



SIXTEEN SAVIORS OR NONE;



OR,

The Explosion of a Great Theological Gun.

AN ANSWER TO JOHN T. PERRY'S
"SIXTEEN SAVIORS OR ONE;"
AN EXAMINATION OF ITS
FIFTEEN AUTHORITIES,
AND AN EXPOSITION OF ITS
TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR ERRORS.

BY KERSEY GRAVES,

AUTHOR OF "THE WORLD'S SIXTEEN CRUCIFIED SAVIORS," "THE BIBLE OF BIBLES," AND "THE BIOGRAPHY OF SATAN."

SECOND EDITION.

Reproduced in electronic form

1998

Bank of Wisdom

P.O. Box 926

Louisville, KY 40201

U.S.A.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1879

Reproduced in electronic form

1998

Bank of Wisdom

P.O. Box 926

Louisville, KY 40201

U.S.A.

The purpose of the Bank of Wisdom
is to again make the United States the
Free Marketplace of Ideas that the
American Founding Fathers
originally meant this Nation to be.

Emmett F. Fields

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION.	5
CHAPTER I.	
The charges against my books.—How to settle the matter.—Five hundred dollars reward.—The two condemned quotations.—Another reward of five hundred dollars.—My "sui generis" memory.	9
CHAPTER II.	
An author tied and gagged.—Typographical errors.—My personal appearance.—My character.—My education.	12
CHAPTER III.	
"Sixteen Saviors or One."—The principal points of difference.—Why Mr. Perry published my review in his book.—Mr. Perry's newspaper puffs.—The Rev. George N. Smith.—The race between truth and error.	19
CHAPTER IV.	
Perry's ignorance of the history of the gods.—Was Prometheus a Roman god.—Ixion.—Esus and Eros.—Alcides and Hercules.	27
CHAPTER V.	
Did the heathen believe in the crucifixion of gods?—Mr. Perry's important admissions in the case.—How early Christians settle the matter of pagans borrowing the story of the crucifixion of Christ to constitute a chapter in the history of their own gods.	34
CHAPTER VI.	
Mr. Perry's authorities.—A revolution in history.—The writers cited by Mr. Perry.—His attempts, with them, to overthrow the historical records of the world and obliterate the established convictions of Christendom.	42
CHAPTER VII.	
An ecclesiastical court.—Mr. H. Klaproth.—Laplace.—Prof. Whitney.—More war among the witnesses.—Dr. Bentley.	45
CHAPTER VIII.	
The judge's review of the testimony.—Mr. Graves' counter-witnesses to the antiquity of Hindoo astronomy.	62
CHAPTER IX.	
Perry's four witnesses, by whom he attempts to show the analogous doctrines of the Hindoo religion were borrowed from Christianity.—Chamber's Cyclopaedia.—Encyclopedia Britannica.—Pavie.—Horace Wilson.—Another conflict among the witnesses.	65
CHAPTER X.	
Mr. Graves' counter-witnesses relative to the alleged modern origin of the Hindoo sacred books and their religion.	72
CHAPTER XI.	
Many other facts, proofs, and authors which show that neither the analogies of the Hindoo gods nor their religion are from Christianity.—St. Augustine denies the truth of Perry's borrowing theory.—Bailly on Origen and Lactantius.—Justin Martyr.	79

CHAPTER XII.

The church of England arrayed against Perry's borrowing theory.—What the Hindoos think of Christ and Christna as compared together. 86

CHAPTER XIII.

A revolution in civil jurisprudence.—The verdict of the jury.—The judge's charge to the jury.—The case reviewed by the judge.—What former writers thought of such wild theories and assumptions as Mr. Perry's and the authors' who support him. 88

CHAPTER XIV.

Perry's six other witnesses—Clarke, Hardwick, Mill, Fiske, "The London Athenæum," and Muller. 95

CHAPTER XV.

Hardwick, author of "Christ and Other Masters."—More clashing among the witnesses.—Mr. Graves' counter-testimony.—Goodrich.—Muller.—Haug.—Muller testifies again. 98

CHAPTER XVI.

John Stuart Mill. 107

CHAPTER XVII.

John Fiske.—"London Athenæum." 107

CHAPTER XVIII.

Max Muller Perry's principal witness.—He "wakes up the wrong passenger."—Muller overthrows Perry's main position 111

CHAPTER XIX.

Godfrey Higgins as a writer. 117

CHAPTER XX.

Muller reproves those occupying Perry's position for their disparaging views of the ancient religions. 120

CHAPTER XXI.

Perry's witnesses condemn his charges against the oriental religions. 122

CHAPTER XXII.

Did Brahminism ever undergo a radical change? 125

CHAPTER XXIII.

Buddhism and Christianity alike.—Perry against himself and all historians on religious analogies.—Positive proofs that Christians stole from the holy books of the Hindoos. 129

CHAPTER XXIV.

The Essenes preached Christianity long before Christ, and were considered original Christians. 133

CHAPTER XXV.

Why does not Mr. Perry refute my book? 134

CHAPTER XXVI.

A list of two hundred and twenty-four errors found in Mr. Perry's "Sixteen Saviors or One," 136

INTRODUCTION.

A NEW AND EXTRAORDINARY EFFORT TO ARREST
THE SWELLING TIDE OF INFIDELITY.

IN an age of scientific ignorance, as realized in the days of Martin Luther, when God and the devil were made the responsible agents for every event in human affairs and every phenomenon of nature, the most pious and learned Christian professors, when they first ventured to travel abroad in heathen lands, discovered to their astonishment that the oriental heathen priests were preaching the same doctrines, principles, and precepts as those contained in the Christian gospels. But they found an easy way of accounting for it by simply assuming that an omniscient and omnipotent devil had outwitted God Almighty and got the start of him by getting up a counterfeit gospel plan of salvation, "more like the original," as Sam Slick would say, "than the original itself." But when the sun of science arose above the Eastern horizon and began to dispel the darkness of religious superstition which reigned

over all the world and enveloped the minds of all Christendom as well as all heathendom, devils, like owls and orthodox priests, being afraid of the light, retired to their dismal dens and subterranean abodes. Hence another expedient had to be devised to account for the sum total of Christianity being preached by the ancient heathen long before they had ever heard of Jesus Christ or a Christian. Necessity being the mother of invention, some pious priests with a fossilized creed started the theory that some of the oriental systems were remodeled after the introduction of Christianity by ingrafting some of the doctrines of this new religion into their creeds. But it was left for John T. Perry to attempt to revolutionize and modernize all the ancient oriental systems of religion in those features resembling Christianity, in order to make it appear the former were borrowed from the latter. As one step toward this end, Mr. Perry has cited a number of Christian writers to establish the proposition that the discoveries in astronomy by the Hindoos, Persians, and other nations, to which they assign a remote date, are, despite their claims to antiquity, of modern origin. The reason so much is said concerning these calculations and discoveries, and so much importance attached to them by Mr. Perry, is that they were made the basis for a belief in the earthly advent and incarnation of gods. Certain astronomical phenomena were believed to occur periodically, and these periods

were called cycles, and were believed to mark the birth and appearance of a god upon the earth. Hence, if it could be shown that those astronomical observations and discoveries are of recent origin, it would lend a support to the assumption that a belief in the incarnation of gods and their crucifixions with their doctrines were borrowed from the gospel history of Christ. To what extent Mr. Perry has succeeded in establishing this proposition the reader can judge after examining the counter facts and authorities cited in this work and comparing them with the naked assumptions of the writers Mr. Perry has called to his aid.

**MR. PERRY'S TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR
ERRORS.**

A critical examination of Mr. Perry's book has disclosed no less than two hundred and twenty-four errors. It will, perhaps, seem strange to many readers that so small a work (only one hundred and forty-six pages; and is rather a *short* book, as well as a "thin book") should contain so many errors; but it should be borne in mind that an erroneous theory can be supported only by error. If the premises are wrong, arguments to support it are likely to be wrong also. If, in calculating a mathematical problem, one wrong figure is introduced, every subsequent line will contain erroneous figures if it should extend to a hundred or a thousand. And

a similar result may be expected in solving moral problems. An error at the outset may lead to a continuous series of errors, and without furnishing just grounds for challenging the author's veracity, which we courteously decline to do in Mr. Perry's case, assuming him to be *intentionally* a man of truth.

N. B.—Many other errors could be pointed out in Mr. Perry's book if necessary.

MY REASONS FOR EXPOSING THE ERRORS OF MR. PERRY'S BOOK.

1. His labored and earnest effort to arrest the progress of that greatly needed theological reform indicated by the term Infidelity, would, if successful, be a moral calamity upon the world.

2. His undue exaltation of the Christian Bible and its religion far above their real merits is calculated to conceal their moral and religious defects, and thus tend to perpetuate their numerous errors and evils to the moral and intellectual injury of the human race.

3. The strong prejudice which he manifests towards other religions, and which leads him to condemn them in a very unfriendly spirit, is calculated to do them injustice and deepen the prejudice long cherished in the minds of most Christian professors toward them, and thus perpetuate another great evil.

4. His untenable assumption of a very wide difference in the character, doctrines, and precepts of the

Christian religion and those of other forms of religious faith must be regarded as another error of no small magnitude.

5. His attack upon my books—apparently involving many misrepresentations—is calculated to create a wrong impression in the minds of those who have never read them as to their real character.

6. These five cogent reasons constitute my apology for writing this book.

NOTE.—Error 83 refers to two statements in Mr. Perry's book which I did not quote. But as few of my readers will see Perry's book, I have concluded to insert them here.

1. He says, "Mr. Graves quotes a silly story from Higgins relative to the concealment of some Hindoo manuscripts, which told against Christianity, by a bishop." This is a grand error. I stated that the notes made by the British committee who examined the Hindoo sacred books were left in the hands of a Christian bishop. There is not a word about concealing Hindoo manuscripts.

2. Again, he says, "Mr. Moor is of a different opinion" from that which he leaves the reader to infer I represent as being his opinion; whereas I said not one word about Moor's opinion.

SIXTEEN SAVIORS OR NONE.

CHAPTER FIRST.

I.—THE CHARGES AGAINST MY BOOKS.—HOW TO SETTLE THE MATTER. — FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS' REWARD.

As a labored and unremitting effort has been made by critics, cavilers, and clergymen to stamp the conviction upon the public mind that my published works contain numerous errors and misrepresentations and erroneous citations from history, I hereby offer them the opportunity of having the matter tested. If, upon a critical examination of any or all the corrected editions of my works, or the original manuscripts of those works which are yet in my possession, and which I will furnish on application, they shall succeed in finding one error, or *one important statement* not corroborated by reliable historical authority, cited in the work itself, or which I will furnish when the case is reported to me, I will forfeit the above-named sum to the investigator or investigators. Will they accept my proposition, and thus settle the matter forever? I have admitted that some errors crept into those works

through the hands of the type setters and the copyists who transcribed the works for the press, which may be found in some of the early editions, one of which was used by Mr. Perry, but which were then corrected in later editions. And he seems to have spent much more time in searching for those typographical errors and criticising them than in trying to refute their leading arguments and positions, which alone should receive the attention of the critic. By pursuing such a course he acts upon the policy of the thief, who searches for the weakest and most assailable parts of a dwelling-house when about to enter it to purloin its contents, or the policy of the nasty "blow-fly," which seeks only for the sores when it alights upon a physical body.

II.—THE TWO CONDEMNED QUOTATIONS.

Mr. Perry only claimed to find two erroneous citations in "The World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors." The first is a quotation from Gibbon relative to the Essenes changing their name to Christian; the second is a citation from the New American Cyclopedia relative to De Quincy's identifying the Essenes with the early Christians. At first I was disposed to admit they might be uncorrected typographical errors. But a more recent critical examination of the matter proves they are both correct, with the exception of two redundant words in the first quotation and the wrong use of quotation marks in the second. With these slight alterations, which are made in the revised editions, the citations are all right.

III.—ANOTHER REWARD OF FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS.

In order to pay Mr. Perry in his own coin with respect to the charge of committing errors in writing books, I hereby obligate myself to pay either to him or to any of his readers the above-named sum if he or she or they will find, in any Christian country, or within the boundaries of the civilized world, another work on theology of equal size with his "Sixteen Saviors or One," containing as many erroneous statements—a charge I am willing to submit to a jury of twelve men, one-half of whom may be Christian professors (provided they are not clergymen or editors of popular newspapers). Will Mr. Perry or some of his friends accept the offer?

IV.—MY SUI GENERIS MEMORY.

As the numerous errors which Mr. Perry charges upon my works must either be attributed to intentional misrepresentation or a very bad memory, I will assume the liberty to state that my well known character will settle the first charge, and my peculiar memory will throw some light on the second. It is a fact for which I claim no merit that I possess a memory which in some respects is not excelled by that of any man living. Not ordinarily, however, but under very favorable circumstances, when all my thoughts and feelings become enlisted in the subject, I not only grasp and retain the facts and ideas by reading, but they rise up like a panorama before my mental vision while writing, so that I see at one view nearly everything I ever read on the subject. And this power of

mind and memory is manifested still more strongly in public speaking. If the subject strongly enlists my feelings, such is the vivid and indelible impression which every word and every thought I utter makes upon my own mind and memory, that after the discourse is delivered I can repeat the whole of it either backward or forward sometimes several days after, even if three or four hours in length and delivered in the most rapid manner. Yet I never depend upon my memory in writing without verifying it by a subsequent examination. Hence I commit no errors in this way and have a double chance of being right.

CHAPTER SECOND.

I.—AN AUTHOR TIED AND GAGGED.

“Never strike a man while tied.”—PYTHAGORAS.

There is a chapter of events connected with the inception and publication of Mr. Perry's book which but few persons are initiated into. At the time Mr. Perry's thirteen-column attack on “The World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors” made its appearance in the “Richmond Telegram,” in the month of February, I was overtaxed with business which would admit of no delay. Hence I was compelled to run over the long and tedious criticism in a rapid manner, and answer it with much haste. In all my experience as a writer I never wrote with greater haste or with greater distraction and confusion of mind, caused by poor health and overwork. This is my apology for any mistakes which I may have made. A similar state of mind

once caused Sir Isaac Newton to state in a letter to a friend that a certain man carried his wife in his pocket, but afterwards corrected it by stating he meant to say his wig. My article was thus dashed together with haste and in mere fragments, and was cut so short as to leave many points entirely unnoticed, partly because I had been forewarned that if it exceeded certain limits it would not be admitted into the columns of the "Telegram." Indeed, the editor told me I was not legitimately entitled to the privilege of publishing *any* reply in his paper, but he would grant it as a special favor. Hence my article was not only dashed together in haste, but cut so short as to omit the notice of fifty points and to treat very briefly all that were noticed, partly from the conviction that I had no time to write a long article, and partly because I believed I could not get it published if I made it longer. And yet this brief and imperfect reply, which I was compelled to restrict to less than half the points, and to omit proofs and authorities for those I did notice, Mr. Perry has seized on and published in his book, and it now circulates over the country as a full and exhaustive reply to his long list of criticisms. It was nothing of the kind. I have spoken of the first wrong to which I was subjected, that of being restricted in my reply to Mr. Perry's first criticism. But the second act of injustice was of still greater magnitude, which consisted in allowing Mr. Perry to publish a second criticism and cutting me off from any reply whatever. The editor announced that Perry's second article would close the controversy. It is true he headed it "Recapitulation," which would imply that

it was a mere summing up of the debate thus far conducted. But the reader will observe many new arguments are employed, many new facts adduced, new charges made, new propositions instituted, and new authorities quoted. If such conduct and such treatment are in accordance with the views of justice as practically recognized by the public press in general, God save me from being an editor. And yet I suppose Mr. Perry and the editor both persuaded themselves they were treating me fairly, for I will do the editor the justice to say he had always treated me with respect when his religious prejudices did not interfere. When Mr. Perry's second article came out in the "Telegram," I stepped into the office and pointed out to the editor many erroneous statements (though I will do Mr. Perry the justice to suppose he considered them true). "Here I am," I observed, "with my hands and tongue tied; the discussion, you say, is closed; so I must go before the world with these dishonorable charges uncontradicted." He made but little reply.

II.—TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS.

I will also do the editor of the "Telegram" the justice to state that he allowed me to correct some typographical errors in his paper. But he would not publish the brief article correcting Perry's criticisms on the two historical citations previously noticed. I stated in my review that my works in their earlier editions contained typographical errors, and that the first edition of "The Bible of Bibles," of which he had previously purchased a copy, contained about thirty. Whereupon he, in the next number of the "Tele-

gram," broke forth in the following dolorous language :

"Like Dives of old in hell, we might have lifted up our eyes in torment before the awful fact would have reached us through Mr. Graves that we had read and been damned by reading the wrong edition of his book."

I replied as follows :

TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS.—THEIR FATAL EFFECTS.

"EDITOR TELEGRAM: As you seem to attach a fearful importance to a few typographical errors found in the first edition of my last work, allow me to inform you that the learned body of Christians now engaged in translating the Bible are reported to have found twenty thousand errors in that 'perfect and infallible revelation from God.' And these errors are not all mere mistakes of type setters—they are 'radical' and lie at the very foundation of the world's salvation. They are (many of them) errors of statement. Most of those in my book are mere inaccuracies in words and figures, and are now corrected, while those in the Bible are of more serious importance and are not corrected. Hence, according to your argument, millions must now, like Dives of old, be in hell lifting up their eyes in torment because they were not informed of these errors while reading their Bibles. And what must be the awful doom of those colporteur missionaries and Bible societies who have distributed millions of copies of this book containing these soul-ruining errors? And this is not the worst view of the case. The learned Dr. Robinson, of England, informs us he has found the frightful number of one hundred and fifty thousand errors in 'God's book.' I guess, then, from the fearful importance you attach to such errors, we may conclude that the world is lost, for not one copy (of the millions sold) of this important 'guide to salvation,' on which Christians hang the destiny of the world, has ever been circulated that did not contain many thousand of these fatal errors, and the people were not informed of them when the book was placed in their hands. So, according to your logic, hell must now be filled with the victims ruined by these errors. What a fearful responsibility rests upon the alphabet! Brother, don't you see you took on too much agony? Look at the fact that Noah Webster found more typographical errors in the Bible than can be found in both my books. And

look at another fact: That profound scholar, Bishop Colenso, wrote and published a work on the Bible nearly fifteen years ago, in which there are still more than fifty typographical errors, and thousands of copies of the work have been sold both in Europe and America with these errors in them. A note was made of them, but practically this did not correct them. They are still in the book. The first edition of nearly all works contain more or less typographical errors, but as they do not affect the leading positions of the book, no importance is attached to them. So much for the wonderful ado about typographical errors now corrected, and which would be of no importance if not corrected. How true it is that 'a drowning man will catch at a straw!'

KERSEY GRAVES."

The editor's article should have been headed "The Mountain Bringing Forth a Mouse," or "Much Ado About Nothing." The objection is too futile to merit serious notice.

III.—MY PERSONAL APPEARANCE.

In a humorous way, as a kind of neighborhood gossip which I did not suppose would obtain a publicity beyond the limited circulation of a country newspaper, I said something about my personal appearance being rather forbidding, which I observe Mr. Perry has copied into his book. I expected it to be seen by but few besides my personal friends, who would understand it.

But as it has gone abroad, I will say in explanation that I was engaged some time ago in growing hedge-plants for the market. Hence, when dressed in accordance with my business, my appearance can be best indicated by the words "rough and ready." It was my personal appearance at that period I humorously referred to.

As for what nature has done for me, I have nothing

to say, only that some conception can be formed of the rough mold she has chosen to cast me in by examining the likeness in my books, though some of my friends think they hardly do me justice. The photographer appears to have given my face one twist too much. Two less would have improved on nature.

IV.—MY CHARACTER.

I also had a little to say about my character, because it was assailed by Mr. Perry. I stated that I had been so fortunate as to escape falling a victim to the common vices of society, such as profane swearing, drinking, gambling, etc.; never had a personal combat with any man; that I never swallowed a dram of intoxicating drinks or enough to make a dram; that I never used tobacco in any form, excepting one chew of the noxious weed, and repented of that in tears in less than half an hour, and rejoiced that I lived long enough after taking it to repent of it. This was a boyhood experiment. This much I have assumed the liberty of saying about my character. Let Mr. Perry show a better record.

V.—MY EDUCATION.

Some of my friends suggested that I misrepresented my educational experience when I stated that I graduated in a pole-cabin schoolhouse. The following letter, addressed to a friend, will perhaps set the matter in its true light:

REPLY TO DAVID JONES.

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE TELEGRAM: I observe by the last ‘Telegram’ that my old friend and fellow school-mate, David Jones, has

arraigned me before the public under the charge of a 'fulminating expansion of elongated veracity' (a college student's polite way of defining a departure from truthfulness). The question is: Am I correct in saying I graduated in a tenement made of unhewn saplings? I confess it is rather a 'Grave' question, and the truth or falsity of my statement must depend upon the facts in the case and the meaning of the word 'graduate.' Webster defines 'graduate' to mean 'to advance by degrees; to advance from one degree to another.' Now I claim that in the pole pen in which I commenced my education I graduated by degrees all the way from the alphabet to algebra, and only took on a few more studies afterwards in other institutions, though I have studied several branches of science since on my own hook. Friend David testifies to having seen me poring over a Greek grammar in a brick schoolhouse in the city of Richmond, and I guess I can't do better than to plead 'guilty' to the charge. After having paid some attention to Latin, I occupied several months in digging among the roots of Greek literature, but my father finally set me to digging among another kind of roots, and I gave it up. I studied so hard in trying to master those old dead languages (Latin and Greek) that my loving mother grew uneasy for fear I would 'go crazy' by such severe mental labor. But I consoled her with the idea that I would not have far to go to get there.

"But to the question of graduating. Perhaps I am in an error about the matter similar to that of Pat's about his native title. When he claimed while on board an English vessel to be an Englishman, a friend reminded him that he was born in Ireland. 'Holy Moses!' exclaimed Pat, 'that makes no difference; if a man was born in a stable that wouldn't make him a horse, would it?' Upon a like parity of reasoning, I claim that my subsequent studies in a brick edifice should not debar me from the honor of having graduated in a pole-cabin schoolhouse. The learned teacher referred to (Mr. McGookin) stated that he studied one year in Oxford College (Ohio) after having graduated in some other institution. In like manner I supposed I might claim that I graduated in a log-hut, oblivious of the fact that I kept on studying afterwards. As to the indications of my Quaker proclivities to which friend Jones refers, I will say I was born a Quaker without my consent or consultation. Hence in my youthful days I was (religiously speaking) a Quaker by trade, but did not work much at it.

KERSEY GRAVES."

I will only add that I have been a diligent student, have spent but few idle hours, have examined various branches of science, and have been in nearly every field of reform.

CHAPTER THIRD.

“SIXTEEN SAVIORS OR ONE.”

This title which Mr. Perry has chosen for his book will be understood when collated with my work, “The World’s Sixteen Crucified Saviors,” as indicating the direct issue between the two works and as pointing to the principal battle-ground on which the theological contest now waging between their authors is to be fought.

I.—THE PRINCIPAL POINTS OF DIFFERENCE.

The main questions at issue between Mr. Perry and myself are comprehended in the two following queries :

1. Have we historical grounds for believing that the belief or conception of the crucifixion of a god was prevalent in any heathen or oriental nation before the birth of Christ. One case would prove that the belief is of heathen origin as well as sixteen. And that is the important proposition aimed to be established by my book.

2. Are the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, which are now found also incorporated in the oriental systems, of heathen or of Christian origin? These two queries comprise the gist of the whole controversy.

The first proposition may be argued either on historical or moral grounds—that is, as a historical fact or as a moral necessity. I indorse the sentiment couched in the heading of Prof. Swing's letter, which Mr. Perry has published in his "Sixteen Saviors or One," which reads thus: "Many Saviors and Their Origin—Sixteen a Poor Collection;" which implies that sixteen does not comprise near the whole number. And this I admit. It does not even comprise the whole number reported to have been crucified. In view of the many nations and sects who believed in from one to a dozen saviors, it must be admitted that "sixteen is a poor collection." Or, if we look at it in a moral point of view, we must acknowledge that sixteen is but a meager supply for a world of sinners. And even if restricted to the Christian world, this supply would be inadequate to the demand, if Parson Brownlow's portraiture of the moral condition of Christendom may be accepted as correct when he declares that lying, cheating, hypocrisy, and rascality are the order of the day in all Christian countries. No such a picture has ever been drawn of the heathen world. And this moral picture indicates the necessity for not merely many saviors, but for numerous crucifixions also, if we may assume that such deific immolations could redeem or result in any moral or practical benefit to such a demoralized set of Christians as Mr. Brownlow represents the professed followers of Christ to be. We may safely assume that the crucifixion of a hundred gods would not be too much to purify, redeem, and fit for the "kingdom" such a lot of vile sinners. Here I wish to call special attention to Perry's "sin of

omission" in this case. He publishes the whole of Mr. Swing's letter in his book, but omits the heading, "Many Saviors and Their Origin—Sixteen a Poor Collection." Why was this title left out? The reason is very obvious. To publish the statement from one of the indorsers of his book that there were "many saviors," when the title of the book itself says there was but one, would be a glaring incongruity that would bring his book into disrepute. No further explanation is necessary.

II.—WHY MR. PERRY PUBLISHED MY REVIEW IN HIS BOOK.

Perhaps I should regard it as a fortunate circumstance that I was debarred the privilege of replying to Mr. Perry's second criticism. For he would never have mustered courage to publish my exposition of the errors of his first criticism to the world had he not been granted the special favor by the "Telegram" of appearing again in its columns with new arguments and new authorities in support of his former seriously damaged position and theories with the distinct promise by the editor that I should not be permitted to criticise or expose any more of his errors or correct any statement he might make—that is, I would not be permitted to reply. He could thus say what he pleased and put it in any shape he pleased without the fear of being mortified by the exposure of its errors. With this double advantage he ventured to patch up some kind of reply to my hastily written review of his first criticism, which he supposed would serve as a kind of mantle or veil to conceal the errors

I had exposed. And then, by claiming to expose more of my errors, he probably solaced himself with the belief that he could divert the readers' attention from his errors to mine by adopting the policy of "stop-thief." Without these special advantages, which allowed him to patch up some of the breaches I had made in his theological fortress, I opine he never would have published my article.

III.—MR. PERRY'S NEWSPAPER PUFFS.

Various popular newspapers, a large portion of whose readers are strongly biased by education in favor of popular orthodoxy, have bestowed all kinds of flattering notices on the "Sixteen Saviors or One" and its "profoundly learned author," who is styled "a walking library," "a standard authority in historical accuracy," etc. I have seen but one or two editorials, however, indorsing the work. Their clerical readers appear more interested in trying to popularize the work. They are solemnly impressed with the necessity of having something done to arrest the tide of Infidelity which is threatening to sink their ship, and thus terminate the reign of superstition. They appear to be seized with a consternation similar to that of the deacon who, on being roused from sleep by a thunder-storm which unroofed his dwelling and prostrated its chimney, exclaimed: "Gentlemen, there must be something done. It won't do to let things go on in this way." But they may be too late coming to the rescue of their darling cause. The orthodox journals and the preachers laud Perry's book as a complete extinguisher of Infidelity and a successful

refutation of my works, "The Sixteen Crucified Saviors" and "The Bible of Bibles;" and yet not one of them in a hundred have read those works, and but few have ever seen them. Their decision is based, not on knowledge, but on desires — a feeling similar to that of the young lady who hastened to the house of a friend, at early morn, to see a newborn babe. Rushing to the cradle (before there was sufficient light in the room to enable her clearly to recognize its occupant) she exclaimed: "What a pretty darling it is! It is the very image of its father;" but when a light was brought she had the mortification of discovering there was nothing in the cradle but a sleeping cat. Chagrined at her hasty decision, she confessed she was influenced by desire more than knowledge in making her decision. Many of Mr. Perry's friends have pronounced his young bantling a model of perfection and the very image of its sire before they have reached the cradle in which it was first rocked. It is to be hoped they will not have the mortification of finding it a cat. The Cincinnati "Gazette," of which Mr. Perry is the "literary editor," styles him a "walking library," "a standard authority of historical accuracy," etc. It lauds his book and condemns mine. And this is true also of various correspondents of other papers published in the interest of an orthodox community who never read my works. And it is probable Mr. Beecher and Mr. Swing have never read them or Mr. Perry's articles either.¹

¹ Mr. Perry published his first criticism in the "Telegram" and furnished Beecher a copy of the paper, who made a brief response and

My newspaper critics know just as much about my books as the old matron did about novels who, on being asked if she liked novels, replied, "Wal, I don't know exactly. I never tasted any; but I guess if they were well fried I could eat a few."

IV.—THE REV. GEO. N. SMITH.

A most scathing criticism and fatal blow at Mr. Perry's theories and assumptions by an orthodox clergyman, who condemns them and turns them topsy-turvy, and shows his utter failure to meet and answer my books, was published in the "Telegram" soon after Perry's criticism appeared in it. It is an exposure of the weakness of his cause and his failure to sustain it by one of his own brethren—a member of "the household of faith." He is one of Perry's many witnesses who "turn state's evidence against him," as hereafter shown. I subjoin a portion of his article:

proposed that Perry should publish his criticism in the form of a "thin book." I stated in reply that the word "thin" is quite suggestive of the character of the article without applying it to the size of the work published. It is thin enough in all conscience. As Beecher has for several years been at a serious discount in the public esteem, and his popularity and reputation very much lowered, he is in a position to work for anybody who will show him any favor. A friend says he is prostrate on his back. Well, that is a favorable position for looking up. Tom Hood would say, Beecher has "a glorious future behind him." It was once in front, but it has retreated to the rear. The sentiment he has expressed relative to the suffering and starving millions of the honest laborers in the country—"Let their bellies go empty, it will do them good"—has placed him beyond the favor or friendship of that class.

THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.

"CANTON, ILL., March 9, 1879.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE RICHMOND TELEGRAM: I have read with much interest the discussion of Kersey Graves' books. And according to my reading, his critic has decidedly the best of the question. But I am not a little surprised that the leading assumption of those books is not noticed by him—that, in fact, he almost seems to give it countenance. It is that if the doctrines of Christianity can be proved to have existed before the coming of the Lord, they are thereby shown to be of human origin. A more astonishing 'non sequitur' was never perpetrated, nor a wilder assumption. And yet the critic fails to use this golden opportunity he has to settle Mr. Graves forever; and he even seems to partially admit his ground where he grants some of the coincidences, but only such as the constitution of the human mind makes a part of all religions."

