There is no end of life" (*Approx. to Truth*, 17, 18).

"Besides being restricted in its distribution to the bodies of the organisms it infests, each species of parasite has usually still narrower limitations; in some cases the infested organisms furnish fit habitats for the parasites only in certain regions; and in other cases, only when in certain constitutional states" (H. Spencer, I., 314).

"Of the animal kingdom, as a whole, more than half the species are parasites. 'The number of these parasites,' says Prof. Owen, 'may be conceived when it is stated that almost every known animal has its peculiar species, and generally more than one, sometimes as many as, or even more kinds than, infest the human body.' . . . The human body is the habitat of parasites, internal and external, animal and vegetal, numbering, if all were set down, some two or three dozen species, sundry of which are peculiar to man" (H. Spencer, I., 342, 343). If there were no men, observes Prof. Huxley, there would be no tape worms (*Lect. to Working Men*, 122). Some appear to appertain only to certain races of man, and can have acquired their special existence only after the division

of races had been established. Pedicula, or lice, observes Mr Darwin, are found in different countries on different races of man. They vary, he informs us, in colour, and the structure of their claws and limbs, and these differences have been found constant. Those on the Sandwich Islanders which have strayed on to the bodies of English sailors, died in the course of three or four days (*The Descent of Man*, I., 219).

The parasitical plants equally abound, and occupy both vegetation and animals. The mistletoe, mosses, and lichens, appear on vegetable forms, and the fungoid growths also invade animal forms, as in the instance so fatal to the silk-worm.

That man has preceded the parasites which infest him is sufficiently apparent, so that every nip which he suffers from these invaders of his peace is a protest to him against the truth of Genesis. It is also clear, from the ancient cave deposits, that he has preceded all the more important terrestrial animal forms now on earth, and was contemporaneous with their predecessors which are now extinct.*

That the Creator terminated his labours with the creation of man has therefore not been the case. Equally is it untrue that he has ever required to rest from his labours, or has done so. The idea of such rest is again of eastern origin.

The Veda represents the occurrence of a succession of dissolutions and fresh creations, caused by the Creator reposing in sleep, and waking up again to activity (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, III. 304). "When that power awakes, then has this world its full expansion; but, when he slumbers with a tranquil spirit, then the whole system fades away;" after which the effects on created objects of the Creator's sleep are described. "Thus," it is added, "that immutable power, by waking and reposing alternately, revivifies and destroys, in eternal succession, this whole assemblage of locomotive and immoveable creatures" (Manu. i. 52-57). "The Creator Hari (Vishnu) sleeps upon the ocean, in the form of Brahmá. . . . When the universal spirit wakes, the world revives. . . . Awaking at the end of his night, the unborn, Vishnu, in the character of Brahmá, creates the universe anew" (Wilson, *Vishnu Purána*, 634). The necessity for the Creator's repose is

* "The Development of Creation on the Earth," 50-52.

significantly shown in the Taittiríya Bráhmana. "Prajápati created living beings. He felt himself emptied. . . . Prajápati, after creating living beings, lay exhausted. . . . Prajápati, after creating living beings, was paralysed. Becoming a heart, he slept" (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, I. 68). The Hebrew writer, as a mere copyist, has adopted the circumstantialities—the sexual conformation, and the repose—without apparently apprehending the import of the myth.

It is thus, it may be judged, from the Hindú conception of the Creator needing renovation that the Hebrews have got their seventh holy day of rest. Seven is a sacred number with the Hindús. They have seven streams, seven oceans, cities, divisions of the world, Rishis, Adityas, horses of the sun, flames or tongues of fire, sacrificial rites, steps at marriage, etc. (*Sansk. Dict.* 1064). In like manner the Jews have clean beasts in sevens in the ark, seven years of plenty and seven of famine foreseen by Joseph, the feast of Pentecost appointed seven sabbaths after a given day, the seventh year to be a sabbatical rest for the land, a jubilee appointed after seven times seven years, Balaam's offering of seven oxen and seven rams on seven altars, the offering of Job's friends of seven bullocks and seven rams, the blood of the sacrificial bullock to be sprinkled seven times, the altar to be sprinkled seven times with oil, the leper to be sprinkled seven times with blood, etc., and seven times with oil, Naaman to wash seven times in Jordan, the walls of Jericho to be encompassed seven days, and on the seventh day seven times, when seven priests were to blow upon seven trumpets, Samson to be bound with seven withies, and the seven locks of his hair to be wove together.

This closes what I have to say in relation to the first or Elohistic account of the creation, in parting with which Dr Gladstone would only be bidding adieu to feeble adaptations of long-standing oriental myths. The next, or Jehovistic account, is of similar character.

We are told that man was formed of the dust of the earth, after which the Creator breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and thus constituted him a living soul. Biblicists are apt to count much upon this description as showing the divine origination of man's immortal being. I doubt not the fact of

the immortality, but the account given of the formation of the man is assuredly erroneous in all its particulars. It is not thus that organized beings are evolved; nor are they made of the solid materials alleged.* We have here the well known Greek legend of Prometheus, both as to material and manipulation. "According to Apollodorus, Prometheus made the first man and woman that ever were upon the earth, with clay, which he animated by means of the fire which he had stolen from heaven" (Anthon's *Lemp.*). Hesiod describes the formation of Pandora, the first woman, after a similar fashion. She was moulded of clay, and then Athene breathed into the figure the breath of life (Cox, *Myth. of Aryan Nations*, II. 208). The like representations occur in accounting for the reproduction of the race after the flood of Deucalion. Stephanus has the tradition that Zeus ordered Prometheus and Minerva to make images of clay in the form of men, and when they were finished he called the winds to breathe into them, and thus gave them life. Lucian has a similar legend, but attributes to Minerva the imparting the breath of life (Bryant, *Anc. Myth.*, III. 14, 15). The whole appears to have been derived from an Egyptian conception. "Sitting as a potter at his wheel, Cneph (at Philœ) moulds clay, and gives the spirit of life to the nostrils of Osiris" (Palmer, *Egyp. Chron.*, I. 2). The Hebrew prophets have adopted the same rather obvious imagery. "Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel" (Jer. xviii. 6). "Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou?" (Isa. xlv. 9). And it is made much of also in the Christian scriptures (Rom. ix. 2).

The locality in which man is placed is the Garden of Eden, which is watered by a river flowing from it in four streams, and it possesses among its vegetation two notable plants, one the tree of life, the other the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, of the fruit of which latter Adam was forbidden to eat.

The Semitic and Aryan nations had a common belief in a paradise situated near the sources of the Oxus and Jaxartes (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 159, citing Spiegel). In the ruins of Nineveh, numerous fragments of clay tablets, inscribed with

* "The Development of Creation on the Earth," pp. 7-9.

cuneiform characters, have been discovered, from which, when pieced together, various legends are decipherable. Sir Henry Rawlinson says they consist of transcripts made in the seventh century B.C., from earlier documents which "evidently belonged to a period long anterior to the exodus of the original Hebrew colony under Abraham from Ur." Among these legends is an account of the terrestrial paradise, which, it appears, owes its name of the garden of Eden, adopted in the Hebrew scriptures, to the vernacular title of the province of Babylonia, namely, Gan-Eden. The four streams in Eden, Sir Henry identifies as the Tigris and the Euphrates, each consisting of double streams (*46th Report of Royal As. Soc.*). Mount Meru, "the Olympus of Hindú mythology," is irrigated in the same way as the Jewish Eden. "The river Ganges falls from heaven on its summit, and flows thence to the surrounding worlds in four streams" (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 795). The Buddhists have the like feature for their Mount Sinéru, and the Scandinavians have four primeval rivers of milk for their sacred Asgard, the abode of happiness (*Edin. Rev.*, art. Pre-Christian Cross).

The tree of life is traceable to the Persian paradise. "The Haoma is the first of the trees, planted by Ahura Mazda in the fountain of life. He who drinks of its juice never dies." (Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, II. 471, citing Dr Windischmann.) This tree of life of the Persians is the source of the living water of life (Barlow, *on Symbolism*, 115, 116). The original is the Soma of the Hindús, early deified by them, the sap of which was the beverage of the gods, and when drank by mortals made them, like the gods, immortal (Muir, V. 258, 262). The Hebrews have exactly adopted the idea: "And Jahveh Elohim said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: therefore Jahveh Elohim sent him forth from the garden of Eden, . . . and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." The puerility and materiality of this exhibition of the source of eternal life, will, it is to be hoped, be readily admitted, when it is seen from what quarters these notions have come. The Egyptians had the same imagery, but reserved their tree of life, and water of life, for the reno-

vation of the souls of the saved, as in the Christian figuration (Rev. ii. 7; xxi. 6; xxii. 1, 2, 17). "Sometimes the tree of life, with the goddess Neith in its branches, is one of the trees in the paradise which the deceased enters" (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 66). The author, at p. 20, gives a drawing of the goddess thus placed in the tree, pouring the water of life into the soul of a deceased priest. "Rosellini, in his great work on Egypt, has a scene in paradise, taken from a tomb at Thebes, in which several generations of an Egyptian family, which flourished under the eighteenth dynasty up to the time of Rameses III., or from the sixteenth century B.C. to the thirteenth, are represented partaking of this immortal nourishment, the fruit of the tree of life, and receiving also the water of life, proceeding from the same divine source" (Barlow, *On Symbolism*, 59).

It was the policy of the learned, among the ancients, to exclude the common people from access to the means of knowledge. The priesthood ordinarily monopolized the learning, and had their advantage in holding down the multitude in subjection under them, debarred from the exercise of intelligence, which, if possessed, would have rendered them independent. The Hebrews have attributed this unworthy jealousy to the Creator in his relations with the worms of his creation. The tree of knowledge had no noxious qualities. It was "good for food," "pleasant to the eyes," and "a tree to be desired to make one wise." It was in the purpose of God to withhold from man the wisdom needed to guide him in his course. The "beasts of the field" had their "subtlety," but he was not to know good from evil, and when he had helped himself to the source of enlightenment, namely, the material fruit of this tree, the jealousy of his maker was excited. "Behold," he said, "the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil," and in his wrath he drove him out of the garden. Godfrey Higgins notices the association that has obtained between trees and literature. "Liber" is at once the inner bark of the tree, and the "book" inscribed upon this material (*Anac.*, II. 164). The Egyptians used the inner bark of the papyrus reed for the purpose, and the Hindús still inscribe documents upon palm leaves. "When we consider," observes Mr Higgins, "that the leaves of a book

were really the leaves of a tree, the allegory of the tree of knowledge almost rises as a natural consequence" (II. 250). Thus the oak and the beech gave out the oracles at Dodona, and the letters of the old Irish alphabet, he informs us, were called after the names of trees (II. 165, 166).

The last object created according to this Jehovistic account, was woman. The man had to feel his destitution. To afford him possible companionship, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air were formed and brought to him. "But for Adam there was not found an helpmeet for him." Thereupon he was cast into a deep sleep, and a rib, as our translators have it, was taken from his side, from which Eve was made. "This," then, said Adam, "is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh." "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."

The Creator, we have seen, was fashioned with the characteristics of the two sexes, figuring, as the Hindú *Ardha-Nari*, with one side male and the other female. According to the Vedas, as also according to Manu, the Creator, thus constituted, "fell in twain," and "becoming male and female," procreated all living forms. Man, being made after the image of his Maker, should in like manner have had this twofold development of the sexes, and the Jewish Rabbins maintain that such was the case. The word צֵלָע (tzaléh), rendered "rib," primarily signifies "the side" of anything. It is used in Exod. xxv. 12 to denote the side of the ark; in 2 Sam. xvi. 13 for the side of a hill; and in Job xviii. 12 Jer. xx. 10 for destruction at one's side (Parkhurst). The Rabbins support themselves in their interpretation by appealing to the mixed use of the singular and plural in the description of Adam's formation. "In the image of Elohim created he *him*, male and female created he *them*." Eve thus representing a side of Adam, could be truly said to be "bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh," a description which a mere rib would not so completely warrant. "The bone of woman," observes Manu, "is united with the bone of man, and her flesh with his flesh, as completely as a stream becomes one with the sea into which it flows" (ix. 22, 45). Plato, in

his *Convivium*, says that at first the sexes were conjoined in the same figure, but Jupiter divided them into two (Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, III. 109). In this manner "from Osiris is formed Isis, his sister and wife, the mother of all living" (Palmer, *Egyp. Chron.*, I. 2). So also Typhon, according to Plutarch, was born from the side of Rhea (Faber, II. 249; Kenrick, *Anc. Egyp.*, I. 408), and Buddha, pursuant to the Lala Vistara, from his mother's side (Prof. Wilson's *Essays*, II. 338).

The period when these acts of creation were effected is given, in the received version of the Bible, as having been the year B.C. 4004, or 5878 years ago. The statement has misled multitudes, and would have continued to do so, but for its refutation by the students of nature, and the Biblical overthrow has here been so complete that few are now to be met with who will venture to confine the history of the earth and its inhabitants to this circumscribed period. "If," says Mr Charles Brooke, one of the writers for the Christian Evidence Society, in reference to the evidence of antiquity afforded by a fossil bone or shell, "the teachings of geology and palæontology be admitted, it must likewise be admitted that the Mosaic account of the creation is not susceptible of a literal interpretation" (*Lecture on the Evidence to the Existence of a God*). For a time, while it was allowed that the deposition of the strata of the earth, stocked as these are with fossils of plants and animals, required the intervention of ages, the stand was made that there was no evidence that man had appeared on the globe before the period assigned to him in Genesis. The age of the earth, and of the lower forms, was to be accounted for by converting the days of Genesis into periods of any required length; but man stood at the close of these periods, and the specific dates associated with him expressed an exactitude which was not to be overcome by any possible conversion of time. But overwhelming evidence to man's vast antiquity having been obtained in the progress of research, we have to observe how the Biblicists are prepared to meet this insuperable difficulty.

"It is quite possible," observes Bishop Harold Browne in the *Speaker's Commentary*, "to believe that Genesis gives us no certain data for pronouncing on the time of man's existence on the earth. The only arguments are to be drawn

from the genealogies. As those given by the Evangelists are confessedly incomplete, there cannot be sufficient reason for maintaining that those in Genesis must have been complete. It is true that we have only conjecture to lead us here; but if the genealogies, before and after the Flood, present us only with the names of leading and 'representative' men, we can then allow no small latitude to those who would extend the duration of man upon the earth to more than the commonly received six thousand years. The appearance of completeness in the genealogies is an undoubted difficulty, yet perhaps not insuperable, when we consider all that may have happened (nowhere more probably than here) in the transmission of the text from Moses to Ezra, and from Ezra to the destruction of Jerusalem. . . . It is well known that there have been some few designed corruptions in the text of the New Testament. It need not surprise us, therefore, if we find reason to think that there were some attempts of a like kind in the text of the Old Testament. . . . And though we believe in the Divine guidance and inspiration of the original writer, we have no right to expect that a miraculous power should have so watched over the transmission of the records, as to have preserved them from all possible errors of transcription, though a special Providence may have guarded them from such loss or mutilation as would have weakened their testimony to Divine and spiritual truth" (I. 62).

