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FAREWELL.

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE.

The World's Parliament of Religions was formally opened in the Art Palace of the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago on the 11th of September, 1893, and closed on the evening of the 27th of September, having been in session seventeen days.

For the first time in the history of the world, representative men, admitted to be the authentic exponents of their various creeds, assembled together fraternally, not for polemical purposes, but to listen each to the other in elucidation of what appears to him religious truth. Gathered on the large rostrum in the Hall of Columbus were men of all nations, all types and races, and of all religions. From far-away India, from the snow-locked crests of the Himalayas, from the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, the representatives of a race and country old and decrepit with age clasped hands with a race now in the vigor of manhood. The oldest religions in the world greeted with friendship the youngest. It was fitting that this golden bond of union should have been forged in the greatest city in the new world.

Long before the hour announced for the opening of the parliament, the vast hall was packed with people. It was a magnificent gathering which greeted the representatives of the religions of the world as they marched down the centre aisle, and, amid the cheer that welled up from the hearts of four thousand men and women, took their seats upon the platform beneath the waving flags of all nations. Gathered there, clad in their native garb, were the sages of India, the followers of Buddha, the devotees of Brahma. Parsees and Presbyterians, Methodists and Moslems, Baptists and Buddhists, sat side by side and greeted one another as brothers in the world's first council of the faiths.

"Peace on earth, good-will to men."

With these sublime words, pronounced by nearly 5,000
voices, this wonderful parliament dissolved, and the representatives of creeds and sects that in bygone times hated one another with a hatred knowing no moderation, have gone back to their different homes, bearing the lesson of love and charity to all men.

It is not likely that the parliament of religions will deeply stir the masses who adhere to the various creeds. The first effect of the conference, however, will be to make it more customary for churchmen throughout the world to maintain a courtesy in controversy which will be a reversal of the acute and too often cruel spirit that has animated religious discussions in the past. It is not to the credit of the Christian faith that its most illustrious exemplars stained their pens with gall. In the ages when formal courtesy was at its height, when learning was supposed to have shed the luster of the renaissance over the ranks of clergy and cultivated laity, controversy still retained an uncouth bitterness. The controversial writings of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, even when their authors were men of prodigious learning and of the highest social plane are marred by coarseness of epithet, acerbity of temper, and a total lack of that gentleness and sweetness which the founders of the great religions of the world sought diligently to promote. It will hereafter be the fashion among churchmen to speak of differing creeds and generally of one another with respect, and if no other result follow the religious parliament, this alone will justify its assembling.

An interpretation of what the speaker says is never so satisfactory as what he actually said, and, therefore, it is proposed in this volume to give verbatim as many of the addresses as possible. The object of this publication is not to serve any particular sect or creed, any particular religion or race, but to give in a popular form the proceedings of the most important Religious Conference that ever assembled in the history of the world.
INTRODUCTION.

BY REV. MINOT J. SAVAGE.

It needs only a superficial knowledge of the history of the world to make it clear to any mind that this Parliament represents the highwater-mark of human civilization. Whoever loves God and cherishes hope for man must rejoice in it.

As we go back down the pathway by which humanity has traveled from the beginning we find mankind divided into tribes and races not only, but we find them worshiping different gods. These different gods were supposed to be jealous of each other, at enmity with each other, and ready to punish their followers for going astray after any other religion, as a king or emperor would punish one of his subjects for treason. The Hebrew and the Pilistine could have nothing in common in their worship. It never occurred to them that Yahweh and Dagon were only different names for one Divine Being. While the attitude of the worshipers towards each other is well illustrated by a verse from one of the Psalms,—"Do not I hate them that hate Thee? (addressed to his god) I hate them with perfect hatred."

When I was a boy, I was taught that Christianity was the only heaven-sent and true religion, and that all others were "false." They were not undeveloped religions, not simply poorer religions than Christianity, they were false religions. Milton, in his Paradise Lost, teaches that the fallen angels originated all pagan religions, that they might draw away to themselves the worship that belonged to God, and so ruin as many as possible of the human race.

So it has naturally followed that the bitterest and bloodiest wars of history have been those of religious fear and hate. It needs only to suggest the conflicts of Christian and Saracen, to recall the Crusades, the wars
against the Moors in Spain, the terrors of St. Bartholomew, the Thirty Years’ War, and the tales of blood are fresh in the imaginations of all.

That this hint of past conditions may not seem to be partisan prejudice, let me quote a few words spoken at the Parliament by Rev. Dr. George T. Candlin, a Methodist missionary from China. “The conventional idea of religion which obtains among Christians the world over is that Christianity is true, all other religions false; that Christianity is of God, while other religions are of the devil; or else, with a little spice of moderation, that Christianity is a revelation from Heaven, while other religions are manufactures of men. You know better, and with clear light and strong assurance can testify that there may be friendship instead of antagonism between religion and religion; that, so surely as God is our common Father, our hearts alike have yearned for Him, and our souls in devoutest moods have caught whispers of grace dropped from His throne.”

But, in this blessed Columbian year, and in the favored city of Chicago, an event has occurred that marks a turning-point in the pathway of the human race. Representatives of not only all the Christian sects but of all the great religions of the earth have met together for peace-ful conference. Often before have met general councils of Christendom which have assumed to call themselves Ecumenical, but this is the first truly Ecumenical (world-embracing) religious Council that has ever been known.

Let me now, under a few numbered heads, indicate the significance and tendency of this great event.

1. It is a recognition of the great fact that all religions are equally natural and equally divine. This does not mean, of course, that one is as good as another. To say that all the shrubs and trees of the world are equally a part of the natural flora of the world does not mean that all are of equal size and value. But when the representatives of all the great religions meet in one parliament, they come as peers and not as king and subjects. One is greater than another only by virtue of the truth it represents and the good it can do.

2. It is a recognition of the fact that, by whatever rites and under whatever name, all are seekers after the one God and servants of the one humanity.
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3. It is a confession that, in all nations, the true-hearted and spiritually-minded do find God and are His accepted worshipers.

4. It is a surrender of all assumptions of infallibility—that one baseless claim that has ever stood in the way of progress, that has treated with contempt those outside its pale, and has persecuted all discoverers of new and higher truth.

5. It is a promise of co-operation instead of mutual hate. It means that henceforth the best in all religions will work, not to destroy each other, but to destroy the evils that darken and oppress the world.

No wise student of human growth expects any one religion to swallow up all the rest. He expects to see all of them slough off their errors, outgrow their partial views, and concentrate more and more on those central virtues of God and man that are common to them all. They will more and more find out that we all have one Father in heaven, and that all we are brethren. So grows the dream of "Peace on earth, good-will to men."
THE WORLD'S CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS.

CHAPTER I.

I.—THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN.—ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY REV. JOHN HENRY BARROWS.

Mr. President and Friends:—If my heart did not overflow with cordial welcome at this hour, which promises to be a great moment in history, it would be because I had lost the spirit of manhood and had been forsaken by the spirit of God. The whitest snow on the sacred mount of Japan, the clearest water springing from the sacred fountains of India, are not more pure and bright than the joy of my heart and of many hearts here, that this day has dawned in the annals of time, and that, from the farthest isles of Asia; from India, mother of religions; from Europe, the great teacher of civilization; from the shores on which breaks the "long wash of Australasian seas;" that from neighboring lands and from all parts of this republic which we love to contemplate as the land of earth's brightest future, you have come here at our invitation in the expectation that the world's first parliament of religions must prove an event of race-wide and perpetual significance.

For more than two years the general committee, which I have the honor to represent, working together in unbroken harmony, and presenting the picture of prophecy of a united Christendom, have carried on their arduous and sometimes appalling task in happy anticipation of this golden hour. Your coming has constantly been in our thoughts and hopes and fervent prayers. I rejoice that your long voyages and journeys are over, and that here, in this young capital of our western civilization, you find men eager for truth, sympathetic with the spirit of universal human brotherhood, and loyal, I believe, to the
highest they know, glad and grateful to Almighty God
that they see your faces and are to hear your words.

Welcome, most welcome, O wise men of the east and of
the west. May the star which has led you hither be like
unto that luminary which guided the men of old, and may
this meeting by the inland sea of a new continent be
blessed of Heaven to the redemption of men from error
and from sin and despair. I wish you to understand that
this great undertaking, which has aimed to house under
one friendly roof in brotherly counsel the representatives
of God's aspiring and believing children everywhere, has
been conceived and carried on through strenuous and
patient toil, with an unflattering heart, with a devout faith
in God, and with most signal and special evidences of His
divine guidance and favor.

Long ago I should have surrendered the task intrusted
to me before the colossal difficulties looming ever in the
way had I not committed my work to the gracious care of
that God who loves all His children, whose thoughts are
long, long thoughts, who is patient and merciful as well
as just, and who cares infinitely more for the souls of His
erring children than for any creed or philosophy of human
devising. If anything great and worthy is to be the out-
come of this parliament, the glory is wholly due to Him
who inspired it, and who in the scriptures which most of
us cherish as the word of God, has taught the blessed
truths of divine fatherhood and human brotherhood.

I should not use the word "if" in speaking of the out-
come of this congress of religions, since, were it decreed
that our sessions should end this day, the truthful his-
torian would say that the idea which has inspired and led
this movement, the idea whose beauty and force have
drawn you through these many thousand miles of travel,
that this idea has been so flashed before the eyes of men
that they will not forget it, and that our meeting this
morning has become a new, great fact in the historic
evolution of the race which will not be obliterated.

What, it seems to me, should have blunted some of the
arrows of criticism shot at the promoters of this move-
ment is this other fact, that it is the representatives of
that Christian faith which we believe has in it such ele-
ments and divine forces that it is fitted to the needs of all
men, who have planned and provided this first school of
comparative religions, wherein devout men of all faiths may speak for themselves without hindrance, without criticism and without compromise, and tell what they believe and why they believe it. I appeal to the representatives of the non-Christian faiths, and ask you if Christianity suffers in your eyes from having called this parliament of religions? Do you believe that its beneficent work in the world will be one whit lessened?

On the contrary, you agree with the great mass of Christian scholars in America in believing that Christendom may proudly hold up this congress of the faiths as a torch of truth and of love which may prove the morning star of the twentieth century. There is a true and noble sense in which America is a Christian nation, since Christianity is recognized by the supreme court, by the courts of the several states, by executive officers, by general national acceptance and observance as the prevailing religion of our people. This does not mean, of course, that the church and state are united. In America they are separated, and in this land the widest spiritual and intellectual freedom is realized. Justice Ameer Ali, of Calcutta, whose absence we lament to-day, has expressed the opinion that only in this western republic would such a congress as this have been undertaken and achieved.

I do not forget—I am glad to remember—that devout Jews, lovers of humanity, have co-operated with us in this parliament; that these men and women representing the most wonderful of all races, and the most persistent of all religions, who have come with good cause to appreciate the spiritual freedom of the United States of America—that these friends, some of whom are willing to call themselves Old Testament Christians, as I am willing to call myself a New Testament Jew, have zealously and powerfully co-operated in this good work. But the world calls us, and we call ourselves, a Christian people. We believe in the gospels and in Him whom they set forth as "the Light of the world," and Christian America, which owes so much to Columbus and Luther, to the Pilgrim Fathers and to John Wesley, which owes so much to the Christian Church, and the Christian college, and the Christian school, welcomes to-day the earnest disciples of other faiths and the men of all faiths who, from many lands, have flocked to this jubilee of civilization.
Cherishing the light which God has given us and eager to send this light every-whither, we do not believe that God, the eternal Spirit, has left Himself without witness in non-Christian nations. There is a divine light enlightening every-man.

"One accent of the Holy Ghost
The heedless world has never lost."

Professor Max Muller, of Oxford, who has been a friend of our movement and has sent a contribution to this parliament, has gathered together in his last volume a collection of prayers, Egyptian, Accadian, Babylonian, Vedic, Avestic, Chinese, Mohammedan, and modern Hindu, which make it perfectly clear that the sun which shone over Bethlehem and Calvary, has cast some celestial illumination and called forth some devout and holy aspirations by the Nile and the Ganges, in the deserts of Arabia, and by the waves of the Yellow Sea.

It is perfectly evident to all illuminated minds that we should cherish loving thoughts of all people and humane views of all the great and lasting religions, and that whoever would advance the cause of his own faith must first discover and gratefully acknowledge the truths contained in other faiths.

This parliament is likely to prove a blessing to many Christians by marking the time when they shall cease thinking that the verities and virtues of other religions discredit the claims of Christianity or bar its progress. It is our desire and hope to broaden and purify the mental and spiritual vision of men. Believing that nations and faiths are separated in part by ignorance and prejudice, why shall not this parliament help to remove the one and soften the other? Why should not Christians be glad to learn that God has wrought through Buddha and Zoroaster—through the sage of China and the prophets of India and the prophet of Islam?