Here it will be observed is a deadly shot at Mr. Perry's logic. It completely prostrates and demolishes his whole theory and points out his utter failure to meet the arguments and propositions of my book. It is a criticism much more damaging to Mr. Perry than Mr. Perry's criticisms are on me; because in the first place he shows Mr. Perry's error is an important one, and in the second place, that he makes not a *partial* failure but an *utter* failure to meet the leading proposition of my books. And in the third place he shows that Perry has uptripped himself, and ruined his own cause by making some fatal admissions which overthrow his whole system. He admits that some of the doctrines of the ancient oriental systems so strikingly analogous to those now called Christian are the natural outgrowth of the human mind, which makes them of human origin in direct opposition to his own theory. The reverend Mr. Smith seems very naturally and logically to conclude that if the human mind is com-

petent to originate some of the doctrines of the Christian faith, it is competent to originate them all; and this, according to Mr. Perry's logic, would make them all of heathen origin. And thus, virtually, Perry has unwittingly canceled the whole ground and settled the question against himself. I need say nothing with respect to the merits of the controversy of these theological disputants, but will leave them to settle the matter themselves. I feel probably as indifferent with respect to it as the woman did with respect to a fight between her husband and a bear, when she declared she did not care a d—n which whipped. They are both defenders of "the faith once delivered by the saints." "A house divided against itself cannot stand." But here I would like to ask Mr. Perry why he inserted the letters of Mr. Beecher and Mr. Swing and omitted this of Mr. Smith. Perhaps it was a timber that did not fit the building. Will he "rise and explain" this mystery?

V.—THE RACE BETWEEN TRUTH AND ERROR.

William Penn says: "Error will never consent to run a race with truth unless it has several miles the start." This maxim sets Mr. Perry's policy in its true light. He had not only several miles the start, but was allowed to keep it, for I was not permitted to follow him. It was thus a single-handed race, a man running from his own shadow. It was doubtless with the conviction that he had done something more towards showing me up in his second criticism that he concluded to have my article published. He probably cherished some such feelings as possessed old Arthur

Elliot when he declared he would rather go to hell with his Infidel neighbors and be roasted a few hours with them than that they should escape becoming inmates of that institution. He would, however, probably want to make sure of a return ticket before he ventured upon such an expedition or took a seat on the underground railroad.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

PERRY'S IGNORANCE OF THE HISTORY OF THE GODS.

Perry's criticisms on the gods show he has read some authors on the subject quite attentively, but, on the other hand, that he has not explored the whole field. Every person who has read a half a dozen works on mythology knows that different authors have different names for the gods and different rules for classifying and locating them. One writer assigns a god to that locality or nationality which marks the place of his assumed birth; another gives him a place in the history of that country where he figured most largely; while a third assigns him to the country which bestowed on him the highest honor. Helstein says, "It is difficult to assign the gods any locality, because they disappear in one nation and reappear in another, sometimes with the same name and sometimes with a different one." Athena of Greece when transferred to Rome became Minerva, and when transferred to Egypt she was known as Neith, while Bacchus passed by the same name in all those countries. Gerald Massey says, "The gods are

so mixed up it is difficult to tell t'other from which." (This is the writer who, speaking of the orthodox doctrine of future endless punishment, declared, "If I had known that a portion of mankind were born to be damned, I will be d—d if I had been born at all.") In view of the foregoing facts, Mr. Perry's criticism on the gods is shown to be not very sensible. This will be made still more apparent when we present, as we will now do, a critical notice of those gods whom he invests with a different history from that found in the "World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors."

X.—PROMETHEUS—WAS HE A ROMAN GOD?

Perry says not. I affirm he was Roman as well as Grecian. This is evidenced partly by the name. Prometheus is not a Greek word, but Roman name; *us* is a Latin termination. And then look at the following facts: Jupiter, a Roman god, was his principal companion nearly all through his history. Jupiter hurled him into Tartarus, *the Roman hell*" (Hades being the Greek name for hell). Jupiter joined with him in fighting the Titans; Jupiter chained him to a pillar, etc., etc. All this is found, not in Greece, but on the pages of Roman fabulous history. It is true a portion of it is also found in the theogony of the Greek gods. The New American Cyclopaedia says there are two different accounts of this god. It might have said half a dozen and applied the remark to nearly all the gods.

As to the story of his crucifixion, different writers have recorded it, whether fact or fiction. The Cyclopaedia alludes to it (see vol. i, page 157), and Higgins says, "I have seen the account which declares

he was nailed to the cross with hammer and nails.' He pronounces the story of his being chained to a rock and his vitals being preyed on by vultures for thirty years a gross fabrication at the hands of dishonest priests. Mr. Perry, in denying his Roman title, perhaps has a philosophy to meet the case analogous to that of St. Patrick, who, when he claimed to be an Englishman and was reminded by a friend that he was born in Ireland—exclaimed, "Holy Moses, that makes no difference; if a man were born in a stable that wouldn't make him a horse, I guess." If Prometheus started in Greece, Perry thinks he must be confined to Greece even if he figured more largely in Roman history.

1. He criticises me for spelling the name of a Mexican god Quexalcote, instead of Quetzalcoatl, evidently ignorant of the fact that I give the English and he the Aztec mode of spelling.

2. Mr. Perry says Quirrinus of Rome was identical with Romulus, and was not, therefore, crucified as a god. Does he not know that Romulus himself was deified and worshiped as a god? Hence, if he was crucified under the name of Quirrinus, he was crucified as a god. Here either his memory or his reading is short again.

3. He says Apis was the sacred bull of Memphis and could not have been identical with Thulis, or Zulis, a crucified god. Apis figured as a bull, a bee, and a man or demigod; and, besides, there were several men or gods who bore that name, according to several authors. The New York "Journal of Commerce" represents the traveler, Auguste Marrietta, as

saying, "Each of the Apis were buried in the same tomb."

4. He says Wittoba was the same as Chrishna. Wittoba was a very different character from Chrishna in some countries, though Chrishna may have occasionally received the name, as it was common for gods to have various names. Chrishna's mother's name was Maia, and Wittoba's was Vana. So much for Mr. Perry's historical researches.

5. Perry ridicules the idea of Iao of Nepaul being the root of the name of the Jewish god, Jehovah. Here is what his great historical oracle Max Müller says about it: "Moses received his laws from the god Iao, according to the Jews" (Science of Religion, page 58). It seems, then, that Perry is ignorant of Jewish history as well as oriental history.

6. Mr. Perry makes a most suicidal blunder in his allusion to the mediæval missionaries. He says, "I get my stories relative to the oriental gods, or a portion of them, from 'uncritical mediæval missionaries.'" Thanks, a thousand thanks, to Mr. Perry for thus acquitting me of the serious charge he himself had heaped upon my devoted head in virtually representing me as making these stories, which were originated by the members of the household of faith, and not by Infidels.

7. Mr. Perry tries to discredit what I said about Lord Kingsborough's Mexican antiquities and about the "Codex Vaticanus" being an ancient work. Both of my statements are correct. Why did he not quote what I have cited as Kingborough's language in "The World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors," and then show

he is not correct? That was the fair way to settle the matter.

8. He disputes Confucius' being miraculously born, because he was the son of his father's second marriage—that is, he had a human father. To be sure; and does he not know that many of the great men of antiquity who were believed to be miraculously born had human fathers. Plato, Pythagoras, Alexander, and Augustus all had natural fathers and yet were believed to be miraculously born.

Of Plato it is declared he was born of Perictione, and begotten by Apollo and not by Ariston, his father. I would recommend Mr. Perry to visit some historical library again and read another chapter on the gods.

9. *The Murder of the Innocents.*—He says, "A dozen children under two years old would be a fair estimate" of those slain under the decree of Herod, and insinuates that I was dishonest for putting the number at 14,000. In my review I referred to the fact that the Greek church, one of the oldest in the world, estimated the number to be 14,000. And consequently, if I am not correct, he must settle the matter with his own witnesses. It is ludicrous and absurd to put the number at a dozen, when the text declares the decree extended to Jerusalem and all the coast round about.

II.—IXION.

Was Ixion a Roman god? Perry says no; I say yes. He plays about the same rôle in Roman history in some respects that Prometheus does. He formed a coalition with Jupiter, the Roman god, and was

on familiar terms with his consort, Juno. Mr. Perry locates him in Thessaly, which he says is a Grecian province. So it was at one time, but it came under Roman dominion more than 2,000 years ago, and more recently passed into the hands of the Turks. Mr. Perry makes him an inmate of hell, and therefore discredits his crucifixion. But according to the New American Cyclopaedia, instead of going to hell himself, he had Deioneus cast into the fiery pit, and was finally crucified on a wheel which revolved in the air, and not in hell, where Perry places him. According to Wilson, the rim of the wheel represented the world and the spokes of the wheel the cross, which indicated a symbolical representation of being crucified for the sins of the world. Where is Perry now, "the standard authority in historical accuracy?"

III.—ESUS AND EROS.

Perry says they were not the same—that Eros was "the God of Love." But here his memory or his reading is short again. Eros was once the "God of Love," but became the "God of Creation." Müller says, "Eros means 'the dawning light' or 'dawning sun;'" and he combats the idea of calling him "the God of Love." Plato shows there were many and different traditions about this god. And Müller says, "Each writer maintained that myth of Eros to be the true one which agrees best with his own ideas of the nature of this god" (Chips from a German Workshop, vol. ii, p. 14). Here he pictures Perry's position very forcibly. In some localities Esus and Eros were

names applied to the same being. In other localities they were separated. Thus Perry is Müllerized.

IV.—ALCIDES AND HERCULES.

He says, "Mr. Graves makes them two different persons, when they are the same." How two persons can be the same when they had different fathers and different mothers is a theological puzzle that a man who can believe that Christ was begotten twice, once by the Father (see John i, 14), and once by the Holy Ghost (see Matt. i, 18), may believe, but it must swamp a philosopher. Hercules (who occasionally borrowed the name of Alcides) was the son of Jupiter and Alcmene (or Prudence); while Alcides, known also as Amphitryon, was the son of Alcæus and Hipponeme. Friend Perry should read and study godology a little longer before he assumes the office of censor and critic.

He criticises me for calling Alcides an Egyptian god, instead of a Grecian god. Four times I have spoken of Alcides as being a Grecian god and in one or two cases I have spoken of the same god, or a god of the same name (though generally spelt Alcites), as figuring also in Egyptian history. Why did he attempt to mislead the reader by leaving out two-thirds of the story.

The above cases are specimens of the erratic nature of many of his criticisms.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

I.—DID THE ANCIENT HEATHEN BELIEVE IN THE CRUCIFIXION OF GODS?

This is the only real question at issue between Mr. Perry and myself, with the exception of the ante-Christian and heathen origin of the doctrines of the Christian faith. These two questions constitute the gist of the whole controversy. The question is not as to the number of gods represented to have been crucified, for that is a matter of no importance, but when and where did this report and belief originate? Nor is it a matter of importance whether the reports are fact or fiction, as stated in "The Sixteen Crucified Saviors." The question at issue between us is, Did the belief in the crucifixion of gods originate with the heathen before the crucifixion of Christ? Mr. Perry and I agree that it is a matter of doubt whether many, if any, of the gods were crucified. But when he asserts that it was not even a matter of belief or tradition among the pre-Christian heathen, and that "the crucifixion of gods did not exist even in conception" prior to the advent of Christ, I take direct issue with him, and the records of history shall be our judge and jury to decide which is right. He has waded through a mass of traditions and superstitions to show that the gods I have represented as having been crucified died a natural death if they died at all. He assumes that no other history of those gods has ever been left to the world but those he presents, or at least none essentially different. But here is his grand error. He has not read quite enough, or has not remembered well.

We can find different and discrepant histories of nearly all the important personages who figured in those days of ignorance and superstition. He can make nothing by attempting to show that the writers he quotes did not believe those gods were crucified. For here he will be met with the important fact that there was the same dispute, the same difference of opinion, among the early Christian writers with respect to the crucifixion of Christ. A number of honest and devout Christian writers always maintained that Christ was not crucified. Even Irenæus, it appears, at one time disbelieved it. Hundreds of thousands of the disciples of the Christian faith in that age, according to Theodoret, never believed that Christ was crucified, and several very popular, or at least very populous, Christian churches rejected the belief in his crucifixion, among which may be mentioned the Marcionites, the Basilideans, and the Manicheans. One of these churches alone (the Marcionites), according to Theodoret, comprised a membership of more than two hundred thousand, which discloses the fact that the disbelievers in Christ's crucifixion were very numerous. Here, then, the cases are parallel. If it is true that many of the early heathens did not believe in the crucifixion of their gods, it is equally true that many and a large proportion of the early Christians disbelieved in Christ's crucifixion; and thus the cases are balanced. And now we will entertain and answer the question, Did any of the ancient heathen believe in the crucifixion of gods? Is it an ante-Christian or pre-Christian conception? Several writers, not Infidel writers, but Christian writers, in-

form us that the belief was prevalent in several heathen nations that gods had appeared among them and had been crucified. Hence it becomes a question of veracity resting upon the credibility of those writers. Did they lie in making this statement? If so, what could have been the motive? It is impossible to conceive of any rational motive that could have influenced them to fabricate such stories without any basis of truth? We will first examine the validity of Mr. Higgins' testimony, who is the principal witness in the case. I see nothing unreasonable in the conclusion that a man who investigated the subject more thoroughly than any other writer has done; who spent ten hours a day for twenty years in directly or indirectly examining the histories of nations and all the principal oriental monuments, sculptures, and inscriptions in all the religious countries of the world, and in ransacking nearly all the public libraries on the Eastern Continent—I see nothing unreasonable in the conclusion that a writer and a scholar who thus grasped the historical lore of all ages and all nations should be able to develop some new and startling facts which had escaped the observation of more superficial observers. Hence his reports on the crucifixion of the ancient gods became quite credible. But let it be borne in mind that the truth of these reports does not rest upon his testimony or upon his veracity—not at all. He cites many facts and authorities. He quotes from history, and gives his authorities and references; and until they are met and answered he stands unimpeached, and the shafts of criticism aimed at him will fall harmless at his feet. The matter is to be settled with them.

Perry's charge against him of indulging in "wild speculations," has no more bearing in the case and can do no more toward invalidating his evidence than the discovery of a few burrs in his horse's tail, as related in chapter sixteenth.

We will now examine some of his alleged facts. He furnishes us with the description in his "Anacalypsis" of a large number of drawings said to have been copied from Hindoo monuments, representing the crucifixion of some god or gods. These drawings are taken from old rock temple walls, pagodas, and crumbling edifices, apparently several thousand years old. Some of them contained the print of the nail in the hands which pinned the gods to the cross, without similar marks for the feet, while others contained both, and others, again, represented a mark in the side made by the piercing of a spear. Now all this must impress the reader and investigator as being something strange and significant, and obnoxious to potent inferences, unless he can assume it to be a sheer fabrication hatched in Mr. Higgins' own brain without any facts to support it. But here the critic and caviler are disarmed at once and cut off from the possibility of convicting Mr. Higgins upon this ground by the fact that many of these drawings can now be seen in the British Museum, deposited there by the hand of the antiquarian. A Mr. Moor published a work, called the "Hindoo Pantheon," containing some of these drawings and diagrams. He, being a pious disciple of Jesus, may have persuaded himself that these drawings were obtained by the Hindoos from an artificial crucifix of Christ, and chiseled in the old rock temples by the

artist. But I think that none but those who, like Paul, are sworn to "believe nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified," can possess a faith or credulity so elastic as to believe that the Hindoos, who have always manifested so much aversion to borrowing or mingling the dogmas of other religions with their own, would be more likely to engraft this dogma in their creeds and incorporate it into their sacred books after the advent of the Christian era, when their holy scriptures were very numerous and their disciples numbering hundreds of millions and scattered all over the Eastern world, than that the little handful of strolling nomads who founded the Christian religion and who possessed exactly the opposite traits of character, and always manifested a strong propensity for borrowing, should, in making up their new creed, have gathered materials from some of the long-established religions of the world. I do not represent the crucifixion of Christ as being a borrowed fable; I am only balancing probabilities. We could easier accept the conclusion that Christians borrowed the dogma (as hundreds of thousands of them once believed so) than that the Brahmins—almost the most conservative sect in the world—should have engrafted it into their creed after their religion had been established several thousand years. Of all things unreasonable, this conclusion is hard to excel. If it were the Buddhists, who once manifested some tendency to innovation, whose creed included this dogma, it would be easier to admit the possibility of its being plagiarized from the Christian gospels. But for the Brahmins, with a creed as old as the human race and as unchangeable as the hills,

to make or submit to such a radical innovation is about the last conclusion a rational investigator can accept.

II.—MR. PERRY'S IMPORTANT ADMISSION IN THE CASE.

He charges me with borrowing stories of some of the crucified gods from "mediæval Christian missionaries." Well, this is basing it upon Christian authority, to say the least, and places me in pretty good company, or at least gives me the credit of having obtained it from pretty good authority. It is, then, a Christian and not an Infidel story; and I will hold those Christians responsible for misleading me, if I am misled in the matter. I am glad Mr. Perry is either so fickle or so forgetful as sometimes to relieve me of one charge by starting another which counteracts and nullifies it. At one time he virtually charged me with making these stories. But now he relieves me of this dishonorable charge by saddling it on to his own bréthren—"defenders of the faith once delivered to the saints." Well, that is quite a relief.

III.—HOW THE EARLY CHRISTIANS SETTLE THE MATTER OF PAGANS BORROWING THE STORY OF THE CRUCIFIXION OF CHRIST TO CONSTITUTE A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF THEIR OWN GODS.

Mr. Perry tells us that some Hindoos visited Christian countries in the latter part of the second century, and intimates that that was the time they obtained and ran home with the story of Christ's crucifixion and stuck it into the history of their thrice-honored God, Chrishna. But I am now going to prove by the best

Christian authorities that they must have had the story of the crucifixion of a god before they thus heard of the crucifixion of Christ. It was only a little after the middle of the second century that Justin Martyr, who was born A. D. 140, addressing some of the heathen nations, used the following significant language :

“For by declaring that Logos, the first begotten son of God, our Master Jesus Christ, to be born of a virgin without any human mixture, and to be crucified and dead and to have risen again into heaven, we say no more in this than what you say of those whom you style the sons of Jove” (Reeve’s *Apollo*, vol. i, p. 69).

Here, reader, you have the whole thing straight out—the virtual admission that the stories and the belief in the crucifixion of gods were in vogue in different countries and relating to different gods long anterior to the time a god was crucified on Mount Calvary. For we must infer from St. Justin’s statement that the belief had long been established among them when he addressed them; and hence, as this was at an early period of the Christian era, we conclude, not only from this fact but from St. Justin’s language, that the belief was established among them before and independent of any knowledge of Christ’s crucifixion. There is no hint or insinuation made by St. Justin that they borrowed the story or the belief, but he mentions it as an established fact. This is a pretty strong case, and upsets Perry’s assumption that the Hindoos borrowed it in some Christian country the latter part of the second century.

But here let it be noted that Justin Martyr’s statement carries the analogies of the two religions much further than this. He speaks of those heathen gods

being the "first begotten sons of God," by which we infer he had many "first begotten sons"—a mathematical problem pretty hard to solve. Perhaps Perry can figure it out.

These gods are also represented as being born of virgins, and as being resurrected and ascending to heaven. But Mr. Perry seems to possess a very elastic faith, and to be quite skilful in hitching the cart before the horse, and his faith seems to be so well founded that, like Mother Grimes, he can't believe anything in opposition to it, even when he "knows it to be the truth;" and therefore he can see with an eye of faith that all this was cut out of the Christian gospels.

I once read of a case of a man being tried for the commission of a heinous crime. Five witnesses testified that they heard him threaten to commit the act; six testified they saw him do it, and seven heard him acknowledge he had committed it after the act was perpetrated; but the foreman of the jury appointed to try the case (who, as was afterwards learned, was a brother-in-law) remarked, in laying the case before the jury, "Gentleman, there has been a great deal said against the prisoner, but it amounts to nothing; my mind was made up before I heard the evidence." And this may be the mental condition of Mr. Perry and those who are puffing his book. Some of the latter probably know about as much about the subject as a goose does about Latin.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

I.—MR. PERRY'S AUTHORITIES.—A REVOLUTION IN HISTORY.—THE WRITERS CITED BY MR. PERRY.—HIS ATTEMPTS, WITH THEM, TO OVERTHROW THE HISTORICAL RECORDS OF THE WORLD AND OBLITERATE THE ESTABLISHED CONVICTIONS OF CHRISTENDOM.—BUT HE FAILS TO MAKE OUT THE CASE, AND SOME OF HIS OWN WITNESSES TURN "STATE'S EVIDENCE" AGAINST HIM.

I will now examine the most important proposition, and perhaps I might say the only important proposition, which constitutes the gist of controversy between Mr. Perry and myself. He attempts, by hunting up some bigoted, superstitious, and obscure writers, with a few others who prove nothing, to resurrect an old, exploded theory which involves a death stab at the established convictions of the Christian world. The attempts made in the past to modernize ancient religious history so as to make the assumption a plausible one that they are an outgrowth from Christianity failed so signally that the conviction has become thoroughly established in the minds of even the Christian public that it is absurd and untrue. But as Mr. Perry has revived the delusion and untenable hypothesis, we will examine the basis on which it is predicated. When a writer attempts, with one stroke of his pen, to demolish whole libraries of history, he has embarked in an enterprise of stupendous magnitude, and one so disparaging to our popular and venerated historic literature that he can expect but few persons to follow him or indorse such a cru-

sade against standard works on history, unless it be those who, like himself, are more interested in the support of a darling creed than they are in the vindication of the truth. Mr. Perry, like Joe Smith, travels among the tombs. He resurrects from their musty resting-places exploded theories of some visionary writers who figured in the world half a century ago or more, and who attracted but little attention at the time, and whose writings made so little impression upon the public mind that both sank into oblivion together, and have been so nearly forgotten that they have been seldom named since; and they would probably have remained in this state of virtual annihilation and cancellation from the tablet of memory had not Mr Perry undertaken the task of resurrecting them and bringing them more conspicuously into notice than they ever had been before.

II.—AN ATTEMPT TO OVERTHROW THE HISTORICAL RECORDS OF THE WORLD.

Mr. Perry, by ransacking a mass of musty tomes, long since partially outgrown and forgotten, which once probably constituted the private library of some devout saint more distinguished for piety than philosophy, has overhauled a few visionary works, penned mostly by obscure writers, which he has brought forward as sufficient authority to overthrow and demolish the established historical works now in circulation throughout the civilized world. It is certainly a great undertaking. But few men would be willing to risk their reputation in such a hazardous and utopian enterprise. It must require faith larger

than a grain of mustard-seed—at least a sufficient amount to remove mountains. It would be an easy matter to find from fifty to one hundred authors (mostly Christian) who stand in opposition to his theory to one he can find to support it. He certainly has a fearful array of authorities to meet and demolish before he can establish his pet theory. He may undertake the formidable task, but can never complete it. It must be a destructive crusade, not only against Infidel writers, but a war of extermination against nearly all the historical works from the pens of Christian writers. His principal enemies are “those of his own household.”

I will here present a part of a list of a hundred authors, a portion of whose writings are now in my possession, who have at some time expressed sentiments antagonistic to his principal theory—that of the post-Christian origin of those heathen doctrines which are essentially the same as those now found in our Christian New Testament: Adams, Arnold, Akenside, Atterberry, Barnes, Barrow, Baxter, Bennett, Burke, Wesley, Eusebius, Edwards, Hale, Le Clerc, Goodrich, Hall, Hare, Johnson, Jones, Lightfoot, Fox, Penn, Barclay, Newton, Orton, Paley, Parr, Leighton. For other names, see appendix.

Thus it will be observed Mr. Perry's theory is demolished by his own church-members—members of the same household of faith. It must require more than ordinary courage to fight a whole army of pious saints sailing in the same vessel and all bound for the same port. He needs the dauntless spirit of the parson who,

“ In reasoning, too, he owned his skill,
For though vanquished, he could argue still.”

III.—A WAR OF EXTERMINATION ON ALL HISTORICAL LIBRARIES.

If Mr. Perry's leveling crusade against the historical records of the world should be crowned with success, we may burn our historical libraries and commence the world anew. More than a thousand works now in our libraries, mostly from the pens of Christian writers, assign those religious tenets common to the heathen and Christian sacred books a date long prior to Christianity, while Mr. Perry holds them to be post-Christian.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

I.—AN ECCLESIASTICAL COURT

Instituted for trying the claims of the oriental religions for originating the story and belief in the crucifixion of gods, and also those tenets of the Christian faith now found in the oriental creeds.

Impartial Justice on the bench.

J. F. Perry contests the claims, and is prosecuting attorney.

K. Graves is counsel for the defense.

Mr. Perry summons the following witnesses: 1. Burgess; 2. Klaproth; 3. La Place; 4. Hardwick; 5. Whitney; 6. Pavie; 7. Chamber's Cyclopaedia; 8. H. Wilson; 9. Fiske; 10. Clark; 11. Mill; 12.

London Athenæum; 13. Encyclopedia Britannica; 14. Dr. Bentley; 15. Max Müller.

K. Graves' counter-witnesses are: 1. Higgins; 2. Sir Wm. Jones; 3. Max Müller; 4. Goodrich; 5. The New American Cyclopedia; 6. Rev. D. O. Allen; 7. Childs; 8. Col. Dow; 9. Rev. Mr. Robertson, D.D.; 10. Gibbon, and the whole army of authentic historical writers.

Mr. Perry's witnesses or authorities examined.

He quotes five witnesses on Hindoo astronomy, viz., Burgess, Klaproth, Whitney, Laplace, and Bentley.

Mr. Burgess, first witness.

MR. PERRY: My first witness is Mr. Burgess. He says, as quoted in my book: "The oldest astronomic observations of India cannot be proved to reach beyond the fourteenth or fifteenth century before Christ, though a few centuries earlier may be conceded as probable. But the treatise on astronomy which skeptics have used against Christianity and the Bible is incontestably proved to have been composed in the fourth or fifth century of our era. Therefore the ancient literature of India affords no material for disputing the truths of Christianity and the Bible."

JUDGE: You admit, then, Mr. Burgess, that India made some advancement in astronomical science at an early period?

MR. BURGESS: Yes, sir.

JUDGE: And does not that indicate an advancement in civilization?

MR. BURGESS: I suppose it does. But the treatise which seems to declare the heathen origin of some of the doctrines of Christianity are *incontestably proved* to

have been composed in the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era.

JUDGE: Have you any proof to offer for this important statement?

Mr. BURGESS: No, sir. I am a clergyman, and I plant myself on the dignity of my profession and the sacredness of my creed. My word must not be disputed.

JUDGE: But, Mr. Burgess, that kind of evidence will not weigh anything with the jury. They don't want creeds or catechisms, but facts. Have you no proof to offer for your affirmation?

Mr. BURGESS: I have not.

JUDGE: The jury will please note this fact. The witness may retire. Has Mr. Graves anything to say relative to the testimony of this witness?

Mr. GRAVES: Yes, sir, I have. I should think that a witness whose whole life proves that his mind is greatly warped by a sectarian education, his mental vision blinded by his creed, and his conscience contracted by his salary, must be rather an untrustworthy witness in such a case as this. As he has to look through an opaque creed to see the truth, I should think he would miss seeing much of it.

Mr. Perry stated I could not object to the testimony of Mr. Burgess on account of his being a clergyman, as I had quoted the Rev. D. O. Allen. He seems to have rather unique ideas about the essential principles of civil jurisprudence and the nature of evidence when he assumes that a man's testimony, when given to save his own creed, church, and salary, etc., as in the case of Burgess, is entitled to as much weight as

that, given by a man who knows that his testimony, though true, must be damaging to the claims of his long-cherished faith, as in the case of the Rev. D. O. Allen. According to Mr. Perry's logic, Dick has nothing to do to acquit himself of the charge of stealing apples but to bring forward Tom, who had his hand in the same basket, and who, by swearing his friend out of the scrape, saves his own back forty-nine lashes. Such is Perry's wonderful logic, shaped by his creed.

II.—MR. H. KLAPROTH.

Mr. Perry's second witness, Mr. Klaproth, a German scholar and traveler, being called upon, says: "I confess I know but little about the subject under discussion. I never made either theology or astronomy my study. My life has been largely, principally, devoted to the study of chemistry, mineralogy, the languages, etc. I am no astronomical scholar; indeed, I am not well read on the subject, consequently know too little about it. True, I once stated, as quoted by Mr. Perry, that

"The astronomical tables of the Hindoos, to which a prodigious antiquity has been attributed, were constructed in the seventh century of this era, and were posteriorly reported by calculations to an anterior epoch."

JUDGE: You have made an important statement, Mr. Klaproth. Please state to the court the facts on which your statement is founded.

MR. KLAPROTH: The court will please excuse me; I have none to offer. As I told you, astronomy has not been my study.

JUDGE: Why, then, do you make a statement relative to a matter you know almost nothing about?

MR. KLAPROTH: Well, sir, I once tried to figure out something, but being a mere novice in astronomy I finally gave it up, and what I now state is mere theory. I don't profess to be able to prove it.

JUDGE: The jury will please notice these admissions. The testimony of the last two witnesses conflicts. Mr. Klapproth, are you aware that your testimony conflicts with that of the previous witness, Mr. Burgess? You state the astronomical tables to which you refer were constructed in the seventh century, while Mr. Burgess solemnly declares that it is "incontestably proved" that the treatise containing those tables was written in the fourth or fifth century. How do you reconcile this contradiction?

MR. KLAPROTH:

I have no proof that Mr. Burgess knows anything more about astronomy than myself. His principal studies were theology and divinity, and mine the natural sciences. We were neither of us professors or teachers of the science. I suppose, to confess the truth in the case, we neither of us know much about it.