It is apparent that the Bishop is attempting to frame an apology, in the consciousness of its weakness and insufficiency. The object to be sustained is a divine record, the vehicle of unerring truth. The apology deals with one that is of uncertain tendency as to its facts; one that is incomplete in its details, and has been tampered with in some parts, and may be equally unreliable in those which are now in question; one for the honest and safe transmission of which to ourselves, through a period of over some three thousand years, we have no adequate security. We are, however, nevertheless to recognize "the divine guidance and inspiration of the original writer," though he has come down to us in such defective and questionable guise.

Dr Gladstone, of the Christian Evidence Society, meets

these difficulties in a similar manner, at the expense of the integrity of the record, and with advancing freedom. "It may be," he says, "that not one of the arguments of either the philologist, the ethnologist, the antiquarian, or the geologist, is absolutely conclusive; but together they form a strong cumulative proof of the inadequacy of the current chronology which is founded on the genealogical tables of Genesis, while there seem to be no arguments of weight on the other side. Here, then, there is more than a supposed collision between science and the letter of the Scripture. Yet it requires no great scholarship to satisfy ourselves that the computation of the date of Adam, as made from the received Hebrew, or the Septuagint, or Peschito versions, will differ by many centuries; that the figures in Genesis v. have been tampered with in early days; that genealogies, even in the New Testament, are purposely curtailed; that one man is sometimes said to be the son of another, though elsewhere it appears that many have intervened between them; and that the genealogical lists after the flood refer, partially at least, to the descent, not of individuals, but of nations—one nation being said to have begotten other nations. As therefore it is evident that these lists of names are intended to indicate only the line of descent, and not every step on the road, as they have suffered in transmission, and as we cannot always in the earlier records distinguish between nations and individuals, we need not consider ourselves bound to any chronology deduced from them" (*Lecture on Points of Supposed Collision between the Scriptures and Natural Science*).

Bishop Harold Browne, doubtless not foreseeing that the difference between Genesis and fact, as to the antiquity of the human race, involves a question, not of centuries, or of thousands of years, but certainly of hundreds of thousands, and possibly of millions,* mildly offers some "small latitude" to those who would extend his time beyond the conventional six thousand years. Dr Gladstone, seeing farther, is prepared for the more decisive measure of excision of the convicted or tainted portion of the sacred record, in the hope of still saving the residue as wholesome sustenance. Where such a process, when once instituted, is to stop, is of course subject for con-

* "The Development of Creation on the Earth," 50-60.

sideration. The learned doctor is ready to part with the Elohistic narrative of the creation, and now is prepared to give up, as useless for any practical purposes, those sections which involve the early genealogies. The sacred writers are with him uninspired, and inaccurate, in what relates to natural phenomena, and are not to be trusted in their chronological details. What assurance there may be, for minds thus disturbed, in the soundness and inspiration of the further delineations, it becomes, with concessions such as these, difficult to understand.

2. OUR FIRST PARENTS.

The account in Genesis leaves it to be understood that the whole race of man has been derived from the couple who are said to have been created and placed in the Garden of Eden. It is so authoritatively declared in the later scripture. "God that made the world and all things therein, . . . hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth" (Acts xvii. 24, 26). "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22). So that Adam is the head of the whole physical family, as Christ is of the spiritual. Accordingly all the genealogies, embracing the patriarchs of all the nations known to the writers of the biblical narratives, are derived from this one stock. Such a representation involves a serious violation of the laws of nature, not likely to have been involved, as a fixed necessity, in the very scheme of the creation. There are few offences more revolting to the feelings of mankind than the perpetration of incest. But Adam's children had no other means of continuing their species except by intermarrying with one another. There is a strong aversion implanted in mankind to such intercourse, and nature makes her protest against its occurrence by the degeneration of the offspring raised where the consanguity is close. On the other hand, the interbreeding of unconnected families is as marked by beneficial results. (For illustration in the instance of the inferior forms, see Darwin on *Animals and Plants under Domestication*, Chap. xvii.). In the later divine legislation such incestuous union was absolutely prohibited, the guilty being laid under a curse, and condemned to be cut off for the sin (*Lev.* xviii. 9;

xx. 17; *Deut.* xxvii. 22). It is impossible that these laws can express the mind of the deity, and that at the same time he can have placed man on earth under circumstances to leave him no option but to commit the offensive transgression. The narrator evades the difficulty by not naming the early wives.

The diversities of races afford a fertile source of evidence against the unity of the species, which has never been overcome by those who assert the unity. Mr Darwin is one of these. At some very remote era he supposes there has been a derivation of all races of men from some common progenitor. He allows that differences of colour are not to be attributed to difference of climate, and concludes, "We have thus far been baffled in all our attempts to account for the differences between the races of man." Thereupon he points to sexual selection as an agent in effecting change, but adds, "I do not intend to assert that sexual selection will account for all the differences between the races," and thus he virtually abandons the field (*The Descent of Man*, I., 229, 241, 242, 249).

The difficulty is enormously increased to the Biblicists, who have to limit the period during which the observed differences have been eliminated to the time that has elapsed since the Noachic deluge, when the human race are said to have been represented by the one family then saved, or to a period of but now 4223 years.

There are many shades of difference among the races of man as occupying various portions of the globe, the most decided of which may be said to be the white races of Europe, the coloured races of Asia, the black of Africa, the yellow of China, and the red of America, all having other distinguishing traits of feature, form, and character. Of such as these, Voltaire has remarked, that it is only for a blind man to doubt that they represent distinct stocks (*Types of Mankind*, xliv.). These are very persistent in the maintenance of their peculiarities. "No one ever saw a Negro, Mongol, or (American) Indian, born from any but his own species" (*Ibid.*, 58). It is impossible to show that the complexion of a pure primitive stock has been altered by climate (*Ibid.*, 72).

Dr Carl Vogt, in his Lectures on Man, has closely examined the distinguishing traits of the negro, that race which above

all others stands out in marked contrast to the rest of the human species. The negro has a specific odour which cannot be eradicated, wash and feed him as you will (126). The hair of the straight-haired races is cylindrical, being, in section, perfectly circular, and provided with a medullary canal; that of the negro is flattened, and in section presents an elongated ellipsis, and is without a medullary canal (127, 128). The nose of the negro is broad and flat, the nostrils being greater in width than they are in height, which is the reverse in the Caucasian face (129). The negro's leg is calfless (137), his facial angle is less by from ten to fifteen degrees than that of a Caucasian (140), his foot is broad, flat, and low in the heel (156). He is lengthier than the white man in the arm, hands, and feet, shorter in the neck, and leaner in the limbs (173). In all these differing features Dr Carl Vogt observes the negro presents a decided approximation to the simious form; and as there are close graduations through all animated forms, the negro, it may be assumed, constitutes a persistent type, standing a step nearer than the white races in outward configuration to the ape.

"It is now known to every educated reader that the Egyptians, from the earliest times of which vestiges remain, viz., the IIIrd and IVth dynasties, were in the habit of decorating their temples, royal and private tombs, &c., with paintings and sculptures of an historical character; and that a voluminous, though interrupted series of such hieroglyphical monuments and papyri, is preserved to the present day. These sculptures and paintings not only yield us innumerable portraits of the Egyptians themselves, but also of an infinitude of foreign people with whom they held intercourse through wars or commerce. They have portrayed their allies, their enemies, their captives, servants, and slaves; and we possess, therefore, thus faithfully delineated, most, if not all, the Asiatic and African races known to the Egyptians 3500 years ago—races which are recognized as identical with those that occupy the same countries at the present day" (*Types of Mankind*, 143). Of these numerous illustrations are given, copied from Rosellini's plates and Lepsius' Denkmäler. We have it, therefore, exhibited to us, ocularly, that such strongly distinguished types as the Arab, Egyptian, Nubian, and Negro,

have been as they now are from within a few centuries of the alleged Noachic deluge. And as we see no change at any time wrought in these types, it is fair to assume that they have ever been what we now observe them to be. There are many other divergent races which are equally to be accounted for as having proceeded from so many original independent stocks, in keeping with all other manifestations in nature, where we meet with associations of forms accompanied by endless diversities. And in no other way than by allowing of these various original stocks can we account for the earth having been found peopled, from the remotest known times, in its various isolated, and, in primitive days, inaccessible regions.* The earliest traces of man, consisting of the rude implements of flint he has left behind him, are so wide spread and distinct as to constitute an epoch, which is termed the age of stone. These remains occur everywhere. They are found in all parts of Europe, its islands and continents, and at the same time in Syria, Egypt, India, and America (Lubbock, *Primitive Condition of Man*, 315; *Pre.-hist. Times*, 62, 71, 235).

That the human race descended from one original pair was the common thought of the ancient nations. According to the Hebrew narrative, when the female was formed, the man said she should be called אשה, marginal reading Isha (Gen. ii. 23), and he assigned her the name of Eve, "because she was the mother of all living." This identifies her with Isis, "the universal mother." In the name Adam, "A" is a formative affix, and "dam" means primarily "blood," and secondarily "red." The Egyptians styled themselves "red men," and in their pictorial representations invariably gave themselves this distinguishing colour (*Types of Mankind*, 563, 572, 573). Isis, as we have seen, was formed from the person of Osiris, as Eve from that of Adam. It is evident, therefore, that the Hebrews have drawn their idea of the first parents from an Egyptian source.

3. THE FALL.

This incident forms the concluding portion of the second or Jehovistic account of the creation, and its features involve

* "The Development of Creation on the Earth," 28-31.

some further serious conflict between the statements of the two narratives. The first account ended in blessing, the Creator recording his perfect satisfaction with all the objects he had made. "And Elohim saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good." So he ended by the commemoration of the seventh day of rest, which he "blessed" and "sanctified," appointing it thus to be passed in holy adoration of himself through endless ages (Isa. lxvi. 23). Now, if the Creator was so thoroughly satisfied of the perfect goodness of all he had called into being, why immediately put man to the proof to know the measure of his goodness? And did not the experiment contradict him, and show, by the issue of the temptation, that man was not so very good? None of the "fallen" race could have behaved worse under the trial than did Adam. The existence of the serpent, endowed with great subtlety, and acting in deceit to overthrow man's allegiance to his maker, is also violently opposed to the entire goodness of the creation maintained by the Elohistic writer. And how could a "blessed" day continue "sanctified" to a fallen and outcast race, living in a world "cursed" by the Creator "for their sakes," as the Jehovist describes to have been the consequence of the fall? Furthermore, while the Elohist lays down the divine prohibition to take animal life, the Jehovist has the Creator violating his own law by clothing Adam and Eve with the skins of slaughtered beasts.

The tale we have now to consider of the Fall has been framed in order to account for what is currently termed the entry of sin into the world. The purpose is to represent mankind as placed under a moral trial. We are subject to such trials, but with us the temptation is to perform some evil act, consciously, for the sake of some fancied gain; the end being to our moral detriment, certainly, if not also to our material disadvantage. But the object placed before Adam was of a beneficial nature, such as, when acquired, raised within him a faculty such as characterized the divine being himself. Formed in the physical image of his maker, he was now attaining to his moral image, and this is treated as sin. Moreover, the trial was imposed upon him when he was destitute of all means of judgment. We never punish an infant or an imbecile who cannot distinguish right from

wrong, and such was the declared condition of the first parents when put upon their trial. Furthermore, when training the inexperienced, exhortation and remonstrance are our first resorts. We seek remedial, not punitive measures. But this one transgression of these defectively constituted beings brings down upon them a terrible and irrevocable sentence, in which, especially according to the further teaching of the Christian scriptures, their unborn offspring, through all generations, were included.

The judgment incurred was that they were driven from their pleasant position in Eden to the outer world, which was stricken with barrenness for their reception, and were subjected to toil, pain, sickness, and death, the curse of the Creator resting henceforth upon them and all associated with them. When we transgress the laws of nature, physical or moral, we reap the precise corresponding consequences. Our sufferings read us a direct lesson to avoid the evil we may have been guilty of. The avenger is such as a teacher. In the instance of the alleged penalties entailed upon mankind, through the transgression of the first parents, there is no such instruction conveyed. Toil is beneficial to body, mind, and soul, and productive of substantial remuneration. It is the lot of the most honest and harmless portion of mankind, the wicked and dishonest evading it. Pain and sickness visit the just equally as the unjust, and the troubles of childbirth, which are particularly expressed, occur in the common course of nature, and terminate joyfully. "A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow, because her hour hath come; but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world" (John, xvi. 21). The evangelist gives his testimony adversely to the thought of the Jewish scribe. Death also is the universal portion of all animated natures. None of the circumstances embraced in the sentence passed carry with them any sense of being punitively sent.

The agent for the temptation is a serpent, described as more subtle than any other of the animal creation which had been formed. Subtlety implies possessing the means of judgment, so as to be able to weigh consequences and choose the more eligible course, in view of gaining some advantage over

another. The animals, consequently, were more highly endowed than man who knew not good from evil. The serpent thus acting was cursed above all other animals, and, as a special punishment, reduced to go thenceforth upon his belly, and to subsist on dust. But we know that he has always thus moved from the remotest ages, as his fossil remains indicate; that in this movement he is graceful and surpassingly agile; that his form is not a monstrosity assigned to him in punishment, but is one of the innumerable manifestations of the resources of the Almighty in varying his creation; and that dust is not his food.*

The aspect given to the Creator in passing his imperfect judgment is the reverse of elevating. The sentence is not expressed as that of a thoughtful discriminative judge, bound to punish while unwilling to afflict. His utterings are in the shape of cursings, as the ebullitions of wrath. The woman's seed and the serpent's seed are set against each other in mere brute hostility. The one was to be bruised on his heel, and the other on his head. The earth is cursed with sterility for the sake of man. One such curse, heartily pronounced by the originator and upholder of all things, would obliterate creation. But the earth stands in perpetual refutation of the Jewish scribe. It teems with regions of surpassing beauty and fertility, and in lieu of producing nothing but thorns and thistles, it liberally remunerates the labour of man. The impotency of the cursing is manifested in its repetitions, the Creator being made to go on cursing through Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, and the further books, until the process culminates in the end of all at the book of Revelation. No one having a real sense of the Almighty could thus represent him. The portraiture is that of a coarse and ignorant mind. We have its type among the Hindús when they had become debased by their advanced mythologies. "By the curse of Siva was Brahmá deprived of temples and worship; Siva himself was deprived of his share of sacrifices by the curse of Daksha; Vishnu's *avatars* were the consequence of his being cursed by Bhrigu; and the thousand eyes of Indra were substituted, as an alleviation of a curse pronounced by Gautama, for other unseemly marks of the saint's displeasure. In short, the

* "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" 109-111.

whole Hindú mythology rests principally on the effects produced by such curses; and on the devotional means adopted for procuring liberation from their effects" (Vans Kennedy, *Hind. Myth.* 178, 179).