We are met together to-day as men, children of one God, sharers with all men in weakness and guilt and need, sharers with devout souls everywhere in aspiration and hope and longing. We are met as religious men, believing even here, in this capital of material wonders, in the presence of an exposition which displays the unparalleled marvels of steam and electricity, that there is a spiritual root
to all human progress. We are met in a school of comparative theology, which I hope will prove more spiritual and ethical than theological; we are met, I believe, in the temper of love, determined to bury, at least for the time, our sharp hostilities, anxious to find out wherein we agree, eager to learn what constitutes the strength of other faiths and the weakness of our own; and we are met as conscientious and truth-seeking men in a council where no one is asked to surrender or abate his individual convictions, and where, I will add, no one would be worthy of a place if he did.

We are met in a great conference, men and women of different minds, where the speaker will not be ambitious for short-lived, verbal victories over others; where gentleness, courtesy, wisdom, and moderation will prevail far more than heated argumentation. I am confident that you appreciate the peculiar limitations which constitute the peculiar glory of this assembly. We are not here as Baptists and Buddhists, Catholics and Confucians, Parsees and Presbyterians, Methodists and Moslems; we are here as members of a parliament of religions, over which flies no sectarian flag, which is to be stampeded by no sectarian war-cries, but where for the first time, in a large council is lifted up the banner of love, fellowship, brotherhood. We all feel that there is a spirit which should always pervade these meetings, and if anyone should offend against this spirit let him not be rebuked publicly or personally; your silence will be a graver and severer rebuke.

We are not here to criticise one another, but each to speak out positively and frankly his own convictions regarding his own faith. The great world outside will review our work; the next century will review it. It is our high and noble business to make that work the best possible.

There will be social gatherings in the course of this parliament, in which we shall be able to get at each other more closely; there will be review sections in the smaller halls, where, in a friendly way through question and answer and suggestion, the great themes to be treated in the Hall of Columbus will be considered, and various lights thrown upon them; but in this central hall of the parliament the general programme will be carried out, and I
trust always in the spirit which glows in your hearts at this hour.

It is a great and wonderful programme that is to be spread before you; it is not all that I could wish or had planned for, but it is too large for any one mind to receive it in its fullness during the seventeen days of our sessions. Careful and scholarly essays have been prepared and sent in by great men of the old world and the new, which are worthy of the most serious and grateful attention, and I am confident that each one of us may gain enough to make this parliament an epoch of his life. You will be glad with me that, since this is a world of sin and sorrow as well as speculation, our attention is for several days to be given to those greatest practical themes which press upon good men everywhere. How can we make this suffering and needy world less a home of grief and strife and far more a commonwealth of love, a kingdom of heaven? How can we abridge the chasms of alienation which have kept good men from co-operating? How can we bring into closer fellowship those who believe in Christ as the Saviour of the world? And how can we bring about a better understanding among the men of all faiths? I believe that great light will be thrown upon these problems in the coming days.

Outside of this central parliament and yet a part of it are the congresses of the various religious bodies in the Hall of Washington and elsewhere. And they will greatly help to complete the picture of the spiritual forces now at work among men and to bring to a gainsaying and gold-worshiping generation a sense of those diviner forces which are moving on humanity.

I cannot tell you, with any completeness, how vast and various are my obligations to those who have helped me in this colossal undertaking. Let me, however, give my heartiest thanks to the devout women who, from the beginning, have championed the idea of this parliament and worked for its realization; to the president of the Columbian Exposition and his associates; to the president of the world's congress auxiliary, whose patient and Titanic labors will one day be appreciated at their full value; to the Christian and secular press of our country, which has been so friendly and helpful from the start; to the more than 3,000 men and women upon our
advisory council in many lands; to the scores of missionaries who have been far-sighted and broad-minded enough to realize the supreme value of this parliament; to President Miller, of the Christian College at Madras, who has used his pen and voice in our behalf; to the Buddhist scholars of Japan who have written and spoken in favor of this congress of the faiths; to Mr. Dharmapala, of Ceylon, who has left important work in connection with his society in southern India to make this long journey to the heart of America; to Mr. Mozoomdar and all others who have come to us from the most populous portion of England's great empire, which has been well called "the hugest standing parliament of religions in the world"; to the imperial government of China, that has commissioned a learned and able Confucian to speak for one of the faiths of his nation; to scores of the bishops of the Anglican, Methodist, United Brethren, African Methodist, and other Churches; to business men in our own city who have generously helped me in times of special need, and to the dignitaries of the great Catholic Church of our country, who, through the learned and broad-minded rector of the Catholic University at Washington, have brought to us a degree of co-operation and fellowship for which I can never be too grateful.

All these I welcome to-day; or, if some of them be not here, I send them, and to a multitude of others whom I have not named, my affectionate gratitude and fraternal salutation. And to the representatives of the orthodox Greek Church, of the Russian Church, of the Armenian Church, of the Bulgarian and other Churches I extend the most cordial welcome and salutation. I believe that you will all feel at home with us; I believe that your coming will enlighten us. We shall hear about the faith of the Parsis in the words of those who hold that ancient doctrine; we shall hear of the faith of the Jains of India in the words of one who belonged to that community which is far older than Christianity. Our minds and our hearts are to be widened as we take in more fully the various works of Divine Providence.

Welcome, one and all, thrice welcome to the world's first parliament of religions. Welcome to the men and women of Israel, the standing miracle of nations and religions. Welcome to the disciples of Prince Siddartha,
the many millions who cherish in their heart Lord Buddha as the light of Asia. Welcome to the high priest of the national religion of Japan. This city has every reason to be grateful to the enlightened ruler of the sunrise kingdom. Welcome to the men of India and all faiths! Welcome to all the disciples of Christ, and may God's blessing abide in our council and extend to the twelve hundred millions of human beings, the representatives of whose faiths I address at this moment.

It seems to me that the spirits of just and good men hover over this assembly. I believe that the spirit of Paul is here, the zealous missionary of Christ, whose courtesy, wisdom, and unbounded tact were manifest when he preached Jesus and the resurrection beneath the shadows of the Parthenon. I believe the spirit of the wise and humane Buddha is here, and of Socrates, the searcher after truth, and of Jeremy Taylor and John Milton and Roger Williams and Lessing, the great apostles of toleration. I believe that the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, who sought for a church founded on love for God and man, is not far from us, and the spirit of Tennyson and Whittier and Phillips Brooks, who looked forward to this parliament as the realization of a noble idea.

When, a few days ago, I met for the first time the delegates who have come to us from Japan, and shortly after the delegates who have come to us from India, I felt that the arms of human brotherhood had reached almost around the globe. But there is something stronger than human love and fellowship, and what gives us the most hope and happiness to-day is our confidence that

"The whole round world is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

II.—ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP FEEHAN, ROMAN CATHOLIC, OF CHICAGO.

On this most interesting occasion, ladies and gentlemen, a privilege has been granted to me—that of giving greeting in the name of the Catholic Church to the members of this parliament of religion. Surely we all regard it as a time and a day of the highest interest, for we have
here the commencement of an assembly unique in the history of the world. One of the representatives from the ancient east has mentioned that his king, in early days held a meeting something like this, but certainly the modern and historical world has had no such thing. Men have come from distant lands, from many shores. They represent many types of race. They represent many forms of faith; some from the distant east representing its remote antiquity, some from the islands and continents of the west. In all there is a great diversity of opinion, but in all there is a great, high motive.

Of all the things that our city has seen and heard during these passing months the highest and the greatest is now to be presented to it. For earnest men, learned and eloquent men of different faiths, have come to speak and to tell us of those things that of all are of the highest and deepest interest to us all. We are interested in material things; we are interested in beautiful things. We admire the wonders of that new city that has sprung up on the southern end of our great City of Chicago; but when learned men, men representing the thought of the world on religion, come to tell us of God and of his truth, and of life and of death, and of immortality and of justice, and of goodness and of charity, then we listen to what will surpass infinitely whatever the most learned or most able men can tell us of material things.

Those men that have come together will tell of their systems of faith, without, as has been well said by Dr. Barrows, one atom of surrender of what each one believes to be the truth for him. No doubt it will be of exceeding interest, but whatever may be said in the end, when all is spoken, there will be at least one great result; because no matter how we may differ in faith or in religion, there is one thing that is common to us all, and that is a common humanity. And those men representing the races and the faiths of the world, meeting together and talking together and seeing one another, will have for each other in the end a sincere respect and reverence and a cordial and fraternal feeling of friendship. As the privilege, which I prize very much, has been given to me, I bid them all in my own name and of that I represent a most cordial welcome.
III.—ADDRESS BY CARDINAL GIBBONS—HEAD OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA.

Your honored president has informed you, ladies and gentlemen, that if I were to consult the interest of my health I should perhaps be in bed this morning, but, as I was announced to say a word in response to the kind speeches that have been offered up to us, I could not fail to present myself at least and to show my interest in your great undertaking.

I would be wanting in my duty as a minister of the Catholic Church if I did not say that it is our desire to present the claims of the Catholic Church to the observation and, if possible, to the acceptance of every right-minded man that will listen to us. But we appeal only to the tribunal of conscience and of intellect. I feel that in possessing my faith I possess a treasure compared with which all the treasures of this world are but dross, and, instead of hiding those treasures in my own coverts, I would like to share them with others, especially as I am none the poorer in making others the richer. But though we do not agree in matters of faith, as the most reverend archbishop of Chicago has said, thanks be to God there is one platform on which we all stand united. It is the platform of charity, of humanity, and of benevolence. And as ministers of Christ we thank Him for our great model in this particular. Our blessed Redeemer came upon this earth to break down the wall of partition that separated race from race, and people from people, and tribe from tribe, and has made us one people, one family, recognizing God as our common Father and Jesus Christ as our Brother.

We have a beautiful lesson given to us in the gospel of Jesus Christ—that beautiful parable of the good Samaritan which we all ought to follow. We know that the good Samaritan rendered assistance to a dying man and bandaged his wounds. The Samaritan was his enemy in religion and in faith, his enemy in nationality and his enemy even in social life. That is the model that we all ought to follow.

I trust that we will all leave this hall animated by a
greater love for one another, for love knows no distinction of faith. Christ the Lord is our model, I say. We cannot, like our divine Saviour, give sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and walking to the lame, and strength to the paralyzed limbs; we cannot work the miracles which Christ wrought; but there are other miracles far more beneficial to ourselves that we are all in the measure of our lives capable of working, and those are the miracles of charity, of mercy and of love to our fellow-man.

Let no man say that he cannot serve his brother. Let no man say "Am I my brother's keeper?" That was the language of Cain, and I say to you all here to-day, no matter what may be your faith, that you are and you ought to be your brother's keeper. What would become of us Christians to-day if Christ the Lord had said: "Am I my brother's keeper?" We would be all walking in darkness and in the shadow of death, and if to-day we enjoy in this great and beneficent land of ours blessings beyond comparison we owe it to Christ who redeemed us all. Therefore, let us thank God for the blessings he has bestowed upon us. Never do we perform an act so pleasing to God as when we extend the right hand of fellowship and of practical love to a suffering member. Never do we approach nearer to our model than when we cause the sunlight of Heaven to beam upon a darkened soul; never do we prove ourselves more worthy to be called children of God our Father than when we cause the flowers of joy and of gladness to grow up in the hearts that were dark and dreary and barren and desolate before.

For, as the apostle has well said, "Religion pure and undefiled before God and the Father is this: To visit the orphan, and the fatherless and the widow in their tribulations, and to keep one's self unspotted from this world.

IV.—ADDRESS BY REV. AUGUSTA J. CHAPIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE OF ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS.

I am strangely moved, as I stand upon this platform and attempt to realize what it means that you all are here from so many lands representing so many and widely differing
phases of religious thought and life, and what it means
that I am here in the midst of this unique assemblage to
represent womanhood and woman's part in it all. The
parliament which assembles in Chicago this morning is
the grandest and most significant convocation ever gath-
ered in the name of religion on the face of this earth.
There have been and are yet to be within these walls
congresses for the discussion of a multitude of themes,
each attracting the attention of a select and limited com-
pany. But this great parliament of religions appeals to
all the people of the civilized world, for all who wear the
garb of humanity have inherited from the infinite fatherly
and motherly One whose children we are, the same high
spiritual nature; we have all of us, whether wise or un-
wise, rich or poor, of whatever nationality or religion, the
same supreme interests and the same great problems of
infinitude, of life, and of destiny pressing upon us all for
solution.
The old world, which has rolled on through countless
stages and phases of physical progress, until it is an ideal
home for the human family, has, through a process of
evolution or growth, reached an era of intellectual and
spiritual attainment where there is malice toward none
and charity for all, where, without prejudice, without fear
and with perfect fidelity to personal convictions, we may
clap hands across the chasm of our indifferences and
cheer each other in all that is good and true.
The world's first parliament of religions could not have
been called sooner and have gathered the religionists of
all these lands together. We had to wait for the hour to
strike, until the steamship, the railway, and the telegraph
had brought men together, leveled their walls of separa-
tion, and made them acquainted with each other—until
scholars had broken the way through the pathless wilder-
ness of ignorance, superstition, and falsehood, and com-
pelled them to respect each other's honesty, devotion, and
intelligence. A hundred years ago the world was not
ready for this parliament, fifty years ago it could not
have been convened, and had it been called but a single
generation ago, one-half of the religious world could not
have been directly represented.
Woman could not have had a part in it in her own right
for two reasons; one that her presence would not have
been thought of or tolerated, and the other was that she herself was still too weak, too timid, and too unschooled to avail herself of such an opportunity had it been offered. Few indeed were they a quarter of a century ago who talked about the divine brotherhood and human brotherhood, and fewer still were they who realized the practical religious power of these great conceptions. Now few are found to question them.