JUDGE: Ought not a man to make such an intricate and profound science as astronomy the study of a lifetime, to be able to make such calculations as you have spoken of with any assurance that they can be relied upon as being correct or that they will be accepted by the learned?

MR. KLAPROTH: Well, I suppose so.

JUDGE: And it appears neither you nor Burgess have given it such attention.

MR. KLAPROTH: No, we have not.

JUDGE: The jury will please notice these damaging concessions.

What does Mr. Perry suppose can be made out of statements of witnesses which are not only devoid of any evidence, but are in such direct conflict as to destroy each other? There must be a "screw loose" somewhere.¹

III.—LAPLACE.

JUDGE: Mr. Perry, we are ready for another witness.

MR. PERRY: We will now hear the views of that profound scholar, Laplace, relative to the antiquity of Hindoo astronomy.

JUDGE: Mr. Laplace will proceed.

LAPLACE: I will only repeat what Mr. Perry has quoted from my writings:

"The origin of astronomy in Persia and India is lost, as in other nations, in the darkness of their ancient history. The Indian tables suppose a very advanced state of astronomy, but there is every reason to believe they can claim no very high antiquity."

JUDGE: You affirm, then, Mr. Laplace, that the tables on Hindoo astronomy can claim no great antiquity? Do you mean by this statement that they are post-Christian?

LAPLACE: No, sir.

¹ Klaproth had some strong orthodox friends whom he often manifested in his writings a greater desire to please than to follow his own convictions of the truth. He once gave notice he was going to lecture on common sense. A friend remarked, "You had better lecture on something you know something about."

"I entertain no such a thought. Some of the Hindoos claim for them an antiquity of 14,000 years. The learned astronomer, Jean Bailly, assigns them the date of 3000 B.C.; and Prof. Playfair inclined to coincide with him; while Wilkins and Delambre were at one time inclined to a period a few hundred years later; and I rather favored the latter period, though I did not profess to fix any date with certainty, knowing, as I have stated, their astronomy is obscured by the darkness of history."

JUDGE: Then you don't assign those tables a post-Christian origin?

LAPLACE: I do not; the language I have used does not warrant any such conclusion. Even if the date fixed by Bailly were correct, it would be no great antiquity. My opinion simply is that, as the origin of astronomy in India is lost in the mazes of history, we cannot arrive at any certainty about the matter.

JUDGE (to Mr. Perry): What have you proved by this witness?

PERRY: That is a hard question to answer. (The relief old Arthur Elliot used to suggest when he got swamped in a similar theological quagmire was, "Let us pray.")

IV.—PROF. WHITNEY.

Mr. PERRY: Prof. Whitney of Yale College will now take the stand.

WHITNEY: With respect to the point now being discussed, the antiquity of Hindoo astronomy, I will only repeat my statement in Perry's book:

"It has been declared by Weber that no mention of the lesser planets is to be found in Hindoo literature until the modern epoch, after the influence of foreign astronomical science began to be felt. If, then,

we find such a science making its sudden appearance in India at so late a period, we cannot help turning our eyes about us to see whence it should have come. Nor can we long remain in doubt as to where it originated."

JUDGE: Should the court understand that Prof. Whitney is an astronomical professor or a professed astronomical scholar.

WHITNEY: Oh, no; by no means; oriental and Sanscrit literature have been my principal studies. I never studied astronomy sufficiently to become a critical scholar in that science, though I know some little about it. I once translated a work of the Hindoos treating on that science.

JUDGE: Who was this Weber you speak of? was he an astronomer?

WHITNEY: No; he pursued the study of Sanscrit in the same institution with myself.

JUDGE: And you are neither of you, then, professed astronomers?

WHITNEY: No, sir; that has not been our principal study.

JUDGE: Are you, then, competent to pronounce upon so important a problem as we are now investigating?

WHITNEY: We don't profess to decide the matter; we only give an opinion.

JUDGE: You speak of looking abroad for the origin of Hindoo astronomy. Do you mean to the Jews or Christians?

WHITNEY: Most certainly not. For, as the immortal historian Mr. Goodrich says, the Jews had no knowledge of astronomy as a science. And as for the

early Christians, they fought it "to the bitter end" with fire and fury till the time of Luther, who also combated it. I simply mean to say they borrowed their astronomy of the Greeks and Romans probably.

JUDGE: Have you any proof of this, or that they borrowed it anywhere? Might not the omission of the lesser planets from their list have been merely accidental?

WHITNEY: I am not prepared to answer the question.

JUDGE: Has Mr. Graves anything to say with respect to this witness?

Mr. GRAVES: Max Müller will now say something with respect to his competency to testify.

V.—MORE WAR AMONG THE WITNESSES.

(Mr. Müller's testimony with respect to the competency of this witness. Mr. Müller considers him an incorrigible bigot, controlled by strong orthodox animosity towards everything that don't square with his creed. He once exposed him in a public lecture, which will be found in his "Chips from a German Workshop." Prof. Steinthal will now have something to say about this witness, also. He concurs with Müller. He pronounces him "a horrible humbug;" "a tricky attorney," etc. Weber has also something to say about this witness.)

JUDGE: Mr. Weber, were you acquainted with this witness?

WEBER: Yes; he studied Sanscrit with me three years at Breslin, and I do not consider either his knowledge or his judgment very reliable. He is both

dogmatical and changeable. He maintained a set of views with a great deal of zeal and dogmatism, but such was the overwhelming proof against him that he was finally compelled to acknowledge he was wrong; and it so mortified him, that he has been giving vent to his spleen ever since.

JUDGE. You do not consider him a very competent witness, then?

WEBER: Certainly not; a man of such a character cannot be.

JUDGE: The jury will please note these facts.

VI.—DR. BENTLEY.—HIS STAR-POINTING THEORY EXAMINED.

I will now notice Mr. Perry's resurrected silly story of Dr. Bentley about the stars indicating the birth of the Hindoo god Chrishna to have taken place in the sixth century of the Christian era, in order to make it appear that his history was borrowed from that of Christ, as it is in nearly all its details strikingly similar. Dr. Bentley's story has been dead and buried about three-fourths of a century; and Mr. Perry should have taken the view of it that some people did about the dead body of Lazarus, "By this time it stinketh." Mr. Perry thinks I have confounded the two Bentleys together. But here either his reading or his memory is short again. No less than four Bentleys have figured sufficiently in the world's history to be honored with a record of their names and their deeds on its pages. But this list, let it be specially noticed, does not include his John Bentley, whom he

claims to be the author of the star-pointing theory; four Bentleys are noticed, but no John Bentley. He was a man of so little note, and so wild and visionary in his theories, that his pretended discovery attracted but little attention, and was regarded as being so futile and foolish that the historian did not consider him nor his story worthy of notice, and hence has omitted to make mention of either of them. At least, I find no allusion to them in any of the modern histories or Cyclopedias in my possession. I read the story twenty-five years ago, the author of which was spoken of as Dr. Bentley, and Richard Bentley is called Dr. Bentley. But whether his Christian name was John or Richard, or Gideon, or William is a matter of no importance. I have given a correct account of his discovery and essentially the true character of the man upon the authority of Max Müller, and to alter his name would make the case no better. We are only concerned to know whether there is any truth or any sense in the story that should justify John T. Perry in dragging it from the grave or galvanizing it into life. I will here repeat the arguments I made use of in my review, to show that, if the pretended discovery could be liquidized, it would be too weak to run down hill. There is a long string of facts demonstrating not only the absurdity but the absolute impossibility of the truth of Mr. Bentley's astrological deductions:

1. The disciples of the Hindoo religion, including both Brahmins and Buddhists, number now about 450,000,000, or, as Müller says, "They constitute a majority of the religious professors of the world, and more than one-third of the inhabitants of the globe;

and have been from two to three thousand years scattered literally from 'one end of the earth to the other,' being established in India, China, Egypt, Birman Empire, Tartary, Japan, Thibet, Ceylon, Siam," etc., etc. Being thus widely scattered, and in some countries established so as almost to cut them off from intercourse with other nations, it can be seen that it would be about as difficult to effect a general and radical change in their religious tenets as it would be to reverse the course of the Niagara or navigate the ocean astride of a teakettle. And yet Mr. Bentley would have us believe that the disciples of these two old time-worn systems of religion, which scarcely make any observable change in a thousand years in their leading tenets, did nevertheless, in the sixth century of our era, as if by an electric shock, suddenly revolutionize and remodel these stereotyped, iron-bound systems of theology and mythology—one of them by stealing the life of Christ from the Apocryphal gospels, and the other his doctrines and precepts, and engrafting them into their own antiquated systems.

2. And this idea looks the more senseless and ridiculous when we learn that they are so extremely averse to change that they will not tolerate the alteration of a single word, syllable, or even letter to be made in their sacred books, and object to their going into the hands of Christian missionaries for fear they will make such alterations. When and how did Christianity creep into their creeds? Will Perry explain?

3. Had there been any science or any sense in Bentley's professed discovery, its announcement would have produced a sensation throughout the Christian

world, and perhaps the heathen world also; but it was so manifestly weak and absurd that it attracted but little attention.

4. It does not appear that any eminent astronomer, either in Europe or America, indorsed Bentley's discovery.

5. His own friends ridiculed it, and finally laughed him out of it.

6. And, finally, a quietus was put upon the matter by some scholar a little smarter or sharper, and a little better posted, informing him that the same pointing of planets his calculation was based on took place prior to the time of Alexander, 330 B.C., which would indicate the time of Chrishna's birth to be (instead of A.D. 600) long before Christ, as 300,000,000 of Hindoos and all our able historians and the historical writers of other nations have always placed it. And thus he was compelled to give it up.

7. The Hindoos have always claimed that such star pointings are periodical, and hence had occurred before several times.

8. The history of Hadrian, a Roman emperor (who was born A.D. 76), proves that the name of Chrishna was known more than five hundred years before the time Bentley assigns for the origin of his history. He is also spoken of in the history of Alexander, before the Christian era.

9. None of the one hundred and fifty Christian missionaries that I have heard of, who have been operating in India, have indorsed Bentley's theory, after examining its books, statues, temples, ancient languages, calculations in astronomy, etc., which furnish

such convincing proof that both those gods, Chrishna and Buddha Sakia, figured in their history more than two thousand years ago.

10. And besides the one hundred and fifty missionaries, I have seen more than fifty authors, mostly Christians, who place Chrishna and Sakia and their doctrines both before Christ. In fact, I have seen no reliable author who does not.

11. That profound oriental scholar, Sir William Jones, in addition to the testimony of his, already cited, says: "In the Sanscrit dictionary, compiled more than two thousand years ago, we have the whole story of this incarnate god (Chrishna), reputedly born of a virgin, and miraculously escaping in infancy from the tyrant ruler of the country, like Christ from Herod" (*Asiat. Res.*, vol. i, p. 260.)

12. The first Christian missionaries that entered India (which was long before Bentley's planet theory), found the history of both these gods there, and confessed their astonishment (as already stated) to find their histories and doctrines so near like those of Christ.

13. That standard authority, the *New American Cyclopedia*, places Buddha's birth at 543 B.C. (see vol. v, p. 61); and Chrishna's birth it admits, and all writers admit, was much earlier.

14. It says the history and doctrines of Buddha were introduced into China 65 B.C. And before that date more than half of the doctrines of Christianity were taught in the old, long-established religion of the country. And Christian missionaries and everybody else admit that there has never been any per-

ceptible change in the religion of China during the whole period of her existence, with respect to its principal doctrines. They possess not the slightest tendency to innovation. When, then, or how, could she, of how did she, borrow the doctrines of Christianity?

15. And Egypt presents us with another formidable case. Not only had she the name of the Hindoo gods before the establishment of Christianity, or the birth of Christ, but in her oldest system of religion are found taught nearly all the doctrines, both of Judaism and Christianity, as shown in my books. And yet the proofs of the great age of her religion and its wide propagation long before Christ are absolutely overwhelming and beyond refutation, and amply sufficient to convince any impartial investigator. Taylor says, "Everything of Christianity is of Egyptian origin." Egypt seems to have the most definite dates of her history, and the strongest proofs of the great antiquity of her religion and her government, of any other religion in the world. Her pyramids, her hieroglyphics, and her dynasties of kings are strong witnesses. Manetho furnishes us with a definite calculation of the reign of three hundred kings, comprising thirty-one dynasties, and covering a period of 3555 years, extending down to 351 B. C., which the *New American Cyclopaedia* says "is fully established by comparison with the monuments" (vol. vii, p. 36). And under the reign of several of these kings, most of the doctrines of Christ and the whole code of the Jewish theocracy were taught; and all long before the advent of Christ, as shown in my two large works.

After the foregoing utter demolition of the Bentley

astrological theory by the most cogent and irresistible facts and arguments, which leave not a splinter of it, Mr. Perry comes forward in his next article with the astonishing declaration that "posterity has decided Bentley was right in general." Well, well, that is singular enough—for posterity to decide a question they know nothing about! Not one in ten thousand ever heard of it. How, then, they could give a decision on it is a "mystery of godliness" I leave Beecher and Swing to solve, as they are some of Perry's vouchers. He admits that "The Edinburgh Review" "took up the cudgel against him," and if it had killed him, there would have been, according to Müller, "one less fool in the world." Mr. Perry cites five mostly obscure writers, whom he says, indorsed Bentley's theory—Delambre, Bishop McAlvaine, Cuvier, Heeren, and Klaproth—all of them tinctured with orthodox bigotry, unless we except Delambre, and Heeren. But I have not seen a figure made by one of those men in support of the theory. They appear to have paid but little attention to it. Men could be found in any age to indorse any kind of theory. But it is useless to argue the case further. The reader can see the thing was dead and buried half a century ago; and for Mr. Perry to resurrect and defend it now indicates a desperate expedient to save a dying cause. I can hardly suppose that Mr. Perry himself credited the story at first, nor can any sensible man credit it until he has passed through a mental experience similar to the basket-maker, who stated that he told inquisitive busy-bodies that his baskets were made to carry water in. "I knew," said he, "it was a lie, but I told it so often that I got to believe

it myself." I will not assume, however, that Mr. Perry has had a similar mental experience. And here let it be noted that Bentley's astrological calculations are the only evidence—if they can be called such—that Mr. Perry has adduced to sustain his theory of the post-Christian origin of the leading tenets of the ancient oriental religions, so that by overthrowing Bentley's wild speculations we have prostrated Mr. Perry's whole theory, which attempts to show the post-Christian origin of those heathen doctrines which so strikingly resemble those found in the Christian Bible; but it will be seen that the facts of history are all against such a hypothesis, and Mr. Perry should call on Mr. Beecher and Mr. Swing to help him let go of it, as Patrick called upon his son Tommy to help him let go of the bear.

ARCHIMEDES FINDS A LEVER.

The tradition has descended to us from Sicily, where Archimedes, the mathematician, was born 287 B. C., that he once stated that if he could find a fulcrum to rest his lever on, he could move the world. This desideratum is now supplied and his ambition realized in his successor, John T. Perry, of Cincinnati, who has found a fulcrum for his lever, consisting of the head of Dr. Bentley, author of the star-pointing theory, and it is presumed his skull is thick enough to sustain the superabundant weight attendant on the movement of a world. Mr. Perry, by using the head and brain of Dr. Bentley as a lever (unless we presume, in accordance with the suggestion of John Van Buren, that his brain "lay below the belt"), has ostensibly succeeded

in overthrowing the world of history and turning it topsy-turvy. The final result of this revolutionary crusade we need not speculate on.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

I.—THE JUDGE'S REVIEW OF THE TESTIMONY.

JUDGE (to Mr. Perry): You have summoned a number of witnesses to establish a very important proposition relative to the science of astronomy, and one so profound and intricate, and at the same time so new and extraordinary, that it must require a profound and critical knowledge of the science, which can only be acquired by a lifetime study, to make a person's opinion or judgment entitled to any weight in the case. But not one of the witnesses you have summoned are men of this character, excepting Laplace; and his testimony, as has been shown, proves nothing to the point. Can't you bring forward some witnesses to testify in this case who have acquired a world-wide fame by their attainments and critical knowledge of this science. There is, for example, the learned astronomer, Jean Bailly, who wrote a great work on this science that is yet a standard authority.

MR. PERRY: You will excuse me, honored Judge, for not summoning this profound astronomer, philosopher, and statesman, as he is pronounced to be, when I tell you he is on the other side of the question. He is one of Mr. Graves' witnesses. Hence I have pronounced some of his speculations rather "wild."

JUDGE: But, as you don't claim to be an astronomer, can you justly claim that you are competent to pronounce on so great an astronomer as Jean Bailly?

Mr. PERRY: That is a matter I have not taken under consideration.

II.—MR. GRAVES' COUNTER WITNESSES TO THE ANTIQUITY OF HINDOO ASTRONOMY.

GRAVES: A large number of opposing witnesses are at hand, but we will examine only a few of them.

1. The learned Mr. Robertson, D.D., author of a large and learned work on India, will first testify.

JUDGE: We have heard the opinions and speculations about the astronomic tables and treatises of India by various witnesses summoned by Mr. Perry, but mere opinions, without facts or proof of any kind, can weigh but little in a case like this. Have you, Mr. Robertson, any evidence or proof to offer?

ROBERTSON: Yes; but not in support of Mr. Perry's theory or position, but in opposition to it:

"I consider it a plain case, when we look at the evidence with an impartial mind, that the four astronomical tables and treatise, of the Hindoos referred to must possess great antiquity, as I have expressed myself and presented the evidence to prove on page 302 to 309 of my work. I have there argued that the accuracy with which the various astronomical epochs are made out, the obscurity of the language used in the case, and the antique nature of the instruments, and other circumstances, evince a remote antiquity for those astronomical calculations with their respective tables and treatise. And I have expressed the opinion that the Hindoos have treatises on astronomy of more remote antiquity than are to be found in any other nation."

2. Prof. Playfair, a philosopher and mathematician of Edinburgh, will now advance some facts in the case :

Mr. PLAYFAIR: My facts are not materially different from those presented by the previous witness :

“ When Dr. Bentley attempted to drag down one of the ancient Hindoo gods into the sixth century of the Christian era, upon the authority of some wild astrological speculations, I met his ridiculous theory with some historical facts, which I regarded as cogent and irresistible, to prove that the astronomical phenomena referred to the sixth century A.D. belonged to the fourth century before the Christian era ” (see Bentley's theory).

Mr. GRAVES: We will listen to the testimony of one more witness—the historian Goodrich.

Mr. GOODRICH: I will only repeat what I have said in my “ History of All Nations,” that the invention of astronomy as a science has been ascribed to various nations, as the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Chinese, and Hindoos (Jews and Christians left out):

“ It is certain these people were very early observers of the motions and phenomena of the heavenly bodies (p. 25). And I have also stated that the Jews or Hebrews knew nothing of astronomy as a science (page 25).

And their successors, the Christians, fought it and attempted to put it down as they would the measles or small-pox.

Here the learned Jean Bailly, the astronomer, philosopher, and statesman, steps forward and says: I fully concur with the various facts presented by the several witnesses who have just been examined :

"I have shown by calculations based on facts and figures, which I think cannot be refuted or disputed (but which are too extensive to be presented here), that some of the astronomical epochs referred to a modern period in this discussion are clearly traceable to the era of 3100 B.C.

JUDGE: The jury have now heard the opinions, assertions, and theories of Mr. Perry's witnesses and the facts and evidence presented by those of Mr. Graves in opposition, and will be governed accordingly in making out their verdict.

CHAPTER NINTH.

I.—PERRY'S FOUR WITNESSES, BY WHOM HE ATTEMPTS TO SHOW THE ANALOGOUS DOCTRINES OF THE HINDOO RELIGION WERE BORROWED FROM CHRISTIANITY.—CHAMBER'S ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Mr. PERRY: Chamber's Encyclopedia indulges in some speculation about the modern origin of the history of Chrishna, which we will now present. After speaking on the rival claims of Chrishna and Siva, two Hindoo gods, it says in effect the adventures of Crishna are more fully detailed in the Puranas of the Vishnuit sect than in the Mahabharata. His incarnation is more fully recognized in the former work, being of later date than the latter:

"In the Mahabharata, which is silent regarding many adventures of Chrishna's life, fully detailed in the Puranas, the worship of this incarnation of Vishnu was by no means as generally admitted or settled as it is in many Puranas of the Vishnuit sect, . . . and which is traceable in later works."

GRAVES: Here the idea seems to be clandestinely broached that as the Mahabharat which contains the more ancient history of Chrishna is not so full as that found in the Purana, said to have been written about the beginning of the Christian era, we may presume his history was enlarged by making draughts from the gospel history of Christ. But all this is sheer assumption without a particle of proof. Nor does the Encyclopedia make any suggestion of that kind, and yet Mr. Perry must assume that that is its meaning. For without such an assumption he can make nothing out of it.

JUDGE: Mr. Perry seems to have summoned rather a rare and worthless set of witnesses—writers who don't seem to know what to say or what they want to say, or if they do they take great pains to conceal their ideas, so that Mr. Graves has to fight them behind masked batteries. He has to reconstruct or assume their arguments before he can meet them.

(The idea of the gospel histories of Christ furnishing the model for the story of Chrishna as found in the Puranas is met and answered in the next chapter by Mr. Graves' witnesses.)

II.—ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA.

Mr. PERRY: The English journal known as the Encyclopedia Britannica is now at hand to present some of its speculations relative to the gods and religions of India.

Mr. GRAVES: In Perry's book this journal is quoted, and first gives some account of the contest in the early ages between Brahminism and Buddhism,

which has no bearing whatever on any point of controversy between Mr. Perry and myself. It then tells us that this sectarian spirit gave rise to a class of works known as the modern Puranas, designed to promote the worship of some particular deity, and that Buddhism began to decline in the seventh century of our era and was on the wane in India. But all this has no bearing on any question under consideration. It then states that

“The language of the Aryan Hindoos has undergone changes and their religious belief has passed through various stages of development boldly distinguished by certain prominent features.”

JUDGE: It would require a magnifying glass of great power to find one definite or tangible idea in this extract, and faith larger than a grain of mustard seed to find any language here used that makes a single point either for Mr. Perry or against Mr. Graves. It states that “the religion of the Aryan Hindoos has passed through various stages of development,” which no one but a fool or ignoramus would deny. As progress is a universal law of nature, it promotes the development of everything; and no institution in any country can remain long unaffected by its influence to a greater or less extent.

MR. GRAVES: If Mr. Perry wishes the reader to draw the inference from the statement that the Hindoo religion alluded to in passing through various stages of development about the time of the inauguration of the Christian era took on the doctrines or a portion of the doctrines of Christianity, and that the modern Puranas he speaks of as containing the life and history and doctrines of Chrishna borrowed them from the Christian

gospels or from other Christian sources, then there is a direct issue between us on these grounds, and an array of witnesses will be summoned to settle the matter as conclusively as a demonstrated problem. If this is not what the *Encyclopedia Britannica* means, then it means nothing having any relevancy to the case. And yet it says nothing of the kind. Mr. Perry must certainly be hard pushed for witnesses and testimony to drag in so many who hardly touch the question; and when they do, it is with such indefinite language that it must take a week to find out what they mean. The antiquity and authenticity of the Puranas will be examined in a subsequent chapter by counter-witnesses.

III.—PAVIE.

PERRY: Mr. Pavie, a French writer, will now say something relative to the traditional history of the Hindoo god Chrishna.

PAVIE: I have made a statement (which is quoted by Mr. Perry to the following effect):

“Chrishna worship is the most recent of all the philosophical and religious systems which divided India into rival sects. Believing in successive incarnations, which are not taught in the Vedas, Chrishnaism differs in all points from the other creeds of India. So that one is inclined to regard it as borrowing made from foreign philosophies and religions.”

GRAVES: Can any one imagine what this testimony is quoted for, or what it is designed to prove? It contains not one fact, argument, or idea of any importance, that I feel any disposition to dispute or deny. It pronounces the worship of Chrishna the most recent of

any of the philosophical or religious systems of India, and it is not less than three thousand years old. The suggestion that it was borrowed from foreign religions and philosophies cannot possibly mean that it was derived from either the Jewish or Christian religion, for neither of them ever had any connection with philosophy. The Jews were altogether ignorant of philosophy, and the early Christians fought and made war upon every appearance of philosophy, with the avowed intention of exterminating it. They believed in nothing but "Jesus Christ and him crucified," and gloried in their ignorance of philosophy, and fought it as an emissary of the devil. We are therefore involved in a very puzzling problem when we attempt to find out what Mr. Perry quoted this writer for, or what he intends to prove by him. As I indorse all his positions, so far as they are intelligently expressed, I need not therefore occupy any more time in discussing them.

JUDGE: Mr. Perry seems to have committed a number of serious blunders in summoning witnesses whose testimony either has no bearing on any question before the court or their language is too vague and indefinite to make anything out of it.

IV.—HORACE H. WILSON.

MR. PERRY: H. H. Wilson has something definite to offer in the case before the court.

WILSON: My statement (as quoted by Mr. Perry) is that

"The Puranas, which furnish the most startling and numerous coincidences in the life and story of Christna, are not anterior to the eighth

or ninth centuries of our era, and the most recent not above three or four centuries old."

JUDGE: As you make a very plain and positive declaration, Mr. Wilson, relative to an assumption or theory so extraordinary that if true it must produce an entire revolution in the religious history of the world, you of course would not venture to broach it without an ample store of facts to sustain it. We are ready for them.

MR. WILSON: Honored Judge, I beg to be excused. I had no thought of being called upon for any facts or proof of my statements. There is a large class of people the salvation of whose creeds and churches depends on believing it, and as they don't require any proof, I made this statement as an unction for their souls. It is a mere theory or belief of my own, that I could cite some evidence in support of, but perhaps it would not satisfy the court.

JUDGE: The jury will not only require the most convincing and the most ample proof for an assumption so extraordinary, but they must also have some evidence of your ability and impartiality to draw correct conclusions from your premises.

V.—ANOTHER CONFLICT AMONG THE WITNESSES.

MR. GRAVES: I ask permission to bring forward Mr. Müller, to speak on this witness' qualification.

MULLER:

"I have known this witness for some time, and have exposed his sectarian prejudices, his bigotry and bias of mind, in my public lectures, and shown he is disqualified for giving an impartial opinion in a case like this. I have shown in my "Chips" that his views, both of

the Hindoo and Persian religions, are very erroneous, and formed under the influence of a biased and bigoted mind. His testimony, therefore, in the absence of proof, can have no weight with the jury."

JUDGE: The jury will note in the case of this witness, not only his want of facts and proof to sustain his theory and conclusions, but his deficiency in the essential qualifications of a good witness.

GRAVES: If the court please, I will now prove and demonstrate the erroneousness of this and three other preceding witnesses' assumptions relative to the modern origin of the Puranas, and their story of Chrishna being borrowed from the Christian gospels. Three other witnesses have presented similar assumptions, all of which we will overthrow by abler and more reliable writers.¹

¹ Wilson, like Klaproth, lived among orthodox Christians, whose favor he courted in his writings in order to make his book sell; for books at that period and in that community must be strictly orthodox to insure their sale. His disposition to curry favor with the bigots is shown in the statement he is reported to have made to an orthodox, that he would like to be painted sitting on the throne with Jesus. A friend asked him if hanging by his side on the cross would not do as well.

NOTE.—Mr. Wilson was a professor in the bigoted institution of Oxford, where orthodoxy reigned supreme.

CHAPTER TENTH.

I.—MR. GRAVES' COUNTER-WITNESSES RELATIVE TO THE ALLEGED MODERN ORIGIN OF THE HINDOO SACRED BOOKS AND THEIR RELIGION.

GRAVES: Mr. Perry's four witnesses last examined—Pavie, Wilson, Encyclopedia Britannica, and Chamber's Encyclopedia—were brought forward by him to testify to a change in the Hindoo religion and the Hindoo sacred books since the dawn of the Christian era, effected by the introduction into them of some or all the doctrines of the Christian faith. I have quite a number of witnesses at hand, mostly Christian professors, who are prepared to deny the assumption, and some of whom will now be heard in the case. Wilson asserts that the Puranas, containing the life story of Chrishna, were written in the eighth or ninth century of the Christian era, and Mr. Perry affirms that the Bhagavat-Gita, part of the Mahabharat, which contains another account of Chrishna, is held by leading scholars to be post-Christian; and thus the effort is made to show that his whole life, doctrines, and precepts, so far as they resemble those of Christ, were borrowed or stolen from the gospel history of Christ. We will examine a few of the large number of witnesses at hand who are ready to refute and overthrow this assumption. The Rev. D. O. Allen, who was a Hindoo missionary for twenty-five years, will testify relative to the antiquity of the Puranas and also the Mahabharat, containing the history of the Hindoo Chrishna.

1. ALLEN: I spent twenty-five years in India, and while there investigated this matter thoroughly; and I will here repeat what I have stated in my work, "India, Ancient and Modern," p. 33 :

"The religion of the Vedas and the Puranas was probably introduced into India twelve or fourteen centuries before the Christian era. On the next page I have stated, 'The religion of the Puranas was established at an early period of her history.' And I have cited many facts to show that both the eighteen Puranas and the Mahabharata, which contain the principal history of the god Chrishna, were written before the time of Alexander the Great. It is true other Puranas have been written at a comparatively modern period, but their subject matter is taken largely from the more ancient Puranas, being a repetition, with some additions and explanations and elaborations."

JUDGE: You do not believe, then, Mr. Allen, that the story of Chrishna was borrowed from that of Christ?

ALLEN: No, sir; I have stated distinctly in my work that I do not believe any such thing.

JUDGE: Well, that is rather a death-blow to Mr. Perry's borrowing theory, and a direct contradiction to his statement that the principal story of Chrishna is post-Christian.

2. Mr. Jamieson, of Monmouth, Ill., will now give the result of his investigations of this matter, he having spent twenty years in India as a missionary.

MR. JAMIESON: I recently declared in an article published in the Monmouth "Review," that the Puranas containing the only authentic history of Chrishna are at least three thousand years old.

JUDGE: Are we to understand, then, Mr. Jamieson, that you do not indorse Mr. Wilson's statement that the Puranas, setting forth the life and doctrines of

Christna are not older than the eighth or ninth century of the Christian era, or Mr. Perry's statement, that they are post-Christian?