It has been the common idea of the ancients that the earliest age was one of innocence and happiness. The Hindús have their *Krita* or *Satya Yuga*, the terms signifying that which is good, pure, and virtuous. Men were then sinless and longlived, and all nature smiled upon them. The Greeks adopted the four ages of the Hindús, and made of the first a golden age, during which there was neither sickness, old age, or death (Faber, *Or. of Pag. Idol.*, II. 21). After this came in sin and degeneration. We easily trace the Hebrew copyings here. Plato taught that mankind, in their primitive condition, lived a life of happiness on fruits, without the labour of agriculture, and not needing clothing. He held also that they then could hold converse with the brute creation (Deane, *Serpent Worship*, 301). The condition in Eden is visibly before us. Manu, in specifying the various acts in creation, has it that the self-existent then made "distinctions between right and wrong, pleasure and pain" (i. 26), bringing before us another feature in Genesis.

The ascribing the origin of evil to the agency of the serpent, was a very early common conception. In the Rig-Veda, Indra, the supreme being, is placed in hostility with Vritra, appearing as "the hideous serpent Ahi" (Baring-Gould, *Curious Myths*, 38). "Among the ancient Iranians the same myth prevailed, but was sublimated into a conflict between good and evil. Ahriman represents Ahi, and is the principle of evil. . . . Ahriman entered heaven in the shape of a dragon" (*Ibid.* 40). "If Ahura-Mazda forms a delicious spot in a world previously desert and uninhabitable, so as to become the first home of his favourites, the Aryans; Angró-Mainyus (Ahriman, or Satan) ruins it, by sending into it a poisonous serpent" (Inman, *Anc. Faiths*, II. 832, quoting from Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*). Bishop Colenso, citing Kleuker from (Kalisch) Ulitzsch on Genesis, gives an exact picture of the Hebrew version of the temptation as appearing in the Zendavesta. "The first couple, the parents of the human race, Meshia and Meshiane, lived originally in purity and innocence. Perpetual happiness

was promised to them by Ormuzd, the creator of every good gift, if they persevered in their virtue. But an evil demon (*Dev*) was sent to them by Ahriman, the representative of everything noxious and sinful. He appeared unexpectedly in the form of a serpent, and gave them the fruit of a wonderful tree, *Hom*, which imparted immortality, and had the powers of restoring the dead to life. Thus evil inclinations entered their hearts; all their moral excellence was destroyed. Ahriman himself appeared under the form of the same reptile, and completed the work of seduction. They acknowledged him instead of Ormuzd as the creator of everything good; and the consequence was, that they forfeited for ever the internal happiness for which they were destined. They killed beasts, and clothed themselves in their skins; they built houses, but paid not their debt of gratitude to the Deity" (*Pentateuch*, IV. 152).

The vehicle of the temptation is the woman, as in Hesiod's well known legend of Pandora. She, as Eve, was the first created woman. The gods richly endowed her, whence she got her name (Πᾶν δῶρον, "every gift"). Last of all, Jupiter gave her a beautiful box which she was to present to the man she married. He accordingly accepted and opened it, when the innumerable evils and distempers to which the human race are subject were let loose. Hope remained at the bottom of the box (Anthon's *Lemp.*), a figure which Biblicists are in the habit of realizing in the crushing of the serpent's head by the woman's seed of which the Hebrew narrator speaks. The Grecian legend required that the fatal gift should pass between wife and husband, apparently denoting that the connubial tie was the channel for generating evil among mankind. The Hebrew scribe, in like manner, makes Eve take the forbidden fruit and pass it on to her husband, whereupon, to indicate the sexual connection, they are made first to entertain a sense of their nakedness.

The woman's seed was to bruise the serpent's head. This brings before us the action of Krishna in his contest with the serpent Kaliya. In the Vishnu Purána it is described how he "set his foot upon the hitherto unbended head, and danced upon it in triumph." "Many bruises," it is added, "were inflicted on the head by the pressure of the toes of

Krishna" (Wilson, 514). The representations of Krishna, at one time encircled by the folds of the serpent, and at another trampling him under foot, are found in Sonnerat, and no Vaishnuvite of distinction is without these images executed in gold, silver, or copper (Maurice, *Hist. of Hindostan*, part 3, pref. vii., citing Sir Wm. Jones). The figure is a common type of the overthrow of evil. "The quarrel between mankind and the great serpent is the subject of the sculptures in the (Egyptian) tombs, and it always ends with the enemy being conquered, and usually taken prisoner, though sometimes killed." "The serpent of evil, the great enemy of the human race, plays an important part in all pictures and sculptures relating to the next world." Among other forms it is depicted "pierced through the head by the spear of Isis" (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 33, 45). We have also Mitra, in the Persian legends, conquering the serpent Ahi; Feridun destroying the dragon Zohak (Baring-Gould, *Curious Myths*, 40, 41); and in the Greek, Apollo killing Python (*Ibid.*, 37); Perseus, the Libyan dragon (Cox, *Manual of Myth.*, 84), and Jason that of Colchis (Authon's *Lemp.*). The Hebrew conception is also traceable in the legend of Hercules destroying the dragon placed over the golden fruit in the garden of the Hesperides (*Ibid.*).

When the guilty couple are ejected from Eden, cherubim are placed there to prevent their ever again having access to the favoured spot. The cherubim and seraphim are composite creatures of mixed human and animal forms who are in attendance upon the Hebrew divinity. The former is ordinarily taken to be the type of the ox, and the latter of the serpent. In Parkhurst's *Lexicon* is a lengthy article on the cherubim, which are considered to be the same as the seraphim, these being of serpent form. The garden of the Hesperides was guarded, as we have seen, as Eden, by a dragon. The golden fleece, which was the object of the expedition of the Argonauts, was similarly guarded. Mount Meru, according to the Mahá-bhárata, is protected from the approach of sinful men by dreadful serpents (Maurice, *Hist. of Hind.*, I., 488, 489; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, II., 132, 133).

The serpent, as a mythological emblem, has presented

strong attraction to the mind of man in ancient times in all countries. The worship of this animal is to be traced in almost every religion throughout Asia, Europe, Africa, and America (Deane, *Serpent Worship*, 32). It is among the earliest forms of worship occurring in every country of the old world, and existed in the new world before its discovery by us (Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, 1). Mr Deane has found evidences of the worship of the serpent in India, Cashmere, Persia, Scythia, Chaldea, Egypt, Phœnicia, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, Scandinavia, Britain, Ireland, Congo, China, Mexico, and Peru. Mr Fergusson adds the Pacific Isles and Australia, and he has traced the worship of the tree and serpent, mostly in combination together, in Persia, Babylonia, Egypt, Phœnicia, Sarmatia, Athens, Scandinavia, Whidah (Africa), America, and among the Buddhists of India and Ceylon. The Hebrews, when unfaithful to Jahveh, associated groves in their worship, and adored the serpent.

Bishop Harold Browne, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, has found himself obliged to allow the identity of the Zoroastrian and Hebrew versions of the fall of man, and suggests how the correspondence may have been brought about. "The Persians," he says, "of all people except the Hebrews, were the most likely to have retained the memory of primitive traditions, and secondly, Zoroaster was probably brought into contact with the Hebrews, and with the prophet Daniel in the court of Darius, and may have learned much from such association." He designates the legend as "the great Semitic tradition," for which he claims the possibility of a "real historic basis" (I. 36, 49). But if the legend is to be accepted as a tradition, resting on an historic basis, it is removed at once from the sphere of revelation. It is a tale that has passed, through human channels, from mouth to mouth; it may be founded on truth, or otherwise; it may be accurately reported, or seriously impaired by exaggerations and direct misrepresentation. We must take it for what it is worth, and require to know the channels of its transmission. The learned bishop calls it "primeval," but we know nothing of its primitive origin, and nothing of its transmitters. We have records of the religious views of a very ancient race, the early Aryans. There were among them faint germs for

such a legend, but they were far from having the legend itself. We meet with it first among an offset from this stock, at a time when mythological fancies had begun to take solid shapes. Because we find it transferred to the records of a much more recent and barbaric people, are these representations of a speaking serpent and a life-giving tree entitled to any more credence than any other of the superstitious imagery of the day and people from whom they have descended? To make of the younger and more barbaric race the originators of the legend, and not its adopters, and to suppose an intercourse between Daniel and Zoroaster, to account for the transmission, is a last resource taken in a desperate cause. The age of Zoroaster is quite uncertain, occupying a range from B.C. 3000 to B.C. 512 (Scholten, *Comparative View of Religions*, 13). "It is impossible," says Dr Dollinger, "to fix the age of Zoroaster precisely. He may have been somewhat junior to Moses (perhaps about 1300 B.C.); in any case he did not live, as has been frequently asserted by mistake, under the father of Darius Hystaspes" (or about B.C. 550). (*Gentile and Jew*, I. 380). The author of the book of Daniel professes to have lived during the Babylonish captivity. He has been convicted of ignorance of those days, and is unnamed among the Hebrew prophets by the author of Ecclesiasticus, writing about B.C. 200.* How the legend may have found its way from the Persian into the Jewish scriptures is easily illustrated. "Now, it is known that about the same time, and in the same place—namely at Alexandria—where the Old Testament was rendered into Greek, the Avesta was also translated into the same language, so that we have at Alexandria in the third century B.C., a well-established historical contact between the believers in Genesis and the believers in the Avesta, and an easy opening for exchange of ideas" (Max Müller, *Chips*, I., 152). That the narrative of the fall was a late introduction into the Jewish record, is apparent from the circumstance that, notwithstanding its doctrinal import, it is not adverted to from Genesis to Malachi by any of the sacred personages occupied in the religious training of the people.

* "The Bible, is it the Word of God?" 175-177.

4. THE ANTI-DELUVIAN PERIOD.

The first earth-born persons were the brothers Cain and Abel. In the Egyptian legends the first earth-located personages were the brothers Osiris and Typhon. These, though divinities, are considered to have been originally mortals (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 7, 9). Typhon, the wicked one, kills Osiris, the righteous one, as Cain killed Abel (Palmer, *Egyp. Chron.*, I. 3, 70). The Egyptian legend had a significancy. Osiris stood for the sun and all that bespoke his fertilizing and beneficent influences. Typhon represented the winter and its associated sterility—whatever, in fact, was in contrast to the genial operations of Osiris. Typhon killing Osiris is the winter season overcoming the solar power (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.* 78-80). The Jewish copyist adopts as historical the elements of the myth without apprehending its meaning.

The ages of the patriarchs are of inordinate length. Adam lives 930 years, Seth 912, Enos 905, and so on. This is in keeping with the lengthened years ascribed to man in the Krita Yuga of the Hindús, and the golden age of the Greeks. The early patriarchs are traceable to the Chaldean account. Berosus describes the flood to have occurred in the time of Xisuthrus, the tenth of their kings, just as Noah comes in as the tenth in descent from Adam (Cory, *Anc. Frag.* 26). The years attributed to the Chaldean patriarchs associates them with the Hindú legends. The ten Chaldean kings reigned for 120 sari, or 432,000 years (Cory, 26). This is a Hindú period. It forms the sum of the Kali Yuga, the aggregate of the four Yugas being 4,320,000 years, called a Mahá or great Yuga, and a day of Brahmá, consisting of a thousand yugas, extends to 432,000,000 years (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.* 213, 818).

The Hebrew patriarch Enoch was translated to heaven, without experiencing death, because of his holiness. The same is said of Xisuthrus. After the flood he disappeared, when his voice was heard from heaven addressing admonitions to those he had left behind him, and informing them that on account of his piety he had been translated to live with the gods. His wife, daughter, and the pilot, were admitted to the same honour (Cory, 28, 29). The name Enoch appears

identifiable with that of the renowned Phrygian king Annakus, who lived before the flood (Colenso, *On the Pent.*, IV. 168). He probably is the same as Anak, whose sons were giants (Num. xiii. 33). Hesperus was in like manner caught up to heaven from the summit of Mount Atlas (Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, II. 39). He was the son of Japetus, one of the Titans (Anthon's *Lemp.*), and therefore belonging to the age under consideration. Japetus himself is recognizable in Japhet, one of the sons of Noah (Faber, *Mysteries of the Cabiri*, I. 130 and note). In the Hindú poem, the Rámayana, Lakshmana, the brother of Ráma, "is conveyed bodily by Indra to heaven" (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 89).

As women multiplied on earth "the sons of God" noticed and admired them, and holding sexual intercourse with them, raised up a special progeny. In Job we are told of such "sons of god" attending the court of the deity in heaven. In Jude we hear of "angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation," who are said to have been "even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh," and whose fate, unlike the position of Satan and his angels who roam about seeking whom they may devour, is to be "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." We have here, seemingly, "the sons of God" of Genesis, who in like manner left their habitation under the temptation of "strange flesh." To avoid a representation in the sacred pages so revolting to reason and sentiment, Biblicists seek to give the passage an inoffensive construction by taking the sons of God who allied themselves to the daughters of men to mean a godly race mixing with an ungodly one. It would be singular that all the godly ones should be males, and the ungodly all females. Nor was there such a godly race to point to, especially in view of the later teaching which has concluded all under sin.

The Hebrew scripture is in exact consonance with the credulous ideas of the early days. It was a common notion that celestials might consort with the human race and raise up progeny from them. In the Hindú legends, as we have seen, the bi-sexual deity begat the race of man. The earliest beings so generated were great Rishis, possessing semi-divine

constitutions and powers. Other such also appeared upon the scene. Agasti was the joint son of the deities Mitra and Varuna by Urvasi (Williams, *Sansk. Dict.*, 4); Kardama was born from the shadow of Brahmá (*Ibid.*, 208); the sage Palastya was the son of Brahmá (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 73 note); the seventh Manu was a son of Surya (*Ibid.*, 61); Indra seduced the wife of the sage Gautama (*Ibid.*, 66); Ráma and his three brothers were produced by Vishnu imparting the *payasa*, or nectar of the gods, to their mothers; Sítá sprang from a sacrificial furrow; the Pándavas and Kauravas were descendants of Soma, the moon (*Ibid.*, 93); the five Pándavas were the sons of the divinities Indra, Dharma, Máruta, and the Aswins (*Ibid.*, 100 note); Prithá had Karna by the sun (*Ibid.*, 94); Nahula and Sahadeva were sons of the Aswins by Madri (*Ibid.*, 96); Draupadí sprang from the sacrificial fire; and the solar and lunar dynasties traced their descent from the sun and moon (*Ibid.*, 132). The Egyptians and Chaldeans had dynasties of gods and demi-gods, who at length gave place to their mortal descendants. The Greeks adopted similar ideas. According to Hesiod gods and mortal men were born together (Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, II. 13). Being similarly constituted, their proclivities for each other had continual effect. Jupiter was the father of Bacchus, Castor and Pollux, Hercules, Perseus, Minos, and Amphion, by human mothers. He also seduced Callisto, Io, and Antiope, daughters of various kings of Greece. Æsculapius, Anius, and Aristæus, were sons of Apollo by human mothers. He had a daughter by Perseis, and amours with Acacallis, Bolina, Daphne, Clymene, Issa, Calliope, Leucothoe, and Chione; he carried off Sinope; he endeavoured to secure Marpessa; and he was repelled by Evadne. Ogyges, Amycus, Nycteus, Nauplius, and Hippathoon were sons of Neptune by mortal females, and he had amours with Theophane, Chrysogenia, Astypalea, Tyron, Antiope, Themiston, Eurynome, Alcyone, Thoosa, Arethusa, Agamede, Ænope, Harpalyce, and Pirene. Cycnus, Diomedes king of Thrace, Romulus and Remus, Ænomaus, and Thrax, were sons of Mars; Penthesilea, queen of the Amazons, was his daughter; and he seduced Philonome, Agraulos, Astyoche, and Demonice. Cœculus, Cecrops, Periphetes, and Cercyo were sons of Vulcan.