I am not an old woman, yet my memory runs easily back to the time when, in all the modern world, there was not one well equipped college or university open to women students, and when, in all the modern world, no woman had been ordained or even acknowledged as a preacher outside the denomination of Friends. Now the doors are thrown open in our own and many other lands. Women are becoming masters of the languages in which the great sacred literatures of the world are written. They are winning the highest honors that the great universities have to bestow, and already in the field of religion hundreds have been ordained and thousands are freely speaking and teaching this new gospel of freedom and gentleness that has come to bless mankind.

We are still at the dawn of this new era. Its grand possibilities are all before us, and its heights are ours to reach. We are assembled in this great parliament to look for the first time in each other's faces and to speak to each other our best and truest words. I can only add my heartfelt word of greeting to those you have already heard. I welcome you, brothers, of every name and land, who have wrought so long and so well in accordance with the wisdom high Heaven has given to you; and I welcome you, sisters, who have come with beating hearts and earnest purpose to this great feast, to participate not only in this parliament but in the great congresses associated with it. Isabella the Catholic had not only the perception of a new world, but of an enlightened and emancipated womanhood, which should strengthen religion and bless mankind. I welcome you to the fulfillment of her prophetic vision.
It affords me infinite pleasure to welcome the distinguished gentlemen who compose this august body. It is a matter of satisfaction and pride that the relations existing between the peoples and the nations of the earth are of such a friendly nature as to make this gathering possible. I have long cherished the hope that nothing would intervene to prevent the full fruition of the labors of your honored chairman.

I apprehend that the fruitage of this parliament will richly compensate him and the world and prove the wisdom of his work. It is a source of satisfaction that, to the residents of a new city in a far country, should be accorded this great privilege and high honor. The meeting of so many illustrious and learned men under such circumstances, evidences the kindly spirit and feeling that exists throughout the world. To me this is the proudest work of our exposition. There is no man high or low, learned or unlearned, but will watch with increasing interest the proceedings of this parliament. Whatever may be the differences in the religions you represent, there is a sense in which we are all alike. There is a common plane on which we are all brothers. We owe our beings to conditions that are exactly the same. Our journey through this world is by the same route. We have in common the same senses, hopes, ambitions, joys and sorrows, and these to my mind argue strongly and almost conclusively a common destiny.

To me there is much satisfaction and pleasure in the fact that we are brought face to face with men that come to us bearing the ripest wisdom of the ages. They come in the friendliest spirit that, I trust, will be augmented by their intercourse with us and with each other. I hope that your parliament will prove to be a golden milestone on the highway of civilization—a golden stairway leading up to the tableland of a higher, grander, and more perfect condition, where peace will reign and the enginery of war be known no more forever.
I suppose that everybody who speaks here this morning stands for something. The very slight claim I have to be here rests on the fact that I am one of the original settlers. I am here representing the New England Puritan, the man who has made this gathering possible. The Puritan came early to this country with a very distinct work to do, and he gave himself distinctly to that work and succeeded in doing it. There are some who criticise the Puritan and say that if he had been a different man than he was he would not have been the man he was.

I venture to say that if the Puritan had not been precisely the man he was this gathering would never have been heard of. The little contribution that he makes this morning in the way of welcome to these guests from all parts of the world is to congratulate them on the opportunity given them of seeing something of the work his hands have established. We are able to show our friends from other countries, not that we have something better than they have, but that we have that which they can see nowhere else in the world. It would be idle to present trophies of old countries to men from India and Japan. We cannot show an old history or stately architecture. We cannot point to the castles and abbeys of England, but we can show a new country which means to be old. We can show buildings as tall as any in the world, and we can show the displacement of buildings that are a few score years old by the stately and elegant structures of our time. But there is another thing we can show, if our brethren from abroad will take pains to notice it. I am not exaggerating when I say that we can show what can be shown nowhere else in the world, and that is a great republic and a republic in the process of making by the force of Christianity.

We can show the whole nation, we can show its beginning, we can show the men who began to make it; at any rate we can show their pictures, the letters they wrote and the cradles their children were rocked in. The begin-
ning of this republic was purely religious. The men who came to start it came from religious motives. Their religion may not have been exactly what other people liked, but they worked with a distinctive religious purpose. They came here to carry out the work of God. They worked with energy and perseverance and steadfastness to that end. They started on Plymouth Rock a parliament of religions. They had presently in Massachusetts a parliament of two somewhat varying religions. Then, when the Dutch went to New York, there were three elements of religion in the country. So it has been going on ever since, and if to-day there is any religion in the world which has not its representative in this country I wish somebody would guess what it is.

There is one thing very remarkable in the working out of the Puritan idea; it has never gone backward, there has been no recession, no losing ground from the time the Mayflower took its way from old Plymouth into new Plymouth. There have been little variances from time to time, but they have tended to cement the great idea of building up this republic. At first they were colonies. Presently they shook off their allegiance to the old country and became a country of their own, fettered and held with slavery which is inconsistent in any republic. Presently came the Revolution which bound them together as a nation, and then came the Civil War which shook slavery off from the republic, and we stood a free and independent nation before the world. Our work advanced without receding and is still going on.

I say that this is the first republic of the world. You may ask if I am not ignorant of history. I believe there were two other republics. I have heard of the Roman republic; I have heard of the French republic, and the republics of Central America. But these were not republics in our sense. They were simply the change in form of government of their own people. A republic like this is peculiar in this respect, that we have here twenty-five different nations to make into one, twenty-five different languages, twenty-five different religions with great diversities, and no religions which have more diversity than the religions.

Now with all this diversity of taste, diversity of religion and desire and purpose we had to make one nation
where the people shall think together, shall worship together, shall rally under the same flag and shall believe in the same principles and same institutions. Since the morning of creation there has never been given to any people in the world so great a task as to make out of twenty-five nations a republic along the old Christian lines. We began our work with the church and school.

I have no sympathy with the discussion which has been frequently heard as to whether we should have the school or the church. You might as well ask, in bringing up children, whether they should have clothes or bread. Why in the name of reason should they not have both? The Pilgrim Fathers came with the church and came with the school. They were not boys when they came or wild adventurers. They were scholars from the universities of England. They brought books with them and made books, and they founded what they called a university. They believed that no religion has any right to live which does not make men more intelligent, and they believed that there is no intelligence worth having that does not reach out to the highest pinnacle of knowledge. To-day we are simply continuing the process they began.

Men sometimes find fault and say that we are a material nation. I think we should give thanks that we are materialists, that we are blessed with railroads, steamships, banks, bankers and many kinds of money, providing they are good. It would be no use attempting to maintain institutions of religion or schoolhouses without material and financial resources. It is rather a reproach to us if we cannot advance the institutions of religion and learning as fast as men advance railroads. I wish our friends would take pains to notice what we are doing here. I should like them to see the fine churches of this and other great cities; I should like them to go into the country communities and see our missionary churches and country schools. I wish they would let me be their guide. I would take them to the place on our own Atlantic seaboard, where they can see men manufacturing a republic — taking the black material of humanity and building it up into noble men and women; taking the red material, wild with every savage instinct, and making it into respectable men.

I do not think America has anything better or more
hopeful to show than the work of General Armstrong at Hampton. We have not built cathedrals yet, but we have built log school-houses, and if you visit them you will see in the cracks between the logs the eternal Light streaming in. And for the work we are doing a log schoolhouse is better than a cathedral.

VII.—MOST REV. DIONYSIOS LATAS, ARCHBISHOP OF ZANTE, GREECE.

Reverend Ministers, Most Honorable Gentlemen, the Superiors of this Congress, and Honorable Ladies and Gentlemen:—I consider myself very happy in having set my feet on this platform to take part in the congress of the different nations and peoples. I thank the great American nation, and especially the superiors of this congress, for the high manner in which they have honored me by inviting me to take part, and I thank the ministers of divinity of the different nations and peoples which, for the first time, will write in the books of the history of the world.

I thank them still more because this invitation gave me the opportunity to satisfy a desire which I have had for a long time to visit this famous and most glorious country. I sat long time at Athens, the capital of Greece, and there had the opportunity to become acquainted with many American gentlemen, ministers, professors, and others who came there for the sake of learning the new Greek, and travelers who visited that classic place, the place of the antiquities. By conversing with those gentlemen I heard and learned many things about America, and I admired from afar the greatness of the country. My desire has always been to visit and see this nation; and now, thanks to Almighty God, I am here in America, within the precincts of the city which is showing the great progress and the wonderful achievements of the human mind. My voice, as representing the little kingdom of Greece, may appear of little importance as compared with the voices of you who represent great and powerful states, extensive cities, and numerous nations, but the influence of the Church to which I belong is extensive and my part is great. But my thanks to the
superiors of this congress and my blessings and prayers to Almighty God must not be measured by extent and quantity but by true sympathy and quality, I repeat my thanks to the superiors of this congress, the president, Charles Bonney, and Dr. Barrows.

The archbishop then turned to the dignitaries on the platform and said:

Reverend ministers of the eloquent name of God, the Creator of your earth and mine, I salute you on the one hand as my brothers in Jesus Christ, from whom, according to our faith, all good has originated in this world. I salute you in the name of the divinely inspired gospel, which, according to our faith, is the salvation of the soul of man and the happiness of man in this world.

All men have a common Creator without any distinction between the rich and the poor, the ruler and the ruled; all men have a common Creator without any distinction of clime or race, without distinction of nationality or ancestry, of name or nobility; all men have a common creator and consequently a common father in God.

I raise up my hands and I bless with heartfelt love the great country and the happy glorious people of the United States.

VIII.—ADDRESS OF P. C. MOZOOMDAR, BRAHMO-SOMAJ OF INDIA.

Leaders of the Parliament of Religions, Men and Women of America:—The recognition, sympathy, and welcome you have given to India to-day are gratifying to thousands of liberal Hindu religious thinkers, whose representatives I see around me, and, on behalf of my countrymen, I cordially thank you. India claims her place in the brotherhood of mankind not only because of her great antiquity, but equally for what has taken place there in recent times. Modern India has sprung from ancient India by a law of evolution, a process of continuity which explains some of the most difficult problems of our national life. In prehistoric times our forefathers worshiped the great living spirit God, and, after many strange vicissitudes, we Indian theists, led by the light of ages, worship the same living spirit, God, and none other.
Perhaps in other ancient lands this law of continuity has not been so well kept. Egypt aspired to build up the vast eternal in her elaborate symbolism and mighty architecture. Where is Egypt to-day? Passed away as a mystic dream in her pyramids, catacombs and sphynx of the desert.

Greece tried to embody her genius of wisdom and beauty in her wonderful creations of marble, in her all-embracing philosophy; but where is ancient Greece to-day? She lies buried under her exquisite monuments and sleeps the sleep from which there is no waking.

The Roman cohorts under whose victorious tramp the earth shook to its center, the Roman theaters, laws, and institutions—where are they? Hidden behind the oblivious centuries or, if they flit across the mind, only point a moral or adorn a tale.

The Hebrews, the chosen of Jehovah, with their long line of law and prophets, how are they? Wanderers on the face of the globe driven by king and kaiser, the objects of persecution to the cruel or objects of sympathy to the kind. Mount Moriah is in the hands of the Mussulman, Zion is silent, and over the ruins of Solomon's Temple a few men beat their breasts and wet their white beards with their tears.

But India, the ancient among ancients, the elder of the elders, lives to-day with her old civilization, her old laws, and her profound religion. The old mother of the nations and religions is still a power in the world, she has often risen from apparent death and in the future will arise again. When the Vedic faith declined in India the esoteric religion of the Vedantas arose; then the everlasting philosophy of the Darasanas. When these declined again the Light of Asia arose and established a standard of moral perfection which will yet teach the world a long time. When Buddhism had its downfall the Saivas Vaishnava revived and continued in the land down to the invasion of the Mohammedans. The Greeks and Scythians, the Turks and Tartars, the Mongols and Mussulman, rolled over her country like torrents of destruction. Our independence, our greatness, our prestige—all had gone, but nothing could take away our religious vitality.

We are Hindus still and shall always be. Now sits
Christianity on the throne of India, with the gospel of peace on one hand and the scepter of civilization on the other. Now it is not the time to despair and die. Behold the aspirations of modern India—intellectual, social, political—all awakened; our religious instincts stirred to the roots. If that had not been the case do you think Hindus, Jains, Buddhists and others would have traversed these 14,000 miles to pay the tribute of their sympathy before this august parliament of religions?