JAMIESON :

"No, sir; from my long and thorough investigation of the matter, I feel certain no man living can be better prepared to decide this matter than myself, and I still maintain that the only authentic history of Christna is 3,000 years old."

JUDGE: Mr. Graves will please call another witness.

GRAVES: That well-known Christian writer and profound oriental scholar, Sir Wm. Jones, will now favor us with some of the facts which constitute his vast storehouse of learning and knowledge on the subject.

3. JONES: I will repeat some of the statements I made many years ago and had published in the "Asiatic Researches." I stated that

"In the Sanscrit dictionary, compiled more than 2,000 years ago, we have the whole history of the incarnate god Christna, born of a virgin and miraculously escaping in his infancy from the tyrant ruler of the country (as Christ did from Herod). He passed a life of the most extraordinary and incomprehensible devotion" (As. Res., vol. i, p. 270).

4. Again I stated that

"The Indian incarnate god Christna, the Hindoos believed, had a virgin mother. He was born about 900 B. C., and passed a life in working miracles, and was so humble as to wash his disciples' feet. At length dying, but rising from the dead, he ascended into heaven in the presence of a multitude. The Cingalese relate a similar story of their Buddha" (Ibid).

5. Again he says that

"The name of Chrishna and the general outline of his history were long anterior to the birth of our Savior, and probably to the time of Homer (600 B. C.), we know very certainly."

Whether the two last accounts were taken from the Bhagavat-Gita, or the Puranas, or obtained from other sources, Mr. Jones does not tell us, but it is evident, from the date he assigns these stories of the Hindoo god Chrisha, that they could not have been borrowed from that of Christ.

JUDGE: As Mr. Jones points out many striking coincidences in their histories and affirms their remote antiquity, we can see at once that the assumption of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Perry, that all the analogies in the two stories are post-Christian, and therefore legitimately referable to the gospel history of Christ for their origin, is superlatively absurd and historically impossible, and must therefore be rejected. Jones completely explodes both assumptions. Such testimonies as Jones' greatly outweigh such naked assumptions as Pavier's and such foolish theories as Bentley's. It is true Sir Wm. Jones was once made a victim of deception by the tricks of some pundits, as were Col. Wilson and Jacolliot, as related in chapter viii.

But that deception was only momentary; he was too well acquainted with their sacred books to be deceived long.

6. We will now cite another able writer who is death on Perry's assumption—the assumption that the Puranas are of post-Christian origin.

L. M. Childs says: "Oriental scholars suppose the

Puranas were collected near the time of Alexander the Great, born 356 B. C."

Here is the opinion, not only of the writer, but of oriental scholars generally, that the Puranas were collected several centuries before Christ, and of course written at a still earlier period. But it seems that the opinion of Mr. Wilson weighs more with Mr. Perry than all the oriental scholars, single or combined, simply because Mr. Wilson and he are in the same pew.

7. And that voluminous historian, Mr. Goodrich, also rises up in opposition to Perry's assumption of the post-Christian origin of the Bhagavat-Gita. Perry says, "It is referable to the first and the third centuries for its origin." To be sure! and what authentic historian so refers it.

Mr. Goodrich, one of the best historians that ever wielded the pen, says: "The Mahabharata (containing the Bhagavat-Gita) and the Ramayana are at least as old as the poems of Homer," whom Herodotus places in the ninth century B. C.; others place him later. The Cyclopedia thinks he was born nearly 700 B. C. The Bhagavat-Gita, according to Goodrich, was written from 700 to 900 years B. C., instead of 300 years after, as assumed by Mr. Perry, who seems determined to have dates to suit himself, though he may differ from all the popular historical works ever written.

We will now hear again from that popular oriental and Hindoo scholar, Sir William Jones. Instead of referring the Gita to the first or third century after Christ, he declares in the most positive terms it was written as long ago as 1451 B. C. It thus differs from Perry's assumption more than 1,500 years. And thus

Mr. Perry's post-Christian theory for the Gita, Puranas, and story of Chrishna is demolished the seventh time in this chapter, and we are not done yet.

8. L. M. Child says: "The extreme antiquity of the Ramayana and the Mahabharat (containing the Bhagavat-Gita), is proved by sculpture on exceedingly ancient temples in solid rock" (vol. i, p. 50). Away goes Mr. Perry's modern origin for the Gita over the dam again. Certainly there can't be much of it left by this time but its shadow.

9. And we have a still stronger Christian battery yet to wield against his theory. That standard authority for the world, the New American Cyclopedia, puts his post-Christian Gita back more than 2,000 years earlier than he does. It says, "The Mahabharat (which includes the Gita) was written in Sanscrit about 4,000 years ago by Veda Vyasa, who also collected the older Puranas" (vol. iii, p. 222). Mr. Perry says the Gita and Puranas are both of modern origin and post-Christian, but the Cyclopedia says they are both nearly 4,000 years old. Surely Mr. Perry must be endowed with indomitable pluck to put forth and vindicate a theory after it has been totally demolished by nearly all the established authorities of the world. And again this standard authority says, "The creed of the Brahmins can only be learned by studying two ancient Sanscrit works, known as the Vedas and the Puranas" (vol. iii, p. 615). A stunning blow at Perry's modern Purana theory. Perry's attempt to modernize the Gita and the Puranas so as to be able to sustain his favorite theory, that the story of Chrishna which they contain was borrowed from that of Christ,

should be demolished so thoroughly that it can never be resurrected again. I will, therefore, continue my long list of authorities arrayed against him.

10. Charles Wilkins, another profound oriental scholar, says of the Bhagavat-Gita, which he himself translated, that "there is satisfactory proof of its being 4,000 years old," while Perry says it is less than 2,000. When learned doctors disagree so widely, what is to become of the patients?

11. Lest Mr. Perry should be too much shocked by the powerful historical battery which has been arrayed against his post-Christian theory, I will quote but one more authority on this point. The learned Dr. Robertson, D.D., in his "History of India," says of the Bhagavat-Gita, "It is a poem of the highest antiquity and great authority in India, and aims to establish the doctrine of the unity of the Godhead, and the true worship of God" (p. 329). Here the unity of the Godhead is affirmed, which Mr. Perry says is wanting in the oriental religions. It will be seen, then, that the many unimpeachable authors we have summoned who are in direct opposition to Mr. Perry's theory of the post-Christian origin of the Gita and the Puranas, with their story of Chrishna, each one of which overthrows it—leaves not a pillar of it standing and not a brick of it on the ground. Will he then give it up? Perhaps not. Douglas Jerrold says: "It is not human nature to confess errors, but to stick to them the tighter the more thoroughly they are exposed." I hope Mr. Perry will not manifest the persistence the jockey did who sold a horse as being seventeen hands high, but which nine witnesses who measured its height swore was only

fourteen hands high. "Well," said the jockey, "I wish I had not said seventeen; but as I did, I will stick to it, for I won't be caught in a lie." I will leave Perry to decide whether the shoe fits him.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

I.—MANY OTHER FACTS, PROOFS, AND AUTHORS WHICH SHOW THAT NEITHER THE ANALOGIES OF THE HINDOO GODS NOR THEIR RELIGION ARE FROM CHRISTIANITY.

1. L. M. Child says, "The description of the Hindoos in the time of Alexander the Great, more than two thousand years ago, nearly describes them now" (vol. i, p. 132). This statement indicates their unsusceptibility to change and the absence of any disposition to borrow or adopt new doctrines. And hence they could not have made draughts or selections from the Christian gospels.

Robinson speaks of "the permanency of its institutions and the immutability of its religion."

2. The cyclopedias prove that no essential changes have been made in the Hindoo religion or the religion of the Vedas. I will here present some more important facts from the Cyclopedias to show that no important changes have ever been made in the sacred books or doctrines of the Hindoos. *Ergo* they did not borrow anything from Christianity. It says their method of writing these sacred books

"Is most ingeniously contrived to secure them against changes and to preserve their purity. The consequence of all these appliances is

that the Vedic texts are handed down to us with almost perfect exactness, as originally established by the schools (under King Asoka, 240 B. C.), with hardly a corrupt passage or doubtful reading—a phenomenon scarcely to be paralleled elsewhere in the history of literature."

Here is another death-warrant issued against Mr. Perry's post-Christian theory. Here it is declared that no important changes have been made in the Hindoo scriptures; that they have been handed down to us "with almost perfect exactness," as established 240 B. C. And the reasons are assigned why no essential changes have been made, and why it is morally impossible to effect such changes.

3. We will summon another important witness—Mr. Goodrich. He piles the proof against Perry's borrowing theory still higher when he says :

"Such is the extreme inertness and immobility of the Hindoo character, and such the stability of the Brahmin religion, that no important changes have been effected in either during a period of several thousand years."

True, Buddhism seems to be an outgrowth from it, but left it in a state of lethargy from which it has never recovered. And Buddhism soon assumed a conservative character which it has maintained with but little change during its entire existence. Here Mr. Perry's whole borrowing theory is shown up and its infinite absurdity exposed in a few lines.

4. Max Müller tells us that every word, every syllable, and every letter of the sacred books of the Hindoos is counted and recorded, so that no change could be made in them without being soon detected; and this is done partly to guard them from alteration.

5. Goodrich says some of the oriental nations are

scrupulous against letting their sacred books go into the hands of the missionaries for fear they will alter them.

II.—THE HINDOOS AVERSE TO BORROWING NEW DOCTRINES.

“To convert or be converted,” says Mr. Robinson, “are ideas equally repugnant to the principles most deeply rooted in the Hindoo mind” (p. 229). And he says the conjoint labors of both Catholics and Protestants have effected the conversion of very few of the 60,000,000 Brahmins. If they took on many of the Christian doctrines in the early age of the church and engrafted nearly the whole story of Christ into that of Chrishna, as Mr. Perry represents, why is it they repel both now with such invincible obstinacy? Will Mr. Perry furnish us a solution of this puzzling theological enigma? Please figure it out, Bro. Perry. Perhaps Beecher or Swing or your newspaper indorsers could help you.

III.—THE EARLY CHRISTIANS' PROPENSITY FOR BORROWING.—CORRUPTIONS AND ALTERATIONS IN THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Having shown by testimonials drawn from the Cyclopaedia, Mr. Robinson, and other writers, that the Hindoos are not only strongly averse to borrowing, but that they have for thousands of years adopted every precaution to preserve their sacred books from the slightest alteration, I will now present the proof drawn from Christian authors and even the Bible itself that the founders and early propagators of the Chris-

tian religion possessed a natural and unyielding inclination to imitate and borrow from other systems. The founders of the Christian religion were Jews by education and descent, and possessed the essential elements of the Jewish character. And the Bible shows that through their whole history they manifested a strong propensity for amalgamating their religion with that of their heathen neighbors. I could quote fifty texts in proof of this. I will cite a few: Gen. xxxvi, 2; Deut. vi, 14; Sam. vii, 3; Jer. xvii, 3; Josh. xxiii, 16, etc., etc.

Bishop Whately has written a whole book, entitled "The Corruptions of Christianity," in which he adduces many facts to show that the early Christians, inheriting the true Jewish character, were constantly making efforts to incorporate the doctrines of paganism with their own, while he acknowledges the pagans manifest a strong repugnance to having other religions mixed with theirs.

Now here is evidence pointing both ways—a two-edged sword playing upon Perry's borrowing theory. The striking difference in the character and natural inclination of the disciples of the pagan and Christian religions, as shown above, amounts very nearly to a demonstration that if there has been any transfer of material from one system to the other, it has been done through the agency of the latter, and the Christians have been the borrowers. Such facts are as strong as "Holy Writ," some of them being drawn from "Holy Writ." We have here science, history, and scripture all combined to disprove Perry's leading proposition that the analogies of paganism and Chris-

tianity are to be accounted for by assuming that the pagans fell in love with Christian doctrines and stole them. He who can believe it in the face of such facts must be as strong proof against conviction as the Canaanite's chariots were against Jehovah's bullets. (See Judges i, 19.) He would hardly believe otherwise if he knew it were the truth.

IV.—PERRY IN CONFLICT WITH ANCIENT CHRISTIAN WRITERS.

Can Mr. Perry be ignorant of the fact that nearly all the ancient Christian writers saw and admitted that the old heathen nations anticipated Christ and Paul with respect to nearly all the doctrines of Christianity. And some of those pious Christians adopted one expedient and some another to account for the strange coincidence. It was suggested by one writer that the devil, foreseeing the advent of Christ, got out a system of doctrines that it was impossible to distinguish from his without the aid of inspiration; and it was difficult to know which inspiration did not come from the devil, or which doctrines were not his, and this placed them in a very serious quandary. And then the idea of the devil getting out the second edition of the gospel doctrines and plan of salvation before the first was published or even revealed to the world, and thus outwitting and getting ahead of God Almighty, partakes pretty largely of the ludicrous, and brings to mind the story of the Italian's dog, which, he stated, scaled a well at two jumps.

“What did he light on,” asked a bystander, “when he made the first jump?”

“Nothing,” was the reply.

“Why, then, did he not fall in?”

“Because,” replied the Italian, “he made the last jump first.”

And the last jump appears to have been made first in getting out a system of doctrines for the instruction and salvation of the world; that is, the second instalment of revelation came first, and came from below instead of from above. Will Mr. Perry please explain this “mystery of godliness?”

V.—ST. AUGUSTINE DENIES THE TRUTH OF PERRY'S BORROWING THEORY.

This early Christian writer, after recounting the doctrines of Christianity, says:

“This in our day is the Christian religion, not as having been unknown in former times, but as having recently received that name.

Here this noted writer virtually admits that the Christian religion existed among the heathen before the coming of Christ, but under another name, and that it became Christianity simply by a change of name. This is a virtual declaration that what is now called the Christian religion was borrowed from the heathen. Here is a complete demolition of Mr. Perry's borrowing theory. It explodes it into a thousand fragments, and I would suggest that he now consign it to the tomb.

VI.—BAILLY ON ORIGEN AND LACTANTIUS.

The learned astronomer and pious Christian writer, Bailly, comes forward and adds to the great mass of

evidence already accumulated. After alluding to St. Augustine's testimony, he adds :

“What I have said of St. Augustine is applicable also to Origen and Lactantius, who have endeavored to persuade us of the immaculate virginity of the mother of Jesus by the example of similar events stored by the heathen.”

Now here is Origen, of the third century, and Lactantius, of the fourth, leading Christian writers of that era, virtually admitting that the miraculous story of Christ was borrowed from that of the heathen gods, by admitting the greater antiquity of the latter.

VII—JUSTIN MARTYR.

This writer speaks of heathen stories about gods being born of virgins, crucified, rising from the dead, ascending to heaven, etc. (See chap. v.) From his language we infer that such stories had long been in existence among them, and consequently they must have been started before the crucifixion of Christ, for St. Justin lived so near the time of Christ that the story of his life and doctrines had not attracted the attention of heathen nations so as to induce them to borrow if they had wished to.

NOTE.—An insuperable and insurmountable difficulty is in the way of changing the oriental religions, or of changing the teachings of their sacred books. The sacred record of most of the oriental heathen nations are so voluminous and ponderous that to effect a change in their contents would be a task almost impossible to achieve. They in some cases amount to thousands. Collections of the Buddhist sacred books have been made at different periods, consisting of 4,083 distinct works. One is called the Tanjar, and comprises 225 volumes folio, weighing each from four to five pounds.

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

I.—THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ARRAYED AGAINST
PERRY'S BORROWING THEORY.

We learn by reports recently published in several papers that some of the leading churchmen and clergymen of England are now discussing the question at issue between Mr. Perry and myself, and it is a remarkable circumstance, and one calculated to add no credit to Perry's speculation, that some leading members of that old orthodox institution (Trinity church), and professors in the orthodox universities of Cambridge and Oxford, are sustaining the very position which Perry is opposing and which I am maintaining, thus placing us both in rather singular positions.

Ernest von Bunsen, son of Josius Christian Bunsen, who figured a few years ago in Europe as a scholar and statesman and a theologian, has recently written a work in which he claims to have found the connecting link between Buddhism and Christianity; and after pointing out many striking analogies in the doctrines of these two systems and the history of their founders, Buddha and Christ, he argues, in opposition to Mr. Perry's theory, that these analogies were recorded in the Hindoo books long before the coming of Christ. He says, "Buddha's birth from Maia anticipated Christ's birth from Mary." Mark the word "anticipated." This is a leveling blow at Perry's theory, who says, "Buddhists simply adopted Christian facts into their own mythology." Bunsen says they had these facts many ages before Christian-

ity was known or thought of. Which must we believe? This Bunsen is a scholar and a popular Christian writer, well known and highly respected in England; a professed believer in Christianity and divine revelation. This writer also indorses my position as laid down in "The Sixteen Crucified Saviors," that some of the founders of Christianity were Essenes. He maintains that Paul was an Essene, and John the Baptist; that Christ's history and teachings savor strongly of Essenism, and that "Christ is fated to become the figure-head of Essenism."

Prof. King, of Cambridge University, is understood to indorse, in part at least, Mr. Bunsen's position. This learned professor points out many features of resemblance between the Persian and Jewish religions. He maintains that the words Parsee and Pharisee are substantially the same word—one a Persian and the other a Jewish name. This is pregnant with an important inference when taken in connection with Max Müller's declaration that "the Persians borrowed nothing of the Jews." It leaves us the conclusion as the only alternative that the Jews borrowed of the Persians; and many other Christian writers affirm this, as I have shown.

II.—ANOTHER POPULAR ENGLISH CHRISTIAN WRITER AND CLERGYMAN LEVELS A BLOW AT MR. PERRY'S THEORY.

The Rev. N. Hoare, formerly chaplain to the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, but now a preacher in London, has been recently writing on the analogies of all religions. He points out many parallels and strong resem-

blances between the Christian Bible and the Zend-Avesta, the Vedas, and the Chinese and Egyptian sacred books, and says "they all hold essentially the same views of God, immortality, charity, etc.," and yet he stoutly maintains they are all older than Christianity. Will Mr. Perry enter a protest?

III.—WHAT THE HINDOOS THINK OF CHRIST AND CHRISHNA AS COMPARED TOGETHER.

One of the modern leaders of the Brahmins in India, known as Chunder Sen, has recently put forth some views respecting Jesus Christ which have excited a great deal of controversy and much opposition and hostility from the missionaries. He maintains there has been two Christs (Jesus Christ and Chrishna)—an Eastern Christ and a Western Christ—and that the people of India are prepared to welcome the Eastern Christ, but never can believe in the Western Christ. He says the Western Christ is the Christ of the dozèn Christian sects and their preachers now in India who are continually denouncing each other, and that the Hindoos have no use for such a Christ. Pretty good for a "heathen." He is "not far from the kingdom," and needs no conversion.

CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

I.—A REVOLUTION IN CIVIL JURISPRUDENCE.

When a suit is tried before a civil court, whether on the civil or criminal docket, the case is decided according to the amount of evidence and the credibility of

the witnesses. And if any of the witnesses are known to have a personal interest involved in the issue, and their testimony is in accordance with that interest, a considerable discount is made in estimating the value or validity of their testimony; while, on the other hand, the statement of a witness testifying adversely to his own interests will usually outweigh that of half a dozen who expect to be benefited if the decision is made in accordance with their testimony. This is exactly the way the case stands now, being tried before the court of public opinion.

Most of the witnesses summoned by Mr. Perry have much at stake in the issue. Their religious capital is all invested in the case, and they would feel much damaged if the decision should go against them. In such an emergency but few men can be supposed to cherish that exalted veneration for truth which would entirely outweigh their self-interest so as to have no influence in shaping their testimony when being presented to the court. And these are the circumstances under which most of Perry's witnesses testify, being Christian professors, or living amongst the most rigid orthodox. While, on the other hand, I have mustered ten times the number of witnesses, who, notwithstanding they are also Christian professors, and would prefer a decision in favor of Perry's theory, possess the moral manhood to present to the world the truths and facts which they have found in opposition to it without stopping to calculate the consequences. Who, then, cannot see that if a decision should be awarded to Mr. Perry under such circumstances it would effect a complete revolution in the established axioms of

civil jurisprudence and reverse the rules of all our civilized courts?

II.—THE VERDICT OF THE JURY.—THE JUDGE'S CHARGE TO THE JURY.

You have now before you the essence and quintessence of all the evidence presented by Mr. Perry's fifteen witnesses. Five of the witnesses—Mr. Burgess, Mr. Klaproth, Laplace, Prof. Whitney, and Dr. Bentley—have been summoned to testify to the recent origin of the Hindoo tables, treatises, etc., exhibiting their calculations in astronomy as evidence that their astronomical discoveries, with which are connected those tenets of religious belief which so strikingly resemble those taught in the Christian Bible, are of post-Christian origin, and thus suggest the conclusion that they were derived from the Christian gospels. But it will be observed that not one of them offers any facts or proof to support the position; and Mr. Laplace, the only accomplished scholar amongst them, does not even express the opinion that the discoveries were made so late as the inauguration of the Christian era. Indeed, none of the witnesses exhibit one particle of proof that they know anything about it; nor have we any proof that any of them, excepting Laplace, were sufficiently learned in astronomy to be competent to give an opinion in the case. The jury will notice these facts.

On the other hand, as will be observed by turning to chapter viii, Mr. Graves has cited the testimony of a number of learned historians and profound scholars, who not only testify to the remote antiquity

of some of the Hindoo calculations in astronomy, but to the impossibility of those calculations referred to being made since the dawn of the Christian era. The learned Mr. Robertson, a D.D., affirms they have calculations in astronomy of more remote date than that of any other nation. And that great scholar, Prof. Playfair, of Edinburgh, declares that if those tables, treatises, etc., the witnesses refer to were of modern or post-Christian origin, the natives would know something about them, as they are familiar with all important events which occurred since the beginning of the Christian era; whereas, they really know nothing about those table, treatises, etc., which is certainly strong presumptive evidence of their ancient origin. The jury will weigh all these facts.

Four other witnesses are summoned by Mr. Perry—Pavie, Wilson, the Encyclopedia Britannica, and Chamber's Encyclopedia—to testify to an alteration in the Hindoo sacred books and a change in their religion since the advent of Christianity. The attempt is made to make it appear that the Bhagavat-Gita, Puranas, etc., which contain a history of Chrishna so strikingly similar to that of Christ, are of post-Christian origin. But none of the witnesses offer any proof of this position. On the other hand, Mr. Graves confronts them with the testimony of numerous witnesses, learned historians, who don't rest the matter upon their naked testimony, but present the proof (in chapter x) that those books were written long prior to the Christian era.

Some of the other witnesses of Mr. Perry are brought forward to testify to the post-Christian origin

of that portion of the Persian sacred books which exhibit such a striking resemblance in their doctrines to those of Christianity. But here again Mr. Graves meets them with able witnesses who present strong evidence in support of the counter-proposition. (See chapter x.) All these potent facts will have much weight with the jury.

It will also be observed that some of Mr. Perry's witnesses are at loggerheads—that they are arrayed against each other, and, in some cases, against Mr. Perry also. As, for example, Müller completely antagonizes Mr. Perry's position with respect to the Vedas being modernized, and overthrows it. (For proof, see chapter ix.)

Thus it will be seen that Mr. Perry's witnesses have left but little of each other, and, in some cases, but little of him also. The result seems to be analogous to the termination of the Kilkenny cats. (For the witnesses set aside by Mr. Müller, see chapter vii.)

Some other testimonies are presented by the witnesses which have no bearing on the question or are too indefinite to disclose their meaning. The jury now have the case before them, and can be at no loss in making out a verdict.

III.—THE CASE REVIEWED BY THE JUDGE.

Before the jury retires, there is one peculiar feature of this case the court desires to call their attention to. The jury should not fail to observe that nearly all the witnesses summoned by Mr. Perry present the evidence either in their testimony or in their past history, augmented by the powerful influence with which they

are at present surrounded, of being strongly biased in favor of the theory which Mr. Perry has summoned them to testify in favor of. And even those who are not thus biased are, nevertheless, subjected to a strong temptation to support his theory, because, living in an orthodox community, they well know the disastrous consequences which they will have to suffer if they oppose it and thus appear to take sides with Infidelity. And these influences were more powerful at the time those witnesses made the statements which Mr. Perry quotes in favor of his assumption, which, in some cases, was half a century ago. It would, then, be unreasonable to decide a case upon such testimony alone, especially when further investigation of the case shows that these witnesses are but few in number and do not represent the views and opinions of the learned world, or even the Christian fraternity generally.

Mr. Perry has summoned or cited a few authors in support of his favorite position, and assumed that it is established by their testimony, when it is well known that ten times as many writers are arrayed against it. No court or jury could be found in the civilized world who would dare render a decision in favor of any case under such circumstances.

IV.—WHAT FORMER CHRISTIAN WRITERS THOUGHT OF SUCH WILD THEORIES AND ASSUMPTIONS AS MR. PERRY'S AND THE AUTHORS' WHO SUPPORT THEM.

Archbishop Whately says: "There has not been wanting, in any age of the church, visionary Christian writers who started vague theories calculated to uproot the established conviction of the Christian world.

They should be rejected as false teachers, if not heretics."

Luther asks: "Can the wild theories of a few speculative Christian writers overturn the world and prove all history a lie?"

Wilson says: "A man can find the writings of visionary Christians in any age of the church to support any kind of theory he may start."

Mr. Goodrich says: "Imaginative writers, taking advantage of the darkness which rests upon the early history of a large portion of the world, have started theories with respect to their religion, science, morals, literature, etc., which, although supported by a little evidence and confronted by a great deal more, they maintain with as much boldness and tenacity as though it were susceptible of the clearest proof; assuming that, whether right or wrong, they will be hard to convict—that positive knowledge cannot be arrayed against them. But modern researches have been so far crowned with success as to partially remove the veil which so long concealed many of the most important events of the early history of the world and kept us ignorant of the religion and literature of a large portion of mankind. But this state of things no longer exists. We have partial access to the sacred books, religion, and science of nearly every nation, race, or tribe, a knowledge of which dispels the false theories we have referred to."

The foregoing testimonies as graphically describe Mr. Perry and his witnesses as though directly aimed at them, and show them up in their true light.

CHAPTER FOURTEENTH.

PERRY'S SIX OTHER WITNESSES EXAMINED—CLARKE,
HARDWICK, MILL, FISKE, THE LONDON ATHENÆUM,
AND MULLER.

Mr. PERRY: James F. Clarke, an orthodox clergy man, will repeat substantially what I have quoted from him relative to the difference about polytheism and the unity of the godhead as taught by heathen nations and the Christian Bible.

CLARKE: My statement is that

“The Egyptian doctrines of the gods is not taught in Moses' Pentateuch; that instead of their plurality of gods we have Jehovah; instead of pictures and images a rigid prohibition of idolatry, and instead of their pantheon of gods our severe monotheism. But we find nothing of a future life or the judgment to come in the Pentateuch. The cherubim of the Jews resembled the Egyptian sphinx; the priests' dress in both cases was of white linen. Both had the urim and thummim; both had a hereditary priesthood; both had temples of worship, and both the great 'I am.' [But the Jews, Mr. Perry adds, were the only nation of antiquity that could conquer the tendency to polytheism. Mr. Clarke concluded by saying], More than 5,000 years ago the hymns to the unity of the godhead were taught in the valley of the Nile, but now Egypt is sunk in the most frightful polytheism.”

Mr. GRAVES: Here is a witness whose testimony points in both directions. It seems to tear down as well as build up his own theological fortress. It is a musket firing at both ends. When he commends the Jewish religion because it opposes idolatry, and then adroitly points the dagger at it because it don't teach the doctrine of a future life or a future judgment, he seems to act on the policy of the hunter who, when

about raising his gun to shoot a deer partly concealed by the bushes, was arrested in the act by a companion, who exclaimed, "Hold on! I guess it is a calf." Pausing a moment, he again leveled his gun with the exclamation, "Zounds! I'm bound to have a shot anyhow; so I will just shoot so as to hit it if it is a deer and miss it if it is a calf." The heathen seem to constitute the deer and the Christian church the calf, with Mr. Clarke, and he fires and hits both. He makes some astonishing concessions with respect to the striking similarity of the Egyptian and Jewish religions in some of their leading rites and doctrines, which strongly indicate a common origin or an outgrowth of one from the other. And as Egypt furnishes a hundredfold evidence of a greater antiquity (as shown in my "Bible of Bibles"), the conclusion is at once established as to which is the parent and which the child.

Mr. Clarke states that the Pentateuch fails to notice the Egyptian gods; and he might have thrown something into the other end of the scale by stating that the early Egyptians neither notice the Jews nor their God in any of their historical writings, which forcibly suggests the conclusion that the Jews were an insignificant nation and made but little mark in the world.

PERRY'S WITNESSES AGAIN AT LOGGERHEADS.

GRAVES: The other points raised by Mr. Clarke Mr. Müller will meet and refute. And as "Müller is second to none in authority" with Mr. Perry, of course his authority will be sufficient to overthrow Mr. Clarke's when he opposes him.

JUDGE: Mr. Müller, what do you think of Mr. Clarke's statement about the polytheism of the Egyptians and the monotheism of the Jews.

MULLER:

"He is wrong, sir, on both, as I have shown in my 'Chips' and in my 'Science of Religion.' I have therein shown that all nations who figured in the past history of the world taught the 'unity of the godhead,' or the monotheistic idea of deity as comprehended in one supreme, overruling God; and all had a class of subordinate beings, denominated gods or deities by some nations and angels by others (including the Jews and Christians). I have stated that the Rig Vedas, the oldest Bible in the world, protests against the belief in many gods. It recognizes 'one supreme God, the creator and ruler of all things.' I have also quoted a learned Hindoo of Benares who, in a public lecture, declared, 'We really lament the ignorance or uncharitableness of those who charge us with polytheism in the teeth of thousands of texts in the Puranas, declaring in clear and unmistakable terms that there is but one God' (Chips, vol. ii, 17). I have also in my 'Science of Religion' shown the absurdity of the Jews being consistent monotheists, with their several gods, Jehovah, God, Lord, Aleim, Elohim (which means gods). These terms do not always apply to the same being; and such language as 'Let us (gods) make man in our own images,' is rank polytheism."