Picus, king of Latium, was a son of Saturn. Autolychus and Cephalus were sons of Mercury, and he had children by Issa, Antianira, Polymela, and Cleobula. Ænopion and three others were sons of Bacchus by Ariadne, daughter of Minos, king of Crete. The female divinities had the like propensities for the human race. Venus was enamoured of Adonis, and bore Æneas to Anchises, and Eryx to Butes. Diana possessed herself of Endymion, a shepherd. Aurora carried off Cephalus, son of Deioneus, king of Thessaly. Thetis, a sea-deity, bore Achilles to Peleus, king of Thessaly; Galatæa, a sea-nymph, consorted with Acis, a shepherd of Sicily; Hermione, daughter of Mars and Venus, married Cadmus, king of Phœnicia; and Egeria, a nymph, became the wife of Numa, king of Rome (Anthon's *Lemp.*).

After so much of specific tradition prevailing around them of connubial intercourse between celestials and terrestrials, it is quite intelligible that the Hebrew narrator should have meant literally what he has said, namely that sons of God raised up offspring on the daughters of men. The offspring are of a description in keeping with their alleged origin, and here also, there is correspondence with the Grecian and other legends. They turned out "mighty men," "men of renown," like the semi-divine heroes of the older mythologies. There were also "giants in the earth in those days," and the whole race of man became steeped in wickedness, so that the divinity came to the resolution to exterminate them in a flood. This brings before us the wars of the Asuras with Indra, of the Daityas with Siva, of Ahriman and his Divs with Ormuzd, of the Titans with Saturn, and of the giants with Jupiter. It is a representation of semi-divine races of gigantic proportions measuring their strength, defiantly, with the deity, and suffering judgment at his hands. The Titans, for example, as the Hebrew men of renown, were the issue of Uranus and Gaia, or heaven and earth, and were overthrown and cast into Tartarus (Dollinger, *Gentile and Jew*, I. 76). And these may be identified with the Hindú Daityas, or enemies of the gods. The word in the accusative is Daity-am, and in the genitive plural, Daityánám, whence, apparently, Τιτανι and Τιτανων (Vans Kennedy, *Hind., Myth.*, 390, note).

5. THE DELUGE.

The earth being filled with wickedness, and "every imagination" of the heart of man being "only evil continually," "it repented Jahveh that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." The wrath of Jahveh extended itself from man to the insentient brute creation, and he determined to "destroy from the face of the earth, both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air," saying that it repented him that he had made them.

The representation given of the Creator is a most unworthy one. He had already cursed his creation, and what was to be expected of mankind, ejected from his favour and guidance, but wickedness? The later teaching describes the natural man as incapable of giving satisfaction to his maker (Heb. xi. 6). In the language of Isaiah (lxiv. 6), "all his righteousness" is but "filthy rags;" and in that of the psalmist, "there is none righteous, no, not one" (Rom. iii. 10). "The whole world lieth in wickedness," or in the wicked one (1 John v. 19), who is its "prince" and "God" (John xii. 31; 2 Cor. iv. 4), and the deceiver of all (Rev. xii. 9). Such being the character of the dispensation, could there have been any other than bad results? To describe the Creator as disappointed and grieved on witnessing, after a trial of 1550 years, the inevitable consequences of his own appointments, is an absurdity. To extend the judgment to the irresponsible animals was an unwarrantable sacrifice of life; and if founded on any possible sense of justice, why were the fishes not embraced in the sentence? Have we not here an evidence of the imperfectness of the instrumentality used for the judgment, which could not embrace one material portion of the objects that had incurred it,—the Creator seeking to avenge himself on his creation, and compassing the task incompletely? Then if Noah's righteousness sufficed for his salvation, why were his family equally admitted to favour? That they were not guiltless beings is apparent from the patriarch, immediately that the judgment was over, finding cause for cursing one of the three branches of which it consisted. There was partiality in excepting these sinners, as

there was in making exceptions among the animal tribes, if they were justly liable. And what a confused lesson have we from the constructive sentence, the harmless animals suffering because of guilty man, and the guilty family saved because of the righteousness of one of them! The judgment was, moreover, wholly ineffectual as a remedial measure. What was to be gained by sweeping off one wicked generation, to renew the earth with fresh generations of inevitable sinners? And why, if the judgment was suitable for correction, should the divinity have pledged himself never to repeat it? The guilt was to recur, and why not the punishment? The expression of Jahveh is, "I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake." What is the meaning of this? He had cursed it at the fall, and now again at the deluge, and would curse it no more. Are the imprecations of the Creator of such light effect that they have to be renewed, and, if not renewed, do they expire in insufficiency? Are we to consider the earth as now under any curse, or does the pledge that it should be cursed no more imply that the curses pronounced had then ceased to operate? The later teaching certainly is otherwise, and makes it appear that the whole system remains groaning under the effects of the primeval curse (Rom. viii. 22).

The difficulties of the flood, as described, have struck every commentator, and are in fact insuperable. Noah would be incompetent to collect the animals, birds, and insects, from all parts, and induce them to take peacable possession of the ark; he had to match them sexually, even as to the minutest insects, themselves scarcely discernible with the highest modern magnifying instruments; the ark was insufficient in dimensions to contain specimens of all animated creatures; they could not have been controlled therein, or supplied with food and water; nor could the floorings have been cleansed of their ordure. The incarceration lasted a year, and there was no provision for either light or ventilation. Besides the door, which the divinity had closed against the surrounding waters, there was but one aperture by way of window. This was in the roof, measuring in its widest diameter but a cubit, or twenty-one inches, the ark having three tiers. And this one aperture remained closed till the time of deliverance approached. The atmosphere within must have been de-

structive to all life, and yet the frailest specimens had to bear it. To cover, as it is declared, the highest mountains, the waters must have lain over the earth to the depth of 30,000 feet. The earth commands no such supply of water, and its prevalence for a year would destroy all vegetation. Yet a green olive leaf is met with directly the waters abated, and the animals, when set at liberty, obtain immediate means of subsistence. Where was the herbage to be had, and how were the carnivorous tribes to be supplied? How also were the various geographical centres to be re-stocked? The narrator makes his statements quite unconscious of these insurmountable difficulties. Nor do the geologists discover the traces of any such universal flood, while there are evidences, in the undisturbed lava and ashes of the extinct volcanoes of Auvergne and Languedoc, and of Mount Ætna, that in times long antecedent to the period stated for the flood there has been no such diluvial disturbance (Colenso, *Pent.*, IV. 200, 204).

There are two accounts of the Deluge, an Elohistic and a Jahvistic one, as in the instance of the creation. In respect of the animals saved they are in conflict. The Elohist says that they consisted of "two of every sort, male and female," making no distinction between "clean" and "unclean." The Jahvist has such distinction, and says that the clean beasts were taken in "by sevens," and the unclean "by two, the male and his female." Seeing that this sacerdotal distinction occurs, it is apparent that the narrative in which it is introduced could not have been framed until the Levitical law had come into operation, which there is room to conclude was not till after the captivity.* Noah's name occurs in the genealogy with which the book of Chronicles opens, and in the writings of the later Isaiah (liv. 9), and in Ezekiel (xiv. 14, 20), all productions of this period. Otherwise this important judgment is not alluded to throughout the Jewish scriptures (Inman, *Anc. Faiths*, II. 387). It is apparent, therefore, that the tale has made its appearance among the Jews at a late period of their history.

To meet the testimony of geology against the universality of the deluge, as well as to lower the difficulties of the case,

* "The Bible; is it the Word of God?" 8-13.

Biblicists ordinarily suggest that the flood was a partial one. It is a modern idea, not due to the language of the narrative, but raised to answer objectors, just as it is sought to convert the days of the creation into ages. The universality of the deluge is declared in the strongest way that words can express a meaning. Repeatedly the declaration is made that it was the purpose of the deity that every creature on earth, "both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air," all "wherein was the breath of life," "every living substance that he had made," should be destroyed "from off the face of the earth." For this end "the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered." And thus "all flesh died that moved upon the earth, and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark." Such is the language used, of which Dr Gladstone, in his lecture in connection with the Christian Evidence Society, asserts that to accept it as meaning a partial deluge would be consistent with "the ordinary use of Semitic terms." He should have added the explanation whether the pledge of the divinity not to visit the earth again with a flood consists with fact, taking the flood to have been a local one. Bishop Harold Browne, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, also favours the idea that the visitation was a partial one. It "is described," he suggests, "as from the point of view of an eye-witness" rather than "from the point of view of the Omnipotent;" and he comforts himself with the supposition that "in all probability we have in Genesis the very syllables in which the patriarch Shem described to the ancestors of Abraham that which he himself had seen, and in which he had borne so great a part." Altogether, we are cast upon a very singular sort of authority for the narrative before us. The learned Bishop begs hard for the admission of an eye-witness. He then claims, notwithstanding the very uncertain medium of tradition through which we have the narrative, that we possess, nevertheless, the "very syllables" in which the witness made his communication. But the description is seriously overcharged. We must remember, then, the circumstances in which the speaker was placed. He stood in an age of ignorance, and spoke under the sense of strong personal apprehensions. His

statements are coloured by his own mind. It is an account given "from the point of view of the witness," and not "from the point of view of the Omnipotent." It is not absolute truth that is before us. It is the witness's apprehension of truth, which we, in these days of better enlightenment, see to be far removed from real truth. Then, if we may import Dr Gladstone's idea that the genius of the Semitic language permits of a very remarkable measure of reduction, not to say alteration, of meanings, the value obtainable under the learned Bishop's supposition of the possibility that we have before us Shem's very syllables in description of what he had gone through, becomes reduced to unavailing proportions. We have a local flood, which often occurs, exaggerated into a divine universal judgment. It is vain to say, after all these apologetic suggestions, as the Bishop does, that "the Divine authority of the narrative" is not interfered with (I. 75, 76).

The want of light and ventilation in the ark, according to the description given of the vessel, Bishop Browne would obviate by further liberties with the text. The solitary window, of a cubit in measurement, he would convert into a "window course," which means any number of such apertures; and as the vessel would require light in its several tiers, he converts the singular into the plural, and suggests that the "window courses" were multiplied on its sides, and, furthermore, glazed to keep out the rain. "It is," he says, "by no means clear that these windows were all in the roof, or deck. They may have been in the gunwales, *i.e.*, on the higher part of the sides of the vessel, like the port-holes of a modern ship of war, the glazing being effected by means of some process afterwards lost sight of" (*On Gen.* vi. 16). This is no interpretation of the language of the text. It is an invention of what is not in it. Dire must be the necessities which could drive any creditable person to such a subterfuge.

After all, even were the deluge described a partial one, the main difficulties of the narrative are not removed. The assemblage, subjection, housing, feeding, and watering the numberless beasts, birds, reptiles, and insects, with the cleansing and purifying their abode, the dismissing them amicably when the flood was over, and their all finding immediate means of suitable nourishment, are circumstances

which have, one and all, to be rendered believably possible. Nor, taking the hills that were submerged to be the adjacent Kurdish range, can the several thousand feet in depth of water necessary to have covered them be accounted for.

The universality of the tradition of the flood is commonly pointed to as an evidence of the actuality of the visitation. But it is certain that there was a period in the early literature of all the most ancient nations connected with Judea, during which the event was unnoticed, and therefore unknown of. "The deluge is not mentioned in the sacred writings of the Zoroastrians, nor in the hymns of the Rig Veda" (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 158). Sanchoniatho's history begins with the Creation, and "ends within four or five hundred years after the Flood" (Bishop Cumberland's version, 119), and he excludes the occurrence. "Thoth's secretaries, the Cabiri," observes the Bishop, "or their successors in *Berytus*—from whose writings *Sanchoniatho* took his Genealogies, as he affirms in Eusebius—have suppressed all mention of this divine judgment," carrying on the genealogies, undisturbed by such an event, for centuries beyond its assigned time (47). It is more reasonable to conclude that Sanchoniatho, or his representative Philo-Biblius, knew of no such legend among the ancient Phœnician traditions, than that, being there, and accepted as the record of a notorious fact, it was deliberately suppressed. The Egyptians, and the early Greeks who followed their ideas, believed, as taught by the Hindús, in successive destructions and renovations of the world, but have no account of any distinct occurrence such as the Noachic deluge (Prichard, *Egypt. Myth.*, chap. ii.) "Neither Homer nor Hesiod makes any mention of a flood" (Colenso, *Pent.*, IV. 212). If early general tradition is to rule the question, the silence of the earliest of the records among all the surrounding ancient nations—Hindús, Persians, Phœnicians, Egyptians, and Greeks—should be admitted as effectually disapproving the occurrence.

The legend first appears among the Hindús in the Satapatha Bráhmana, which is an adjunct of the Yajur Veda, and one of the latest of the Bráhmanas (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 158; Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, II. xviii., xix.) This is the most ancient known version of the story. It is not where it should be if based upon reality, namely, in the primitive Vedic liter-

ature, but occurs only in the midst of the fanciful delineations of a highly imaginative people, at an advanced stage of their history.

The Satapatha Bráhmana describes Manu as the one person saved from the flood. A fish, which had claimed and received his protection, warned him that in a certain number of years the flood would visit the earth, and directed him to construct a ship, in which he should be saved. This he accordingly did; and when the deluge came, the fish conducted the vessel, and fastened it to a northern mountain, which the commentator explains was the Himalaya. All living creatures had been swept away by the waters, and Manu alone was left. Wishing for offspring, he performed a sacrifice, when a female was provided him, through whom a fresh race of men were produced (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 34, 35; Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, I. 183-185).

The tale next appears in the Mahá-bhárata, where it is entitled the Mátsyaka Purána, or Legend of the Fish. The particulars are the same as those in the Bráhmana, but with sundry embellishments and additions. The fish is described to be an incarnation of Brahmá, and the mountain to which the vessel was secured is explicitly stated to have been the Himavan. The world is described as submerged for many years, and the seven primeval Rishis are said to have been saved, together with Manu; the number of the saved persons being thus brought up to eight, as in the later Jewish narrative. Manu took with him the seeds of all plants, but renewed the animals by a fresh creation, after the flood had passed away (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 35, 36; Muir, *Sansk Texts*, I. 200, 201).