No individual, no denomination can more fully sympathize or more heartily join your conferences than we men of the Brahmo Somaj, whose religion is the harmony of all religions, and whose congregation is the brotherhood of all nations.

Such, as our aspirations and sympathies, dear brethren, accept them. Let me thank you again for this welcome in the name of my countrymen, and wish every prosperity and success to your labors.

IX.—HON. PUNG QUANG YU, SECRETARY CHINESE LEGATION IN WASHINGTON.—CONFUCIAN—(PAPER READ BY DR. BARROWS.)

On behalf of the imperial government of China I take great pleasure in responding to the cordial words which the chairman of the general committee and others have spoken to-day. This is a great moment in the history of nations and religions. For the first time men of various faiths meet in one great hall to report what they believe and the grounds for their belief. The great sage of China, who is honored not only by the millions of our own land, but throughout the world, believed that duty was summed up in reciprocity, and I think the word reciprocity finds a new meaning and glory in the proceedings of this historic parliament. I am glad that the great Empire of China has accepted the invitation of those who have called this parliament and is to be represented in this great school of comparative religion. Only the happiest results will come, I am sure, from our meeting together in the spirit of friendliness. Each may learn from the other some lessons, I trust, of charity and good will, and discover what is excellent in other faiths than
his own. In behalf of my government and people I extend to the representatives gathered in this great hall the friendliest salutations, and to those who have spoken I give my most cordial thanks.

X.—ADDRESS OF PRINCE SERGE WOLKONSKY OF RUSSIA.

Those who, during the last week, have had the opportunity of attending not only the congresses of one single church, but who could witness different congresses of different churches and congregations must have been struck with a noticeable fact. They went to the Catholic Congress and heard beautiful words of charity and love. Splendid orators invoked the blessings of heaven upon the children of the Catholic Church, and in eloquent terms the listeners were entreated to love their human brothers, in the name of the Catholic Church. They went to the Lutheran Congress and heard splendid words of humanity and brotherhood, orators inspired with love and the blessing of God invoked on the children of the Lutheran Church. Those who were present were taught to love their human brothers, in the name of the Lutheran Church. They went to other more limited congresses, and everywhere they heard these same great words, proclaiming these same great ideas and inspiring these same great feelings. They saw a Catholic archbishop who went to a Jewish Congress and with fiery eloquence brought feelings of brotherhood to his Hebraic sisters. Not in one of these congresses did a speaker forget that he belonged to humanity, and that his own church or congregation was but a starting point, a center for a further radiation.

This is the noticeable fact that must have struck everybody and everybody must have asked himself at the end of the week: “Why don’t they come together, all these people who all speak the same language? Why do not all these splendid orators unite their voices in one single chorus, and, if they preach the same ideas, why don’t they proclaim them in the name of the same and single truth that inspires them all?” This seems to have been the idea of those, who, in composing the programmes of the religious congresses, decided that the general religious congress should follow the minor ones. To-night, in fact,
we see the representatives of different churches gathered together and actuated with one common desire of union. Being called to welcome it on the day of its opening, I will take the liberty of relating to you a popular legend of my country. The story may appear rather too humorous for the occasion, but one of our national writers says: "Humor is an invisible tear through a visible smile," and we think that human tears, human sorrow, and pain are sacred enough to be brought even before a religious congress.

There was an old woman who for many centuries suffered tortures in the flames of hell, for she had been a great sinner during her earthly life. One day she saw far away in the distance, an angel taking his flight through the blue skies; and with the whole strength of her voice she called to him. The call must have been desperate, for the angel stopped in his flight and coming down to her asked her what she wanted.

"When you reach the throne of God," she said, "tell Him that a miserable creature has suffered more than she can bear, and that she asks the Lord to be delivered from these tortures."

The angel promised to do so and flew away. When he had transmitted the message God said:

"Ask her whether she has done any good to any one during her life."

The old woman strained her memory in search of a good action during her sinful past, and all at once: "I've got one," she joyfully exclaimed: "One day I gave a carrot to a hungry beggar."

The angel reported the answer.

"Take a carrot," said God to the angel, "and stretch it out to her. Let her grasp it, and if the plant is strong enough to draw her out from hell she shall be saved."

This the angel did. The poor old woman clung to the carrot. The angel began to pull, and, lo! she began to rise! But when her body was half out of the flames she felt a weight at her feet. Another sinner was clinging to her. She kicked, but it did not help. The sinner would not let go his hold, and the angel, continuing to pull, was lifting them both. But, oh! another sinner clung to them, and then a third, and more and always more—a chain of miserable creatures hung at the old woman's feet. The
angel never ceased pulling. It did not seem to be any heavier than the small carrot could support, and they all were lifted in the air. But the old woman suddenly took fright. Too many people were availing themselves of her last chance of salvation, and, kicking and pushing those who were clinging to her, she exclaimed: "Leave me alone; hands off; the carrot is mine."

No sooner had she pronounced this word "mine" than the tiny stem broke, and they all fell back to hell, and forever.

In its poetical artlessness and popular simplicity this legend is too eloquent to need interpretation. If any individual, any community, any congregation, any church, possesses a portion of truth and of good, let that truth shine for everybody; let that good become the property of every one. The substitution of the word "mine" by the word "ours" and that of "ours" by the word "everyone's"—this is what will secure a fruitful result to our collective efforts as well as to our individual activities.

This is why we welcome and greet the opening of this congress, where, in a combined effort of the representatives of all churches, all that is great and good and true in each of them is brought together in the name of the same God and for the sake of the same man.

We congratulate the president, the members and all the listeners of this congress upon the tendency of union that has gathered them on the soil of the country whose allegorical eagle, spreading her mighty wings over the stars and stripes, holds in her talons those splendid words, "E Pluribus Unum."

XI.—ADDRESS BY RT. REV. RENCHI SHIBATA, SHINTO BISHOP OF JAPAN.

I CANNOT help doing honor to the congress of religions held here in Chicago, as the result of the partial effort of those philanthropic brothers who have undertaken this, the greatest meeting ever held. It was fourteen years ago that I expressed, in my own country, the hope that there should be a friendly meeting between the world's religionists, and now I realize my hope with great joy in being able to attend these phenomenal meetings.
THE WORLD'S CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS.

In the history of the past we read of repeated and fierce conflicts between different religious creeds which sometimes ended in war. But that time has passed away and things have changed with advancing civilization. It is a great blessing, not only to the religions themselves, but also to human affairs, that the different religionists can thus gather in a friendly way and exchange their thoughts and opinions on the important problems of the age.

I trust that these repeated meetings will gradually increase the fraternal relations between the different religionists in investigating the truths of the universe, and be instrumental in uniting all religions of the world, and in bringing all hostile nations into peaceful relations by leading them to the way of perfect justice.

XII.—ADDRESS OF COUNT BERNSTORFF OF GERMANY.

I am happy to be able, as a German, to return words of thanks for the kind welcome that has just been expressed to the visitors from different nations. I can hardly say that I speak on behalf of Germany. Not countries as such, nor even churches as such, can take part in a conference like this. I fully understand that men, who in high offices represent the church, hesitated to accept the cordial invitation, which, as private persons, they would perhaps gladly have followed. I think the gentlemen who have come to attend this parliament, yet unique in the history of the world, come as individuals, not binding by their presence the religious or national bodies to which they belong; but this does not in the least diminish the value of their presence here. They come as men engaged in the religious work of their country and are representative men as such, even if no religious body has given them full powers.

I also come only as an individual, but in the hope that I may, perhaps, help a little to further the great object which you, who so kindly invited us, have in view. It is a great pleasure to me to be once more in this great country, which I visited for the first time in 1873. One week spent here twenty years ago has remained deeply rooted in my memory.

Let me begin by stating my great pleasure, and I know
that I am not alone with this feeling in my country, that for the first time religion should be officially connected with a world's exhibition. Religion, the most vital question for every human being, is generally laid aside at such gatherings and men are too apt to forget the claims of God in the bustle of life. Here is a free country, where the church is not supported by the government and yet where the churches have more influence on public life than anywhere else. It has been recognized that such a large influx of men should not meet without paying attention to the question of all questions. This parliament is, therefore, a testimony and one whose voice will, I trust, be heard all over the earth, that men live not by bread alone, but that the care for the immortal soul is the paramount question for every man, the question which ought to be treated before all others when men of all nations meet.

The basis of this congress is common humanity. Though the term humanity has often been used to designate the purely human apart from all claims of divinity I hesitate not, as an evangelical Christian, to accept this thesis. It is the Bible which teaches us that the human race is all descended from one couple, and that they are, therefore, one family. Let us not forget this; but the Bible also teaches that man is created after the image of God. Therefore, man as such, quite apart from the circumstances which made him be born among some historic religion is meant to come into connection with God. I have heard preachers who spoke at the anniversary of a reformation say that children who were baptized end what obligations this fact lays upon them. I could not help thinking that if children were not baptized, would not the duty to lead them to Christ be quite the same? He said every child is a member of the great human family. Has the offspring of that race, created after the image of God, the right to be brought into contact with truth?

If this was not the case the precept which states in the Old Testament, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," would have been impossible. It is based on the principle that every man, as such through his religious convictions, has a claim on our help; yea, more, on our love. Even the Jews, who were separated from all other nations of the
world, had this taught to them. The abuse of this truth made by men of no religion cannot abrogate the truth itself. If this parliament helps to bring forth this truth in the right light, if it shows that we can profess common humanity without putting the human in opposition to the divine, it will do a great work for the progress of civilization. The word "neighbor," in that precept that we are to love our neighbor as ourself, seems very narrow at first sight. It seems as if it only meant the person who lives next door to us, but in truth it is very comprehensive. The parable of the good Samaritan shows that the suffering one is our neighbor in so far as he requires our help. Every man is our neighbor. Every man practically becomes so by being brought near to us.

Now the world's fair, by bringing together a number of men from all nations, makes neighborhood practical for many people who never met before. Altogether the progress of civilization, the facilities afforded for locomotion in this century of steam and electricity, make many men closer neighbors than they were before, and if all the representatives of foreign nations who come here for the fair are told by this parliament that every man has a claim on the love of every other for the sake of the common humanity it is a lesson which certainly deserves not to be lost. We already feel that foreigners coming here can learn much, especially from the great voluntary Christian efforts of Americans.

This parliament teaches us that other great lesson. Not that—some one might say, and I have heard the objections expressed before—this idea of humanity will tend to make religion indifferent to us. I will openly confess that I also, for a time, felt the strength of this objection, but I trust that nobody is here who thinks lightly of his own religion.

I, for myself, declare that I am here as an individual evangelical Christian, and that I should never have set my foot in this parliament if I thought that it signified anything like a consent that all religions are equal, and that it is only necessary to be sincere and upright. I can consent to nothing of this kind. I believe only the Bible to be true, and Protestant Christianity the only true religion. I wish no compromise of any kind.

We cannot deny that we who meet in this parliament
are separated by great and important principles. We admit that these differences cannot be bridged over, but we meet, believing everybody has the right to his faith. You invite everybody to come here as a sincere defender of his own faith. I, for my part, stand before you with the same wish that prompted Paul when he stood before the representative of the Roman Congress and Agrippa, the Jewish king. I would to God that all that hear me today were both almost and altogether such as I am. I cannot accept these bonds. I thank God I am free, except for all these faults and deficiencies which are in me and which prevent me embracing my creed as I should like to do.

But what do we then meet for if we cannot show tolerance. Well, the word tolerance is used in a very different way. If the words of the great King Frederick of Prussia, "In my country everybody can go to heaven after his own fashion," is used as a maxim of statesmanship, we cannot approve of it too highly. What bloodshed, what cruelty would have been spared in the history of the world if it had been adopted. But if it is the expression of the religious indifference prevalent during this last century and at the court of the monarch who was the friend of Voltaire then we must not accept it.

St. Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, rejects every other doctrine, even if it were taught by an angel from heaven. We Christians are servants of our Master, the living Saviour. We have no right to compromise the truth He intrusted to us, either to think lightly of it or withhold the message He has given us for humanity. But we meet together, each one wishing to gain the others to his own creed. Will this not be a parliament of war instead of peace? Will it bring us further from instead of nearer to each other? I think not, if we hold fast our truths that these great vital doctrines can only be defended and propagated by spiritual means. An honest fight with spiritual weapons need not estrange the combatants; on the contrary, it often brings them nearer.

I think this conference will have done enough to engrave its memory forever on the leaves of history if this great principle found general adoption. One light is dawning in every heart and the nineteenth century has brought us much progress in this respect; yet we rise to enter the
twentieth century before the great principle of religious liberty has found universal acceptance. I am proud that in Prussia the ideas of religious liberty are so far advanced. The present Bohemian churches in our capital are a horrible memorial of how the Protestants of Bohemia and Austria found refuge in our country. Many blessings have come from these immigrants. The Jews are also fully emancipated with us, as the law gives all religions liberty. In Roman Catholic countries, like Spain, every obstacle is put in the way of Protestants. In Turkey and equally in Russia, we hear of sad persecutions. The principle of religious liberty is based on the grand foundation that God wants the voluntary observance of free men.