GRAVES:

"Why, then, does Perry quote Clarke's erroneous statement that the Egyptians were gross polytheists and the Jews consistent monotheists, when neither assumption is true, as shown in the 'Chips' and 'Science of Religion?' by Max Muller."

See also "Bible of Bibles," chapter xxxii.

GRAVES: The charge of idolatry against the Egyptians by Clarke I have fully refuted in chapter xxxii of the "Bible of Bibles," wherein it is shown that no nation of people ever worshiped idols or images, but used them as people do the photograph images of their friends, merely as reminders of absent friends. Swedenbourg is quoted to prove this also.

JUDGE: Then, Mr. Müller, you do not concur with Mr. Clarke and Mr. Perry in the statement that any of the nations were, strictly speaking, either polytheists or idolaters?"

MULLER: I do not. I have fully disproved these assumptions in my "Chips" and "Science of Religion."

JUDGE: And is it true, Mr. Müller, that the tendency has been from monotheism to polytheism, as Perry states?

MULLER: No, sir; I have shown that the growth has been in the opposite direction, and that trinities of gods who once figured as three separate characters are now comprehended in the conception of one being, and whole pantheons of gods are subordinated to one supreme, omnipotent God who controls everything.

CHAPTER FIFTEENTH.

HARDWICK, AUTHOR OF "CHRIST AND OTHER MASTERS."

Mr. PERRY: This witness will now testify.

HARDWICK: I will repeat substantially what I am quoted as saying in "Sixteen Saviors or One." After comparing Chrishna with Bacchus and Hercules, and also with the elder Cyrus (points which have no legitimate bearing on the question before us), I have stated that

"The divine and the human could not come together and permanently exist in Chrishna according to the theory of his followers, and that in going back to his celestial home he laid aside the perishable body, and in this respect differs from the god-man Christ."

JUDGE: Your first point seems to be that the divine and the human could not co-exist together in Chrishna. But do not many writers concur with Sir Wm. Jones, who wrote considerable on the subject, and who says "his followers believed he was an incarnation of the Deity in the human form"?

HARDWICK: Yes, that is true.

JUDGE: And would not a Deity clothed in human flesh be half God and half man, and thus be a god-man, as you say Christ was?

HARDWICK: It does look a little that way. But I hold that the divine and human were not so psychologically or metaphysically united in Chrishna as in Christ.

JUDGE: But that is a mere metaphysical speculation that we know nothing about, and it would not benefit us one iota if we knew. It looks like splitting hairs, and illustrates a drowning man catching at straws. It is as senseless as the question, Which is the mother of the chicken, the hen which lays the egg, or the one which hatches it? and would be as hard to settle. There is nothing gained by such speculation. We cannot, therefore, entertain such a speculation.

Mr. GRAVES: Mr. Perry's next point is that Chrishna laid aside his physical body when he entered his celestial home, and that Christ did not. But is he not aware of the fact that there was a difference of opinion and considerable speculation about the matter among the early Christians as to whether Christ's

body was laid aside or merely changed when he went back to the "house of many mansions," and the question was never settled.

No rational or philosophical Bible-believing Christian ever believed that Christ entered heaven with his physical body, for the Bible declares "Flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." And to assume, as some have done, that his body of flesh and blood and bones was changed into a spiritual body, is a still more glaring absurdity; for, in that case, he would have two spiritual bodies, as, according to the Bible, he brought one with him when he came into the world. On the other hand, a large portion of the followers of Chrishna believed he took his earthly body with him when he returned to Nirvana, and, in proof of the fact, they point to the very spot where he ascended, in the presence of a multitude, with his earthly body.

Mr. Hardwick, then, ought to see that the cases are parallel, and that he has committed an egregious blunder and disclosed an ignorance of history in assuming a difference where there is none. Mr. Hardwick must also see that we have made the case very strong against him, but his popularity, his salary, his church, and his creed may induce him to hold to it, right or wrong.

Mr. Hardwick's second position is that the Persians borrowed some of the doctrines of Christianity.

Mr. Hardwick is quoted in the "Sixteen Saviors or One" as saying:

"Modern explorations tend to show that . . . the treatises of the Zend-Avesta, in their present shape, can date no further back than

the third century of the Christian era, at the Sassanian epoch, A.D. 226. And they persuade our ablest scholars more and more that writings which have been brought together in the Avesta are the productions of different ages, many of the chapters, though written as long ago as 400 B. C., have all been modified and modernized by the intrusion of new matter."

JUDGE: Mr. Hardwick, you have made some momentous assumptions here. Have you any facts or any kind of proof to offer in support of them?

HARDWICK: My name is Charles Hardwick. I am an archdeacon, and have been a teacher of divinity in that old orthodox institution of Cambridge, which has never been polluted with the slightest tinge of Infidelity. My word should not, therefore, be called in question.

JUDGE: That kind of proof is not satisfactory. Clergymen who have to look through catechisms and creeds and the Thirty-nine Articles to see the truth are likely to miss seeing a good deal of it.

MORE CLASHING AMONG THE WITNESSES.

Mr. GRAVES: Mr. Hardwick illustrates and exemplifies the corrupting influences of the clerical profession and divinity schools in disqualifying men for acting as witnesses in any case affecting their creeds and salaries. And I will now bring forward a witness (Max Müller) to prove that Mr. Hardwick has been a victim to these cramping and corrupting influences.

MULLER: I have much regretted to observe the extent to which Mr. Hardwick's mental vision has been blinded and perverted, and the depth to which his soul has sunk in a fathomless sea of bigotry, and his mind and judgment warped by a straight-jacket

orthodox education. I exposed him thoroughly in a long public lecture, which will be found in my "Chips," vol. i, page 51.

Perry has quoted from his "Christ and Other Masters." This is the very work Mr. Müller so severely criticised, as it evidently presents very perverted, unfair, and erroneous views of the religions of the oriental nations, as found in China, India, Persia, etc.

Mr. Müller says in that lecture that "No honest impartial person can like the temper of his criticisms on those religions. An under-current of sectarian prejudice breaks out again and again which prevents him from seeing their beauty and their deep lessons of wisdom. He uses harsh language, and seems glad of every opportunity to try to show that they are but chaff. He speaks in a tone of offended orthodoxy. He has no sympathy with those religions. He virtually insists on the falsity of all other religions in order to prove his own true. He shows a want of faith in God and the inscrutable wisdom of his government" (Chips, vol. i, page 55.)

One of his neighbors jocosely remarked that his soul was so dried up with bigotry that it rattled when he walked.

JUDGE: Mr. Müller, do you consider such a witness qualified to testify in the case now before the court?

MULLER: I have stated several times inferentially in my lectures that it is morally impossible for a mind so biased and so blinded to present the straightforward, unvarnished truth. He would naturally distort, leave out, and perhaps misrepresent.

Mr. GRAVES: The reader will observe that Mr. Hardwick and Mr. Müller are Mr. Perry's principal witnesses. He quotes more extensively from them than from any of his other authorities. They must, therefore, be regarded as his principal authorities. And we here observe they are at loggerheads; Hardwick may, therefore, be considered as being ruled out of court. He fails to present any proof of his position, and also fails to present the credentials of a good witness. His testimony, therefore, can have no weight with the jury.

MR. GRAVES' COUNTER-TESTIMONY.

We will now proceed to show by counter-testimony that Mr. Hardwick's statements and positions have no basis of truth, and must, therefore, be rejected as false if they are to be understood in the light Mr. Perry evidently designs them to be, though it will be observed his language is so indefinite it is difficult to determine what he does mean. He speaks of the Zend-Avesta in "its present form." Whether that form refers to the shape of the book, the construction of its language, the projection of its illustrations, the nature of its ceremonies, the order of its rituals, or the spirit and tendency of its doctrines, is all left to blind conjecture.

He intimates that the book underwent a change at the time of the Sassanian revival, A. D. 226. Nobody doubts that. The word *Zend* is simply used to denote a sort of commentary, interpreting and explaining the Avesta, and, strictly speaking, is no part of the sacred book. At the time referred to, the *Zend* was more

permanently united to the Avesta (that is, one of the zends, for there have been several); and in this way we admit its form was changed. If this is what Mr. Hardwick means, we take no issue with him; but if he means, as I suppose Mr. Perry understands him to mean, that a radical change was made in its doctrines and its moral teachings at that period, we are prepared to overthrow the assumption. We have quoted the statement from Mr. Hardwick that the Avesta was changed and modernized by the intrusion of new matter. Here the language is indefinite again; but we will assume he means its doctrines and teachings underwent a change at that period, and will proceed to show the position is not true.

GOODRICH.

Our first witness shall be the great historian, Mr. Goodrich, who has stated, in his "History of All Nations," that "the Persian religion originated in an age when history was lost in fable; but it has been preserved, through good and bad fortune, through the long series of ages *without alteration.*"

Here Mr. Goodrich declares the teachings of the Persian religion have not been essentially changed, Hardwick to the contrary notwithstanding.

MULLER.

We will now hear from Mr. Müller. Again Müller says, "There is no more primitive religious code than the Avesta" (Chips, vol. i, p. 116). Thus Müller virtually says Hardwick is mistaken in saying it has been modernized. Müller also states that the Persians

venerate their religion, like other nations, for its antiquity, which makes them guard it very sacredly from the slightest alteration in its teachings.

HAUG.

Haug, who has studied the Persian religion more critically than any other living man, says: "The Persians cherish such an exalted veneration for Zoroaster, the reputed writer of the Avesta, that they will not suffer one word of alteration in it, so that a word could not be added or abstracted from it."

JUDGE: Will Mr. Hardwick, then, explain how it has been modernized, by the introduction of new matter if not a word has been added or altered?

MR. HARDWICK: As that question is a sort of historical puzzle, you will please give me a little time on it.

MULLER WILL TESTIFY AGAIN.

Max Müller has stated in his "Chips," vol. i, p. 116, that

"The Persians have always turned a deaf ear to the appeals of the Christian missionaries, and adopt every scheme they can invent to counteract their influence. Hence but few of them have been converted to Christianity."

JUDGE: Will Mr. Hardwick explain how a nation of people cherishing such a strong hatred or dislike for Christianity should fall in love with its doctrines as if by magic, and modernize their religion by drawing those doctrines into their time-honored sacred books?

HARDWICK: As that question is rather a hard one,

I should like time to consult with Mr. Beecher and Mr. Swing before giving an answer.

MR. GRAVES: Hardwick says many chapters of the Avesta were written as long ago as 400 B.C.; but gives us to understand that most of them were written since the dawn of the Christian era.

JUDGE: Mr. Haug, who is the best informed writer on this subject of any scholar of the age, will state what he thinks of Hardwick's statement.

HAUG: I have found many cogent facts in my researches which clearly and fully establish the conclusion that "the oldest books of the Avesta were written about 1200 B.C., and the last books about 500 B.C.," as I told Mr. Müller.

JUDGE: Then you don't agree with Mr. Hardwick that most of the books were written since the beginning of the Christian era?

HAUG: No; and no sensible man who is well informed on the subject can entertain such an opinion.

MR. GRAVES: We will hear the testimony of one more witness—the learned writer Mr. Bopp.

Mr. Bopp has published the statement in writing that "the Avesta must all have been written before the Alexandrian conquest, 300 B.C."

That leaves none of it to have been written as late as the beginning of the Christian era. No; and no well informed scholar can entertain such a belief.

CHAPTER SIXTEENTH.

JOHN STUART MILL.

MR. PERRY : Mr. Mill will now speak of Christ.

MILL : My statement, as found in Mr. Perry's book, is that

“ Christ was a unique figure, unlike both his precursors and his followers, and none of his disciples or proselytes were capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to him or of imagining his life and character as revealed in the gospels.”

JUDGE : Why is this testimony presented ? Does Mr. Graves suppose the story of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ were invented ?

MR. GRAVES : No, sir ; I do not. Such a thought never entered my mind, though I suppose some of it was borrowed.

JUDGE : Why do you, Mr. Perry, attempt to prove a position which Mr. Graves does not deny ? It looks like shooting in the air.

MR. PERRY : I have nothing to say, only that I thought it would add to the size of my “ thin book.”

CHAPTER SEVENTEENTH.

JOHN FISKE.

MR. PERRY : John Fiske has something to say about Jacolliot.

FISKE : My language, which Mr. Perry has appropriated to his own use, is simply a condemnation of

Gladstone for showing favor to Jaccoliot's "Bible in India." I have stated that

"Gladstone does not unreservedly approve of this book, neither does he appear to suspect that it is a disgraceful piece of charlatanry written by a man ignorant of the subject of which he treats."

JUDGE: Will Mr. Perry please explain what bearing this testimony has in the case now before the court? Why is Mr. Gladstone arraigned here to be condemned? Is he one of the parties in this suit?

Mr. PERRY: No, sir; I believe not. But that was a matter I did not think much about. I noticed he showed some favor to Jaccoliot's book, and that was sufficient to prompt me to attack him without considering whether it had any relevancy to this case or not.

Mr. GRAVES: My name is not Gladstone, and therefore Mr. Fiske's condemnation of him does not hit me. It is difficult to see why Fisk's censure of Gladstone was not sent to him instead of being hurled at me. I suppose Mr. Perry's purpose is to show that Gladstone's partial approval of a book which he calls one of my authorities is condemned by such a great man as John Fiske. But let me remind him that John Fiske is but a pigmy by the side of a great giant when weighed in the scales with Mr. Gladstone. But Gladstone is amply able to take care of himself, and to distance in the race both Fiske and Perry. I never indorsed Jaccoliot's book nor quoted anything from it but what is indorsed by other writers. This is more of Mr. Perry's random shooting in the dark. He fires into the air and hits nothing.

THE LONDON ATHENÆUM.

This paper is quoted in condemnation of Mr. Higgins. And here is what it says about him :

“ We remember being much struck by seeing among the books of reference in the Museum reading-room the Anacalypsis of Godfrey Higgins. Never was there more wildness of speculation than in its attempt to lift the veil of Isis. But thousands of statements cited from all quarters and very well indorsed brought the book into such demand that it was placed in the reading-room.”

Mr. GRAVES :

Here is a case of tearing down with one hand and building up with the other. It admits the book was in great demand, and its readers and admirers were some of the most learned and intelligent of men, but then it indulges in some “ wild speculations.” It is hard to conceive of a wilder speculation than that of condemning a book which contains thousands of statements gathered from nearly all nations, from all the great libraries of the world, and from hundreds of the ablest and most popular writers that ever wielded the pen, and from inscriptions found on the numerous monuments of the East, and finally a book embodying the greatest storehouse of facts and knowledge with respect to all the religions of the world ever accumulated before or since, almost amounting to a sum total of all the religious and theological literature of the world, the result of more than twenty years' labor, consuming ten hours daily. To condemn such a work because it indulges in some speculations which the writer deems wild is itself the very acme of “ wild speculation.” The writer probably knew but little about the learned work written by Godfrey Higgins.

If every work should be condemned which is equally obnoxious to such a charge, or in which some strongly prejudiced reader living in the hot-bed of an orthodox community like Higgins' critic (who desired to increase the patronage of his paper) might fancy he had found some wild speculation, the shelves of our libraries would soon be empty. Nearly every popular work would pass under the flaming sword of condemnation.

Before Higgins' work can be overthrown the numerous authorities on which it is based, and which amply sustain it, must be met and vanquished, and he who undertakes the task should count the cost before he begins. Truly Mr. Perry seems very much beset to find objectionable traits in the character of those writers he calls Mr. Graves' authorities. He appears about as much perplexed to find any ground for criticism as Mother Gray was to find a pretext for dismissing some of her boarders when they became too numerous for her limited supplies. They were all such clever fellows that it was hard to conjure up an objection to any of them. But she hit upon it at last. She told Jim and Jake and Joe that she could board them no longer because they parted their hair in the middle. According to Perry, De Quincy was an opium eater, "Baillie was wild," Eusebius a blunderer, Bunsen extravagant, Higgins wild in speculation, etc. All these crimes are nearly as terrible as that of "parting the hair in the middle."

CHAPTER EIGHTEENTH.

MAX MULLER PERRY'S PRINCIPAL WITNESS.—HE
"WAKES UP THE WRONG PASSENGER."—MULLER
OVERTHROWS PERRY'S MAIN POSITION.

Mr. Perry attaches so much importance to Max Müller's testimony that he declares "it is second to none." And I acquiesce in this estimate of Mr. Müller's testimony. Although he lived in the heart of an orthodox community, and was a professor in a bigoted orthodox university, which greatly hampered the free expression of his views, and caused him at times in his efforts to accommodate his friends, to pursue a compromise course, and make concessions to their strong sectarian feelings which almost involved contradictions to other statements made by him when not under the pressure of such powerful antagonistic influences; yet, on the whole, his testimony is for the truth. His large and cultivated mind could not be restrained, at all times, from giving utterance to some glorious truths, and citing some important facts which offended the orthodox, and which are quite damaging to Mr. Perry's main proposition; the citation of which may excite some such cogitations in his mind as were excited in the mind of the pious matron who, when called upon to give in her experience in class meeting, replied, "I have been thinking, the least said the soonest mended."

We will first examine the citation which Mr. Perry makes from his writings, and notice whether they really prove what he claims or affects to prove by them in support of his main proposition—"The post-

Christian origin of the leading tenets of the oriental religions.”

JUDGE: Max Müller is a witness whose testimony may be regarded as almost a final decision on any controverted question of oriental literature or theology, he being considered the greatest living oriental scholar. “His authority is second to none,” says Perry. He also says, “No man’s diction carries greater weight.”

GRAVES: Mr. Müller will now speak.

MULLER: I published in a London paper, a few years ago, under the head of “A Chapter of Accidents in Comparative Theology,” an account of a trick which some Hindoo pundits played off on some pseudo missionary confederates or co-workers (portions of which Mr. Perry has inserted in his “Sixteen Saviors or One”). I will relate the whole circumstance, substantially. A Mr. Wilford, connected, I believe, with the East India enterprise as a co-laborer with Sir Wm. Jones, having discovered some striking analogies between the Hindoo Vedas and the Jewish portion of the Christian Bible, had his curiosity raised to the highest pitch, which resulted in a determination to investigate the matter thoroughly, and learn the extent of the resemblance or similarity between the two religions. Some of the learned Brahmans, having discovered his great anxiety to make a strong case, came to the conclusion to assist him by a clever trick, which consisted in forging some new leaves for the Vedas, containing well-known Greek, Latin, and Hebrew names (which is thus spoken of in the extract found in Perry’s book):

'Essay after essay from Col. Wilford's pen appeared in the "Asiat. Res.," with extracts from the Sanscrit manuscripts, containing, not only the names of Deucalion, Prometheus, and other heroes or deities of Greece, but likewise the names of Adam and Eve, and Abraham and Sarah, and all the rest At last, however, the coincidence became too great, the manuscripts were again carefully examined, and then it was discovered that a clever forgery had been committed—that leaves had been inserted into ancient manuscripts, and that on these leaves the pundits, urged by Col. Wilford to disclose their ancient mysteries and traditions, had rendered in correct Sanscrit verses all that they had heard about Adam and Abraham from their inquisitive master (Mr. Wilford). Col. Wilford, having discovered the trick, did not hesitate to confess that he had been imposed upon."

The same article shows that Jacolliot was imposed upon, in a similar manner, by forged leaves stuck in one of the Vedas, containing the names of Adam, Eve, Abram, Isaac, Moses, etc., which he copied into his book called "The Bible in India." But it appears that he also finally discovered the trick; and thus the whole thing ended. And what does all this amount to? In the name of reason, I would ask how it can do anything towards establishing the conclusion which Mr. Perry seemingly quotes it to prove, viz., that an entire change and revolution was effected in the sacred books and religion of the Hindoos by the idle tricks of a few pundits. For Mr. Perry not only quotes several writers to prove it, but affirms himself that important additions and changes have been made in the Hindoo sacred books and their religion, and his readers understand him to relate this story in proof of it. But the facts in the case, so far from supporting the conclusion that any changes were thus made in their scriptures or their religion, go far toward proving the impossibility of effecting such an achievement in

that way. It shows that such an undertaking could not progress very far till some able scholars would detect the alterations by comparing the new editions with the older manuscripts. And this is true, not only with respect to India, but likewise Persia and other oriental nations. Mr. Perry argues that radical changes have been made in several of the oriental religions, and this circumstance is probably related to suggest the manner in which it was done. But a critical investigation of the matter will show it could not have been effected in this way, nor in any other way. I will make a brief statement of some of the insuperable difficulties to be encountered in any movement for the consummation of a change and revolution in any of their institutions or customs.

1. The disciples of the Hindoo faith have long comprised about one-third of the inhabitants of the globe scattered in various countries, and in many localities cut off from communication with each other.

2. They are divided into various sects so hostile to each other, in some cases, that they could not have been induced to unite together in any enterprise for general change in any of their religions, customs, habits, or institutions.

3. And yet, most of their creeds comprise some of the doctrines of the Christian Bible.

4. They have not less than nine hundred sacred books found in various countries; and nearly all of them, so far as examined, contain doctrines always claimed by Christians to be peculiarly Christian, and a number of them contain sketches of their principal gods, which

strongly resemble the life and doctrines of Jesus Christ.

5. They are known, from their earliest history, to have been scrupulously and conscientiously opposed to any essential change in any of their sacred books or fundamental doctrines, and hence no such changes have been known to have been made by any of the leading sects since they were organized, though some of them, by virtue of the general law of growth, have modified some of their minor tenets and religious customs.

6. To guard against change in their sacred books, and their religion, they, several thousand years ago, had every word, syllable, and letter counted in their principal holy books, so that they could at once detect any change or alteration in their doctrines, or any of their teachings. To suppose, therefore, such a general and radical change has been made in the Hindoo religion as Mr. Perry assumes, since the establishment of Christianity, is supremely absurd, if not superlatively ridiculous.

MULLER TURNS STATE'S EVIDENCE AGAINST PERRY.

Müller, the very authority which Mr. Perry here quotes to sustain his theory and assumptions, shows by the language he uses on different occasions that he does not deduce any such conclusions from the Col. Wilford and Jacolliot deception as Mr. Perry evidently does, and he denies, what Mr. Perry affirms, that radical changes have been made in the Hindoo religion since the dawning of the Christian era. For he declares, as quoted elsewhere, that "the religion and

literature of the Vedas and the Brahmins have been preserved in an uninterrupted chain for a period extending over a period of more than 3,000 years" (Sci. Rel., vol i, p. 33).

And he says again, as if in direct allusion to Perry's assumption of important changes in the Vedas in modern times, "The Vedas is no modern forgery." Such declarations as are here made by Mr. Müller explode Mr. Perry's assumption of important changes in the Vedas since the inauguration of the Christian era, into a thousand fragments. For if it has been preserved in an uninterrupted and unbroken chain for more than three thousand years, then it is evident and even self-evident that it has undergone no essential changes by taking in some of the doctrines of Christianity. I wish Mr. Perry to look these facts right in the face, even though it should cause a little trembling of the knees. It will require more help than Mr. Beecher and Mr. Swing can both render him to drag his borrowing theory out of this logical morass.

1. Here I must notice the assertion of Mr. Perry that I have borrowed largely from Jacolliot, and that he is one of my principal authorities; whereas the truth is, as I have elsewhere stated, that with the exception of about half a dozen words, there is but one chapter of the forty-six in the book ("The Sixteen Saviors") which contains one line from Jacolliot.

2. And I have quoted nothing from Jacolliot that is not also found in other authors. I have quoted none of the spurious passages which Müller has pointed out and condemned.

3. And then, as Müller himself says those spurious

passages in the Vedas were soon detected by observing they could not be found in the older manuscripts, it will be seen at once that no permanent changes could be effected in their sacred books in this way.

Here let the reader note the fact that the story of a father offering a son as a sacrifice to a god which the Hindoo pundits have been charged with making and sticking into the Vedas to parallel the case of Abraham offering his son Isaac, is actually found in the Rig Veda, which Müller says is more than 3,000 years old, and therefore was not manufactured by them nor Jacolliot, though they altered the names. The name of the father in the Veda is Ajigartha, and that of the son Sunahsepa, which the Pundits changed to Abraham and Isaac; and the name of the god to whom the offering was to have been made, was Váruna. But the boy made his escape, and the father afterwards acknowledged he was wrong and was condemned by his friends. In these respects his story differs from that of Abraham. The only thing Müller condemns in the case is the change in the names. He don't deny the story. It was, then, no forgery at all either of the Pundits or Jacolliot.

CHAPTER NINETEENTH.

GODFREY HIGGINS AS A WRITER.

We will now see with what success Mr. Perry has demolished Mr. Higgins, whom he assumes to be my principal authority; and as he was one of the greatest

historians the world ever produced, I am proud to own him as an authority.

Mr. Perry first exhausts his own quiver in his effort to annihilate him, and then brings to his aid a bigoted orthodox journal, the "London Athenæum," which was about as much afraid of Infidelity as it was of the Asiatic cholera. But as I have already shown how ridiculous were its charges in chapter xv, I will confine this notice to Mr. Perry's charges against that great author, who reached a mental altitude that but few can hope to attain.

Mr. Perry, after admitting him to have been a very learned man, says he was "eccentric, absurd, and incapable of weighing authorities." To be sure; but thousands of intelligent people would pronounce him as capable of weighing authorities as Mr. Perry himself. Who is to decide between them, or who can show his authorities are not correctly weighed? If Mr. Perry can do it, why did he not do so? It is an easy matter to conjure up some kind of flimsy objections against any writer who gives utterance to unpopular truths. No such writer has ever escaped being attacked in this way; even Jesus Christ himself was considered eccentric, "mad," in "possession of a devil," etc., because he did not preach or teach the popular orthodox religion.

Mr. Higgins claimed to be a religious man, and did not denounce any system of religious faith. But he made some astonishing and startling discoveries relative to the crucifixion of the oriental gods, and showed that many stories of the crucifixion of gods were prevalent in the world long before the crucifixion of Christ.

This was enough to bring down upon his devoted head the bitter anathemas and condemnation of the orthodox churches, because, like Paul, they had determined to "know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified;" that is, they are determined not to know any other gods were crucified. And then Mr. Higgins shows that most of the doctrines of the Christian faith were taught by various heathen or oriental nations long before the advent of Christ. This also made him a target for the missiles of the orthodox priesthood.

Dr. Johnson relates an anecdote which illustrates this prejudice quite forcibly. A young lady of fastidious taste, who was once riding with a popular author, had her high-toned sense of propriety disturbed by observing that his horse's caudal appendage was disheveled and disfigured with burrs, which grew on some weeds in that locality. A short time after this occurrence his forthcoming work came from the press, and a copy of it was placed in her hands. On examining it, she observed some views set forth in it not in accordance with her established predilections. Hence, when asked to purchase the work, she replied she could not believe all an author wrote who suffered his horse's tail to get in such a fix. She evaded the real objection just as Mr. Perry and the "Athenæum" have done in the case of Higgins when they charge him with being "eccentric," "indulging in wild speculation," etc., which is about as sensible as the burrs in the horse's tail, and, I presume, comes about as near stating the real objections. Before they can overthrow Higgins, they must overthrow his authorities, and that they have not even attempted to do.

The "Alliance," published at Chicago, suggests that Mr. Perry's exposition of Mr. Higgins will cause me to wish he had never been born. No; I entertain a more rational wish than this in the case. I wish that editors who attempt to write on subjects of which they are as ignorant as goats, had been born several thousand years ago, when it was customary for all animals of that species to travel on four legs.

CHAPTER TWENTIETH.

MULLER REPROVES THOSE OCCUPYING PERRY'S POSITION FOR THEIR DISPARAGING VIEWS OF THE ANCIENT RELIGIONS.

The minds of a large portion of Christian professors are so thoroughly saturated with prejudice toward the professors and disciples of other religions that they can hardly speak a good word in their favor.

Max Müller comes forward in defense of these maltreated disciples of religion and administers a wholesome moral reproof to their Pharisaical enemies. We will quote his language :

1. "A scholar-like treatment of the religions of the world is still a desideratum" (Chips, vol. ii, p. 184).

He was referring to the actions of Christian professors, and thus virtually says "The great body of Christians do not treat them properly."

2. Again Müller says: "What we know of the ancient religions comes frequently from prejudiced observers."

Here is a very instructive moral lesson. It suggests the thought that we cannot implicitly rely upon any of the reports with respect to the character and teachings of the ancient religions coming from the hands of Christian writers unless we have corroborative evidence of their correctness.

Where is Mr. Perry? I want him to read this.

3. "No judge," says Müller, "if he had before him the worst of criminals, would treat him as most historians and theologians have treated the religions of the world. Every act in the lives of their founders which shows they were but men is eagerly seized and judged without mercy. Every doctrine that is not carefully guarded is interpreted in the worst sense that it will bear. Every act of worship that differs from our own way of serving God is held up to ridicule and contempt. And this is not done by accident, but with a set purpose. . . . And if the study of the ancient religions produces but this result—that it drives this godless heresy out of every Christian heart—it will have done a good work" (Chips, vol. ii, p. 104).

4. Again Muller says: "Those who imagine that in order to make sure of their own salvation they must have a great gulf fixed between their own religion and the religion of Buddha, Zoroaster, and Confucius . . . should learn that those religions have effected the divine education of the human race, and are supported by authorities before which they would probably bow in silence" (Science of Religion, p. 106).

He also says their writings contain "gems of truth more precious than gold." Here Perry should stick a pin.

5. Col. Dowe says that "bigoted and sectarian writers have prejudiced all Europe by their unfair descriptions of the Hindoo religions, which they do not understand and do not try to understand."

6. Müller says: "When we accustom ourselves to believe in an earlier civilization of Egypt, Babylon, China, and India . . . we shall have to drop the name of barbarian altogether" (Chips, p. 266).

Perhaps Perry will still have use for the word. I guess he will.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIRST.

PERRY'S WITNESSES CONDEMN HIS CHARGES AGAINST THE ORIENTAL RELIGIONS.

After stating that much that is degrading and foolish and inconsistent is found in the oriental religions (admitting some moral wisdom), Mr. Perry says, "The gospel of good news is found only in our scriptures," thus intimating a wide difference between the Christian religion and its scriptures and those of other nations. And his book seems to be a labored effort to show that there is but little that is really good and valuable in other systems of religion excepting what they borrowed or stole at a later date from Christianity. Here again he is met, confronted, and refuted by his own witnesses. I will cite some of their testimonies, and first of all Mr. Müller's:

1. This writer says (by quotation): "He who knows but one religion knows none." A pretty hard hit at

Mr. Perry, who, practically knows no religion but that of Jesus.