The Institutes of Manu speak of numerous creations and destructions of the world, but have no specific deluge. The method of the creation, which is drawn from Vedic sources, is described by the legislator, but he takes no account of the Brahmanical representation of the deluge, and thus excludes the occurrence.

The legend, among the Hindús, next occurs in the Puránas, which, it will be remembered, are modern representations of ancient traditions. It appears in the Matsya, Bhagavata, and Agni Puránas. The saved being is now said to have been the

royal rishi Satya-vrata, who became appointed to the office of Manu, and was thus the seventh Manu. Satya-vrata means "upright in conduct," "adhering to truth." We thus have the "just man, perfect in his generations," adopted by the Jewish narrator. The fish who saves him is represented to be an incarnation of Vishnu, the then popular divinity. The seven rishis are also among the saved, and Satya-vrata provides himself not only with plants and seeds, but with specimens of all living creatures (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 36; Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, I. 206, 209, 212).

The legend found its way to Chaldea, and recently the earliest known version of it, belonging to that quarter, has been brought to light. The account is inscribed on a tablet found in the ruins of Nineveh, the purport of which has been explained to the Society of Biblical Archæology by Mr Smith of the British Museum, who was introduced by Sir Henry Rawlinson. Sir Henry, in addressing the meeting, said, "Some fifteen years ago, during the excavations of the site of the old palace of Nineveh, the *débris* of the royal library was found. In ancient days books were merely inscribed on clay tablets, and a great many of these were discovered among the ruins in as perfect a state of preservation as they had been 2,500 years previously. They were deposited in the British Museum, and had since furnished a perfect mine of resource to all Assyrian scholars, of whom Mr Smith was the first of the day." Sir Henry pledged his reputation and authority that the translation of the inscription was as generally perfect as could be. Thereupon Mr Smith informed the meeting that out of several thousand fragments of the tablets in question, he had collected a series of legends of which the one he was about to explain, on the subject of the deluge, formed the eleventh. These legends had been ascertained to belong to the time of Assurbanipal, who lived about 660 years before the Christian era, and had been copied from much more ancient documents belonging to the city of Erech, the date of which could not be placed later than the 17th century B.C. Sir Henry Rawlinson supported Mr Smith as to these great antiquities, observing that the historical period of Babylon could be traced back, as I have before had occasion to notice, to B.C. 5150.

The hero of the flood, in the narrative in question, is Sisit, who, Mr Smith thinks, may be identified with Xisuthrus, the saved personage figuring in Berosus's account of the flood. The tablet represents him as recounting the event to one whose name Mr Smith was unable satisfactorily to decipher, whom he designates, provisionally, Izdubar. He is adverted to by Sir Henry Rawlinson as a deified sage, who may have been the first civilizer of the Babylonians, and have lived about B.C. 6400. The tablets describe the offer of marriage made to him by the goddess Ishtar, the monsters living at the time, his vision of the gods, and his journey to the celestial regions, where Sisit communicates to him what befel him at the flood.

The legend represents that the flood was sent in judgment, "the world having turned to sin." Sisit, warned of the event, was directed to take refuge in a ship. The deity said to him, "I will cause it to rain from heaven heavily. Enter to the midst of the ship, and shut thy door." Sisit accordingly embarked with "all his male and female servants, the beasts of the field, the animals of the field, and the sons of the army." In a fragment more recently discovered (*Daily Telegraph*, 20th September 1873,) Sisit, it appears, was directed to take with him also his corn, furniture, goods, and gold and silver. The pilot Buzursadirabi was appointed to guide the ship. The flood, it is said, "reached to heaven; the bright earth to a waste was turned; the surface of the earth, like . . . it swept; it destroyed all life from the face of the earth." On the seventh day the storm that was raging abated. "The sea he caused to dry, and the wind and tempest ended." "The doers of evil, and the whole of mankind who turned to sin, like reeds their corpses floated. I opened the window, and the light broke in, over my refuge it passed." "To the country of Nizir went the ship; the mountain of Nizir stopped the ship, and to pass over it, it was not able." Sir Henry Rawlinson explained that this mountain was not the ordinarily accepted Mount Ararat, near Erivan, but belonged to the precipitous range overlooking the valley of the Tigris to the north-east of Mosul. Six days were passed with the ark arrested on the head of the mountain. "On the seventh day," the narrator continues, "in the course of it I sent forth a dove, and

it left. The dove went and searched, and a resting-place it did not find, and it returned. I sent forth a swallow, and it left. The swallow went and searched, and a resting-place it did not find, and it returned. I sent a raven, and it left. The raven went, and the corpses on the waters it saw, and it did eat; it swam, and wandered away, and did not return. I sent the animals forth, to the four winds I poured out a libation. I built an altar on the peak of the mountain; by seven herbs I cut, at the bottom of them, I placed reeds, pines, and simgar. The gods collected at its burning; the gods collected at its good burning. The gods like *sumbe* over the sacrifice gathered." "When his judgment was accomplished, Bel went up to the midst of the ship, he took my hand and brought me out, me he brought out, he caused me to bring my wife to my side, he purified the country, he established in a covenant" (The *Times* of the 4th, and the *Record* of the 6th December 1872.)

The deluge of Xisuthrus is recorded by the Babylonian historian Berosus, who was a priest of Belus, and of the time of Alexander the Great. The saved man was the tenth in descent of the first Chaldean kings, as Noah was the tenth from Adam. The deity Cronus (Saturn) warned him of the day when the flood should descend, and directed him to build a vessel and take with him his friends and relations, all that was necessary to sustain life, and all species of animals, both birds and quadrupeds, and so escape the danger. A "pilot," as in the legend of Sisit, is spoken of as of the company. The vessel constructed was of huge proportions, measuring five stadia in length by two in breadth, or 3032½ feet by 1213. After some undefined time the flood abated, and Xisuthrus sent out birds from the vessel, which returned, having found no resting place. After some days he sent them out again, and they came back with mud adhering to their feet. On sending them out a third time they did not return, whence he concluded that dry land had reappeared. On this he "made an opening in the vessel," and found it had stranded on the side of a mountain in Armenia. He then quitted the vessel with his wife, daughter, and the pilot, and constructed an altar, and offered sacrifices to God. After this he disappeared, and his voice from heaven informed those whom he

had left behind that because of his piety he had been translated to live with the gods (Cory, *Anc. Frag.*, 27-29).

The Phœnician account of the deluge designates the saved man as Sydyk, a name signifying "the just man," of whom the Hebrew Noah is descriptive. He had with him his sons, who were the seven mythical beings called the Cabiri. Pherecydes (*Apud Strab.* x. 472) calls the saved man Vulcan, and makes his family, who were with him in the ark, consist of his wife Cabira, his three sons who were Cabiri, and his three daughters who were Cabiræ (Faber, *Mysteries of the Cabiri*, I. 55, 56, note). Pherecydes is said to have been a Grecian philosopher of the time of Thales, who flourished about B.C. 600. He is stated to have made the sacred books of the Phœnicians his study, and to have had Pythagoras for a disciple (*Anthon's Lempriere*).

The Greeks have accounts of two deluges. In one the saved person was Ogyges, a mythical being, son of Terra or Neptune by Thebe, daughter of Jupiter, and ruler of Bœotia and Attica. This flood is said to have occurred 1600 years before the first Olympiad, or B.C. 2376, bringing it within twenty-seven years of the Hebrew flood (*Anthon's Lemp.*). In the other account the hero is Deucalion, who is said to have been a son of Prometheus, and king of Thessaly, which was the scene of the visitation. His father warned him of the coming judgment which Zeus had determined to inflict for the destruction of the whole human race, because of their wickedness. By the instructions of Prometheus, Deucalion built a vessel, in which he and his wife Pyrrha embarked. The vessel was tossed about for nine days, and then rested on the top of Mount Parnassus. The event is said to have happened B.C. 1503 (*Anthon's Lemp.*). Bryant adds, on the authority of Apollodorus, that on leaving the ark Deucalion offered up a sacrifice to Jupiter (*Anc. Myth.*, III. 22; V. 25).

The name of the hero of the Hebrew legend, "Noah," or "Nuh," is fairly identifiable with that of the hero of the Sanskrit legend, "Ma-nu" (Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, III. 468; Maurice, *Hist. of Hindostan*, I., pref. ix.). "Nuh" was one of the most ancient of the Egyptian gods, and a divinity of the waters (Osburn, *Monumental Hist. of Egypt*, I. 238).

The name written as "Nus," or "Nusus," is also identifiable with "Dio-nusus," "the god Nusus," this being a designation of Bacchus, the god of wine. Dionusus, according to Diodorus Siculus, taught men to plant the vine and to make wine (Bryant, *Anc. Myth.*, III., 19, 21; Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, II., 268); in keeping with which Noah is no sooner delivered from the flood than he "begun to be an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard, and he drank of the wine, and was drunken." Another connection is Osiris, the Egyptian divinity, who was born on Mount Nysa. The Hebrew deity is accordingly termed Jahveh-Nissi in Exod. xvii. 15, and, by transposition of the syllables, his holy place is termed Mount Sinai (Sharpe, *Egyp. Myth.*, 10, 11). Osiris, by a stratagem, was shut up by his wicked brother Typhon in a chest, or ark, and thrown into the Nile. This occurred on the 17th day of the month of Athyr (Prichard, *Egyp. Myth.*, 58, 59). Plutarch gives the legend, and says that the event was celebrated annually by the Egyptians on the day in question (Drummond, *Æd. Jud.*, 93-96). These were the mystic rites adopted by the Greeks to commemorate the deaths of Bacchus and Adonis (Faber, *Mys. of the Cabiri*, II. 334, 335). Great emphasis is laid upon Noah having been incarcerated in his ark on a given day. "In the self-same day," the Hebrew writer points out, he entered it. This was the 17th day of the 2d month, or the very day in which Osiris was entombed in his ark (Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, II. 241, 242). That Noah was the embodiment of the Pagan divinities Dionusus and Osiris, is sufficiently apparent; and as "the just man" we recognize in him the Hindú Satya-vrata and the Phœnician Sydyk; and as the tenth in descent from the primeval man, the Chaldean Xisuthrus.

The very birth of the legend of the deluge may be said to be before us, and its growth from stage to stage, as it passed from one source to another, is equally apparent. There was the early literature of the most ancient nations, but the tale is not there. The incident is due to imagination, and not to fact, and in the first known times it had not been conceived. The Hindús, Persians, Egyptians, Phœnicians, and Greeks had indulged in records of the marvellous acts of their divinities and ancestors, but this marvel had not been created. Then,

when the full tide of Brahmanical mythologies had long been flowing, this wonderment makes its appearance. It is not met with in the primitive ages, but as corruptions advance it comes to light, and necessarily in bad company. A crafty priesthood were busy in feeding their deluded followers with ever-multiplying superstitions, when to some fertile brain the idea of the visitation of the flood, and the salvation of some favoured individual, presented itself, and found vent. At first, there is but this one personage rescued from the waters. He is not encumbered with numbers to provide for, nor with hosts of animals to be preserved with him; nor is his incarceration in his vessel described to have been of lengthened duration. The story was in its germ, and not overladen with particulars. Thus it stood in the Satapatha Bráhmana. As it advanced to the Mahá-bhárata it was built up with fresh matter. The seven great Rishis are introduced as companions of the saved one, and the earth is said to have been submerged for many years. The party provide themselves with all manner of seeds, but are not embarrassed with the presence of animals. When the legend reappears in the Puránas, the animals are added in. The Hindús believed in a succession of submergences and recreations of the earth, and the deluge in question, in their hands, partakes of the character of one of these supposed phenomena. It is a representation of some primeval man through whom the earth is peopled. But when it travels into Chaldea, an essentially new feature is introduced into its character. The earth has been stocked with inhabitants, but they have incurred the divine displeasure because of their wickedness, and the flood is sent in judgment for their destruction. The saved persons are of both sexes, to continue the species, and specimens of the animal races are also preserved. But the difficulty of maintaining so many beings is reduced by limiting the duration of the flood to a few days. This is the flood of Sisit. When we pass on to the flood of Xisuthrus, the narrator is seen to have thought of the necessity of describing the accommodation requisite to hold the many beings, human and animal, that had to be saved, and he projects accordingly a vessel of stupendous dimensions. The Phœnician legend is an adaptation of that of the Mahábhárata, the seven Rishis being con-

verted into the seven Cabiri. An improvement is made upon this version in the one recorded by Pherecydes, by converting the Cabiri into persons of the opposite sexes, for the continuance of the species. The Phœnician and the Greek legends do not fall into the difficulties involved by the presence of the animals in the ark, and the duration of the incarceration for a lengthened period.

Of all the races who have put forth this legend, the Hebrews were the most debased in ignorance and barbarism. Comparatively with the other nations, they were a modern people. Being the latest of the copyists, their narrative is the most abounding in details, in framing which unthought of difficulties are introduced to the overthrow of the whole representation. The Phœnician legend, derived as the feature evidently is from the improved version of the Hindûs, is followed as to the numbers saved, the contrast of the sexes, as with Pherecydes, being adopted; but whereas six of the parties, with Pherecydes, were brothers and sisters, the Hebrew narrator, to avoid the consequent incest, makes of these husbands and wives. In other respects, the Hebrew story is moulded upon that of the Chaldeans, with whom they came into close contact at that critical period of the history of themselves and their literature when they underwent captivity in Babylon. The writer, unarrested by adequate knowledge, and intent on magnifying his theme, makes the bold assertion that the waters "prevailed" over "all the high hills that were under the whole heaven." Of the Himalaya and the Andes, and their towering heights, he was of course profoundly ignorant. But he is able to assure us, as if Noah had stood over these distant regions with a plummet-line in his hand, that the waters stood "fifteen cubits upward" over "all" these "high hills." The ordinary resources of rains and land springs he described as sufficing to produce the requisite mass of water, under the weight of which he submerged the earth for about a year, concluding that, when the waters were drained off, the usual facilities for supporting animal life at once presented themselves. The Chaldean legendary had projected a vessel half a mile in length to contain all the living creatures that had to be saved, together with the food to sustain them. This was rather startling. The Hebrew legendary thought to

improve the tale by reducing the proportions, and gaining space by multiplying the flooring into three tiers. He was tempted also to give the dimensions and position of a window for the ark, but quite overlooked the difficulties in which he had involved himself, for lighting up, ventilating, and keeping clean his several tiers. Sisit, Xisuthrus, and Deucalion, when severally delivered from the flood, erect altars and offer sacrifices to their respective divinities. Noah does the like. At the sacrifice of Sisit, the gods eagerly assemble to partake of the good things provided for them. "The gods collected at its burning, the gods collected at its good burning. The gods like *sumbe* over the sacrifice gathered." The idea is traceable to the Hindús. "Sacrifice," with them, "is not merely expiatory or placatory; it is necessary for the *actual support* of the gods." "They are represented as *living on the sacrifices* offered to them by human beings, and at every sacrificial ceremony assemble in troops, eager for their shares" (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.* 52, note). So in all the Jewish sacrifices Jahveh has his allotted portion. On the present occasion he sniffed up the good things prepared for him; or, as the legendary has it, "Jahveh smelled a sweet savour," and in gratitude promised to curse the earth no more. "He established a covenant," as in the case of Sisit. Thus was a happy reconciliation effected. Noah, as the one righteous being on earth, representing here the Satya-vrata and the Sydyk of the Hindús and the Phœnicians, and the translated Sisit and Xisuthrus of the Chaldees, was the vehicle of the blessing. But as Nuh, Nusus, or Dio-nusus, he had to be associated with the juice of the grape, and the legendary, overlooking his alleged sanctity, or being too coarse in mind himself to consider the act a transgression, illustrates the potency and uses of the beverage by inebriating his hero. And the more graphically to carry out the incident, he subjects him to an indecent exposure of his person, and then fills his mouth with cursings of unborn generations. The simplicity of the original Sanskrit legend became loaded with these extravagancies as it passed finally into the atmosphere of Palestine.