XIII.—ADDRESS OF ARCHBISHOP REDWOOD OF NEW ZEALAND.

I am glad, indeed, that it has been announced to you that I shall address you in only a few words, for we have been here so long, we have been listening to such strains of eloquence, we have had our minds so enlarged by the presence of this multitude and the varied representatives of the races and colors of mankind, that it would be impossible for me at this stage of the proceedings to detain you for any great length of time. However, as your honorable president has had the kindness to say, I have at least one merit, that of having come from afar; I have also another merit: I have the honor of representing the newest phase of civilization of the Anglo-Saxon race and the English-speaking people.

I represent Australasia, a country divided into various colonies, governing themselves with wonderful freedom, and, I may say without boasting, making rapid advances on the way to true civilization. I deem it a very great honor and privilege to be present on such an occasion as this, in an assembly that begins, as it were, on a new era for mankind—an era, I believe, of real brotherly love. It is a sad spectacle, when the mind ranges over a whole universe, to see that multitude of 1,200,000,000 of human beings created by the same God, destined to the same happiness, and yet divided by various barriers; to see that, instead of love prevailing from nation to nation, there
are barriers of hatred dividing them. I believe an occasion like this is the strongest possible means of removing forever such barriers.

I stand here as the representative of that distant land, of that noble old Church founded by God from the beginning; for, as one of the holy fathers said, the beginning of all things is the holy Catholic Church. We go back to Christ, her founder; to Christ, foretold thousands of years before He came. There she stands as a landmark in history. In her teaching there is an event which the human race shall never forget—that the Godhead took up our human nature to so elevate and unite it with the divine nature, whence began a brotherhood of man never dreamed of by merely human beings.

Now we can walk the earth and say truly we are the brothers of God. Indeed, in the whole of creation is the brotherhood of God known. It is known in the soul representing the spiritual creation, in the body representing the material creation, for man's body is an epitome of the material universe. Is it indeed that God glorified and deified the whole of creation in that act so that now the very mountains, trees, rocks, and plants can be saluted, not only as his creation, but as Christ's brother? These are the great ideas that underlie Christianity fully understood. We are to remove, in this nineteenth century, the barriers of hatred that prevent men from listening to the truths contained in all religions.

In all religions there is a vast element of truth, otherwise they would have no cohesion. They all have something respectable about them, they all have vast elements of truth; and the first thing for men, to respect themselves and to take away the barriers of hatred, is to see what is noble in their respective beliefs and to respect each other for the knowledge of the truth contained therein.

Therefore, I think that this parliament of religions will promote the great brotherhood of mankind, and in order to promote that brotherhood it will promote the expansion of truth. I do not pretend, as a Catholic, to have the whole truth, or to be able to solve all the problems of the human mind. I can appreciate love and esteem and any element of truth found outside of that great body of truth. Some men have said, we are the lovers of truth, we are
the seekers of truth, we are the philosophers of truth, but Christ had the divine audacity to say, "I am the truth." Wherever there is truth there is something worthy the respect, not only of man, but of God, the God-man, the incarnate God. Therefore, in order to sweep away the barriers of hatred that exist in the world, we must respect the elements of truth contained in all religions, and we must respect also the elements of morality contained in all religions.

Man is an intelligent being, and therefore he requires to know truth. He is also a moral being that is bound to live up to that truth, and is bound to use his will and liberty in accordance with truth. He is bound to be a righteous being. We find in all religions a number of truths that are the foundation, the bed-rock of all morality, and we see them in the various religions throughout the world, and we can surely, without sacrificing one point of Catholic morality or of truth, admire those truths revealed in some manner by God.

Man is not only a moral being, but a social being. Now the condition to make him happy and prosperous as a social being, to make him progress and go forth to conquer the world, both mentally and physically, is that he should be free, and not only to be free as a man in temporal matters, but to be free in religious matters. Therefore, it is to be hoped that from this day will date the dawn of that period when, throughout the whole of the universe, in every nation the idea of oppressing any man for his religion will be swept away. I think I can say in the name of the young country I represent, in the name of New Zealand, and the Church of Australasia that has made such a marvelous progress in our day, that we hope God will speed that day. Less than a century ago there were only two Catholic priests in the whole of Australasia. Now we have a hierarchy of one cardinal, six archbishops, eighteen bishops, a glorious army of priests, with brotherhoods and sisterhoods teaching schools in the most practical manner. The last council of the Church held in Sydney, sent her greeting to the Church in America, and the Church in America was seized by surprise and admiration at the growth of Christianity in that distant land. It is in the name of that Church I accept with the greatest feeling of
thankfulness the greeting made to my humble self representing that new country of New Zealand and that thriving and advancing country of Australasia.

XIV.—ADDRESS OF H. DHARMAPALA OF CEYLON.

Friends:—I bring to you the good wishes of 475,000,000 of Buddhists, the blessings and peace of the religious founder of that system which has prevailed so many centuries in Asia, which has made Asia mild, and which is to-day in its twenty-fourth century of existence, the prevailing religion of the country. I have sacrificed the greatest of all work to attend this parliament. I have left the work of consolidation—an important work which we have begun after 700 years—the work of consolidating the different Buddhist countries, which is the most important work in the history of modern Buddhism. When I read the programme of this parliament of religion, I saw it was simply the re-echo of a great consummation which the Indian Buddhists accomplished twenty-four centuries ago.

At that time Asoka, the great emperor, held a council in the city of Patna of 1,000 scholars which was in session for seven months. The proceedings were epitomized and carved on rock and scattered all over the Indian peninsular and the then known globe. After the consummation of that programme the great emperor sent the gentle teachers, the mild disciples of Buddha in the garb that you see on this platform, to instruct the world. In that plain garb they went across the deep rivers, the Himalayas, to the plains of Mongolia and the Chinese plains, and to the far-off, beautiful isles, the empire of the rising sun; and the influence of that congress held twenty-one centuries ago is to-day a living power, because you everywhere see mildness in Asia.

Go to any Buddhist country and where do you find such healthy compassion and tolerance as you find there? Go to Japan, and what do you see? The noblest lessons of tolerance and gentleness. Go to any of the Buddhist countries and you will see the carrying out of the programme adopted at the congress called by the Emperor Asoka.
Why do I come here to-day? Because I find that in this new city, that in this land of freedom the very place where that programme can also be carried out. For one year I meditated whether this parliament would be a success. Then I wrote to Dr. Barrows that this would be the proudest occasion of modern history and the crowning work of nineteen centuries. Yes, friends, if you are serious, if you are unselfish, if you are altruistic, this programme can be carried out and the twentieth century will see the teachings of the meek and lowly Jesus accomplished.

I hope in this great city, the youngest of all cities, but the greatest of all cities, this programme will be carried out and that the name of Dr. Barrows will shine forth as the American Asoka. And I hope that the noble lessons of tolerance learned in this majestic assembly will result in the dawning of universal peace which will last for twenty centuries more.

XV.—ADDRESS OF CARL VON BERGEN OF SWEDEN.

"I hope that there will be a bond of mental, spiritual affinity," he said, "between Swedes and Americans. God is not always on the side of the great warriors—the grim-visaged, powder-stained warriors who have stood in the front ranks and kept at bay huge armies. God is not always with them, but is as often with the meek, the lowly spirited, even as He was with the Puritans in the early days when they hewed the path of progress into the new world. There is but one God. Swedes and Americans alike share His bountiful gifts."

XVI.—ADDRESS OF VICHAND A. GHANDHI OF BOMBAY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I will not trouble you with a long speech. I, like my respected friends, Mr. Mozoomdar and others, come from India, the mother of religions. I represent Jainism, a faith older than Buddhism, similar to it in its ethics, but different from it in its psychology, and professed by 1,500,000 of India's most peaceful and law-abiding citizens. You have heard so many speeches from eloquent members, and, as I
shall speak later on at some length, I will therefore, at present, only offer on behalf of my community and their high priest, Moni Atma Ranji, whom I especially represent here, our sincere thanks for the kind welcome you have given us. This spectacle of the learned leaders of thought and religion meeting together on a common platform, and throwing light on religious problems, has been the dream of Alma Ranji's life. He has commissioned me to say to you that he offers his most cordial congratulations on his own behalf, and on behalf of the Jain community, for your having achieved the consummation of that grand idea, of convening a parliament of religions.

XVII.—ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR MINAS SCHEREZ OF LONDON.

Salutations to the new world, in the name of Armenia, the oldest country of the old world, Salutations to the American people, in the name of Armenia, which has been twice the cradle of the human race. Salutations to the parliament of religions, in the name of Armenia, where the religious feeling first blossomed in the enraptured heart of Adam. Salutations to every one of you, brothers and sisters, in the name of the Tigris and the Euphrates, which watered the Garden of Eden; in the name of the majestic Ararat, which was crowned by the ark of Noah; in the name of a church which was almost contemporary with Christ.

A pious thought animated Christopher Columbus when he directed the prow of his ship toward this land of his dreams, to convert the natives to the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. A still more pious thought animates you now, noble Americans, because you try to convert the whole of humanity to the dogma of universal toleration and fraternity. Old Armenia blesses this grand undertaking of young America and wishes her to succeed in laying, on the extinguished volcanos of religious hatred, the foundation of the temple of peace and concord.

At the beginning of our sittings allow the humble representative of the Armenian people to invoke the Divine benediction on our labors, in the very language of his fellow-countrymen: Zkorzs tserats merots oogheegh ora i mez, Der, yev zkorzs tserats merots achoghis mez.
I came here to represent a religion, the dawn of which appeared in a misty antiquity which the powerful microscope of modern research has not yet been able to discover; the depth of whose beginnings the plummet of history has not been able to sound. From time immemorial spirit has been represented by white and matter has been represented by black, and the two sister streams which join at the town from which I came, Allahabad, represent two sources of spirit and matter, according to the philosophy of my people. And when I think that here, in this City of Chicago, this vortex of physicality, this center of material civilization, you hold a parliament of religions; when I think that, in the heart of the world's fair, where abound all the excellencies of the physical world, you have provided also a hall for the feast of reason and the flow of soul, I am once more reminded of my native land.

Why? Because here, even here, I find the same two sister streams of spirit and matter, of the intellect and physicality, joining hand and hand, representing the symbolical evolution of the universe. I need hardly tell you that, in holding this parliament of religions, where all the religions of the world are to be represented, you have acted worthily of the race that is in the vanguard of civilization—a civilization, the chief characteristic of which, to my mind, is widening toleration, breadth of heart, and liberality toward all the different religions of the world. In allowing men of different shades of religious opinion and holding different views as to philosophical and metaphysical problems, to speak from the same platform—ay, even allowing me, who, I confess, am a heathen, as you call me—to speak from the same platform with them, you have acted in a manner worthy of the motherland of the society which I have come to represent to-day. The fundamental principle of that society is universal tolerance; its cardinal belief that, underneath the superficial strata, runs the living water of truth.

I have always felt that between India and America there was a closer bond of union in the times gone by, and I do
think it is probable that there may be a subtler reason for
the identity of our names than either the theory of John-
son or the mistake of Columbus can account for. It is
true that I belong to a religion which is now decrepit with
age, and that you belong to a race in the first flutter of
life, bristling with energy. And yet you cannot be sur-
prised at the sympathy between us, because you must
have observed the secret union that sometimes exists be-
tween age and childhood.

It is true that in the east we have been accustomed to
look towards something which is beyond matter. We
have been taught, for ages after ages, and centuries after
centuries, to turn our gaze inward toward realms that are
not those which are reached by the help of the physical
senses. This fact has given rise to the various schools of
philosophy that exist to-day in India, exciting the wonder
and admiration, not only of the dead East, but of the liv-
ing and rising West. We have in India, even to this day,
thousands of people who give up as trash, as nothing, all
the material comforts and luxuries of life with the hope,
with the realization, that, great as the physical body may
be, there is something greater within man, underneath
the universe, that is to be longed for and striven after.

In the west you have evolved such a stupendous energy
on the physical plane, such unparalleled vigor on the
intellectual plane, that it strikes any stranger landing on
your shores with a strange amazement. And yet I can
read, even in this atmosphere of material progress, I can
discern beneath this thickness of material luxury a secret
and mystic aspiration to something spiritual.

I can see that even you are getting tired of your steam,
of your electricity, and of the thousand different material
comforts that follow these two great powers. I can see
that there is a feeling of despondency coming even here—
that matter, pursued however vigorously, can be only to
the death of all, and it is only through the clear atmos-
phere of spirituality that you can mount up to the regions
of peace and harmony. In the west, therefore, you have
developed this material tendency. In the east we have
developed a great deal of the spiritual tendency, but even
in this west, as I travel from place to place, from New
York to Cincinnati, and from Cincinnati to Chicago, I
have observed an ever-increasing readiness of people to
assimilate spiritual ideas, regardless of the source from which they emanate. This, ladies and gentlemen, I consider a most significant sign of the future, because through this and through the mists of prejudice that still hang on the horizon will be consummated the great event of the future, the union of the east and of the west.