2. Again Müller says: "Let us make up our mind to look at those oriental religions for what is true and good and we will hardly know our old religion again" (Science of Religion, p. 108).

This is virtually saying that whatever we find that is good and true in our own religion can be found also in other systems. I propose that Mr. Perry appoint Mr. Beecher and the editor of the "Telegram" a committee to visit him and put him on the right track.

3. Again he says: "In Buddhism and the Chinese religion we find what we most value in our own." Mr. Perry don't find anything of the kind.

4. Müller calls the old religions "Precious metals which shine with brightness and purity after the rust of ages is worn off" (Science of Religion, p. 27). Mr. Perry seems only to see the rust.

5. "The ancient religions are the divine educators of the human race," according to Müller. But Mr. Perry does not appear to find anything divine about them, but stigmatizes them as "foolish, degrading, and inconsistent." I guess these qualities can be found also in his own religion when he gets the scales off his eyes so that he can see them.

6. Again Müller says: "We have a period of the intellectual life of man in the Vedas to which there is no parallel in any other part of the world" (Chips, p. 67). What becomes of Mr. Perry's exalted view of Christianity in this case?

7. "Not even the Christian religion," says Muller, "has exercised so powerful an influence in diminishing

crimes" (Science of Religion, p. 132). What will Mr. Perry do with this statement?

8. "The moral code of Buddhism," says Müller, "taken by itself, is one of the most perfect which the world has ever known" (Chips, p. 217).

How widely he differs from Mr. Perry, who tells us that "the gospel of good news can be found only in our scriptures." I fancy Perry will here enter a protest.

9. "We need not appeal to any authority if we will, but read the records of the ancient religions with an open heart and a Christian spirit" (Science of Religion, p. 108).

Here is another good lesson for Mr. Perry and his sectarian friends. I guess Perry is getting enough of Müller.

10. "There is no religion which does not say, 'Do good and avoid evil'" (Science of Religion, p. 108).

What a pulverizing blow on Mr. Perry's statement that "the gospel of good against evil are found only in our scriptures!" Will he recant and take it back?

11. "According to Buddhism, the motive to all our actions should be pity and love for our neighbor" (Science of Religion, p. 114). Is not this the gospel of good news?

12. "Buddhism," says Bishop Bagendat, "upholds the notion of a savior and a deliverer, and the necessity of his mission for procuring the salvation of man."

This is a leveling blow at Perry's position about a savior. And if this is not the sum total of Perry's "gospel of good news," it would be hard to find it.

13. "The role of Buddha, from beginning to end, is that of a deliverer" (Science of Religion, p. 133).

This, with the testimonies above cited, comprehends the essence of what the early Christians meant by "the gospel of good news," which Perry declares is found only in the Christian scriptures. A lunatic in one of our asylums once exclaimed, "I say the whole world is crazy, and the whole world says I am crazy." Will Perry adopt a similar soliloquy? It will be observed by the foregoing citations that thirteen historical batteries are fired at Perry's favorite theories and assumptions by some of the ablest writers that ever wielded the pen. I admire the courage more than the wisdom or good sense of the man who can still defend a theory or assumption after it has been demolished a thousand times.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SECOND.

DID BRAHMINISM EVER UNDERGO A RADICAL CHANGE?

Mr. Perry, after quoting my statement, that neither the language nor religion of the Brahmins has ever been known to change, gives vent to uncivil language by declaring, "A greater amount of absurdity and falsehood could hardly have been comprised within so few lines." Did I cherish the disposition to retaliate, I would say, A greater amount of ignorance is seldom found in so few lines, or a greater insult to established authorities than this statement.

I will now show that if there is any "absurdity and

falsehood" in the case, they are chargeable upon his own witnesses, and he must settle the matter with them. As he accepts Müller as an authority, to settle such disputes, we will first hear what this matchless historian says in the case. He says this: "The Vedas, with the Brahmanas, form an uninterrupted chain of theological literature extending over a period of three thousand years" (Science of Religion, vol. ii, p. 33).

If the chain of their religion has been unbroken for three thousand years, as Müller affirms, then the question is settled forever that their religion has not been essentially changed. Mr. Perry affirms it has, because the Vedas do not say a word about Chrishna, the greatest of the incarnate gods. This is true, and it is equally true that the Hindoos believed in incarnate gods at the time the first Veda is said to have been written, about 1200 or 1400 B.C.; and Mr. Perry himself virtually admits it, for he concedes that Chrishna was the eighth incarnation, which is an admission that seven incarnations preceded him, and this would cover a period of several thousand years before Christ.

Another fact on which Mr. Perry bases the assumption that the Hindoo religion has been suddenly changed is that the Vedas don't speak of the incarnation of gods, which was afterwards taught by some of the Hindoo sects. But a little investigation of the matter will show that this assumption is founded in an ignorance of history, for facts show that the belief in incarnate gods is as old as the Vedas, although the Vedas is silent on the subject, because not written by the sect who taught the doctrine. But accepting the testimony of that great oriental scholar, Mr. Higgins,

that the incarnated god Christna was born about 1200 B.C., and that of the Rev. D. O. Allen, that the Vedas were written about 1000 or 1200 B.C., we must admit that the doctrine of the incarnation is as old as the Vedas, and thus Perry's assumption falls to the ground.

Again, Mr. Perry refers to the great Buddhist schism which took place in the fifth century, B. C., seemingly as evidence of a radical change in the Brahmin religion. Well, this idea, I confess, is somewhat novel—that a sect which separated from the old fossilized religion of Brahminism simply because after laboring long and hard to get it to change and adopt their reformatory ideas and doctrines, did change it, nevertheless. The fact is, they would never have left it only that it was so completely fossilized or crystallized that it could not be changed. There would be as much sense, science, or logic in assuming that Martin Luther changed the religion of Christianity when he left the Roman Catholic church, or that the various sects which have sprung up since have effected a radical change in its doctrines, as that the new sect of Buddhists changed the religion of the Brahmins. Nothing can be further from the truth. I admit, however, that Brahminism has changed slowly and gradually, like all other institutions, by the great inherent and universal law of growth and decay, which changes everything; but that changes sufficient to make any visible alteration in their leading doctrines or tenets of religious faith have taken place, I do not admit.

Mr. Perry dares not cite that able witness, Mr. Müller, in this case, for he demolishes the very posi-

tion he would have him affirm. Mr. Perry says the authentic history of India commenced in the twelfth century, and predicates the assumption probably upon the fact that that appears to be the date of their oldest manuscripts. But such an assumption must ruin the claims and destroy the foundation of his own religion, and thus his historical blunder proves too much and hangs him, Haman-like, upon his own gallows; for Müller shows that the Christian Bible (the Old Testament portion) is in a worse condition than the Hindoo Bible, for its oldest manuscripts only date to the tenth century, while the Hindoos' date to the twelfth. Hence his argument strikes more fatally at his own religion than the Hindoos'. But Müller says, that aside from the date of the manuscripts, there is evidence that the manuscripts in both cases were written before the Christian era—the Hindoo religion 1200 B.C., the Jewish 400 B.C. Instead of thus putting the authentic history of India in the twelfth century of our era, he says there is proof that the Hindoo manuscripts were written 1200 B.C., instead of A.D. 1200, as Mr. Perry seems to assume—a difference of twenty-four hundred years. Thus his best witness is against him. If we must assume that the authentic history of India commenced in the twelfth century, A.D., then we must assume that the Jewish history commenced in the tenth, according to Müller. I have quoted Müller's statement that the religion of the Vedas has remained unbroken for 3,000 years. And the Rev. D. O. Allen says, "It is the general opinion of oriental scholars that the Vedas were put into their *present* form 1200 or 1400 B.C." And he also declares that "Brahmin-

ism, as originally taught from the Vedas, still continues to be the religion of the great body of the people of India." Thus we have testimony upon testimony to prove there has been no radical change in the religion of the Brahmins. Will Mr. Perry give it up?

CHAPTER TWENTY-THIRD.

I.—BUDDHISM AND CHRISTIANITY ALIKE. — PERRY AGAINST HIMSELF AND ALL HISTORIANS ON RELIGIOUS ANALOGIES.

After stating that I confound Buddhism and Christianity together, he declares, "But they are very different." And yet he himself, apparently in a moment of forgetfulness, points out several important analogies, thus "building up cob-houses with his hands and then kicking them down with his feet." But here we will dispose of his assumptions again, and rule them out of court by his own witnesses.

1. Müller says, "Between the language of Buddha and his disciples, and Christ and his apostles, there are strong coincidences" (Science of Religion, page 112).

2. "Some of the Buddhist legends and parables sound as if they were taken from the New Testament," and yet he shows they were not, but were in vogue long before the birth of Christ. He speaks of Buddha, like Christ, meeting a woman at a well, and points out other resemblances.

3. Bishop Bagendat confesses there are "many striking features of an astonishing resemblance between Buddhism and Christianity."

4. And the Bishop of Ramath says :

"Most of the moral truths prescribed by the gospels are to be met with in the Buddhist scriptures. And it is impossible not to feel reminded of many circumstances in our Savior's life by reading the life of Buddha Gautama. He upholds the notion of a savior and a deliverer."

And yet he admits it is all pre-Christian. Here is more work for Perry's historical sledge-hammer if he is going to demolish all the historical authorities in our libraries.

Müller says the Manichean Christians concluded that Buddha and Christ were one and the same person on account of the astonishing similarity of their lives and doctrines; but Mr. Perry says they are very different. Which must we accept as "the standard authority?" I will present one more extraordinary testimony from a Christian clergyman. The Rev. Mr. Malcom, in his "Travels in Asia," says: "The doctrine and practical piety of their Bible (the Bhagavat-Gita) bear a strong resemblance to those of the (Christian) Holy Scriptures. It has hardly a precept or principle that is not found in the (Christian) Bible. And were the people to live up to its principles of peace and love, oppression and injury would be known no more within their borders. It has no mythology of obscene and ferocious deities, no sanguinary or impure observances; no self-inflicting tortures; no tyrannizing priesthood. . . . In its moral code its description of the purity and peace of the first ages

and the shortening of man's life by sin, it seems to follow genuine traditions. It seems to be the best religion ever invented by man." Here, Mr. Perry, is a dish of strong theological food for you. Accepting this description as correct, I cannot see where the superiority of the Christian Bible comes in. And if this old heathen Bible contains anything bad, remember this Christian clergyman says, "It has hardly a precept or principle not found in the Christian Bible." Well, well, where can the honest and unbiased man or woman now be found who will not give up that all Bibles and religions are essentially alike, Mr. Perry to the contrary notwithstanding?

II.—DID BUDDHISM BORROW FROM CHRISTIANITY?

1. Mr. Müller says that in three translations of the Dhammapada not a word or syllable was altered, which is another fact militating against the conclusion that they ever suffered any new doctrines or precepts to creep into their sacred books. Thousands of them commit the holy book to memory, so that they could readily detect any alteration.

III.—HAS BUDDHISM CHANGED OR BORROWED ANY-THING FROM CHRISTIANITY?

Mr. Perry says the features of Buddhism which so strongly resemble Christianity can be traced no further back than the second century after Christianity was established, and that "the Buddhist romancers simply adopted Christian facts into their own mythology."

Here is a very positive assertion. We will see what

his favorite author and standard authority, Max Müller, has to say about it, and whether he sustains Perry's position. He says, "The Buddhist Canon had been settled in several councils and received its final form under Asoka 246 B. c." (p. 162). If it received its final form 246 B. c., then it is self-evident its form has not been changed since. What has Mr. Perry to say to this? It spoils his form of it completely.

IV.—POSITIVE PROOF THAT CHRISTIANS STOLE FROM THE HOLY BOOKS OF THE HINDOOS.

Müller relates an extraordinary circumstance of the early Christians stealing the history of a Hindoo god to deify one of their saints with. He declares that "the early life of Josaphat, a popular Christian saint, is exactly the same as that of Buddha Sakia" (Chips, vol. iv, p. 174). "No one," says Müller, "can read their two stories without being convinced that one was borrowed from the other" (Ibid, 175). "And we know," he declares, "that the story was current among the Hindoos in the sixth century before Christ." "It follows, therefore," says Müller, "that the story of Josaphat was borrowed from the Hindoo scriptures." And thus the matter is settled as to which party borrowed the story. This Josaphat was a popular character among the early Christians, and the story of his life was translated into many languages. Here, then, is one of the most extraordinary cases of religious plagiarism ever recorded in the history of the human race; and Prof. Benfry says that "Theudus the Sorcerer," mentioned in the Christian New Testament, is one of the characters in the same story. Here, then,

we have the evidence that our New Testament writers drew from the Hindoo scriptures, and that our Bible is partly borrowed Hindooism. How much of it has been borrowed it is impossible to decide. Hereafter, then, let Mr. Perry and his one-sided and bigoted witnesses forever hold their peace about Brahminism, Buddhism, and Chrishnaism having made any draughts on the Christian gospels. The evidence, the facts, and the proof all run in the opposite direction.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOURTH.

THE ESSENES PREACHED CHRISTIANITY LONG BEFORE CHRIST, AND WERE CONSIDERED ORIGINAL CHRISTIANS.

Why did not Mr. Perry attempt to overthrow my position with respect to the Egyptian Essenes preaching and practicing nearly every doctrine of Christianity long anterior to the birth of Christ? "For it was" (in Egypt), says Mosheim, "the Essenes dwelt long before the coming of Christ" (vol. i, p. 196). And I have given a long list of the most striking analogies in their doctrines and principles to those of Christ, to the *formidable number of sixty*, which embraces nearly all the doctrines and precepts of the gospel. I suppose the reason he skipped over this chapter, he found it impossible to bring down their origin into the Christian era. He has no Bentley theory to help him out of this difficulty. Hence he barely alludes to the subject, and then dismisses it by

saying, "No modern writer of eminence has confounded the Essenes with the Christians, except De Quincy, the opium-eater." But here his historical knowledge falls short again. Bishop Marsh, Weiting, Michaelis, a work entitled "Christ the spirit," and that world-renowned Christian historian, Eusebius (and others), all admit that the Essenes preached the doctrines of Christianity long before the coming of Christ. Eusebius makes the astounding statement that "those ancient Therapeuts (Essenes) were Christians, and their ancient writings were our gospels" (Eccl. Hist., p. 63). What have you to say to this, Brother Perry? And "Christ the Spirit" (by Hitchcock), says, "The Christians were the later Essenes—that is, the Essenes of the time of Eusebius under a changed name. Here Perry is completely demolished again.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIFTH.

WHY DOES NOT MR. PERRY REFUTE MY BOOK?

As the Rev. Mr. Smith states in his letter which I have quoted in chap. iii, Mr. Perry has not answered or even noticed the leading positions of "The Sixteen Saviors," nor has he noticed one of the nine distinct propositions laid down in "The Bible of Bibles." Mr. Smith states that so far from attacking the leading positions of the "Sixteen Saviors," he virtually indorses them. This is a strange way of putting down Infidel books. It calls forth from Mr. Smith a stinging rebuke. According to Mr. Smith, he fires at them and

misses them. How long, I ask, would it take to conquer an enemy or repel an invading foe by discharging volleys of bullets from guns pointing over their heads. It would probably take about as long as it did the boy to reach the schoolhouse of an icy morning, when, according to his statement, in attempting to take one step forward he slipped two steps backward.

"How did you get here, then?" queried the teacher.

"Why," said Tom, "I turned round and went the other way."

Perhaps Mr. Perry will yet adopt this reverse policy. It is stated that a Russian soldier, while his regiment were halting for recruits, came running into camp from the enemy's grounds, exclaiming:

"I have demolished them! I have cleaned them out!"

"How did you do it?" asked a fellow-soldier.

"Why, you see, I fired on them a tremendous charge, so powerful that it kicked me over and filled my eyes full of smoke. When I rubbed the smoke out of my eyes so I could see, which was in about an hour or two, I looked, and lo! not one devil of them could be seen. I guess I blowed 'em all to hell."

He made rather large calculations in supposing a single charge would demolish a whole regiment when it could not have dispatched more than one or two victims. Mr. Perry seems to have made a similar mistake if he supposes that a volley of criticism which is fired at a book and misses it and often hits some of his friends, and which leaves the main propositions of the book untouched, its principal facts unnoticed, and its leading arguments unrefuted and even unassailed

as affirmed by his own witnesses. If he supposes such a lame and futile attack will effect its utter annihilation, he is egregiously mistaken.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIXTH.

A LIST OF TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR ERRORS FOUND IN MR. PERRY'S "SIXTEEN SAVIORS OR ONE."

It is not claimed that Mr. Perry can in no case find some show of authority for some of the statements here classed as errors, but that the weight of historical evidence is in all cases against him. It will be observed that the errors are not noticed in the order in which they occur in his book, nor is the page given in many cases, as so many references would have burdened the work with figures. The book being small, they can easily be found. In presenting the list we will first notice those found in chapter iv, on the gods:

Error 1. Mr. Perry errs about Prometheus (see chap. iv).

Er. 2. Also on the spelling of Quexalcote (Quetzalcoatl) (do).

Er. 3. On the identity of Quirrinus and Romulus (do).

Er. 4. On the identity of Apis and Thulis (do).

Er. 5. On the identity of Wittoba and Chrishna (do).

Er. 6. On the Mexican antiquities (do)

Er. 7. On the miraculous birth of Confucius (do).

Er. 8. About the god Ixion (do).

Er. 9. On the identity of Alcides and Hercules (do).

Er. 10. Relative to Alcides as an Egyptian god (do).

Er. 11. On the crucifixion of the gods. Errors in the spelling of names, or at least his criticisms, are wrong in this case.

Er. 12. Chrishna, as spelt by many writers, Perry spells Krishna.

Er. 13. Menu, as spelt by most modern writers, he spells Manu.

Er. 14. His Arjuna is mostly spelt Arjune or Arjoon.

Er. 15. His Kali Yuga is generally spelt Kali Yug.

Er. 16. His Bhavagat-Gita should be Baghavat-Gita.

Er. 17. His Mahabarata most writers spell Mahabarat.

Er. 18. His Puranas is now spelt Purans.

Er. 19. Keliga by the best authors is spelt Kaliga.

Er. 20. And he adopts the antiquated form for Sakiamuni.

Other similar errors are noticed in the work. These errors are noticed because he often criticises my mode of spelling names and because he is called "A standard authority in historical accuracy." And yet he confesses he has not conformed to any standard. He virtually claims to erect his own standard. If other writers were to indulge in the same license we would have a thousand standards, or rather no standard at

all, but endless chaos and confusion. We will now continue his list of errors as arrayed against facts, figures, and history, but we will be compelled to notice them briefly to avoid swelling the book to an enormous size.

Er. 21. Mr. Perry says he has reviewed my two books which have obtained the widest circulation. Here he furnishes the evidence that he has not critically examined my books. One of the works he has reviewed has reached the fifth, the other the seventh edition, while the work *he has not reviewed* has advanced to the *eleventh edition*. If "walking libraries" always commit such errors and make such false statements, it is a fortunate circumstance that so few libraries possess the power of locomotion.

• Er. 22. He says he has fully and fairly met all my arguments. Wonderful achievement, truly. But a critical examination of the case will show that he has met my arguments as Jo Johnson once met a bear. Being badly frightened, he fired, dropped his gun, and retreated, and afterwards discovered he missed the bear but killed his dog. Perry in like manner generally misses me in firing his logical missiles, but often hits some of his own friends, as the reader has of course observed.

Er. 23. He says the positions refuted are those which constitute the stronghold of Infidels in general. To be sure! But I have not found any positions refuted. He should have pointed them out.

Er. 24. He says he has destroyed my foundation. Then away goes Christianity, for my foundation is furnished by Christian writers.

Er. 25. He says he has shown that Christ is no copy of Chrishna. Dear me, how has he shown it? He has not answered or refuted one of my 344 parallels between Christ and Chrishna. He lacks 344 miles of reaching it.

Er. 26. He says natural philosophers have changed ground in hundreds of particulars within the last quarter of a century. Well, what of it, as they have not abandoned any ground or any former position? they are only enlarging their grounds and augmenting their strength.

Er. 27. He says when I speak of an exposition of the Bible errors I mean "exposure." How wonderfully wise! Exposition is defined to mean, "The act of exposing;" and that is exactly what I was trying to do.

Er 28. He faults me for putting Mohammed among the divinely honored personages, and says he only claimed to be a prophet. Exactly what I have stated in the "Bible of Bibles," and yet he received divine honors.

Er. 29. Mr. Perry says I get my account of Hindoo gods from the mediæval Christians. Well, that suits me exactly, for it will be seen that if there are any lies told in the case they will be placed to the credit or discredit of primitive and devout Christians.

Er. 30. It is declared by Mr. Perry that "none of the miraculous stories related of Buddha can be traced back beyond the Christian era." Then the many writers I have read on the subject, a number of whom I have cited in this work, are either liars or ignoramuses.

Er. 31. He says Mr. Bunsen is always extravagant

on the side of antiquity. He might have added, And Mr. Perry is extravagant in the other direction. The truth is, Mr. Bunsen stood high as a calm, moderate, well-read, reliable, and popular writer.

Er. 32. He challenges both my intelligence and my honesty. The Louisville "Age," an orthodox journal, differs with him (see error 198).

Er. 33. Mr. Perry consoles himself with the thought that Christianity, despite all defects and all opposition, is still spreading and converting to its ranks; it is still multiplying. But I would suggest that it would be a mark of wisdom to inquire what is the character of those converts in heathen lands who have embraced its doctrines, whether it is such as to justify the enormous expense incurred in proselyting them. As a sample of the practical fruits of missionary labor, I will here present a condensed report of the result of thirty years' labor by one missionary in India, that of Abbé Dubois. After stating that he only made between two hundred and three hundred converts during his twenty years' labor, he says: "Of this number two-thirds were pariahs or beggars (a very low, ignorant, and superstitious class), and the rest were composed of shudras, vagrants, and outcasts of several tribes." After showing that these converts embraced Christianity from selfish motives, he adds: "And I will declare it with shame and confusion that I do not remember any one who embraced Christianity from conviction and from quite disinterested motives. And many of them apostatized and relapsed into paganism." He concludes by saying that he was much ashamed to make the humiliating avowal that those

who continued Christians were the very worst of his congregation. Good Lord! who can conscientiously contribute one cent to the missionary fund after such a revelation as this, especially when it is known that it takes from one to ten thousand dollars to make one convert. This is "paying dear for his whistle."

Er. 34. Mr. Higgins' arguments, he tells us, were shaped to suit his "preconceived theory." Had they been shaped to suit Mr. Perry's "preconceived theory," they would have been all right. I found no "preconceived theory" in Higgins' work.

Er. 35. He says Higgins was "credulous, believing everything but the Bible." Well that is nearly as bad as Perry, that of "believing nothing but the Bible."

Er. 36. He says Dupuis argued that "the religions of antiquity arose from nature worship," and Mr. Perry has not adduced one fact or one argument to disprove the position. Such criticisms are utterly worthless.

Er. 37. He says Higgins' "Saitic Isis was not veiled," and yet he virtually admits it was, for he confesses he don't understand it.

Er. 38. The planets, he says, were first worshiped as "dwelling-places of divinity and afterwards as deities." Here, as usual, he has got "the cart before the horse." They were first deities and then the homes of deities. (See "Bible of Bibles," chap. xxxii.)

Er. 39. He says Higgins "selected India as the mother of all mythologies." And he was right, or Perry was wrong in not even trying to refute the position.

Er. 40. We are told that Dupuis discovered that the zodiac of Denderah is younger than our era. I think he did not, as I have seen no announcement of it.

Er. 41 He acknowledges (p. 27) that the Hindoos believed that a god was incarnated at every recurrence of certain astronomical phenomena, which is evidence that the belief in cycles and saviors was established among the heathen prior to the incarnation of Jesus, and out of that belief grew the doctrine of the crucifixion. Hence both were pre-Christian.

Er. 42. Perry says, "Everything that was supernatural in all religions came from the scheme of cycles." Then the supernatural origin of Jesus Christ and his supernatural history came from that source, and hence is fabulous, for "all religions" includes Christianity. Is this a blunder of Mr. Perry, or what is it?

Er. 43. He admits the English discovered coincidences in the life of Christ and Chrishna "which were very startling," and "exceedingly troublesome" (p. 28). And there was no way to get out of this trouble and dilemma but to invent the false theory that the story of Chrishna was post-Christian and borrowed from that of Christ. This is the key to the explanation of Perry's post-Christian theory.

Er. 44. He says Chrishna was the son of Vasudeva, but Mr. Jamieson—twenty years a missionary in India—says he was the son of Busadeo. How is that? Had he, like Christ, two fathers (Jehovah and the Holy Ghost)? Mr. Perry, please explain this "mystery of godliness."

Er. 45. He says Chrishna's mother's name was

Devaki. Sir William Jones says; and, residing in India many years, he had the best opportunity of knowing.

Er. 46. He says Chrishna was "licentious in appearance, if not in reality." Not quite so much so, I presume, as Solomon and David, two favorites of Jehovah. And besides, the Hindoos say such ascriptions, are merely symbolical figures.

Er. 47. He admits Chrishna is reported to have cleansed lepers, raised the dead, descended to hell, figuratively trampled on the head of a serpent, etc. And as I have by many facts and authorities overthrown his post-Christian and borrowing theory, we are compelled to conclude the story of Christ was in part at least plagiarized from that of Chrishna.

Er. 48. He says Higgins was "incapable of weighing authorities." If his authorities were like some of those of Mr. Perry's they could not be weighed: They would not have possessed sufficient momentum or ponderosity to draw down the scales. A dozen such as Burgess and Hardwick thrown into one end of the scale would hardly have counterpoised or balanced a feather. He should have come to Mr. Perry to get his authorities weighed. He possesses scales that will weigh mountains—that is, mountains of faith. As for weighing facts, the scales have not been used much in that way, I believe.

Er. 49. For the several ridiculous absurdities of Dr. Bentley's horoscope theory, indorsed by Mr Perry, see chap. vii.

Er. 50. He says Brahmins concede that the history of Chrishna, containing the Christian analogies, is the

production of Vopadesa, of the twelfth century A. D. And how many Brahmins? I will risk my life on it that not one in a hundred concede any such thing that the analogies are post-Christian.

Er. 51. Mr. Perry admits "there may have been an ancient hero (like Chrishna), about whom legends gradually clustered." Here is some lofty leaping to escape from the quagmires of his borrowing theory, but he tumbles back into it again. I guess somebody has been trampling on his toes. He inadvertently admits enough here to make a rope to hang himself with.

Er. 52. The statement quoted from Mr. Hardwick and indorsed by Mr. Perry, that Chrishna differed from Christ in the incident of "laying aside his perishable body," I have shown the absurdity of in chap. ix.

Er. 53. And his irrelevant comparison of Chrishna, Hercules, and Bacchus, is shown to be a blundering admission of one of my leading propositions, that nearly all the gods of history resemble each other, including that of Christ.

Er. 54. He speaks of "all lands where God and his unity have been abandoned." What a muddle and stretch of ignorance! Müller asserts, and proves there has been no such abandonment; the tendency is in the other direction.

Er. 55. Perry quotes the statement of the Encyclopedia Britannica, that the modern Puranas were composed to promote the worship of some particular deity. Here he aims his arrows at a "man of straw." I have said nothing to the contrary, and I have shown

in chap. ix, that the term "modern Puranas," that paper uses is a virtual admission of the existence of the ancient Puranas which contain the analogies of Chrishna.

Er. 56. Perry's blunders in quoting the Eycyclopedia's statement that the religion of the Hindoos has passed through various stages of development, I have fully exposed in chap. ix.

Er. 57. Mr. Perry sneers at Mr. Greeley as an authority for the statement that "there is no doctrine of Christianity that has not been anticipated by the Vedas." But his sneering recoils on himself; if he will turn to Mr. Greeley's statement, he will find he proves it.

Er. 58. Mr. Perry speaks of "the blunder of Eusebius in reckoning the Essenes as the original Christians." What a swell of egotism to call a very popular early Christian writer, whose works are in every Christian library, a *blunderer*. Cobb says, "When a man is interested in supporting error he won't tell the truth unless he blunders into it." Perhaps this was Eusebius' experience. His admission is very damaging to his own religion. It may, therefore, have been a blunder. But it is quite a truthful and lucky one. But there is a greater blunder in the case of a more recent date than Eusebius'.

Er. 59. Mr. Perry says, "We have frequent unacknowledged flings (quotations) from Paine's 'Age of Reason' in my 'Sixteen Saviors.'" Here is some more random firing with his theological blunderbuss. I *have not quoted one sentence from Paine.*

Er. 60. H. M. Wilson's extravagant and unproved

assertion that the Baghavat-Gita was composed in the third and fourth and eighth centuries A. D., is shown up in chap. x.

Er. 61. Mr. Perry's challenge of the veracity or testimony of that great and popular Christian writer, De Quincy, because he was an opium-eater, would, if the spirit of it were carried out, rule nearly all Christendom out of court, as a large portion of them use another narcotic nearly as bad, called tobacco.

Er. 62. Mr. Perry says that many of my coincidences between the lives of Chrishna and Christ are drawn from Jacolliot's "Bible in India." Here is more of his random conjecturing. *I did not take one of the 449 parallels between Christ and Chrishna from Jacolliot.*

Er. 63. For my exposure of Perry's blunder in quoting John Fiske's condemnation of Gladstone for indorsing Jacolliot see chap. xvii.

Er. 64. He speaks of my "incompetency to separate truth from falsehood." Of his incompetency to separate them it is difficult to judge, for he apparently mixes them up together without an attempt to separate them. The reader may judge which is the greater sinner.

Er. 65. He says, "The doctrine of Buddhism and Christianity are very different." On the contrary, I have quoted many writers—Mr. Müller, and even Mr. Perry himself among the number—who show they are strikingly similar (see chap. xx).

Er. 66. He says the Buddhists "simply adopted Christian facts into their own mythology." That statement I have totally demolished in chap. xx, and

have shown that adopting facts was a two-handed game that both parties could work at.