6. THE TOWER OF BABEL.

A hundred years after the flood, according to the marginal

chronology, the then inhabitants of the earth journeyed together from the east till they reached the plain of Shinar, where they began to build a city, which got the name of Babel or Babylon. Instigated by some evil motive, they proceeded to construct a tower, "whose top might reach unto heaven;" but Jahveh, jealous of their ambition, and mistrusting their design, defeated them by confounding their language, so that they could not understand one another, and thus he dispersed them. The incident presents us with a pitiable aspect of the divinity of Jahveh. The loftiest edifices yet constructed by human hands have not attained the height of five hundred feet. Whatever tradition may allege, no people could be so foolish as to attempt to carry into action the alleged project; nor would the low level of Shinar have been the platform selected for the purpose by men just fresh from the heights of Armenia or Media. As usual, the Hebrew delineator has been drawing his materials from pagan sources. The legend has been recorded by Berosus as of Chaldean origin, and has been adopted by the Greek writers Hestiœus, Abydenus, and Eupolemus. It appears also in the Sibylline writings of Babylonia and of Greece, and is a version of the Titanic war (Cory, *Anc. Frag.* 34, 50, 57). In far nobler form the Homeric poet imagines the rebellious Titans endeavouring to scale the abode of Zeus, by piling Ossa upon Pelion and Olympus. Philo, though a devout Jewish author, has been struck with the analogy, and quotes from Homer. He also cites a Greek legend of the whole animal creation having at one time possessed a common means of holding intercourse with each other, a faculty which became confounded in punishment for a trangression (II. 2, Bohn's ed.). "The whole earth," according to the Hebrew legendary, were present involved in the rebel action at Babel. Noah, and Shem, who survived the flood by 350 and 502 years respectively, and who were necessarily among the emigrants to Babel, must have been there taking part with the Titans. Constructing his work with ill sorted borrowed materials, the Hebrew writer falls into this strange inconsistency.

7. LOT'S DELIVERANCE FROM THE JUDGMENT ON SODOM.

Zeus and Hermes once visited the earth and met with Philemon and Baucis, an old couple who retained their virtue

in the midst of surrounding profligacy. The rich and powerful of the land repulsed the divinities, who took shelter in the cottage of Philemon, and partook of his simple fare. The deities avenged themselves on the depraved and inhospitable city by plunging it beneath the waters of a stagnant lake, and the cottage of Philemon and Baucis was converted into a temple, of which they became priest and priestess. After a long life they were changed into trees overshadowing the porch. This tale Mr Christmas identifies with that of Sodom and Gomorrha, the transformation of the human beings into trees striking him as the parallel of the change of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt (*Un. Myth.* 166, 167). The correspondence is too close to allow of the supposition that the stories have independent origin. The Greek tale, it will be observed, embraces the hospitality of Abraham to the celestials who visited him at Mamre (Gen. xviii.), and the action of two of them who proceeded to deliver Lot from Sodom. The Greek versionist presents us with a pleasant story, consistent in its details. The saved beings with him are both virtuous. Nothing can well be coarser or more revolting than the Hebrew story in all its parts. Lot is ready to sacrifice the virtue of his daughters to the lusts of a depraved multitude, and they first inebriate and then commit incest with him. The most innocent of the party, the wife, is at one instant saved, and at the next undergoes a divine judgment. The time of Ovid would certainly place his poem after the period of the Hebrew version, but as Philemon and Baucis were of Phrygia (*Lemp.*), there is room to conclude that he was drawing from a foreign tradition current before his time.

8. ABRAHAM'S INTENDED SACRIFICE.

The ideal Abraham is represented to have purposed the sacrifice of his son to Jahveh in obedience to a divine command. Jephtha, it is said, actually carried out such a sacrifice under a like instigation. "The spirit of Jahveh," we are told, "came upon Jephtha," and he passed over to engage with the Ammonites, vowing that if Jahveh would deliver his enemies into his hands, he would offer up to him as a burnt offering "whatsoever" came forth from his house to meet him on his return. The conditions were apparently

accepted. The victory was given him, and the victim presented to him for the fulfilment of his rash vow was his own daughter. We are to reconcile, how we may, the divine instigation with the character of such an act, and the very strong terms in which it is reprobated in other parts of the Hebrew scriptures. The Gentile nations were addicted to these sacrifices, but to the Jews they were strictly prohibited (Lev. xviii. 21; xx., 2-5; Deut. xviii. 10), as an "abomination to Jahveh, which he hateth" (Deut. xii. 31). They were stigmatized as a "shedding of innocent blood," and a mere human "invention" (Ps. cvi. 37-39). It was what the divinity assures them, "I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart" (Jer. vii., 31); "which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind" (Jer. xix., 5). "Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" the prophet indignantly demands (Mic. vi. 7). These inhuman rites characterized the worst kings of Judah, as Ahaz and Manasseh (2 Kings xvi. 3; xxi. 6); but the contemplation of the atrocious cruelty forms the brightest circumstance in the patriarch's career (Heb. xi. 17-19).

Jephtha's sacrifice may assuredly be identified, even by name, with that of Iphi-genia ("born of Iptha," or Jephtha), by her father Agamemnon. There also it was by divine command that the act was perpetrated. Agamemnon and his allies were on their way to the siege of Troy, but were arrested by Diana until she was thus appeased. According to one version Iphigenia was saved by the substitution of an animal sacrifice, as in the case of Isaac. When the executioner "was going to strike the fatal blow, Iphigenia suddenly disappeared, and a goat of uncommon size and beauty was found in her place for the sacrifice" (Anthon's *Lemp.*). The Hebrew annalist, at the expense of consistency with the legal enactments of the people, has, it is clear, been embellishing his history with foreign materials.

A model for the whole is to be found in the well-known and graphic Sanskrit story of Sunehsepha. The king Harischandra possessed a hundred wives, but had nevertheless no son to succeed him. The sage Narada warned him that there was no life in the futurity for one without a son, and

encouraged him to make a vow to Varuna that he would offer up his son to him in sacrifice if he gave him one. In this manner the king obtained a son, on which Varuna claimed the sacrifice. The father put the deity off with various pleas until the son became of age to assume his arms as one of the martial class. But when the youth was then called upon to submit himself to the sacrifice, he defied his father, seized his bow, and marched off to the forest. Varuna thereupon smote Harischandra with dropsy. Rohita, the son, heard of this, but under the instructions of the deity Indra, renewed year by year, he roamed about in the forest for six years. He then met with a Rishi, or holy sage, named Ajigarta. This man was living secluded in the forest, with his family, in great destitution. He possessed three sons, and he consented to give up one to be sacrificed in the room of Rohita, for the consideration of a hundred cows. The father, then, throwing his arms round the eldest son, said, "not him," and the mother, throwing hers round the youngest, said, "not him," on which Sunehsepha, the middle son, was taken. Varuna accepted the substitute, a Bráhman being superior to a Kshatriya. But no one would bind the innocent victim to the stake. The father, for another hundred cows, performed the task. Then there was no one who would slay the victim. Again, for another hundred cows, the father agreed to do the deed. Sunehsepha thereupon claimed permission to address the gods, and called upon Indra, who referred him to Agni, saying, "he is nearer to thee than I am." In this manner he was passed from god to god, and ended by praising them all. As he did so, the bonds fell off his person, and Harischandra was freed of his dropsy. The deity had taken compassion on the doomed man, and had fully relented. This is a very ancient legend. It appears in the Aitareya Bráhmana, an adjunct of the Rig Veda, in the Sunkhayana Sutras, and in the Rámáyana, and hymns by Sunehsepha occur in the Rig Veda itself (Max Müller, *Sansk. Lit.*, 408-417, 493, 494; Muir, *Sansk Texts*, I. 355; Prof. Wilson's *Essays*, II. 247-249; Prof. Wilson, in *Jour. of As. Soc.* XIII. 96-102).

Mr Colebrooke's opinion was that the Purusha-Medha, or sacrifice of a man, in the Vedic times, was never anything but

typical, the victims being bound to the stake, but liberated unhurt, a goat, or oblations of butter, being offered in their room (Prof. Wilson, in *Jour. of As. Soc.*, XIII. 106, 107). The legend of Sunehsepha is conformable to this usage. It shows the horror there was in contemplating such an immolation, no man being willing to put his hand to it, and the gods eventually disallowing it. Throughout the tale, whether in respect of the object vowed, or his substitute, it is the father who has to perpetrate the sacrifice of his son, and on the idea that it would be an act acceptable to the deity, who is even supposed to have exacted it. These features belong to the tales of Abraham, Agamemnon, and Jephthah, the two former of which are also characterized, as in the instance of Sunehsepha, by the deliverance of the victim.

9. JACOB WRESTLING WITH A DIVINE BEING.

No representation could well do more violence to our apprehensions of the Almighty than that he should stoop to match himself in a physical struggle with one of his creatures, and even have failed "to prevail against him." The imaginative Easterns have drawn such scenes.

In the Mahábhárata the hero Arjuna is desirous of being supplied with a celestial weapon. Indra announces to him that his request will be granted if he can obtain a sight of the god Siva. For this end he subjects himself to a course of severe penance. A mountaineer approaches him. A wild boar at the same time makes an attack upon him. Arjuna and the mountaineer both shoot their arrows, and the boar falls dead. Each claims the spoil, on which they quarrel and engage in fight. Arjuna, who has hitherto been conqueror in every engagement, after a long contest fails to subdue his opponent. At length his eyes are opened, and he recognizes him to be Siva, and prostrates himself before him. Siva then confers upon him the weapon he desired, and disappears (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 104).

There is another such incident in the same Sanskrit poem. Aswatthâman, a leader of the Kauravas, is approaching the hostile camp to make a night attack upon the Pándavas. A gigantic and awful figure meets and opposes him. After a terrific conflict Aswatthâman recognizes his opponent as the

divinity Siva, and worships him. Siva then aids him in his enterprise (*Ibid.*, 121, 122).

The Hindú representations occur in a mythological poetical effusion, and are in keeping with the genius of the people, who delighted in the most extravagant marvels. The Hebrew tale, bald, coarse, and purposeless, and utterly incongruous with its surroundings, is presented to us as sober history.

10. Moses.

In the leader of the exodus we appear to have for the first time an actual personage, but overlaid with mythical materials, according to the habit of the compositors of the Hebrew scriptures. A bare narrative of facts would not serve to illustrate the history of a people who were to be represented as the special objects of the favour and interventions of the Almighty. The historian, consequently, drew from surrounding sources whatever might be calculated to exalt the subject of his narrative.

The first incident in the life of the Jewish leader is, that being in peril of death under the edict of a tyrannical ruler, his mother exposed him in an ark of bulrushes by the brink of the Nile, where he was found and adopted by the king's daughter; his mother, not known to be such, being appointed to nurse him. It was a very common expedient of the ancients to excite an interest in their infant heroes by subjecting them to just such a risk. Dionusus, or Bacchus, with his mother Semele, was enclosed in an ark and cast into the sea. The mother died, but the child was taken up and adopted by Danae, a king's daughter (Cox, *Man. of Myth.*, 67). According to another version, Ino, or Isis, in her wanderings, found him, and became his nurse (Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, II. 266). Moses, it will be hereafter seen, is moulded upon Bacchus. Danae, and her infant Perseus, were put into a chest and abandoned to the ocean, but came to shore and were rescued by Dictys, brother of the king of the island on which they were cast (Cox, 80, 81). Telephus, son of Hercules, with his mother, were exposed in an ark and saved (Faber, *Mys. of the Cabiri*, I. 201). Semiramis was exposed in a desert, and adopted by the king's shepherd (Anthon's *Lemp.*). Cyrus was thus abandoned; Romulus was exposed on a river's bank;

Œdipus was similarly exposed on the hill Cithœron; and Paris on Mount Ida (Cox, *Man. of Myth.*, 4, 86, 93; do., *Tales of Anc. Greece*, 211). The splendour of their countenances, and the dignity of their bearing, revealed the exalted origin of these infants (Cox, *Man. of Myth.*, 4); and accordingly Moses, as we are told, was "a goodly child" (Exod. ii. 2), "exceeding fair" (Acts vii. 20). Josephus enlarges upon this feature, and attributes to Pharaoh's daughter a speech in which she says, "I have brought up a child who is of a divine form" (*Ant.* II. ix.). In the Hindú legends, Karna, one of the heroes of the Mahábhárata, who was the offspring of the sun by a human mother, was exposed in a river, and found by a stranger and adopted (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 94).

In his character of an emissary of the deity, Moses has been formed on the model of Zoroaster. Zoroaster is represented as one inspired of God, by whose mouth Ormuzd has spoken (Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, 381). The Zendavesta is appealed to "as containing the word of God, revealed by Ormuzd to Zoroaster" (Max Müller, *Chips*, I. 171). "We agree," says the learned professor, "with Dr Spiegel, that Zoroaster's character resembles most closely the true Semitic notion of a prophet. He is considered worthy of personal intercourse with Ormuzd; he receives from Ormuzd every word, though not, as Dr Spiegel says, every letter of the law" (*Ibid.*, I. 159). So "there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jahveh knew face to face. In all the signs and the wonders, which Jahveh sent him to do" (Deut. xxxiv. 10, 11).

When Moses received his commission to deliver Israel out of bondage, he desired to know from the deity by what name he should announce him; the answer to which was, "I am that I am," and he was directed to say that "I am" had sent him. Zoroaster, before him, had made a like demand, and had received a similar reply. Twenty names were communicated to him by which the deity might be designated, of which the first was "I am," and the twentieth "I am who I am" (Max Müller, *Chips* I. 127). Of Viraj, the primeval being, the Hindús state "that conscious of none other than himself, he said, 'I am I'" (Colebrooke in *As. Res.*, VIII. 425). In the Bhagavat Gita, an episode of the Mahábhárata, the divinity

says, "I am that which is; and he, who must remain, am I" (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 245). In keeping with this is the celebrated inscription in the temple of Isis at Sais, in which the goddess is made to say, "I am all, that hath been, and is, and shall be" (Sir Wm. Jones in *As. Res.*, I. 253).