The East enjoys the sacred satisfaction of having given birth to all the great religions of the world, and even as the physical sun rises ever from the east, the sun of spirituality has always dawned in the east. To the west belongs the proud privilege of having advanced on the intellectual and on the moral plane, and of having supplied to the world all the various contrivances of material luxuries and of physical comfort. I look, therefore, upon a union of the east and west as a most significant event, and I look with great hope upon the day when the east and the west will be like brothers helping each other, each supplying to the other what it wants—the west supplying the vigor, the youth, the power of organization, and the east opening up its inestimable treasures of a spiritual law, which are now locked up in the treasure-boxes grown rusty with age.

And I think that this day, with the sitting of the parliament of religions, we begin the work of building up a perennial fountain from which will flow for the next century waters of life and light and of peace, slaking the thirst of the thousands of millions that are to come after us.

XIX.—ADDRESS OF SUANI VIVE KANANDA, BUDDHIST OF INDIA.

It fills my heart with joy unspeakable to rise in response to the warm and cordial welcome which you have given us. I thank you in the name of the most ancient order of monks in the world; I thank you in the name of the mother of religions, and I thank you in the name of the millions and millions of Hindoo people of all classes and sects.

My thanks, also, to some of the speakers on this platform who have told you that these men from far-off nations may well claim the honor of bearing to the different lands the idea of toleration. I am proud to belong to a religion
which has taught the world both tolerance and universal acceptance. We believe not only in universal toleration, but we accept all religions to be true. I am proud to tell you that I belong to a religion into whose sacred language, the Sanscrit, the word seclusion is untranslatable. I am proud to belong to a nation which has sheltered the persecuted and refugees of all religions and all nations of the earth. I am proud to tell you that we have gathered in our bosom the purest remnant of the Israelites, a remnant which came to southern India and took refuge with us in the very year in which their holy temple was shattered to pieces by Roman tyranny. I am proud to belong to the religion which has sheltered and is still fostering the remnant of the grand Zoroastrian nation. I will quote to you, brethren, a few lines from a hymn which I remember to have repeated from my earliest boyhood, which is every day repeated by millions of human beings: "As the different streams having their sources in different places all mingle their water in the sea, O Lord, so the different paths which men take through different tendencies, various though they appear, crooked or straight, all lead to Thee."

The present convention, which is one of the most august assemblies ever held, is in itself a vindication, a declaration to the world of the wonderful doctrine preached in Gita. "Whosoever comes to me, through whatsoever form I reach him, they are all struggling through paths that in the end always lead to me." Sectarianism, bigotry, and its horrible descendant, fanaticism, have possessed long this beautiful earth. It has filled the earth with violence, drenched it often and often with human blood, destroyed civilization, and sent whole nations to despair. Had it not been for this horrible demon human society would be far more advanced than it is now. But its time has come, and I fervently hope that the bell that tolled this morning, in honor of this convention, be the death-knell to all fanaticism, to all persecutions with the sword or the pen, and to all uncharitable feelings between persons wending their way to the same goal.
The dream that allured hardy navigators for many years was the supposed existence of a northwest passage by land. But in our day it has been found that that great northwest passage is not by sea but by water. We have discovered that the shortest way from the old world to the world of Japan and China is across Canada. So Canada feels herself now to be the link between old Europe and the older east, and the link between the three great self-governing parts of the British Empire.

How is it possible for a people so situated to be parochial? How is it possible for them not to meet in a genial way the representatives of other religions? It is very impossible, because across our broad lands millions are coming and going from east to west, mingling with us, and we are obliged to meet them as man should always meet man. Not only this, but on that great new ocean which is to be the arena of the future commerce of the world—on that our sons are showing that they intend to play an important part. Their position, as the fourth maritime nation of the world as regards ocean tonnage, shows the aptitude of our people for foreign trade, and, as sailors owning the ships they sail in, they are more likely than any others to learn the lesson that the life of the world is one, that truth is one, that all men are brothers, and that the service of humanity is the most acceptable form of religion to God.

And, therefore, we feel that we have a sort of right to join with you in this matter of extending a welcome to those from different nations, whose faiths are different, but whose spiritual natures are the same, in whom dwelleth that true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. Our place in history gives us a still more undoubted right to come here and to take our place in a friendly way beside the representatives of other religions.

Our racial, political, and religious evolution bids us do that. Our racial evolution your own Parkman has described to you in pages glowing with purple light. He has told you of the two centuries of conflict between France and Britain for the possession of this fair young
continent, and he has told you that, while outward failure was the part of the former, all the heroism and enduring successes were not with the conquerors. France gave without stint the greatest explorers, whose names are sown all over this continent thick as seeds in a field—martyrs and missionaries of deathless fame, saintly, whose works do still follow them. In Canada the seeds sprang from good soil, and we see its permanent memorial now in a noble, fresh, Canadian people, enjoying their own language, laws, and institutions under a flag that is identified with their liberties and under a constitution that they and their fathers have helped to hammer out. Their children sit side by side in our federal parliament with the children of their ancestral foes, and the only real contest between them is which shall serve Canada best. The union of the two races and languages was needed to enable England to do her imperial work. Will not the same union enable Canada to do a like work, and does it not force us to see good even in those that our ancestors thought enemies?

Our political evolution has had the same lesson for us. It has taught us to borrow ideas with equal impartiality from sources apparently opposite. We have borrowed the federal idea from you, the parliament, the cabinet, the judicial system from Britain, and, uniting both, we think we have found a constitution better than that which either the mother country or the older daughter enjoys. At any rate, we made it ourselves, and it fits us; and this very political evolution has taught us that ideas belong to no one country, that they are the common property of mankind, and so we act together, trying to borrow new ideas from every country that has found by experiment that the ideas will work well.

Our religious evolution has taught us the same thing. And so we have been enabled to accomplish a measure of religious unification greater than either the mother land or the United States. Eighteen years ago, for instance, all the Presbyterian denominations united into one church in the Dominion of Canada. Immediately thereafter all the Methodist churches took the same step, and now all the Protestant churches have appointed committees to see whether it is not possible to have a larger union, and all the young life of Canada says "Amen" to the proposal.
Now it is easy for a people with such an environment to understand that where men differ they must be in error, that truth is that which unites, that every age has its problems to solve, that it is the glory of the human mind to solve them, and that no church has a monopoly of the truth or of the spirit of the living God.

It seems to me that we should begin this parliament of religions, not with a consciousness that we are doing a great thing, but with an humble and lowly confession of sin and failure. Why have not the inhabitants of the world fallen before truth? The fault is ours. The Apostle Paul, looking back on centuries of marvelous, God-guided history, saw as the key to all its maxims this: that Jehovah had stretched out His hands all day long to a disobedient and gainsaying people; that although there was always a remnant of the righteous, Israel as a nation did not understand Jehovah, and therefore failed to understand her own marvelous mission.

If St. Paul were here to-day would he not utter the same sad confession with regard to the nineteen centuries of Christendom. Would he not have to say that we have been proud of our Christianity instead of allowing our Christianity to humble and crucify us; that we have boasted of Christianity as something we possessed instead of allowing it to possess us; that we have divorced it from the moral and spiritual order of the world instead of seeing that it is that which interpenetrates, interprets, completes, and verifies that order, and that so we have hidden its glories and obscured its power. All day long our Saviour has been saying, "I have stretched out My hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people."

But, sir, the only one indispensable condition of success is that we recognize the cause of our failure, that we confess it with humble, lowly, penitent, and obedient minds, and that with quenchless western courage and faith we now go forth and do otherwise.

XXI.—ADDRESS OF MISS JEANNE SERABJI OF BOMBAY, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PARSSEES.

Dr. Barrows just told you that I belonged to the order of Parsee. He is correct in one way and not in another.
My people were fire-worshipers, but I am not now. Before I go on further I wish to thank all those who have extended their welcome to us. This morning, as I looked around and saw the many faces that greeted a welcome I felt indeed that it was the best day I have seen in Chicago. I have been here for some time and I have asked the question over and over again: Where is religious America to be found—Christian America? To-day I see it all around me. You have given me a welcome. I will give you a greeting from my country. When we meet one another in our land the first thing we say to each other is "Peace be with you." I say it to you to-day in all sincerity, in all love. I feel to-day that the great banner over us is the banner of love. I feel to-day more than ever that it is beautiful to belong to the family of God, to acknowledge the Lord Christ.

My father, at the age of eighteen, was brought to the knowledge of Christ by the light of an English missionary. He gave up friends and countrymen, rank and wealth and money, to be a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ; and I tell you, friends, that it is a great privilege and a great honor to be able to stand here and say to you that I love that Lord Christ, and I will stand by Him and under His banner until the end of my life.

I would close with one little message from my countrywomen. When I was leaving the shores of Bombay the women of my country wanted to know where I was going, and I told them I was going to America on a visit. They asked me whether I would be at this congress. I thought then I would only come in as one of the audience, but I have the great privilege and honor given to me to stand here and speak to you, and I give you the message as it was given to me. The Christian women of my land said: "Give the women of America our love and tell them that we love Jesus, and that we shall always pray that our countrywomen may do the same. Tell the women of America that we are fast being educated. We shall one day be able to stand by them and converse with them and be able to delight in all they delight in."

And so I have a message from each one of my countrywomen, and once more I will just say that I haven't words enough in which to thank you for the welcome you have given to all those who have come here from the
east. When I came here this morning and saw my countrymen my heart was warmed, and I thought I would never feel homesick again, and I feel to-day as if I were at home. Seeing your kindly faces has turned away the heartache.

We are all under that one banner, Love. In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ I thank you. You will hear possibly the words in His own voice saying unto you, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these, My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

XXII.—ADDRESS OF B. B. NARGARKAR OF BOMBAY.

Brothers and Sisters in the Western Home:—It is a great privilege to be able to stand on this noble platform. As the president has already announced to you, I represent the theistic movement in India, known in my native country as the religion of the Brahmo Somaj. I come from the City of Bombay, the first city of the British Empire. It was only five months ago that I left my native land, and to you, the Americans, who are so much accustomed to fly, as it were, on wings of the atmosphere, it would be a hard task to imagine the difficulties and the troubles that an Oriental meets when he has to bring himself over fourteen thousand miles. The Hindus have been all along confining themselves to the narrow precincts of the Indian continent, and it is only during the last hundred years or so that we have been brought into close contact with western thought, with English civilization, and by English civilization I mean the civilization of English-speaking nations.

The Brahmo Somaj is the result, as you know, of the influence of various religions, and the fundamental principles of the theistic church in India are universal love, harmony of faiths, unity of prophets, or rather unity of prophets and harmony of faiths. The reverence that we pay the other prophets and faiths is not mere lip-loyalty, but it is the universal love for all the prophets and for all the forms and shades of truth by their own inherent merit. We try not only to learn in an intellectual way what those prophets have to teach, but to assimilate and imbibe these truths that are very near our spiritual being.
It was the grandest and noblest aspiration of the late Mr. Senn to establish such a religion in the land of India, which has been well known as the birthplace of a number of religious faiths. This is a marked characteristic of the east, and especially India, so that India and its outskirts have been glorified by the touch and teaching of the prophets of the world. It is in this way that we live in a spiritual atmosphere.

Here in the far west you have developed another phase of human life. You have studied outward nature. We in the east have studied the inner nature of man. Mr. Senn, more than twenty years ago, said: "Glory to the name of God in the name of the parliament of religions." Parliament of religions is exactly the expression that he used on that occasion in his exposition of the doctrine of the new dispensation. It simply means the Church of the Brahma Somaj, Church of India, so that what I wish to express to you is that I feel a peculiar pleasure in being present here on this occasion. It was only two years ago that I heard of the grand scheme that was to be worked out here in the midst of the country of liberty, and I took the first opportunity to put myself in communication with the worthy Dr. Barrows. For a long time I thought I would not be able to come over in the midst of you, but God has brought me safe and I stand in the midst of you. I consider it a great privilege.

In the east we have a number of systems of philosophy, a deep insight into the spiritual nature of man, but you have, at the same time, to make an earnest and deep research to choose what is accidental and what is essential in Indian philosophy. Catch hold very firmly of what is permanent of the eastern philosophy. Lay it down very strongly to heart and try to assimilate it with your noble western thoughts. You western nations represent all the material civilization. You who have gone deep into the outward world and tried to discover the forces of outward nature, you have to teach to the east the glory of man's intellect, his logical accuracy, his rational nature, and in this way it is that in the heart of the church of the new dispensation—call it by whatever name you will—you will have the harmony of the east and the west, a union between faith and reason, a wedding between the Orient and the Occident.
Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—One of your humorists, Artemus Ward, has said, "I am always happiest when I am silent," and so am I, friends. I shall not trespass on your attention more than two minutes. But there are three things which I feel that I must say. First, I must tender my most sincere thanks to you for the honor which you have done me in inviting me to come here, and also for the many words and deeds of welcome with which I have been greeted ever since I came. Secondly, I feel bound to say that there is one thing which, to me personally, casts a gloom over the brightness of the day, and that is the absence of my own archbishop. I am always bound to speak with all respect of my ecclesiastical superior, and, personally, I have the highest regard for him. He has been very kind to me; I may almost venture to call him a friend, but that makes me all the more sad that he is absent on this occasion. But, as the chairman has just told you, you must not therefore think that the Church of England, as a whole, is out of sympathy with you. One of the greatest and best men the Church of England has ever had, the late Dean of Westminster, would, if he were alive to-day, have been with us, and I believe, too, he would have succeeded in bringing with him the Archbishop of Canterbury, also many men like Arnold, of Rugby; Frederick Robinson, of Brighton; Frederick Morris, who was one of my predecessors at Kings College.