Er. 67. He says Higgins attempted to prove that both Chrishna and Buddha were crucified by passing off Roman Catholic pictures, a statement not proved, and which cannot be proved. Higgins did not practice deception.

Er. 68. Mr. Perry quotes Hardwick to prove that the Persian Bible, the Zend-Avesta, in the present form, is not older than the third century of our era. For my exposure of that error, see chap. xv.

Er. 69. As for the refutation of the erroneous statement that I confound Buddhism with Christianity, see chap. xx.

Er. 70. He speaks of "inconsistency and folly" in heathen teachings. "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." Thousands who have read the Christian Old Testament know the same errors and evils, are spread pretty thick on some of its pages.

Er. 71. As for "the gospel of good news being found only in our scriptures," as Mr. Perry asserts, I have demonstrated it to be erroneous in chap. xviii.

Er. 72. He says, "All evidence points to early April as the true date of our Savior's birth." Then all Christendom have been fools or ignoramuses for the last fifteen or sixteen hundred years for celebrating the 25th of December as his birthday. Prior to that date the time of his birth was not agreed upon, but was shifted about. This obscurity and uncertainty, according to the Cyclopedia (vol. v, p. 194), led some Christian professors to confound it with the Epiphany in April (which is probably the case with Mr. Perry).

Others selected a day in May. Such changing about from one date to another shows there is nothing certainly known about the matter.

Er. 73. He says at one time that my objections against the Bible are original. At another time he says my objections were answered long ago. How objections could be answered long ago that were but recently originated by me, and consequently did not then exist, is about as hard a problem to solve as that of the Tonga Islanders, who say that "the first goose was hatched from an egg, and that the same goose laid the egg." Pardon another illustration. When Timothy Titcomb was asked if he knew a certain man, he replied, "Yes, I knew him when his father was a little boy," an absurdity similar to that of answering objections before they have an existence.

Er. 74. Mr. Perry's absurdity in quoting the statement of John Stuart Mill, relative to the story of Christ not being invented, I have exposed in chap. xvi.

Er. 75. Mr. Pavie's statement, as quoted by Mr. Perry relative to the Hindoos borrowing from foreign philosophies and religions, I have refuted in chap. ix.

Er. 76. And the statement of Chamber's Encyclopedia, that the Puranas contain a fuller history of Chrishna than the Mahabharat, I have refuted in chap. ix.

Er. 77. "The church Fathers of the fourth century [says Mr Perry] were not startled when they heard of Buddha." Yes, but those of an earlier date were startled, according to Mr. Goodrich, when they entered India and found a religion so nearly like their own.

The former had probably heard of it before. Here either his reading or memory of dates appears to stop short.

Er. 78. He says, "It is evident if there were any appropriations the Buddhists were the borrowers." I say it is evident they were not, as all history proves on the other hand that the early Christians had a strong propensity for borrowing, and that the Buddhists on the other hand were averse to it. Here is logic *versus* history.

Er. 79. Mr. Perry makes the fatal admission that Müller argues that the Buddhist sacred writings of modern date are faithful reproductions of the primitive versions accepted as canonical at the great council under King Asoka before Christ. Here is a broadside from Müller which levels Mr. Perry's borrowing theory to the dust, and leaves it a heap of ruins. If the modern Puranas and other Hindoo scriptures are only reproductions of their ancient scriptures, then they were not borrowed or stolen from Christianity, and thus away goes his borrowing hypothesis.

Er. 80. Prof. Whitney, Perry tells us, coincides with Burgess in the statement that the Surya Sydhanta treatise is post-Christian. It is probable he does. It is natural that "Herod and Pilate should be friends." Müller shows that they both had strong orthodox proclivities.

Er. 81. Mr. Perry admits that Prof. Whitney repudiated Dr. Bentley's foolish astrological star-pointing theory. Good for Whitney. He had sense enough

to know that if he indorsed it it would sink his reputation as it did that of Dr. Bentley.

Er. 82. Mr. Perry says he don't question my sincerity, and that I may be an honest man, and yet he several times charges me with being dishonest. It is about as difficult to reconcile these incongruous statements as that of the Nantucket lady with respect to her pastor, of whom she said: "He is the goodest man I ever saw. He has but one little fault, and that is he swears a little too hard when he gets drunk." What a spotless character! What a godly saint!

Er. 83. He says he has avoided the imputation of misrepresenting me. Let the reader turn to page 68 of his book and observe what I said of Moor's "Hindoo Pantheon," and then notice his version of it on page 117; also compare my statement on page 62, and his on page 117 relative to the British deputation sent to India, and see if he has not misrepresented me.

Er. 84. He says Mr. Graves has "picked up boomerangs which have recoiled upon himself." Mr. Perry has been still more unfortunate. His boomerangs have not only recoiled upon himself, but upon a number of his witnesses, and prostrated them all in the ditch together.

Er. 85. He says my boastings about new discoveries in theology are like the whistling of a man passing through a graveyard to keep up courage. He is mistaken; my whistlings were in earlier life, when my orthodoxy was seriously shaken and alarmed by reading Horace Greeley's statement that there is no doctrine of Christianity that is not found in the old heathen Hindoo Bible, the Vedas. It scared my ortho-

doxy so badly I had to whistle day and night to keep it from running off the track or switching into Infidelity.

Er. 86. He says, "Oriental research has made prodigious strides since Sir Wm. Jones' day." Very true, and at every step in its giant march it has trampled down and obliterated the senseless borrowing theories of religious fanatics. Almost every day it has brought to light some new and startling historical facts tending to prove that those oriental religions and religious doctrines which sectarian and biased Christians have assumed to be an outgrowth from Christianity, are of very ancient date. Müller establishes this position fully. See what he says about the Hindoo sacred book, "Lalita," which Christians assume to be of modern date.

Er. 87. He speaks of three Brahmins at an early period of the church visiting Christian communities, "either in Alexandria or Asia Minor or Parthia." He don't know which; and this shows he don't know anything about it. It appears to be mere assumption and guess-work. He is as indefinite and undecided about the matter as the mother was relative to the military title her son received in the army. "They honored him with the title of *generall*, *corporall*, or *scoundrall*, and I can't tell exactly which." Of course there was but little difference in the titles.

Er. 88. Perry asks why Christians should go to India for religious conception which their own sacred books supplied? That is begging the question. He can furnish no proof that they possessed them before they had the opportunity of borrowing them from India.

Er. 89. He says I should study other works besides Higgins and Taylor before I write any more books. I beg leave to inform him that for several weeks past I have been occasionally reading a work entitled "Sixteen Saviors or One," but don't find it any more reliable than Higgins or Taylor; but much less so.

Er. 90. He cites James F. Clark in support of certain errors which I have pulverized in chap. xiv.

Er. 91. He says I have twisted and tortured texts of scripture to make out contradictions and absurdities. I have quoted the texts exactly as they are in the Bible, without note or comment. That is a singular way of twisting and torturing them.

Er. 92. He censures me for considering Jehovah of the Bible an angry, malevolent being. Well, that is the view some of the heathen nations have of him after reading the Bible description of him. The Zulus say he would not be allowed to run loose in their country. He would be arrested and put into prison.

Er. 93. He speaks of "the senseless legends of the Greek church," which reckoned the infants said to have been destroyed by Herod at 1400. Now that Greek church comprised 70,000,000 of pious Christians, which should entitle their opinion to some weight—a little more than Perry's.

Er. 94. Mr. Perry acknowledges himself under special obligations to Hardwick, whom Müller has shown to be a hard twisted, one-sided bigot (see chap. xv). He thus confesses he has kept bad company and relies on very poor authorities.

Er. 95. Perry declares Buddha was not crucified.

How does he know, as he was not there to see? Higgins says he was, at least in the popular belief, and he is the best authority.

Er. 96. Mr. Perry asks if there were any irreligious nations. Mr. Livingston mentions several; and the London "Athenæum" places the natives of the Arru Islands in this class.

Er. 97. Mr. Perry says, "In the institutes of Manu, a later compilation, there is the first trace of the modern system of God" (p. 31). Strange, indeed, that a work which missionary Allen and nearly all authentic writers tell us is about 3,000 years old should contain the system of gods originated in modern times. The conception is about as ludicrous as the reformer's idea of the effects of tobacco in shortening human life. You say he observed to a friend that your father has used tobacco fifty years, and yet has lived to be seventy. "Well, that is nothing; if he had let tobacco alone he might have been eighty." It is as difficult to conceive how a book written 3,000 years ago can be modern with respect to its contents as that a man born seventy years ago could by any mode of living be in his eightieth year. Perhaps Perry has a new system of philosophy to meet the case.

Er. 98. Mr. Perry tries to create the impression that the New American Cyclopedia I have quoted from is not reliable because it is the first edition. This is not true, as I have learned by a correspondence with the publishers. The new edition contains additions, illustrations, but no important alterations, at least not of the chapters I have quoted from, for I have compared them.

Er. 99. Mr. Forbes, in his "Oriental Memoirs," says there is a cave temple in Elephanta, in India, on the walls of which is a sculpture representing a king with a drawn sword in his hand, surrounded by slaughtered infants, supposed to refer to the decree of King Kansa, who many centuries before Christ issued a decree ordering all the first-born male infants in his kingdom under two years old to be slain. Mr. Perry says it is of Buddhistic construction, and therefore modern. Here is another display of ignorance in direct contradiction to all authorities I have read on the subject. Mr. Perry asserts that these figures were constructed in the fifth century of the Christian era; while the score and a half of writers I have read referring to the subject concur with L. M. Child, who says, "Everything proves their antiquity to be exceedingly great" (vol. i, p. 95). That great Hindoo historian, Mr. Robertson, D.D., says they are evidently of such remote antiquity that European scholars have concluded they were constructed by the disciples of a very ancient religion. Thus it will be seen that Mr. Perry appears to make statements to support his creed without regard to authentic history.

Er. 100. In reply to Perry's insinuation that I hold intercourse with spirits, I will take the liberty to say they are not the kind of spirits that many of his Christian brethren and others hold intercourse with, and which they come *en rapport* with by uncorking the bottle.

Er. 101. I have spoken of a Hindoo god as Sali-vahna, of Bermuda. Mr. Perry says he can't find the Bermuda. Neither can he find Kapilavastu, the birth-

place of Chrishna, in the geographies. Müller supposes the names have been changed. A weak criticism this.

Er. 102. Mr. Perry stigmatizes some of the oriental religions as being degrading. Müller says, "Buddha delivered the people from a degrading thralldom and a priestly tyranny." How different is the feeling and spirit manifested by these two writers, Perry and Müller!

Er. 103. My books are represented as being filled "with deadly poison." Well, that is strange indeed, as they are made up largely by selections from Christian authors and the Christian Bible. If he admits the Bible is filled with poison, why does he condemn me for suggesting that its influence must be immoral when accepted as true. He seems to have failed to comprehend the character of my works as signally as the illiterate Quaker from the sand hill regions did the dictionary, which, after looking through it hastily, he pronounced a very pernicious book. "It is," said he, "the worst book I ever saw. It is full of bad words. I do not think any Christian ought to be allowed to read it." And they did not read it much in those days. The gentleman referred to was pronounced to be "honest toward God, but toward man somewhat twistical and diabolical."

Er. 104. "How different is Brahminism from Christianity!" says Perry. Müller says they agree in more points than they differ in. What will Perry do with this testimony from his "second to none" witness? It clinches the nail.

Er. 105. He says the Vishnuite sects undeniably bor-

rowed New Testament honors for Chrishna. Why does he say "undeniably"—when the position is not only virtually *denied* by many authors but *disproved* by many.

Er. 106. Mr. Perry's inadvertent and blundering concessions that some of the doctrines of Christianity were originated by the human mind is effectually shown-up by his good friend and preacher of the gospel, G. H. Smith (see chap. iii).

Er. 107. None of the heathen gods, Mr. Perry virtually tells us, are saviors in the usual sense of that term. But Mr. Müller does not agree with him. On the contrary, he says, "Gautama of India (Buddha Sakia) upholds the notion of a savior and deliverer, and the necessity of his mission for procuring the salvation of man." Here he must admit that savior is used in the usual sense of that word, and hence that his statement is wrong.

Er. 108. I have shown, in chap. vii, the failure of Mr. Perry's attempt to make anything out of Prof. Whitney's testimony relative to Hindoo astronomy. "The mountain brings forth a mouse."

Er. 109. Mr. Perry says, "There is nothing in pure Buddhism requiring a supernaturally born child." Neither is there in Christianity, as he assumes. Nor do the prophets, as he supposes, predict the advent of such a being. The (assumed to be) prophecy of Isaiah with respect to a virgin having a child does not always refer to an unmarried woman, as young wives and mothers were often called virgins.

Er. 110. I will notice the wonderful contradiction Perry finds in "The Sixteen Crucified Saviors" rela-

tive to loving enemies. In one chapter he finds the following, which I quoted from a Persian ballad, and eulogized as being the noblest sentiment that ever issued from human lips on the treatment of enemies :

“ Forgive thy foes, nor that alone ;
Their evil deeds with good repay,
Fill those with joy who leave thee none,
And kiss the hand upraised to slay.”

In another chapter he finds the following criticism on Christ's injunction to love enemies, viz.: “ No man ever did love an enemy. It is a moral impossibility; as much so as to love bitter or nauseating food.” This statement, he thinks, contradicts the first. His logical perception must be rather obtuse not to observe that the Persian ballad says not a word about loving enemies, which is what I pointed out in Christ's injunction as being impracticable. As a question of philanthropy, it is a noble sentiment, and bespeaks a kind and loving disposition; but as a question of philosophy it is of impracticable application, and that is the ground on which I condemned it. I designed not to criticise his philanthropy, but his philosophy—that is, his ignorance of mental philosophy. The Persian ballad enjoins, not the loving of enemies, but the forgiving of enemies, which is both practical and praiseworthy. There is, therefore, no contradiction in the two statements. He reads through colored glasses.

Er. 111. Perry refers to Hesiod's omission to speak of Prometheus' crucifixion as evidence that the belief was not then entertained. But Müller says, “ The distinguishing features of Hesiod's writings are the things he leaves out.” Hence we can understand

why he omitted to speak of Prometheus' crucifixion. The "walking library" should include some works of history.

Er. 112. Because Higgins is not much quoted by Infidel writers, Perry concludes they lack confidence in him. But it is nearly impossible to find Higgins' "Anacalypsis" outside of the large libraries in Europe, and then it sells for \$38.00. These facts suggest the reason why it is not more read and quoted by Infidel writers.

Er. 113. He speaks of Higgins' wild speculation. That charge I have noticed in chap. xvix.

Er. 114. He says, "Mr. Higgins' word is of no weight against the classical writers who had no Christian prejudices to gratify." Very true; for all who had no Christian prejudices to gratify coincide with him and corroborate his main positions.

Er. 115. Perry says, "Mr. Graves' sixty points of analogy (found in the Essenian religion) cannot stand against the testimony of history." Most certainly not; because, as I have amply shown, the testimony of history is in their favor. (See chap. xxxii. of "The Crucified Saviors.")

Er. 116. Another blunder or misrepresentation. He represents me as saying the committee sent to India by the British Parliament to examine their religious and political institutions obtained copies of their sacred writings and left them in the hands of a bishop at Calcutta. By turning to page 117 of his own book it will be found I said no such thing. It was their own notes I stated they left in his hands,

and not the sacred writings of India. This is a palpable blunder. (See note to the Introduction.)

Er. 117. Another blunder. He tries to create the impression that I represent Moor, author of "The Hindoo Pantheon," as believing the collection of drawings of the crucifixion of a god, which he obtained in India, as appertaining to Chrishna. Turn again to page 117 of his book, and it will be seen I said nothing of the kind. As Moor was a Christian professor and living in a bigoted community steeped in the dregs of orthodoxy, he dared not suggest they were pre-Christian, whatever might have been his own private views as to their origin.

Er. 118. He quotes Gibbon's declaration that Bagnage demonstrated that the Essenes were neither Christians nor monks. But he dodges the two main points in my exposition; first, that "the Essenes believed in and taught all the essential doctrines of Christianity; second, that these doctrines were taught by them long anterior to the advent of Christ. Why doesn't he meet these two grand issues? (See also error 115.)

Er. 119. Paul's lying. He says, "Paul indignantly repudiates the doing of evil that good may come of it." And asks, if "lying for the glory of God" would not be a case of this kind. I answer, yes; but the ablest commentators say he used the two declarations together to show he did not consider "lying for the glory of God doing evil that good might come of it." I leave the matter with his own witnesses. Paul's two statements were evidently designed to suggest that "lying for the glory God," is not "doing evil that good may come of it."

Er. 120. He supposes I did not know Müller was appointed by the East India Company. I did know it, and also knew that some of that company would not allow him to give full expression to his views.

Er. 121. The spelling of Müller. Perry says it should be spelt Mueller. But certainly the greatest scholar in the world ought to know how to spell his own name; and he spells it Müller. And besides, one writer in the Saturday "Review" says Mueller does not give the true sound of the name—that Müller comes nearer it than Mueller.

Er. 122. The two Bentleys again. Perry, besides blundering by speaking of the two Bentleys, when there were four Bentleys—Richard, John, Gideon, and William—says Robert Taylor and myself both confound Richard and John Bentley together. This is not true; he can't find in any of Taylor's writings or any of my works any allusion to Bentley except as Dr. Bentley, and both Richard and John Bentley were called doctor, so that the term doctor would refer to either of them, while their religious characters were not very different except that Richard made some mark in the world so as to be noticed in history, while the author of the star-pointing theory (John) sank into oblivion with the explosion of his wild theory.

Er. 123. Perry says when three Brahmins visited Christian countries in the second or third century Brahminism was pretty well known to the Christian world. This is a mistake and discloses his ignorance of the oriental religions; for none of the Brahmin nor Buddhist sacred books had been translated at that time, nor for more than a thousand years after. In

fact, neither of the prominent sacred books, the Vedas of the Brahmins nor the Tripitaka of the Buddhists, had been translated fifty years ago, and there was no scholar living capable of translating them.

Er. 124. Perry says one of the questions between us is whether Krishna was pre-Christian or post-Christian. I have shown that his assumption that he was post-Christian is at war with nearly all the historical records of the world.

Er. 125. Mr. Perry says another question between us is whether the idea of a virgin-born miracle-working and finally crucified God entered into the conception of many nations of antiquity. This point is not correctly stated. The question is whether the conception or belief of those doctrines is of heathen origin or Christian origin. One case would prove it as well as a dozen or a hundred.

Er. 126. We are told by Mr. Perry that the text in the Bible which declares "Eve was the mother of all living" obviously means *prospectively* the mother of all living, and he censures me for not accepting this random guess of his. But a book claiming to be inspired by infinite wisdom should be able to say exactly what it means and leave nothing to be guessed at. But it is not true in any sense that she was the mother of all living, even *prospectively*. According to Prof. Agassiz, she could not have been the original maternal ancestor of more than one-fifth of the human race, there being originally five types, as he contends. And then "all living" would include animals also, such as monkeys, apes, hyenas, skunks, wolves, elephants,

etc., etc. Was she the mother of these quadrupeds, and of birds, lizards, snakes, etc.?

Er. 127. Mr. Perry seems to conclude that the death penalty pronounced upon Adam meant spiritual death. But some of our ablest biblical scholars say it will not admit of this construction, because part of the sentence is included in the declaration, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," which could not possibly apply to the spirit. A "walking library" should have a Bible and know what it says.

Er. 128. My numerous scientific objections to the Bible (twenty-seven in number) are pronounced by Mr. Perry "wonders of malignant absurdity." Well, that is a cheap way of answering unanswerable arguments, but not a very effectual way, however. It leaves the reader of the same opinion still. And he has failed to show either my malignity or absurdity, but not his ignorance of the Bible.

Er. 129. He represents me as "caring not at all whether my citations are true or false." Here is more cheap logic, or rather a substitute for logic. I feel inclined to say of Perry what Müller says of Whitney, one of Perry's historical authorities, "The harder he is pushed, the louder he speaks in bombastic language and high-flown words; and the more he fails in argument, the more he excels in dogmatism and denunciation." I will, however, leave the reader to judge of this matter.

Er. 130. Mr. Perry admits and cites a number of contradictions in the Bible. Here he again fires upon his own theological fortress, for if one contradiction is proved or admitted, it destroys all claim to the plenary

inspiration of the Bible, and suggests the probability of many more errors, and that "God's perfect book" is very imperfect.

Er. 131. Mr. Perry several times charges me with borrowing "all, or nearly all," my Bible contradictions from a pamphlet which I never read, and which contains only one hundred and forty-four contradictions, while my list comprises two hundred and seventy-seven. I did not copy one of its contradictions.

Er. 132. Mr. Perry says I confound Hadrian with the historian Adrian. I do no such thing. It was Hadrian I referred to. I know something of the history of both. Here is more wild guessing.

Er. 133. I am also charged with saying Cardinal Wiseman spent ten years as a missionary in India. I never said any such thing; but I did quote from his work a list of some striking analogies between the Hindoo god Chrishna and Christ. Why does he quibble about words and omit to notice these striking facts? Why does he not answer Mr. Wiseman? He will find exactly what I did say about Mr. Wiseman in the corrected edition of the book. Perry assumes to be wiser than a "Wiseman."

Er. 134. Robert Taylor's recantation. Mr. Perry, in his first criticism, stated that "Mr. Taylor recanted of his Infidelity in later life." To which I replied: "Well, that is news, but it can't be true, whoever may have started the report, for he died in an apoplectic fit, so that he had no time to repent. And, besides, he was almost the last man in the world to repent of anything. With firmness and self-esteem almost

unbounded, he feared nothing. It would take something as powerful as thunder and lightning to move such a man. He was about such a character as Tom Corwin represented General Jackson to be. A friend asked Mr. Corwin if he supposed when General Jackson died he went to heaven. To which Mr. Corwin replied: "It is a little doubtful. I think he would hardly want to go to the Christian heaven; but if he did, all hell could not stop him."

Mr. Perry, in his second criticism, when noticing my reply, says: "I did not say he repented. I fear he did not. I said he recanted." What a dodge! It is equal to that of the boy who, when accused of lying, replied: "No, sir, I didn't lie; it is nothing but a fulminatory expansion of elongated veracity." It is about the difference between "a right fat pig and a pig right fat." Everybody knows the two words "repent" and "recant" are understood to mean about the same thing. And here is what he did say: "Taylor recanted his infidelity in later life, and so may be regarded as having abandoned his untenable hypothesis." If this don't mean death-bed or latter-day repentance, then it can have no meaning at all; and he must know every reader would understand it in that way. He evidently got into a tight place here.

Er. 135. Müller on Jacolliot. Here I have shown Mr. Perry got into the wrong pew. He not only failed to prove by Müller the point he seemingly undertook, but Müller appears in evidence against him and virtually demolishes his whole theory. For proof, see chap. viii. .

Er. 136. Mr. Perry says Buddhism makes Nirvana, or annihilation by absorption, the end of our being. Here is more ignorance or misrepresentation. Nirvana does not mean the annihilation of our identity, as Perry here teaches. Müller says "Nihilism or Nirvana may mean an extinction of many things, but it does not mean an extinction of our consciousness at death" (Science of Religion, p. 141). And in proof of the statement he says: "Buddha, after he entered Nirvana, is spoken of as living and showing himself to his disciples" (Chips, p. 230). This settles the matter that Nirvana, which Buddhists enter at death, does not mean the extinction of our consciousness, as Perry teaches, though Müller admits texts of their scriptures seem to teach the doctrine, and it was the doctrine of the skeptics.

Er. 137. We are told by Mr. Perry that the stories of the crucifixion of both Krishna and Buddha were suggested to the Hindoos by seeing a Roman Catholic crucifix. Here is another bold assertion, which I have shown is contradicted by several popular writers, such as Sir William Jones, Higgins, etc. There is much more evidence to prove that the borrowing, if by either party, was by the Christians. For proof see chap. v. This is one of Perry's wild assumptions unsupported by facts.

Er. 138. Mr. Perry says the story of Buddha being born of a virgin (Maia) originated several hundred years after Christianity was established. I have cited many facts and testimonies to disprove the truth of this assertion, and a positive contradiction by Sir Wm. Jones (see chap. 10).

Er. 139. I have stated that Persians have calculations in astronomy which scientists admit must have been made four hundred years before Moses. To which Mr. Perry replies, "This, as far as scientists are concerned, is decidedly novel." Here Mr. Perry makes one of the greatest displays of his ignorance of the history of the science I have yet noticed. Several scientific writers are against him, such as Bailly, Prof. Playfair, Goodrich, etc., some of whom date some of the Persian calculations in astronomy as remotely as 3000 B.C., while my statement of 400 years before Moses would only make it about 2000 B.C. My statement was, therefore, very moderate. Here Mr. Perry again manifests an ignorance of history which must shake our confidence in him as a historical critic. For further proof see chapter xv. If such historical ignorance is characteristic of "walking libraries" I shall prefer those without legs.

Er. 140. Mr. Perry misrepresents me when he assumes that the astronomical calculations I speak of as being made before Moses and those of Berosus referred to as being made 15,000 years ago are the same. I never thought of such a thing, and can hardly see how an honest critic could understand it so.

Er. 141. His quotation from Hardwick relative to Chrishna I have thoroughly riddled in chapter xv., to which I refer the reader. "Had God Almighty known Hardwick as well as I do (said a wag), he would never have called him to preach."

Er. 142. When Mr Perry asserts that the unity and personality of God are not taught in the Persian religion or the Zend-Avesta, he displays a great

amount of ignorance for a historical critic. I could cite forty writers who contradict him. In the "Bible of Bibles" I have quoted several pages taken from the Zend-Avesta which recognize but one God, such as, "O Lord, forgive me," "O Lord, I repent of my sins," etc. The New American Cyclopedia says: "The Zoroastrian system recognized but one God, omnipotent, invisible, the creator, preserver, and ruler of the universe, and the last judge" (Vol. viii, p. 546). Nothing in the Christian Bible can excel this. Perry should stick a pin here. It completely turns him sommersault. Mr. Goodrich says: "The principal religion of Persia consisted in a belief in one God, and a pious fear, love, and admiration of him; a reverence for parents and aged persons, and a fraternal affection for the whole human race, and a compassionate tenderness for the brute creation" (p. 113). We can find nothing equal to this in the Christian Bible. The Persian or Parsee catechism declares: "We believe in *only one God*, and do not believe in any other beside him." Here is the positive declaration that they believe in *one*, and *only one* God.

Er. 143. Another serious blunder. Mr. Perry says that instead of the unity of the Godhead, the Persians teach a dualism, consisting of a good god and a bad god. To be sure, and does he not know that this is one of the essential doctrines of the Christian system. The dual gods being Jehovah and Satan. Christians not only believe in a good and a bad deity, both invested with the power and attributes of a god, but both are designated by the term God in their Bible. Will Mr. Perry please read his Bible again?

Er. 144. We must assume either that Mr. Perry is hypercritical or at a loss to find salient points in my books when he hatches up such criticisms as he bestows on my citation from the Roman historian Pausaneus, which states that Esculapius raised Hyppolytus, and Pyndarius from the dead. He says they were fabulous beings and, therefore, assumes they could not have been resurrected. But I aver no other kind of beings ever were raised from the dead than "fabulous beings," and this was done only in conception or in the popular belief. That is, the reported resurrection from the dead of any being that had a real tangible existence can be nothing but fiction, or fable, for it would be as easy to infuse life into a stump or stone and make it walk and talk as to reanimate a dead and decomposing human body. If such an act could be performed, we would have no further use for natural law. I only aimed to show that heathen nations have their stories of resurrecting the dead, which are as credible as those reported of Elijah, Elisha, Jesus Christ, etc.

Er. 145. He says Hyppolitus should be spelled Hippolytus. If he will put on his glasses, and look again on page 275 of "The Sixteen Crucified Saviors," he will find that is the way I have spelt the name exactly. What wild criticism!

Er. 146. He exhibits a lack of being posted in current history and a want of true courtesy when he questions the truth of my statement about the present superior moral condition of Japan on the authority of Col. Hall and Dr. Oliphant, men well known in England, and of high standing with respect to honor, hon-

esty, and veracity; and as one or both of them belong to the same theological school with Mr. Perry, they are his own witnesses, and he must settle the matter with them. I have given their own language in "The World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors," page 376, and in "The Bible of Bibles" also in part.

Er. 147. Mr. Perry speaks of the logical absurdity of calling Chrishna's mother a virgin in view of the fact that she had several other children. Has he forgotten that Christ's mother had at least two other sons, James and John, and was nevertheless still considered to be a virgin? And if she had been the mother of forty sons, she would still have been honored as a "holy virgin," because believed to be the mother of a god. Mr. Perry thus kills two gods with one stone. He is in the quandary of the hunter who, when he leveled his gun to shoot a duck swimming on a lake, was disconcerted and defeated by another duck getting in his way, as he expressed it. Mr. Perry, with less discrimination, fires away and kills two gods. Logical consistency is a virtue that no popular religion has ever been burdened with.

Er. 148. Mr. Perry charges me with "a great amount of absurdity and falsehood" for saying the Hindoo language (the Sanscrit) and the Hindoo religion have never been known to change. This is a serious and dishonorable charge and a very bold assumption. Now I have proved in chapter xviii, by one of his own witnesses, whom he virtually admits is a sufficient authority to settle such disputes, that there is no absurdity or falsehood in the case.

Er. 149. Mr. Perry very reluctantly acknowledges

that the Persian religion contains many striking analogies to Christianity, relating to the temptation and fall of man, etc., but says, "It is mingled with much that is degrading." Is it possible he does not know that this statement recoils disastrously upon his own religious system? Has he never read the "degrading" story of Lot and his daughters; the shocking familiarity of the father of God's pet people (Abraham) with his servant-maid Hagar, whom he then turned with her child into the wilderness to starve or perish with thirst? And has he not read the no less shocking and degrading account of the Bible God ordering young maids to be snatched as victims from the sword in the battlefield and saved to become victims to the lusts of the priests—a still more horrible fate? If anything can be found in the Persian system more degrading than these and many other similar features of the Christian Bible religion, I confess I have not seen it. Mr. Perry had better have "skipped" this statement.