In drawing the image of Moses as a popular leader, the type of Bacchus has been followed. Godfrey Higgins, citing the Abbé Bazin, says, "In Bacchus we evidently have Moses. Herodotus says he was an Egyptian, brought up in Arabia Felix," which is paralleled by Moses being adopted into "Pharaoh's" house, and afterwards withdrawing to Midian. The Orphic verses relate of Bacchus that he was preserved from the waters, in a little box or chest; that he was called Misem in commemoration of the event" (Exod. ii. 10); "that he was instructed in all the secrets of the gods" (Acts vii. 22), "and that he had a rod, which he changed into a serpent at his pleasure; that he passed through the Red Sea dry-shod, as Hercules subsequently did, in his goblet, through the Straits of Abila and Calpe. . . . Moreover, it is said, that he touched with his magic rod the waters of the great rivers Orontes and Hydaspes, upon which those waters flowed back and left him a free passage. . . . He wrote his laws on two tablets of stone" (*Anac.*, II. 19).

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Commentary on Exod. iv. 17, draws a similar parallel between Moses and the Greek divinity. "Cicero," he says, "reckons five Bacchuses, one of which, according to Orpheus, was born of the River Nile, but according to the common opinion, he was born on the banks of that river. Bacchus is expressly said to have been *exposed* on the river Nile. Hence he is called Nilus, both by Diodorus and Macrobius, and in the hymns of Orpheus he is named *Mysis* because he was drawn out of the water. He is represented by the poets as being *very beautiful*, and an illustrious warrior; they report him to have *overrun all Arabia* with *a numerous army*, both of men and women. He is also said to have been an eminent *law-giver*, and to have written his laws on *two tables*. He always carried in his horn the thyrsus, a *rod* wreathed with *serpents*, and by *which* he is reported to have wrought many *miracles*."

The Hebrew account makes it apparent that the Egyptian

magicians, equally as Moses, practised their art with the aid of a rod; and the Druids performed magical acts with the same instrument (Higgins, *Anac.*, I. 16).

The legislation of Moses professes to have been obtained by him direct from a divine source, but it is clear that it is due to copying from human models. I have already shown that the sacrificial usages, the rite of circumcision, the temple, ark, and cherubim, were adopted by the Jews from neighbouring nations. The Speaker's Commentators make liberal admissions on this head, tracing to such sources the distinction made by the Jews between clean and unclean meats; the priesthood by inheritance; the priests shaving their whole bodies; their purification by bathing continually; their use of none but linen garments; the anointing of Aaron when clothed in his priestly robes; the ceremony of the scape-goat; the mysterious Urim and Thummim on the breast of the high priest; the writing of the divine commandments on the door-posts and gates; the erecting pillars and coating them with plaster to receive inscriptions (I. 15, 16); the law of marriage with a brother's widow (I. 198); the putting off the shoes when treading upon holy ground (I. 261); the uncleanness arising from childbirth (I. 558); the uncleanness from secretions (I. 583); the mode of slaughter of animals sacrificially (I. 596); the ordinance of the red heifer (I. 651); the trial of jealousy (I. 669); the shaving the head of the Nazarite when he had accomplished the term of his vow (I. 673); the fringes placed on the borders of garments (I. 707); the purification from the uncleanness caused by association with the dead (I. 717); the use of amulets (I. 825).

Any flaw in an alleged divine work should unsettle its authority, and prove it to be of human origination. It is inconceivable that Moses should be accepted as a legislator taught and commissioned by the deity, when the institutions ascribed to him are seen to be formed out of Egyptian and Chaldean materials. The trial of jealousy is one of the elements of this legislation which specially courts exposure. The rule laid down was, that if a man suspected the fidelity of his wife, and was without evidence of her guilt, he might bring her to the priest with an offering of barley meal, on which "the priest shall bring her near, and set her before

Jahveh." He was then to take "holy water," and to mix with it "the dust that is in the floor of the tabernacle," which, with uncovered head, and "an oath of cursing," she was to drink. If guilty, "her belly shall swell, and her thigh shall rot; and the woman shall be a curse among her people. And if the woman be not defiled, but be clean, then she shall be free, and shall conceive seed." The terms have only to be read to satisfy any one that the device can have been inspired by no higher source than some foolish, ignorant, and superstitious human brain. The Speaker's Commentators at once admit the nature of the origin of this law and its practical effeteness.

Num. v. 11-31.—The trial of jealousy. "The process prescribed has been lately strikingly illustrated from the Egyptian romance of Setnam, translated by Brugsch, which though itself comparatively modern (of the third century B.C.), yet refers to the time of Rameses the Great, and may therefore well serve to illustrate the manners and customs of the Mosaic times. In the story, Ptahneferka takes a leaf of papyrus, and on it copies out every word of a certain magical formula. He then dissolves the writing in water, drinks the decoction, and knows in consequence all that it contained. See Smith, *Pent.*, I. 297, 298; *Revue Archéol.*, Sept., pp. 161 sqq. This, then, like several other ordinances, was adopted by Moses from existing and probably very ancient and widely spread institutions." To the present day there are ignorant Mahometans who practise this method of charming with words taken from their sacred Koran. The commentator (Mr Espin) goes on to observe in dealing with Num. v. 27: "We do not read of any instance in which this ordeal was resorted to, a fact which may be explained either (with the Jews) as a proof of its efficacy, since the guilty could not be brought to face its terrors at all, and avoided them by confession, or more probably by the licence of divorce tolerated by the law of Moses. Since a husband could put away his wife at pleasure, a jealous man would naturally prefer to take this course with a suspected wife rather than to call public attention to his own shame by having recourse to the trial of jealousy." There can be no better evidence of the valuelessness of a law than the circumstance of its not

being put to use, and yet this piece of legislation is introduced as what "Jahveh spake unto Moses."

No act could be ushered in with more solemn protestation of a divine origin than the laws of the Decalogue. The thunders of Sinai were enlisted to give them importance; they were inscribed on stone, with the very finger of the deity; were personally committed by him to Moses; and were to be deposited for ever in the ark of testimony, beneath the terrestrial throne of Jahveh, in the holiest of holies. One would imagine that nothing would be more clear and precise than the words used by the deity on this occasion to convey his will; and yet the record itself shows that there is no such dependence to be placed on the reported language of this law.

There are two accounts of the Decalogue in the same sacred legislative code, and these seriously disagree. I mark the discrepancies, as occurring in the original Hebrew, by placing them in italics:—

EXODUS XX.	DEUTERONOMY V.
8. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.	12. *Keep* the Sabbath day to sanctify it, *as Jahveh thy Eloah hath commanded thee.*
9. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work:	13. Six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work:
10. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of Jahveh thy Eloah: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:	14. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of Jahveh thy Eloah: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, *nor thine ox, nor thine ass,* nor *any of* thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; *that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou.*
11. For in six days Jahveh made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,	15. *And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Jah-*

and rested the seventh day: wherefore Jahveh blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.	*veh thy Eloah brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore Jahveh thy Eloah commanded thee to keep the Sabbath.*
12. Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which Jahveh thy Eloah giveth thee.	16. Honour thy father and thy mother, *as Jahveh thy Eloah hath commanded thee;* that thy days *may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee,* in the land which Jahveh thy Eloah giveth thee.
17. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.	21. *Neither* shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, *neither* shalt thou *covet* thy neighbour's house, *his field,* or his manservant, or his maidservant, (*nor*) his ox, or his ass, or any thing that is thy neighbour's.

There is an end of certitude as to the words of the law, when the same code recites them differently. The Speaker's Commentators have again the candour to acknowledge the blemish. "What actually," they ask, "were the words of Jehovah that were engraven on the tables of stone? We have two distinct statements, one in Exodus xx. 1-17, and one in Deut. v. 6-21, apparently of equal authority, but differing from each other in several weighty particulars. Each is said, with reiterated emphasis, to contain the words that were actually spoken by the Lord, and written by him upon the stones." And then, canvassing the very insufficient reasons ordinarily suggested to explain away the difficulty, they add, "If either copy, as a whole, represents what was written on the tables, it is obvious that the other cannot do so." (I., 335, 336.)

It is certain that no such discrepancy could have arisen, and assuredly not at the very time of the enunciation, had the decalogue been put forth under the circumstances alleged.

The finger of Jahveh, on the durable material, would have fixed the words too indelibly to allow the possibility of their being read or reported awrong. We must conclude that there was no such material record, and the non-existence of a deposit, too precious and important to have been overlooked or mislaid, is in itself evidence that it was one that was never made. If then the reality of the substance of the picture fails us, the frame work must be equally ideal, and the terrors of Mount Sinai have to be relegated to the regions of myth. Nor is there room to admit the occurrence of such special legislation, when rules embraced therein are found orally announced on other repeated occasions. For example, the edict against the manufacture of graven images is reiterated in Exodus xx. 23; xxxiv. 17; Lev. xix. 4; xxvi. 1; Deut. xxxiv. 17, and the injunction to labour for six days and keep holy the seventh is given in Exodus xxiii. 12; xxxi. 13-17: xxxiv. 21; xxxv. 2; Lev. xxiii. 3, just as if no such enactments had been, or were to be, entered on the tables of stone. Neither can it be supposed that there was a call, at this late period of the history of mankind, for the provision, from a divine source, of a law interdicting such self-evident crimes as theft and murder, acts which we, in fact, see entailing penal consequences, to the persons of Benjamin and Moses, in the very land of bondage which the Israelites had just quitted (Gen. xliv. 12-16; Exod. ii. 11-15). Furthermore, why should the ten specific precepts be recorded on the tables of stone and solemnly laid up in the ark, when there was so much else left to flow from the lips of Moses without any such provision?

Modern criticism has abundantly established the composite character of the Pentateuch, and that it has been put together long after the time of Moses. Bishop Harold Browne, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, allows as much, however reluctantly. "It is not necessary," he observes, "to insist that every word of the Pentateuch was written down by the hand of Moses in his own autograph. He may have dictated much, or all of it, to Joshua, or to some secretary or scribe." The admission surely amounts to a confession of ignorance who were the scribes by whom the record may have been drawn up. The dictation of Moses is suggested, but without attempt to support the fact. "It is not necessary to deny that the Penta-

teuch, though the work of the great prophet and lawgiver whose name it bears, may have undergone some recension in after times, as by Ezra or others." That is, there is interpolated matter, which may be of the age of Ezra, or later. "If Ezra collated MSS., and carefully edited the books of Moses, it is not impossible, and is not inconsistent with the original authorship, that he should have admitted explanatory notes, which some think (rightly or wrongly) to betray a post-Mosaic hand." "It is not necessary to deny that Moses had certain documents or traditions referring to the patriarchal ages, which he incorporated into his history. Indeed, it is likely that such traditions should have come down through Shem and Abraham to Joseph and the Israelites in Egypt, and there can be no reason why an inspired historian should not have worked up such trustworthy materials into the history of the ancestors of his people." (I., 2.)

This gives us as much as we need demand at the hands of one doing his best to maintain the credit of the composition treated of. It is a picture of a human workman, making the best of the materials at his command, stringing together floating records and traditions to illustrate the history undertaken. The fence of the Mosaic authorship under divine dictation is gone.

The incongruous decalogue has every appearance of being a foreign element, inartistically introduced, with the view of giving importance to the dispensation it was the aim of the writer to found upon a divine source. The Buddhists had just such a code of precepts which may have reached Alexandria before the earliest known version of the Jewish scriptures saw the light. It was a decalogue, four of the terms of which correspond with those of the Jews, namely (1), not to kill; (2), not to steal; (3), not to commit adultery; (4), not to lie (Max Müller, *Chips.*, I. 248, citing Burnouf, Barthélemy Saint Hilaire, and Neumann; Spence Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, 24; Moore, *Lost Tribes*, 191, citing Klaporth). It cannot be by accident, but only by copying, that there has been again this close accord between the Hebrew scripture and the oriental model.

11. VISIBLE MANIFESTATIONS OF THE DEITY.

When Jahveh was occupied in personally dispensing his laws to Moses, he undertook to exhibit himself openly to some select members of the Jewish congregation. Accordingly, Moses invited Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, to ascend the mount, whereupon they there "saw the god of Israel; and there was under his feet, as it were, a paved work of sapphire stone, and, as it were, the body of heaven in his clearness" (Exod. xxiv. 10). In Job (i. 6; ii. 1), the divinity is twice represented holding his court on particular days, "when the sons of God came to present themselves before Jahveh." In the days of Ahab, Micaiah "saw Jahveh sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left" (1 Kings xxii. 19). Isaiah (vi. 1-4), "saw also Jahveh sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train (*i.e.*, the skirts of his garment, *marg. reading*), filled the temple. Above it stood the Seraphims: each one had six wings. . . . And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke." Ezekiel (i. 26, 28) beheld "the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness of a man above upon it." There was shining round a brilliant refulgence of the colour of amber, with fire, combined with the prismatic colours of the rainbow. "This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of Jahveh." Daniel (vii. 9, 10) had a vision of "the ancient of days," with hoary locks and in a white garment, seated on a throne which was "like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him."

An attempt on the part of human delineators to portray the unseen ruler of the universe, could only be made by heaping together elements of terrestrial glory. This was the method of those early people from whom were derived the Jewish models. As Jove, observes Sir Wm. Jones, held his court on a brilliant mountain, so Mahádeva (Siva) held his on Mount Kailása (*As. Res.*, I. 248). Meru, the Olympus of

the Hindús, is a mountain of enormous height, the whole of which consists of gold and gems ; its summit is the residence of Bráhma, and a place of meeting for the gods, rishis, ghandarvas (heavenly musicians), &c. (Williams, *Sansk, Dict.*, 795). This region is also denominated svarga, paradise, or the dwelling-place of the deities (*Ibid.*, 1160). In the Mahá-bhárata this celestial abode is described as constructed by Visvakarman, the architect of the gods, and is said to be 800 miles in circumference, and 40 high. Its pillars are formed of diamonds, its palaces of gold, and it is said to be so resplendent with gems as to exceed in radiance the blended brightness of a dozen suns (Coleman, *Myth. of the Hindús*, 123). Vishnu's abode on Mount Meru is called Vaikuntha. It is stated in the Mahá-bhárata to be 80,000 miles in circumference, and entirely of gold, its edifices being of jewels (*Ibid.*, 12). Kailása, the heaven of Siva, is on the Himalaya. It is also resplendent with gold and jewels (*Ibid.*, 72). Varuna also has a heaven constructed by Visvakarman. This is eight hundred miles in circumference, the divinity and his consort occupying there a throne of diamonds (*Ibid.*, 135).

There is another aspect in which it has been attempted to place the Almighty before human spectators. On the occasions hitherto noted there has been an open exhibition of his presence, the enhancement of the demonstration being dependent on the magnificence of the display, in which race the Orientals have certainly surpassed the Jewish scribes. But it has also occurred to the delineator that the contemplation of the actual form of the Omnipotent might be a vision beyond the power of a mere mortal to sustain. The two forms of representation certainly do not agree ; but both, nevertheless, have been resorted to in this complex record.