All these men would have been here, and further, I know for a fact, from my own personal experience, that a very large number of the English clergy and a still larger number of English laity are in sympathy with your congress to-day. So that in spite of the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury is away it still remains true that all the churches of the world are in sympathy with you and taking part in the congress this week.

Then the third, the last thing which I wish to state, is that I feel and shall always feel the profoundest thanks to the president, Dr. Barrows, and for all who have helped
him in bringing about this great and glorious result. Of all the studies of the present day the most serious, interesting, and important is the study of comparative religion, and I believe that this subject lesson, which it is the glory of America to have provided for the world, will do far more than any private study in the seclusion of the student's own home. The report of our proceedings, which will be telegraphed all over the world, will help men by thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands to realize the truth of those grand old Bible words that God has never left himself without a witness. It cannot be—I say it cannot be—that that new commandment was inspired when uttered by Christ and was not inspired when uttered, as it was uttered, by Confucius and by Hillel.

The fact is, all religions are fundamentally more or less true, and all religions are superficially more or less false. And I suspect that the creed of the universal religion, the religion of the future, will be summed up pretty much in the words of Tennyson, words which were quoted in that magnificent address which thrilled us this morning:

The whole world is everywhere bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

XXIV.—ADDRESS OF BISHOP BENJAMIN W. ARNETT, OF THE AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Through the partiality of the committee of arrangements, I am put in a very peculiar position this afternoon. I am to respond to the addresses of welcome on behalf of Africa. I am to represent on the one side the Africans in Africa, and on the other side the Africans in America. I am also, by the chairman, announced to give color to this vast parliament of religions. Now, I think it is very well colored myself, and, if I have any eyes, I think the color is in the majority this time anyhow.

But Africa needs a voice. Africa has been welcomed, and it is so peculiar a thing for an African to be welcomed, that I congratulate myself that I have been welcomed here to-day. In responding to the addresses of welcome I will, in the first place, respond for the Africans in Africa, and accept your welcome on behalf of the African
continent, with its millions of acres and millions of inhabitants, with its mighty forests, with its great beasts, with its great men, and its great possibilities. Though some think that Africa is in a bad way, I am one of those who have not lost faith in the possibilities of a redemption of Africa. I believe in Providence and in the prophecies of God that Ethiopia yet shall stretch forth her hand unto God, and, although to-day our land is in the possession of others, and every foot of land and every foot of water in Africa has been appropriated by the governments of Europe, yet I remember, in the light of history, that those same nations parceled out the American continent in the past.

But America had her Jefferson. Africa in the future is to bring forth a Jefferson who will write a declaration of the independence of the dark continent. And, as you had your Washington, so God will give us a Washington to lead our hosts. Or, if it please God, He may raise up, not a Washington, but another Toussaint L'Ouverture, who will become the path-finder of his country, and, with his sword, will, at the head of his people, lead them to freedom and equality. He will form a republican government whose corner-stone will be religion, morality, education, and temperance, acknowledging the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; while the ten commandments and the golden rule shall be the rule of life and conduct in the great republic of redeemed Africa.

But, sir, I accept your welcome, also, on behalf of the negroes of the American continent. As early as 1502 or 1503, we are told, the negroes came to this country. And we have been here ever since, and we are going to stay here too—some of us are. Some of us will go to Africa, because we have got the spirit of Americanism, and wherever there is a possibility in sight, some of us will go. We accept your welcome to this grand assembly, and we come to you this afternoon and thank God that we meet these representatives of the different religions of the world. We meet you on the height of this parliament of religions and the first gathering of the peoples since the time of Noah, when Shem, Ham, and Japhet met together. I greet the children of Shem, I greet the children of Japhet, and I want you to understand that Ham is here.

I thank you that I have been chosen as the representa-
tive of the negro race in this great parliament. I thank these representatives that have come so far to meet and to greet us of the colored race. A gentleman said to-day in this meeting that he had traveled 14,000 miles to get here. "Why," said I to myself, "that is a wonderful distance to come to meet me. I wonder if I would go that far to meet him." Yes, he says he came 14,000 miles to meet us here, and "us" in this case means me, too. Therefore, I welcome these brethren to the shores of America on behalf of 7,400,000 negroes on this continent, who, by the providence of God and the power of the religion of Jesus Christ, have been liberated from slavery. There is not a slave among us to-day, and we are glad you did not come while we were in chains, because, in that case, we could not have got here ourselves.

Mr. President, we thank you for this honor. God had you born just at the right time. We come last on the programme, but I want everybody to know that although last, we are not least in this grand assembly where the fatherhood and the brotherhood of man is the watchword of us all; and may the motto of the church which I represent be the motto of the coming civilization: "God our Father, Christ our Redeemer, and mankind our brother."

XXV.—ADDRESS OF C. C. BONNEY, PRESIDENT OF WORLD'S PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.

Worshippers of God and Lovers of Man:—Let us rejoice that we have lived to see this glorious day; let us give thanks to the eternal God, whose mercy endureth forever, that we are permitted to take part in the solemn and majestic event of the world's congress of religions. The importance of this event cannot be overestimated. Its influence on the future relations of the various races of men cannot be too highly esteemed.

If this congress shall faithfully execute the duties with which it has been charged it will become a joy of the whole earth and stand in human history like a new Mount Zion, crowned with glory, and marking the actual beginning of a new epoch of brotherhood and peace.

For, when the religious faiths of the world recognize
each other as brothers, children of one Father, whom all profess to love and serve, then, and not till then, will the nations of the earth yield to the spirit of concord and learn war no more.

It is inspiring to think that in every part of the world many of the worthiest of mankind, who would gladly join us here if that were in their power, this day lift their hearts to the Supreme Being in earnest prayer for the harmony and success of this congress. To them our own hearts speak in love and sympathy of this impressive and prophetic scene.

In this congress the word "religion" means the love and worship of God and the love and service of man. We believe the Scripture that "of a truth God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." We come together in mutual confidence and respect, without the least surrender or compromise of any thing which we respectively believe to be truth or duty, with the hope that mutual acquaintance and a free and sincere interchange of views on the great questions of eternal life and human conduct will be mutually beneficial.

As the finite can never fully comprehend the infinite, nor perfectly express its own view of the Divine, it necessarily follows that individual opinions of the Divine nature and attributes will differ. But, properly understood, these varieties of view are not causes of discord and strife, but rather incentives to deeper interest and examination. Necessarily God reveals himself differently to a child than to a man; to a philosopher than to one who cannot read. Each must see God with the eyes of his own soul. Each must behold Him through the colored glass of his own nature. Each one must receive Him according to his own capacity of receptions The fraternal union of the religions of the world will come when each seeks truly to know how God has revealed Himself in the other, and remembers the inexorable law that with what judgment it judges it shall itself be judged.

The religious faiths of the world have most seriously misunderstood and misjudged each other from the use of words in meanings radically different from those which they were intended to bear, and from a disregard of
the distinctions between appearances and facts; between signs and symbols, and the things signified and represented. Such errors it is hoped that this congress will do much to correct and to render hereafter impossible.

He who believes that God has revealed Himself more fully in his religion than in any other, cannot do otherwise than desire to bring that religion to the knowledge of all men, with an abiding conviction that the God who gave it will preserve, protect, and advance it in every expedient way. And hence he will welcome every just opportunity to come into fraternal relations with men of other creeds, that they may see in his upright life the evidence of the truth and beauty of his faith, and be thereby led to learn it, and be helped heavenward by it. When it pleased God to give me the idea of the world's congress of 1893, there came with that idea a profound conviction that their crowning glory should be a fraternal conference of the world's religions. Accordingly, the original announcement of the world's congress scheme, which was sent by the Government of the United States to all other nations, contained, among other great themes to be considered, "the grounds for fraternal union in the religions of different people."

At first the proposal of a world's congress of religions seemed impracticable. It was said that the religions had never met but in conflict, and that a different result could not be expected now. A committee of organization was, nevertheless, appointed to make the necessary arrangements. This committee was composed of representatives of sixteen different religious bodies. Rev. Dr. John Henry Barrows was made chairman. How zealously and efficiently he has performed the great work committed to his hands, this congress is a sufficient witness.

The preliminary address of the committee, prepared by him and sent throughout the world, elicited the most gratifying responses, and proved that the proposed congress was not only practicable but also that it was most earnestly demanded by the needs of the present age. The religious leaders of many lands, hungering and thirsting for a larger righteousness, gave the proposal their benedictions and promised the congress their active cooperation and support.
To most of the departments of the world's congress' work a single week of the exposition season was assigned. To a few of the most important a longer time, not exceeding two weeks, was given. In the beginning it was supposed that one or two weeks would suffice for the department of religion, but so great has been the interest, and so many have been the applications in this department, that the plans for it have repeatedly been rearranged, and it now extends from September 4 to October 15, and several of the religious congresses have nevertheless found it necessary to meet outside of these limits.

The programme for the religious congresses of 1893 constitutes what may, with perfect propriety, be designated as one of the most remarkable publications of the century. The programme of this general parliament of religions directly represents England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, France, Germany, Russia, Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, India, Japan, China, Ceylon, New Zealand, Brazil, Canada, and the American States, and indirectly includes many other countries. This remarkable programme presents, among other great themes to be considered in this congress, Theism, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Zoroastrianism, Catholicism, the Greek Church, Protestantism in many forms, and also refers to the nature and influence of other religious systems.

This programme also announces for presentation the great subjects of revelation, immortality, the incarnation of God, the universal elements in religion, the ethical unity of different religious systems, the relations of religion to morals, marriage, education, science, philosophy, evolution, music, labor, government, peace and war, and many other themes of absorbing interest. The distinguished leaders of human progress, by whom these great topics will be presented, constitute an unparalleled galaxy of eminent names, but we may not pause to call the illustrious roll.

For the execution of this part of the general programme seventeen days have been assigned. During substantially the same period the second part of the programme will be executed in the adjoining Hall of Washington. This will consist of what are termed presentations of their distinctive faith and achievements by the different churches.
These presentations will be made to the world, as represented in the world's religious congresses of 1893. All persons interested are cordially invited to attend.

The third part of the general programme for the congresses of this department consists of separate and independent congresses of the different religious denominations for the purpose of more fully setting forth their doctrines and the service they have rendered to mankind. These special congresses will be held, for the most part, in the smaller halls of this memorial building. A few of them have, for special reasons, already been held. It is the special object of these denominational congresses to afford opportunities for further information to all who may desire it. The leaders of these several churches most cordially desire the attendance of the representatives of other religions. The denominational congresses will each be held during the week in which the presentation of the denomination will occur.

The fourth and final part of the programme of the department of religion will consist of congresses of various kindred organizations. These congresses will be held between the close of the parliament of religions and October 15, and will include missions, ethics, Sunday rest, the Evangelical Alliance, and similar associations. The congress on evolution should, in regularity, have been held in the department of science, but circumstances prevented, and it has been given a place in this department by the courtesy of the committee of organization.

To this more than imperial feast, I bid you welcome.

We meet on the mountain height of absolute respect for the religious convictions of each other; and an earnest desire for a better knowledge of the consolations which other forms of faith than our own offer to their devotees. The very basis of our convocation is the idea that the representatives of each religion sincerely believe that it is the truest and the best of all; and that they will, therefore, hear with perfect candor and without fear the convictions of other sincere souls on the great questions of the immortal life.

Let one other point be clearly stated. While the members of this congress meet, as men, on a common ground of perfect equality, the ecclesiastical rank of each, in his own church, is, at the same time, gladly recognized and
respected, as the just acknowledgment of his services and attainments. But no attempt is here made to treat all religions as of equal merit. Any such idea is expressly disclaimed. In this congress, each system of religion stands by itself in its own perfect integrity, uncompromised, in any degree, by its relation to any other. In the language of the preliminary publication in the department of religion, we seek in this congress “to unite all religion against all irreligion; to make the golden rule the basis of this union; and to present to the world the substantial unity of many religions in the good deeds of the religious life.” Without controversy, or any attempt to pronounce judgment upon any matter of faith or worship or religious opinion we seek a better knowledge of the religious condition of all mankind, with an earnest desire to be useful to each other and to all others who love truth and righteousness.