Er. 150. Mr. Perry charges me with "constantly berating Christianity." "Berate" means "to scold vehemently;" but he don't prove one case of scolding. His conception of the meaning of the word berate seems to be quite unique, about as much so as the sophomore's signification of the word thermometer, which he defined to be "a machine for regulating the weather."

Er. 151. I am criticised by Mr. Perry for classing the Sadder of the Persians or Parsees with their scriptures, because it is, as he says, "only a summary of Parsee doctrine." The fact of their constituting a sum-

mary of doctrines is the very circumstance which entitles them to be called scriptures. The Rev. Mr. Allen ranks the code of Menu among the Hindoo scriptures principally because they contain "a summary of doctrines."

Er. 152. Perry says Mr. Graves cannot affirm that the Jews borrowed anything of the Persians. In my reply I named a number of Christian writers who say they did, such as Beers, Enfield, Campbell, etc. And Archbishop Whateley makes the express declaration that both the Jews and early Christians borrowed of the Persians and other heathen nations.

Er. 153. He says much of the Old Testament is as old if not older than the hymns of the Zend-Avesta. Here he is in conflict with his own Christian writers again. The learned Prof. Stepp, of Munich University, whom I have referred to elsewhere, says, "The cuneiform inscriptions of Persia are of older date than our Old Testament, and testify to the same truths," and hence the inference that the latter are borrowed from the former. Here Mr. Perry is completely overthrown by a learned professor.

Er. 154. Mr. Perry says, "The *later forms* of religious thought developed a kind of mediator in the person of Mithra." Here fifty writers rise up against him if we are to understand him to mean that the belief in Mithra, the mediator, is post-Christian. Burnouf, Goodrich, Whately, Müller, Childs, Haug, Zanthus, Berosus, Bopp, Lassen, Benfey, etc., have all expressed themselves adversely to this assertion, and the evidence to disprove it will be found in the other chapters of this work (see chap. vii). Will Mr. Perry

rally to the task of overthrowing these standard authors?

Er. 155. Mr. Perry says I should "desire to learn truth and not make argument." I flatter myself I have done both with some success, and trust my works will sustain me in this opinion.

Er. 156. He says some of my objections refute themselves. Perhaps he takes the same view of them that I do of some of his, that they leap so high that when they fall they are broken to pieces by their own weight. Here, then, we are even.

Er. 157. He asks if I can suppose the Christian martyrs died for a master they knew never existed. I reply, No; like the martyrs of other religions, they died for a master whom they did not know ever existed, or at least as a god. They did not know anything about it; that is, they did not know that he ever existed as a god, as I have shown in "The Sixteen Saviors."

Er. 158. He says I have not "attempted to grapple with chap. liii of Isaiah." Because there is nothing in it to grapple with. I do not assume, as he does, that it refers to Christ; and he had better not if he wants to save the credit of either Christ or the prophet, for some very dishonorable things are said of the being prophesied of (if we assume it to be a prophecy), such as his "dividing the spoil with the strong," which implies he would engage in a war of conquest and plunder, and get half the booty. His seed is also spoken of. Had Christ any children? These and similar texts led some of the early Christians to conclude that chapter liii of Isaiah does not refer to Christ, as it

would make him a cruel, inhuman, and bloody warrior.

Er. 159. He says there is no evidence of Mithra having been born of a virgin and crucified. To this I need only reply that if the testimony of Christian writers and ancient inscriptions as furnished by Mr. Higgins can furnish any evidence, then there is more evidence of it than in the case of Jesus Christ.

Er. 160. He speaks of Mithra's birthday being the 25th of March. Here he projects another missile which falls upon his own head. I have in the "Sixteen Saviors" named a number of gods, and Jesus Christ among the number, who were believed to be born on the 25th of March. The inference is potent that a part of their history is borrowed from the starry heavens.

Er. 161 He asks why I did not refer in my works to the Chaldean story of creation, which so strikingly resembles that found in the Christian Bible. If he will turn to page 48 of "The Bible of Bibles," he will find I did so refer. I advise him to stop criticising my books till he has read them and knows something about them.

Er. 162. I have also furnished much evidence in this work to disprove the truth of his assumption that the Persians borrowed the story of creation, fall of man, the general deluge, etc., from the Jewish account of them. (See chap. xv.)

Er. 163. According to Mr. Perry, Infidel books in general, including mine, are filled with "pious frauds." I beg leave to inform him that, according to Eusebius, early Christian writers set us the example. If I

were to commit any frauds, I would try to keep the piety out. I don't believe in mixing them together.

Er. 164. Mr. Perry adduces as an argument in favor of his own Bible that it is venerable for age. Here he overshoots the mark again by an assertion which, if true, proves too much. Several of the heathen Bibles, as I have shown, are older, and consequently still more "venerable" on account of age. And most of the crimes now committed in society being prevalent in the world several thousand years ago must, according to Perry's reasoning, be considered "venerable for age." How superlatively absurd and ludicrous the argument is thus shown to be!

Er. 165. He says the Bible "contains much that is beautiful in thought and expression, but Mr. Graves sees nothing of this." It seems strange he should make such a statement as this, when I have a chapter headed "The Beauties and Benefits of Bibles," in which I have declared "There are in all Bibles veins of beautiful thought coursing through their pages;" and much more to the same effect may be found in the "Bible of Bibles," p. 28. Here, then, is another blunder which shows he has not read the book, and yet takes the liberty to criticise it. Many of his criticisms furnish evidence that he has not read my books.

Er. 166. Mr. Perry says the Hindoos had a good opportunity to borrow of the Christians the latter part of the second century. True, but "it is a poor rule that won't work both ways." Experience proves that when a man has an opportunity to catch a tiger, the tiger has the same opportunity to catch him. Borrowing and catching are games that both parties could

work at. But the Hindoos being always averse to borrowing, and Christians strongly prone to it, suggests the party most likely to borrow. Should we not conclude that Perry is "morally jaundiced," as he suspects me with being?

Er. 167. Mr. Perry again surrenders the whole ground and pulls down his theological castle on his own head. He admits (most unfortunately for his borrowing hypothesis) that some of the early Christians did manifest a disposition to amalgamate and wed Hindooism and Christianity. This was the cropping out of the true Jewish character, who were always prone to borrow from other religions, and the founders of Christianity were Jews by descent. He mentions the Manichean church as trying to splice Hindooism and Christianity together. But this concession involves a complete overthrow of his whole theory, for the other churches were of the same stock, and hence possessed the same propensity to borrow as the Manichean church did. Like Haman, Perry is here hung on his own gallows again.

Er. 168. We are told by Mr. Perry that the tenth Avatâr of the Hindoos is "a borrowing from the white horse of Revelations." To be sure. I suppose the thought did not occur to him that the party who had the strongest inclination to borrow might have done the borrowing in this case. Here he hitches the cart before the horse again.

Er. 169. The virgin-born Buddha, says Mr. Perry, is found only in the works that are post-Christian. But I have arrayed against this assumption a great

many historical facts and several of the world's ablest historical writers, and Sir William Jones especially.

Er. 170. I also disproved his assertion that the analogies of the Persian religion are post-Christian by many facts and many authorities. (See chap. xv.)

Er. 171. In his second criticism, Mr. Perry says that in my answer to his first criticism I said nothing about the Zend-Avesta, thus presuming I am unable to meet him on this ground. But he will get enough of the Zend-Avesta in this work. (See chap. xv.)

Er. 172. Mr. Perry also assumes that I was not able to meet his authorities (Laplace, Burgess, and Wilson) in my review, as he says "Mr. Graves found no fault with these writers." As I knew the editor of the "Telegram" would not allow me space to notice one-half the points Mr. Perry had raised, I omitted to notice these writers, having observed their arguments were substantially the same as other writers I did notice. In this work, however, I have found fault enough with each one of these writers to satisfy him to *his heart's content*. If he wants a feast of fault-finding of these men (error exposing), let him read chapters vii. and ix.

Er. 173. Mr. Perry says my story about Mr. Bentley is second-hand. Yes, and so is his, unless he made it himself out of "whole cloth," for neither of us were there, and all our information relative to events which transpired before we were born must necessarily be second-hand.

Er. 174. His assertion that the authentic history of India commenced in the twelfth century of our era, I have exploded in chapter xix. A "walking library"

carrying so much ignorance should stop and rest occasionally.

Er. 175. By stating I have nothing to say against Wilson he insinuates I am unable to grapple with his arguments (no, not his arguments either, for he uses none, but his *ipse dixit*). By reading chapter ix of this work he will discover I have a little to say about this author, and in the same chapter he will see Müller also has something to say about him. And now what has Mr. Perry to say about the arguments Müller and I have wielded against him?

Er. 176. Mr. Perry speaks of my indignation against Bentley. He must have about as strange a conception of the meaning of the word indignation as the Connecticut lady had of the word eloquent when she declared her pastor was the most eloquent preacher she ever heard, as he knocked five pulpits to pieces and banged the inside out of three Bibles in one year. That was eloquence with a vengeance. And perhaps Mr. Perry's idea of indignation may be ranked with it.

Er. 177. Again Mr. Perry, the "standard authority in history," says there is almost no reliable Hindoo history, and that only one date has been actually verified before Christ, and that found in the history of a king named Chandrugupta, who ascended the throne 315 B.C. On the contrary, both Haug and Müller tell us that different edicts issued by King Asoka, who reigned not long after the time he assigns for King Chandrugupta, can now be seen in rock inscriptions in various parts of India, with indications of the date more ancient than that of any event in the history of

the king he mentions. For many more disproofs of this statement see chapter ix. Thus it will be seen "the standard authority in history" is flat on his back.

Er. 178. In reply to the extraordinary statement which I quoted from Col. Dow, that the Brahmins have a wonderful story about a pious Hindoo emigrating westward several thousand years ago and establishing a new system of religion answering exactly to the Jewish religion, and which they now maintain was the origin of that religion, Mr. Perry very coolly says, "He mentions, I believe that the Brahmins accuse the Jews and Mohammedans of having borrowed some religious rites, and that is about all." *No, indeed,* it is not "about all." He gives the name of this founder of the new religion as Turuh (almost Teruh, the father of Abraham), and says the Hindoos are able and ready to give "a very particular account of the origin of the Jewish religion" in this way, as stated in my "Bible of Bibles," page 41. Of course, this is cold news for Mr. Perry, who

" Gives an opinion as though he gave it not,
And what he remembers he seems to have forgot.

Er. 179. Mr. Perry takes no exception to the statement of Prof. Swing in his book that "logic cannot deduce . . . the conclusion that the universe did not come from an intelligent creator." Where is the science of either Mr. Swing or Mr. Perry? Every scientific man in the world now believes in growth, and not creation. They are behind the times.

Er. 180. Mr. Perry says the Essenes resembled the Christians mainly in those points in which the Chris-

tians resembled the Jews. This is a grand mistake, as will be seen by reading chapter xxxi. of the "Sixteen Crucified Saviors," wherein it is shown the Essenes were Christians in the most absolute sense, both in belief and practice. Sixty proofs are furnished of this.

Er. 181. Mr. Perry says Mr. Graves is savage against Müller for exposing Jacolliot. *Savage*, indeed; and what did I say! Simply this: "Müller was a professor in the old orthodox institution of Oxford." That is all I said. Is there anything savage in this? He seems to have coined a new meaning for the word *savage*. No, I have not a word to say against Müller, but against that bigoted, priest-ridden community and its institutions, which frequently restrain him from giving full expression to his real sentiments and convictions on questions of theology; occasionally, however, he ventures so far as to give offense to his orthodox audiences and to be threatened with a prosecution for heresy by them.

Er. 182. Mr. Perry admits there are "passages in the Bible the harmonizing of which is not easy, if possible." (Page 123.) Here he tears down his theological fortress upon his own head again. No Infidel could make a more fatal concession against the Bible than that it contains passages which it is impossible to reconcile. How, then, in the name of God, are we to know, or can we know, what it teaches when one passage teaches one thing and another contradicts it and teaches the opposite? And this being indeterminate, how can we be benefited by such a book that thus contradicts itself? Please answer.

Er. 183. We are told by Mr. Perry, however, that the contradictions of the Bible do not "render any doctrine doubtful." Here is a stupendous absurdity, not to say a moral impossibility. When one text teaches one doctrine, and another the opposite (many cases of which I have cited in my "Bible of Bibles"), if it don't render it doubtful which is to be accepted as the true doctrine, it must be simply because the Bible is no authority to settle any question in theology, and we are left to other resources, and thus the book is abandoned. Will Mr. Perry please solve this moral riddle?

Er. 184. He admits there are words in the Bible which time has rendered vulgar and obscene, or "coarse." If, then, by becoming more refined and enlightened, we have outgrown the language of the Bible, why not admit we have outgrown its theology also? Will Mr. Perry please answer this question?

Er. 185. He admits the Bible treats on subjects that it is not proper to talk about in good society. Then why, in the name of God, were they recorded to be read in good society, and even in schools to children, and treated in such language that Lord Brougham, of England, declared they are calculated to make our daughters blush when they read them in their private parlors? Here is another knotty question in theology for Mr. Perry to explain.

Er. 186. Perry tells us the Bible does not necessarily justify the bad acts of men which it records; but as it does justify them in many cases, we must conclude it does that which is not necessary. As, for example, after Abraham had lied to two kings in rep-

resenting his wife as being his sister, and made his servant-maid a victim to his lust and turned her into the wilderness to starve; after thus ruining her character, God is represented as saying, "Abraham kept all my commandments, all my statutes, and all my laws." (See Gen. xxvi, 5.) If this is not justifying his bad conduct to represent it as being in accordance with the laws of God, it is impossible to conceive how it could be justified. And David, after having committed fourteen wicked acts, some of which would send him to the state prison if committed in this enlightened age, is declared to be "a man after God's own heart." (1 Sam. xiii, 14.) If this does not justify his wickedness, will Mr. Perry please explain what language could be used to justify it?

Er. 187. He says, "The Bible describes the gross misconduct of some men whom on the whole it pronounces good." Yes, and I ask if in this way it does not justify, popularize, and perpetuate those crimes which they committed? Please answer, Mr. Perry, this question, and tell us if "pronouncing" men "good" who were guilty of "gross misconduct" does not justify and encourage crime. Please answer this question also.

Er. 188. He criticises me for saying the Bible sanctions and justifies war, intemperance, slavery, polygamy, licentiousness, etc.; but he does not attempt to show, nor can he do it, that when a book represents God (as the Christian Bible does) as sanctioning and often as commanding these crimes, it does not justify them, and thus tend to popularize and perpetuate them.

Er. 189. He also criticises me for saying "such a book must necessarily inflict a demoralizing influence on society where it is read and believed." Mark the language, "where it is read and *believed*;" that is, where it is read and believed *literally*. If Christian sects generally would follow the example of the Swedenborgians in symbolizing all the seemingly bad and immoral texts of the Bible they would confer a benefit upon society by arresting the demoralizing influence of the idolized book. The more I investigate the matter, the more I admire the rational and beautiful system of religion which the Swedenborgians have erected on the Bible, compared with the cramping and to some extent demoralizing system of orthodoxy. It is doing much to make religion and the Bible more acceptable to the thinking and skeptical world, whatever its basis.

Er. 190. Mr. Perry says that Watson's reply to Paine was a sufficient antidote to his argument against the Bible. Yes, Watson demolished Paine about as effectually as the old lady did the college student when she told him he was a fool for believing the world is round, as anybody with half sense can see it is a square piece of ground standing on a rock. When asked what the rock stands on, she replied, "La, child, how ignorant you are; there are rocks all the way down." Watson was about equally successful in replying to Paine.

Er. 191. In reply to my statement that a lamb is represented as being crucified on one side of the Celtic god Hesus, and an elephant on the other, Mr. Perry says it does not resemble an elephant. That may be;

I never said it did, but several writers say it was designed to represent an elephant; and according to Müller the elephant symbol was known among the Hindoos as well as among the Celtic Druids.

Er. 192. Mr. Perry tells us Isaiah visited India, which furnished the Hindoos an opportunity to borrow religious tenets of the Jews. But Müller says that "the opinion that the pagan religions are mere corruptions of the religion of the Old Testament (or the New Testament either is implied), once supported by men of high authority and great learning, is now as completely surrendered as the attempt to explain Greek and Latin as corruptions of the Hebrew" (Science of Religion, p. 24). Here again Mr. Perry is convicted by his own witness of either being ignorant in history or unscrupulous in argument. Müller here explodes his borrowing theory into fragments.

Er. 193. His assumption that the Puranas are post-Christian I have effectually overthrown in chap. x.

Er. 194. Mr. Perry says Christ means anointed, while Chrishna means black. Wilkinson shows that both names are derived from the same word (Chris). Hence whatever either Christ or Chrishna originally meant the other meant also. *Chris* was the Chaldean name for the sun or sun god.

Er. 195. He asks me if I have read the Rev. J. H. Haley's *masterly exposure* of the work on Bible contradictions. I can only say if it is "masterly," it is a masterly trespass on common sense. Mr. Haley comes about as near demolishing the work as the clown did to demolishing Newton's discovery of the rotundity and revolution of the earth by hanging

a mush pot in the chimney, which as it was not found in the morning turned "topsy turvy" with the contents in the fire was regarded as a "masterly exposition" of the fallacy of the Newtonian discovery. Mr. Haley seems to have been equally fortunate in his "masterly exposition" of the errors of the work on Bible contradictions. It seems to be a mess of learned ignorance.

Er. 196. He says that none of the Bible contradictions are of great importance. Strange, indeed, when as I have shown we have two opposite statements for nearly every doctrine, principle, and precept in the Bible. It is impossible to learn by such a book what is the truth in the case. If this is not a matter of great importance, then nothing in the Bible can be of much importance, and it might as well be used for wrapping paper.

Er. 197. He says, "If the Bible be such a nonsensical and immoral book as I represent it to be, it is strange that none but men of loose doctrines, if not of loose lives, have discovered the fact." Here is an intimation that the moral character and practical lives of Infidels are inferior to those of Christians; but in the "Bible of Bibles" I have cited Christian writers of the highest authority to disprove the assumption. I have quoted the testimony of "The New York Evangelist," a rigidly orthodox Presbyterian journal, which declares that all the moral reforms and philanthropic movements of the age are carried on by Infidels to the shame of the church, and that in morals and practical righteousness they are in some cases far in advance of the Christian world; that they

are the pioneers in moral reform, going before and beckoning to a sluggish church to follow in the rear, etc., etc. And I have also cited the testimony of Catharine Beecher, who has collected the testimony of leading business men all over the country who declare that Infidels are more honest, more reliable, and more trustworthy than the majority of church-members, etc. (See "Bible of Bibles," p. 301.) Thus Mr. Perry's slanderous insinuation against Infidels is completely refuted.

Er. 198. He censures me for inconsistency in charging the Scriptures with indecency while "frequently indulging in profane and indecent jests." But he can find no case in any of my works in which I have indulged in either profanity or indecency. They are both so repulsive to my nature that I have in many cases refrained from quoting the language of the Christian Bible because of its approximating either to profanity or indecency. I wish Mr. Perry to notice how differently the "Louisville Age" speaks of this work, though it is not an Infidel paper and does not indorse the work. It says, "This work of Mr. Graves. presents the condensed results of a great deal of reading and a style of singular clearness, and is so generous and catholic in spirit, so just and fair in criticism, and so reverential and at the same time so humane as to be a model in literature of this kind." How fair, candid, and mild compared with Mr. Perry's unkind and bitter denunciations. "When doctors thus disagree, what is to become of the patient?"

Er. 199. Mr. Perry quotes my statement that "I have assumed Chrishna indorsed some doctrines which

I have placed in his list, although not found in his teachings." Here part of the sentence was omitted in setting up the type, which reads "because they constitute a part of the system of religion which he taught and preached." This makes it read with better sense, and Perry's criticism is uncalled for. He is hypercritical.

Er. 200. Mr. Perry says I seemingly forget myself when I admitted that the story of Chrishna is not found in the Vedas. He is a little too smart in this case. I never gave a hint anywhere that it is to be found in the Vedas; I only said many of his doctrines are taught therein.

Er. 201. Another display of historical ignorance. Mr. Perry, when referring to my mention of the name of the Hindoo god Sakia, says, "It is none other than Buddha." He here assumes there was but one Buddha, when their sacred history refers to more than a hundred. Allen mentions a writer who enumerated one hundred and thirty. He evidently supposes Buddha is a name, whereas it is only a title, meaning in one sense a savior or deliverer, and as such was applied to all their gods. Müller says, "No one ever supposed that Buddha is more than a title" (Chips, vol. i, p. 215). He should have said, "Except the walking library, John T. Perry."

Er. 202. After Perry had referred to Josephus' allusion to Christ in his first criticism, I replied by stating that it is now almost universally admitted to be a forgery by even Christian writers themselves, and I referred to some of Dr. Lardner's nine reasons for rejecting it as spurious, among which is the fact that

it is not found in the early editions of Josephus, which date before the time of Eusebius; and the President of Harvard College once stated in a public lecture that "the passage is not accepted as genuine by any Christian scholar of any eminence." And the Rev. S. B. Gould, in his "Lost and Hostile Gospels," says, "It is singular that neither Philo nor Josephus nor contemporary Roman and Greek writers nor anybody but *Christian* writers in that age make any allusion to either Christ or primitive Christianity." Mr. Perry, in his second criticism, after reviewing the utter demolition I made of his attempt to build on this passage of Josephus, says, "Well, it is not of first-class importance." What a marvelous idea that an author who wrote as voluminously as Josephus did of that age and country, and almost on the very spot where we are told the greatest being that ever appeared in the world (no less than a god) was born and lived for many years, and astonished thousands by his miracles—that a writer like Josephus, who professes to record almost everything of importance which transpired then and there, should pass over entirely unnoticed the history or the most remote allusion to such a being as Jesus Christ is claimed to have been, must be set down as an absolute demonstration that he never made much mark in the world, and consequently the miraculous portion of his history is enormously exaggerated; that he led a natural and not a supernatural life. Mr. Perry's view of the case as being of no great importance brings to mind the cool *nonchalant* manner in which a newspaper speaks of an accident which terminated a man's life. It states that, "as Mr.

Beard was riding into town yesterday, he was thrown from his wagon, which broke his neck, but *happily* he received no further injury." This was "taking it quite cool."

Er. 203. Mr. Perry also speaks of Pliny's and Suetoneus' reference to Christ and Christians. Does he not know that these passages are also pronounced forgeries or caricatures by the best historical scholars, as they represent Christ as being a rioter and Christians as being "villainous and wicked?" Dr. Lardner says that learned Christians have concluded that they are either forgeries or do not refer to Christ or Christians at all. This leaves the case in a quandary or quagmire.

Er. 204. Mr. Perry says I limit the proof of Christ's existence to Tacitus' testimony that Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate. Here is another signal blunder. Nothing can be found in the "Annals of Tacitus" referring to Christ or Christians which learned Christian writers are willing to indorse as referring to him or them, and consequently they have concluded they were not intended so to refer by the writer. Here he is in another theological morass.

Er. 205. Mr. Perry refers to the prediction relative to the dispersion of the Jews, but he only tells half the story. It is also predicted over and over again in various parts of the Bible that they would return to their sacred homes; that they would have a perpetual lease on the throne of David or Israel, and that all nations would ultimately come and bow to them, etc. Will Mr. Perry show us how this prediction has been fulfilled? Here is another knotty question.

Er. 206. Mr. Perry criticises my statement that Paul's declaration of five thousand brethren witnessing the ascension of Christ does not agree with the statement in Acts i, 15, of the number of brethren being only one hundred and twenty. I will only say in reply that Mr. Barnes says the one hundred and twenty constituted all that could properly be called brethren at that time. I therefore refer Mr. Perry to Barnes, one of his own Christian brethren, to get the matter straightened up.

Er. 207. Mr. Perry says all the early adversaries of Christianity admitted that Christ worked miracles, heathen as well as Jews. To be sure they did; and they also admit that impostors wrought miracles; that magicians were skilled in the miracle-working power, and all conceded that even old Satan, the devil himself, bore off the palm in the miracle-working business. As it was not an age of science, but a miracle-believing and miracle-working age, of course everybody believed in miracles (excepting a few philosophers), whether performed by men, gods, or devils. Here the facts of history uptrip his logic again.

Er. 208. Mr. Perry says no new temples are being erected in heathen countries. And why is this? Because they have too much veneration for the old ones, of which they have hundreds of thousands. This also accounts for their religion not changing. But he affirms it does, and then cites facts which prove it does not change.

Er. 209. He calls me to account in his second criticism for not noticing John Stuart Mill's statement, which he had quoted, that the story of Christ was not

invented. I never supposed it was invented, and therefore had no objections to offer to Mill's statement. It is more reasonable to suppose it was borrowed, and I have adduced a thousand facts to support the position in the "Sixteen Crucified Saviors." He first makes an objection for me, then answers it.

Er. 210. He says Mr. Graves does not believe in prophecy. This blunder shows he has not read my books, for I have made the statement in both of them that I do believe in prophecy, and have cited many facts to prove it. Why is it that a "walking library" so often misses the truth?

Er. 211. In "The Sixteen Crucified Saviors," page 300, I have shown the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel all failed on Tyre, such as its being taken by Nebuchadnezzar, its utter destruction, its being consumed by fire, and that on the contrary, in spite of all their predictions (none of which were ever realized), it is still a flourishing city of more than five thousand inhabitants. Mr. Perry, in reply to my statement that these prophecies were not fulfilled, says, "That is a point disputed among scholars." Why, then, may I not dispute his conclusion in the case without being called to account for it? Please answer the question, Mr. Perry.

Er. 212. In the same work and same chapter I have cited many proofs that Isaiah's prediction of the utter destruction of Babylon—it is never to be inhabited again, etc.—was never fulfilled; on the contrary, a town of nine thousand inhabitants is still standing there, as I have shown. Mr. Perry, in reply, says I have attempted to explain it away by the fact that "a

small settlement exists near by." This is not correct. I have shown that it is a town on the *very site* where Babylon once stood, in spite of Isaiah's prediction that "it shall not be inhabited from generation to generation." A prophecy failing of fulfillment is like a gun which misses fire.

Er. 213. Mr. Perry says I fall into one pit while digging another. He is still more unfortunate; he falls into both of his. He flounders awhile in one, and then in the other. He acknowledges that a number of the striking resemblances of the oriental religions to Christianity are ante-Christian, and then tries to prove them post-Christian. This is like the effort to wheel himself in a wheelbarrow.

Er. 214. He says the New York *Evangelist's* eulogy on Infidels referred only to the Abolitionists. But it is not true that it was confined to the Abolitionists; it referred to Infidels in general, as he will see by reading the whole passage. More random shooting.

Er. 215. Mr. Perry says that the Council of Nice merely separated the Bible books which had always been acknowledged to be canonical from the Apocryphal. Here is another wonderful display of historical ignorance. The gospels which the Council of Nice rejected as spurious were for the most part—according to Christian writers—more popular and had been more extensively read and believed and indorsed as inspired than the four gospels which they decided by a vote should constitute God's word. They decided it by a vote, as they would a tax on dogs.

Er. 216. Mr. Perry surrenders the whole ground. After acknowledging in the first place that the teach-

ings of Buddha "have been translated with only slight modifications," he admits "some curious coincidences between Buddhism and Christianity." It must follow from these two admissions that those curious coincidences are ante-Christian or pre-Christian, with but little modification. Then why does he try so hard to make it appear they are post-Christian? Here he gets caught in his own trap. Like Haman, he is again hung on his own gallows.

Er. 217. Perry's position that the Hindoo Bible, the Baghavat-Gita, is post-Christian, I have thoroughly demolished in chapter x.

Er. 218. He speaks of the story and doctrines of Chrishna as being "stealings from the Apocryphal gospels." Well, that is rich and funny enough. The early Christians attributed the Apocryphal gospels to the devil. And as he admits "the resemblance between Christianity and heathenism" are found in the Apocryphal gospels, we would ask when his Satan-ship became a missionary for propagating the gospel, and what divine reward he will receive for it? Here is another of Perry's wild assumptions.

Er. 219. With respect to the falsity of his statement that the Nestorian Christians had intercourse with India before the Puranas attained their present form, see chapter x.

Er. 220. For a thorough refutation of that bigoted clergyman's statement (Mr. Burgess) that the oldest Hindoo treatise on astronomy was composed four or five centuries after Christ, see chapter vii.

Er. 221. And his statement that the tendency of European scholars is to bring the literature of the

Brahmins more and more within modern limits is refuted in the same chapter.

Er. 222. For the complete exposure of Klaproth's false and unsupported assumption that the astronomical tables of India were constructed in the seventh century of our era see chapter vii.

Er. 223. For Perry's utter failure to make anything out of Laplace's testimony in support of his false theories see chapter vii.

Er. 224. Mr. Perry says, "Mr. Graves has not shaken one vital point of mine." I will not call in question the truth of this statement if he will allow me to assume I did not find any "vital points" to shake; neither could I shake them if there was nothing in them to shake. But laying all jokes aside, I would like to know if he supposes he can make his readers believe I did not shake his position with respect to Bentley's star-pointing theory; with respect to Josephus's notice of Christ; with respect to the alleged contradiction in the "Sixteen Crucified Saviors" about loving our enemies; with respect to my belief in prophecy, and many other points. The case may be illustrated. We are told that a soldier in the rebel army, while in the act of loading his musket, had it blown away by a cannon ball, leaving nothing in his possession but the ramrod. "There," he exclaimed, "I suppose they think they have robbed me of my gun, but they miss it powerfully; I have it all left yet but the lock, stock, and barrel." Mr. Perry may perhaps derive comfort from a similar reflection that his theological gun is yet in his possession minus the *lock, stock, and barrel*. He may estimate the damage

on his arguments and positions as the proprietor of a large brick dwelling standing on the bank of the Ohio River did when it was washed away by a sudden and extraordinary freshet, which left not a brick or a vestige of the once stately mansion to mark the spot where it had stood. "Well," exclaimed the ruined proprietor, "I am glad it is no worse." How it could be worse, when it was all swept away, totally demolished, is as puzzling a question for a philosopher as that none of Perry's two hundred and twenty-four errors are shaken in this work.