Moses on one occasion is said to have requested Jahveh to show him his glory, meaning evidently the glories of his personal form. The divinity, contradicting all that is said elsewhere of the unrestricted manifestations made by him of his material presence, at this time chose to declare, "Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me, and live." Willing, however, to go as far as he safely could towards gratifying his favoured follower, he said, "Behold, there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock; and it shall come to pass,

while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by; and I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts; but my face shall not be seen" (Exod. xxxiii. 18-23). Had an enemy planned a representation with the view of bringing the record into disrepute, he could scarcely have devised one more calculated to answer his end than this account of the purposeless curiosity of Moses, and the ridiculous—not to say indecent—manœuvre of the anthropomorphic god to gratify it. When Jahveh was in a different mood, and exhibited himself openly on his throne to Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders of Israel, there was still a note of apprehension introduced, to put the common herd of mankind on their guard in dealing with this formidable being. "And upon the nobles of the children of Israel," it is then said, "he laid not his hand." The sight of him they might sustain, but not the touch. They were nevertheless placed sufficiently at their ease to be able to replenish nature in his presence. "Also they saw the Elohim, and did eat and drink," is the solemn announcement made for the edification of the human race in all ages. Gideon is thrown into a state of alarm on having a vision of an angel, and says, "Alas, O Lord Jahveh! for because I have seen an angel of Jahveh face to face;" and is pacified with the assurance that this should not cause his death (Jud. vi. 22, 23). Manoah and his wife see a celestial emissary of Jahveh. The man, full of apprehension, exclaims, "We shall surely die, because we have seen Elohim;" but his more sensible wife reminded him that Jahveh would not have accepted their offering had he designed to kill them with the revelation of his presence (Jud. xiii. 22, 23). Isaiah (vi. 5-8) was quite overcome by a vision of Jahveh. "Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Jahveh of hosts"—on which this Gospel prophet, as he is sometimes called, underwent a very materialistic purgation, not, however, with blood (Heb. ix. 22). "Then flew one of the seraphims" (that is, one of the mythical serpent-formed creatures) "unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar; and he laid it upon my mouth,

and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips, and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged;" on which he professed himself ready for his mission. It is remarkable that the element selected in the later teaching for the torment of the wicked should have worked so great a reformation in the Hebrew prophet. Daniel (viii. 18; x. 9-11) is twice cast into "a deep sleep" on being brought into contact with a celestial apparition. On each occasion a touch of this being restores him to animation; but in the second of these occasions he is helped merely into the somewhat ridiculous attitude of being on his hands and knees, till told to "stand upright," when he rises "trembling."

The idea that the aspect of the divinity might be too formidable for mortal man to sustain, had presented itself also to the Hindús; but they were able to express it free of the debasing incidents resorted to by the barbaric Jews. Krishna figures in the Mahá-bhárata as an incarnation of Vishnu, a god who veiled his form, for the purpose of action among mankind, in a fleshly tabernacle. His disciple, Arjuna, with considerable hesitation, expressed a desire to see him in his divine aspect. "If thou thinkest," he said, "that that form is possible for me to look on, do thou, Lord of devotion, show thine inexhaustible self to me;" on which Krishna manifested himself as Vishnu, surrounded with types of omnipotence and infinitude, overwhelming Arjuna with reverential awe (Mrs Manning, *Anc. and Med. Ind.*, I. 230-232).

There is also the well-known tale of Semele in the Greek mythology. She, being one of Jupiter's human paramours, had aroused the jealousy of Juno, who, by an expedient, tempted her to ask her lover to come to her arms with the same majesty that he approached herself. "This rash request was heard with horror by Jupiter; but as he had sworn by the Styx to grant Semele whatever she required, he came to her bed, attended by the clouds, the lightning, and the thunderbolts; the mortal nature of Semele could not endure so much majesty, and she was instantly consumed by fire" (Anthon's *Lemp.*)

The Hebrew narrators may have had these narratives before them when they framed their accounts of Jahveh; or the common working of human thought, when let loose in

this direction, may have suggested their ideas to them independently.

12. JOSHUA.

The act of the Jewish leader in staying the sun and moon in their course, in order to have time to complete the slaughter of his enemies, is one the literality of which none in the present day can maintain in the face of the knowledge we possess of the movements of the earth, and its relation to the solar orb. The unknown writer of the non-extant book of Jasher is cited as the authority for the occurrence, which leaves the record here confessedly without the support of contemporaneousness or divine dictation. In the time of Hezekiah a similar miracle is reported. He had the option of accelerating or putting back the progress of time to the extent of ten degrees as marked upon the dial, and, as being the greater feat, had it put back. The fancy that such an interference was possible might readily occur to minds ignorant of the true correspondence and relative dependence on each other of the heavenly bodies. The Hindús have resorted to the imagery in their poetic narrative of the Rámáyana. The demon Rávana, to exhibit his great power, seized on the sun and the moon with his arms, and prevented their rising (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 73); and Hanuman, to enable him to execute a certain task, induced the sun to "stand still, and not rise till mid-day" (T. Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 369, note). Bacchus also is said to have arrested the sun and moon when on his march to India (Higgins, *Anac.*, II. 19).

13. SAMSON.

It is sufficiently apparent that Samson and Hercules are a repetition of one another. Most nations have had some traditionary hero possessed of superhuman strength, as the Bala Ráma and the Bhima of the Hindús, and the Rustum of the Persians. Hercules is depicted at Cadiz, where he had a temple, carrying a gate on his shoulders, as Samson bore off the gates of Gaza (Drummond, *Œd. Jud.*, 252; Higgins, *Anac.*, I. 239). His treacherous paramour Delilah shore off his locks, wherein lay his strength, and left him helpless in

the hands of his enemies, who thus effected his destruction. So Scylla, out of love for Minos, who was besieging Megara, her father's capital, cut off a golden lock of her father's hair, on which depended his strength, and thus gave her lover the victory (Anthon's *Lemp.*; Cox, *Tales of Anc. Greece*, 143, 144). Hercules in like manner met his fate at the hands of a woman, receiving from Dejanira the fatal gift of the poisoned tunic which caused his death. Dupuis considers Hercules to be the sun, his twelve labours being his passage through the twelve signs of the Zodiac; and he finds him figuring in this aspect upon an ancient sphere (*Or. de Tous les Cultes*, I. 315; III., part 2, 124, 125). The name of Samson is derivable from Shemsh, the sun. Dr Inman considers it to express, "On is the sun," or "Shemesh is On" (*Anc. Faiths*, II. 679). The shearing off of his locks would then be the depriving the sun of his rays (Higgins, *Anac.*, I. 239). Hercules, in the Greek mythology, has a high moral aspect which does not belong to the Jewish hero, who has nothing to exhibit but brute strength. Hercules is an example of obedience, patience, and fortitude. By his heavenly father Zeus's appointment, he lowers himself to become the servant of the mean Eurytheus. This has been thought to figure the sun as subservient to the uses of the earth. He went, he said, to do his duty, having been warned that his life would be full of perils; but he gladly accepted his mission, seeking eternal life. "In serving thee," he said to his unscrupulous employer, "I serve my father. 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 Rev. J. M. Neale, *Heathen Mythology*).

14. ELIJAH AND ELISHA.

These are peculiar characters who move and act solely for thaumaturgical display. The tales concerning them are suitable only for the amusement of infancy. The Orientals have delighted in such figurations, and accordingly the legends of the Hebrew thaumaturgists meet among them with frequent correspondence.

During a famine Elijah is fed by ravens, which, by the divine command, bring him bread and flesh morning and

evening. This must have been before the enactment of the Levitical law which declares "every raven" to be unclean (Lev. xi. 15). The Buddhist king Asoka was even more assiduously attended to by the brute creation. "Parrots brought him daily 9000 yalas of the rice that grows spontaneously upon the borders of the Chaddanta Lake, and it was freed from the husk by mice, that in the process broke not a single grain; bees brought honey, which they prepared and left, without taking any for themselves." Bears, tigers, birds of song, and pea-fowl ministered to him in various other ways (Spence Hardy, *East. Mon.* 178). Elijah is afterwards sustained by a widow of Zarephath whose handful of meal and modicum of oil are miraculously renewed for "many days." In the Mahá-bhárata is the description of a sage named Mudgala who lived a life of piety and self-restraint, and though in great poverty, depending on grain he obtained by gleaning, exercised hospitality towards others to the extent of his means. Durvása, a holy man, comes, like Elijah to the widow, to eat up all his little hoard, and miraculously the supply is rendered inexhaustible (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, new series, I. 312). In the same poem is the account of an old woman, the mother of the Raja of Badravati, who, when asked to accompany him and bathe in the Ganges, refused, saying, "Have I not a hundred better springs here." Her disbelief in the efficacy of the Ganges to wash away sins has naturally reminded Mr Wheeler of Naaman's reply when directed by Elisha to wash seven times in Jordan to remove his leprosy. "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them, and be clean?" (*Hist. of Ind.*, I. 393). Elijah is whirled up to heaven in a chariot and horses of fire. Elisha, afterwards, when on a mountain, exhibits to his astonished attendant a multitude of horses and chariots of fire by which he was surrounded. In the Rámayána there figures a wonderful vulture, named Jatáyus, descended from Garada, the bird of Vishnu. At his death a chariot of fire is despatched by Vishnu to transport his soul to Vaikuntha, the celestial abode of the deity (Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.*, II. 307). In the same poem, when Sarvari immolates herself, a celestial car descends and conveys her to the mansions of Vishnu

(*Ibid.*, II. 312). In the Mahá-bhárata, a messenger of the gods arrives in a heavenly car to transport the sage Mudgala to the abodes of bliss, but he prefers, for some higher reward, to continue his asceticism on earth (*Jour. of As. Soc.*, new series, I. 312-315). In the same poem the great divinity Indra appears in a chariot to transport king Yudhishthira to heaven (Williams, *Ind. Ep. Poet.*, 30). When Hercules expired he was conveyed to heaven in a chariot drawn by four celestial horses (Anthon's *Lemp.*).

15. Jonah.

The tale of Jonah is constructed, obviously, with mythical materials. Jonah flies from the local divinity Jahveh, is taken in a fish's belly where he passes three days and three nights, and then returns to his duty to Jahveh. This happened off the coast of Phœnicia, where the fish-god Dagon was worshipped. We appear to have the figure of a Hebrew prophet becoming unfaithful to Jahveh, transferring his allegiance to Dagon, and finally returning to Jahveh. There was also a female deity worshipped in the same region, named Derceto, with whom the legend may be associated. She was a beautiful woman to the waist, and then ended as a fish, and she is said to have been enamoured of a remarkably handsome young priest to whom she bore Semiramis (Anthon's *Lemp.*). The figure of a priest clothed in a fish, his head and arm alone appearing out of the fish's form, has been found in the remains of Nineveh (Inman, *Anc. Faiths*, I. 112). Similar figures have been met with inscribed on a Babylonish cylinder (*Ibid.*, II. 398). They portray, apparently, the subject of the famous Babylonish legend of Oannes, the fish-man. His body was that of a fish, but under the fish's head he had another head, as of a man, and human feet subjoined to the fish's tail. His voice and language were human. He passed the day among men, instructing them in the arts of life and in sciences, and at night retired to the sea, being amphibious (Cory, *Anc. Frag.*, 22, 23). The name Oannes is easily recognizable in that of Jonas, and the Hebrew legend may be safely based upon that of the Babylonians (Inman, *Anc. Faiths*, II. 400, 401; Higgins, *Anac.*, I. 656, citing Bryant). The author of the Book of God, or Apocalypse of Adam-Oannes, identifies

the Jonah of the Hebrews with the Dag-on of the Philistines, the Oannes of the Chaldeans, and the fish avatára of the Hindú Vishnu (300). Mr Maurice considers Dagon, Oannes, and the fish avatára to belong to the same source (*Hist. of Hind.*, I. 566). Higgins gives a drawing from Taylor's Calmet of Vishnu, in his fish avatára, coming out of a fish's mouth (*Anac.*, I. 638). Oannes, the author of the Book of God informs us, appears in Bonomi's drawings of the Nineveh sculptures, his head covered with a fish's head, and his body clothed with a fish's body, the statue being of colossal proportions. He appears again in the Nemroud marbles deposited in the British Museum, where he bears the name of Dag-on, or the Fish-on. We have here, the author observes, the Egyptian On, or the Sun, easily recognizable as Oannes, the Hebrew יוֹן (Aon) being fitted with a Greek termination. This "primitive Aon," he remarks, "was, therefore, an enlightener of man to a people speaking the primitive language out of which the Coptic sprang; and the Jews stole the tradition, and made a Rabbinical fable out of it, which they call the Book of Jonah, making that person like Vishnu emane from a fish" (304, 305).

The Egyptian legend of Osiris stands also connected with the Hebrew legend of Jonah. Osiris was shut up in his ark for three days, and was cast on shore, as Jonah, upon the coast of Phœnicia (Faber, *Pag. Idol.*, II. 241). The incidents are too close not to have been derived from one another. Jupiter left his celestial sphere and tided over three nights on earth with Alcmena, in order to form the greatest hero the world ever saw (Anthon's *Lemp.*); a circumstance, observes Dr Inman, of which Jonah in the fish "provokingly reminds us" (*Anc. Faiths*, I. 696). The offspring of the Greek divinity was Hercules, who in like manner passed three days in a fish's belly (Dupuis, *Or. de Tous les Cultes*, I. 335; *Book of God*, 296). The story is this: Laomedon, king of Troy, bound his daughter Hesione to a rock as a sacrifice to Poseidon's devouring sea-monster. Hercules delivered the maiden, springing full-armed into the fish's gaping throat, and coming forth hairless after three days' hacking within (Tylor, *Prim. Cult.*, 306; Anthon's *Lemp.*, *Art. Hesione*). Osiris, Jupiter, and Hercules, all representing the sun, his obscuration for three

days and three nights, appears to be here signified, the Hebrew writer adopting the facts, without consciousness, probably, of their mythical import.

The tale of Jonah is entirely out of keeping with the scheme of the Jewish theocracy. Jahveh and his prophets could only be presented to the exclusive people. The rest of the world were abandoned to their courses, and there could, properly, have been no such mission as represented from Judea to Nineveh; nor could such a mission, if undertaken, have commanded the alleged results. If Moses had no knowledge of Jahveh, but through the means of a special personal introduction, what could the Ninevites have known of him? Judged therefore by the Hebrew standards alone, the story is destitute of reality, and from its affinities to the mythological elements circulating all round the Jews in Chaldea, Egypt, Phœnicia, and Greece, it is apparent that to their propensity to build up their record with whatever could give to a race so ignorant as themselves a feeling of factitious importance, we owe its introduction into their sacred volume.

TURNBULL AND SPEARS, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.