This day the sun of a new era of religious peace and progress rises over the world, dispelling the dark clouds of sectarian strife. This day a new flower blooms in the gardens of religious thought, filling the air with its exquisite perfume. This day a new fraternity is born into the world of human progress, to aid in the upbuilding of the kingdom of God in the hearts of men. Era and flower and fraternity bear one name. It is a name which will gladden the hearts of those who worship God and love man in every clime. Those who hear its music joyfully echo it back to sun and flower.

It is the brotherhood of religions.

In this name I welcome the first parliament of the religions of the world.
CHAPTER II.

ANCIENT RELIGIONS.

I.—THE ANCIENT EGYPTIAN RELIGION.—J. A. S. GRANT (BEY) OF CAIRO, EGYPT.

Manetho, an ancient Egyptian priest and historian, writing in Greek a history of his country and people at the request of Ptolemy Philadelphus (280 B.C.) for the grand library at Alexandria, tells us that the history of Egypt, as gathered from the hieroglyphic archives in the temple libraries, was divided into a mythical period and a historical period. These periods were also subdivided into dynasties. The mythical period had four dynasties and the historical period had thirty, down to Nectanebo II., the last Pharaoh of Egyptian blood.

As the ancient Egyptian religious beliefs have their foundation in the Mythical Period, I shall confine myself to that particular division of the history, leaving out only the prehistoric dynasty that does not come within the scope of this paper.

Here, then, is Manetho's way of putting it:

**ANCIENT EGYPTIAN HISTORY.**

I.—THE MYTHICAL PERIOD.

| A kind of evolution. | 1st Dynasty—A Dynasty of Gods (Elohim in Hebrew), as rulers, probably over nature and the lower creation. |
| | 2d Dynasty—A Dynasty of Gods, as rulers over a higher creation, as Man. |
| | 3d Dynasty—A Dynasty of Demi-Gods, as rulers over Man as a race. |
| | 4th Dynasty—A Dynasty of Prehistoric Kings, as rulers over communities of men. |

We see in this profane history of Manetho transitions that he himself does not explain, but that now are made clear by the latest light thrown on the religion of the
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Ancient Egyptians. Let me then give you a running commentary on the above.

The first Dynasty, that lasted a great many Sothic Cycles, was taken up with the creation of the world under the Gods (Elohim).

The second Dynasty probably became so through some great change that took place on the creation of Man. The Gods now were ruling over while at the same time they had free intercourse with Man.

Here Manetho's division of his history might have stopped, and if so we should have had at the present day the second Dynasty of the Mythical Period still continuing, i.e., God ruling over and having a free intercourse with unfallen man; but no, it was destined otherwise.

It appears, from some cause unrecorded by Manetho, that the Gods were obliged to withdraw themselves from Man and have no further intercourse with him. Man, however, being naturally religious, was ill at ease, owing to the withdrawal of his Gods. And the Gods had pity on him, so, as he could no more raise himself to the level of the Gods, the Gods lowered themselves by partaking of his nature, and thus they came again to the earth to rule over and have friendly intercourse with Man.

This introduces us to the third Dynasty, or Dynasty of Demi-Gods. This was taught to the people thus: The sky was deified and called Nut, a Goddess, while the earth was deified and called Seb, a God. Seb and Nut now appear as husband and wife, and have a large family of sons and daughters, who are partly terrestrial and partly celestial, sharing the natures of father and mother. This is the family of Demi-Gods that introduces the third Dynasty of Manetho's Mythical Period. The names of the more prominent among them are Osiris (male), Isis (female), Set (male), Nephthys (female).

This part of the myth has been put into verse by a Scottish bard, thus:

"A new relationship, yet old,
In ancient story hath been told;
The Sky's descent to meet the Earth,
And shower its blessings on each hearth.
Its azure hue beams on its face,
While o'er the earth in close embrace
It bends and holds with loving clasp
The rounded globe within its grasp."
Could we discern these movements made
As zephyrs waft o'er hill and glade
The loving whispers sent from heaven,
Of peace on earth, of sins forgiven,
We might not think the Egyptians wrong
Who led the Sky in nuptial song
The Earth to wed; and thus began
A race, at once both God and Man
(The offspring of this union fair),
On earth to dwell, for Man to care."

In this family of demi-gods Osiris took the lead and ruled. He married his sister Isis, but we do not read of their having any children during their married life. Osiris was the personification of everything good. He and his brothers and sisters had their seat of government at Abydos in Upper Egypt; but Osiris was always going on journeys to do his people good, and more especially to teach them agriculture. They were a happy family and lived in paradise—peace and concord—until undue ambition on the part of Set made him conspire against his brother Osiris and kill him. Set now becomes the personification of Satan, or the Evil One, and usurps the place of Osiris. This is a parallel of the apocalyptic rebellion in heaven and the rule of Satan on the earth. Isis was in great distress and wept over the dead body of her husband, and while thus engaged she became miraculously pregnant and in due time gave birth to Horus, who was destined to wage war against Set and to overcome him. Being Demi-Gods, however, neither the one nor the other could be annihilated; so Seb came and arbitrated between them, and decided that they both should have place and power. This was by way of explaining the continuance of good and evil on the earth. Although Osiris was killed in as far as his earthly body was concerned, yet he appears in the nether world as judge of the dead, and Horus, his son, is represented in the world of spirits introducing the justified ones to his father. Here Osiris takes the place of the Christian Messiah, and is offered up as a sacrifice for sin.

The Osirian myth was also allegorically explained by a solar myth. Osiris, after his death, became "the sun of the night" and appeared no more upon the earth in his own person, but in that of his son Horus, who was the "sun at sunrise," as the dispeller of darkness—to bring
light and life to the whole world and to destroy the power of Set. Osiris, after his death, was Ra, the sun of the day. Isis, the wife of Osiris, was the moon Goddess, and all the Pharaohs were deified and looked upon as the personification of Ra upon the earth, (here we have the origin of the divine right of kings).

The belief in the death of Osiris on account of sin was the only atoning sacrifice in the Egyptian religion. All the other sacrifices were sacrifices of thanksgiving, in which they offered to the Gods flowers, fruits, meat, and drink; for they thought the Gods had need of such things, as the Egyptians believed spiritual beings lived on the spiritual essences of material things.

Besides these beliefs, the ancient Egyptians had a moral code in which not one of the Christian virtues is forgotten—piety, charity, sobriety, gentleness, self-command in word and action, chastity, the protection of the weak, benevolence toward the needy, deference to superiors, respect for property—in its minutest details, etc.

Osiris, Isis and Horus, i.e., father, mother, and son, were worshiped universally as a triad; and Isis so frequently represented with Horus as a suckling child on her knee, gave origin to the combination of the Madonna and infant on her knee in the Christian religion.

This worship of the Madonna was a cunning device to gain over the pagans to Christianity, who saw in her their Isis or Ashtoreth, as the case might be. [The Ptolemies about four centuries before this, adopted similar trick to unite the Egyptians and Greeks in their cultus, and when Egypt came under the sway of the Romans they adopted the tactics of the Greeks.]

Again, the Ancient Egyptians believed that the living human body consisted of three parts: (1) Sahoo, the fleshy, substantial body—the mummified body. (2) Ka, the double. It was the exact counterpart of the substantial body, only it was spiritual and could not be seen. It was an intelligence that permeated all through the body and guided its different physical functions, such as digestion, etc. It corresponded to what we call "the physical life." (3) Ba. The Ba corresponds to our soul, or, rather, spirit; that part of our nature which fits us for union with God.

When the Sahoo died the Ka and the Ba continued to
live, but separated from each other. The Ba, after the death of the body, took flight from this earth to go to the judgment hall of Osiris in Amenta, there to be judged as to the deeds done in the body, whether they had been good or bad. The justified soul was admitted into the presence of Osiris, and made daily progress in the celestial life, as represented by different heavenly mansions, which the soul entered by successive gates, if it could pronounce the special prayers necessary for opening these gates.

There were still obstacles in the path, but these were easily overcome by the soul assuming the form of the Deity. And, in fact, the justified soul is always called "the Osiris," or Pa-aa, the great one, i.e., it became assimilated to the great and good God. The Ba was generally represented as a hawk with a human head (the hawk was the emblem of Horus), as if the seat of the soul was in the head, which was furnished with the hawk's body, whereby it was able to fly away from the earth to be with Horus.

The Ka, which means double, was represented by two human arms elevated at right angles at the elbows. This was to indicate that the spiritual body was exactly the same in every way as the natural body, just as one arm is like the other, only it could not be seen.

The Ka was not furnished with wings, so that it could not leave the earth, but continued to live where it used to live before it was disembodied and more particularly in the tomb, where it could rest in the mummy (it was for this very purpose that the Egyptians preserved the dead body), or in the portrait statues placed for it in the ante-chamber of the tomb. The Egyptians believed that the Ka could rest also in portrait statues. This must have been a great consolation to the friends of those whose bodies had been lost at sea or in any other way that prevented their being embalmed and preserved. The Ka continued to have hunger and thirst, to be subject to fatigue, etc., just as when in the body, and it had to live on the spiritual essence of the offerings brought to it. It could die of hunger, etc., but this meant annihilation for the Ka.

There is some indication of the future union of the Ka and the Ba, for we occasionally find the Ba visiting the mummy in the tomb where the Ka dwells, and again we
have a divinity called the Neheb-Kaoo, which simply means the joiner of Kas (probably to Bas). This may come out more clearly after further research.

There were two grades of punishment for the condemned Ba. The more guilty Ba was condemned to frightful sufferings and tortures and devouring fire till it succumbed and was ultimately annihilated; the less guilty Ba was put into some unclean animal and sent back to the earth for a second probation.

After the dead body was embalmed it was a common custom with the Egyptians, for the relatives of the deceased to keep the mummy for even a lengthened period in the house and the place apportioned to it was the dining-hall, where it served as a constant reminder of death. And at their great public feasts a mummified image of Osiris was handed round among the guests, not only to remind them of death, but to indicate that the contemplation of the death of Osiris would benefit them in the midst of their feasting and hilarity.

While Osiris and Horus are represented as father and son, they are yet really one and the same. Osiris was "the sun of the night," while Horus was "the sun of the day." This symbolism simply taught different phases of the same deity: for the sun remains the same sun after sunset, as it was before sunset, and all the Egyptians must have known this. You may get people even now-days to believe in the coat of Treves, the Veronica, the liquefying of St. Januarius' blood, and a thousand other cunningly devised fables that do not lead to higher beliefs, but rather detract from such beliefs when they exist. The ancient Egyptians, however, although accused of animal worship, saw in these animals attributes of their one nameless God, and originally their apparent adoration of an animal was in reality adoration of their God for one or other of his beneficent attributes; and the result was elevating, as the history of the early dynasties proves.

Bunsen says that the animals in the animal worship of Egypt were at first mere symbols, but became, by the inherent curse of idolatry real objects of worship. Maspero believes that the religion of the Egyptians, at first pure and spiritual, became grossly material in its later developments, and that the old faith degenerated.

To clothe or symbolize a spiritual truth is evidently a
very dangerous proceeding, as we learn from past history. The ancient Egyptians figured the attributes of their one God, and in due time each of these figures was worshiped as a separate deity. This constituted idolatry, which led to the degradation of the Egyptians and disintegration of their power. The Elohim of the Hebrews was exactly the same as the Gods of the Egyptians, i.e., a unity in plurality and *vice versa*, one God with many attributes.

The one God of the Egyptians was nameless, but the combination of all the other good divinities made up his attributes, which were simply powers of nature. Renouf says, that in the Egyptian, as in almost all known religions, a power behind all the powers of nature was recognized and was frequently mentioned in the texts. But to this power no temple was ever raised. "He was never graven in stone. His shrine was never found with painted figures. He had neither ministrants nor offerings."

The Jehovah of the Hebrews would correspond to the Egyptian Osiris. Jehovah is more particularly the divine ruler of the Hebrews, while Osiris was the divine ruler more particularly over Egypt and the Egyptians, having his seat of government in Egypt. These two names were held so sacred that they were never pronounced, and in the ancient Egyptian religion this superstition was carried to such an extent that sculptor and scribe always spelled the name Osiris backwards; i.e., instead of "As-ari," made it "Ari-as."

We don't know, I believe, how Jehovah should be spelled or pronounced, and therefore we do not know its etymology; but some scholars trace it through the Phoenician, to an appellation for the sun. Now Osiris was a solar deity, and his name "As-ari" means "the enthroned eye," no doubt to indicate that he is the all-seeing one, just as the sun in the heavens throws light on everything and rules the seasons for the benefit of man.

Jehovah-Elohim in the Hebrew religion would be Osiris-Ra in the Egyptian mythology. Elohim created the heavens and the earth, in the Hebrew religion, while Ra, in Egyptian mythology, received materials from Phthah to create the world with. Ra was the creative principle of Phthah. Phthah was the originator of all things, but he worked visibly through Ra, just as, in the case of the
Christian religion, God created all things through Jesus Christ.

"The search for knowledge is only good when it is the seeking for truth, and truth valuable only when it leads to duty, right, and God. Sleepless vigilance is the price of liberty. What man knows of God is from Christ, who was able to reveal the one to the other, because He partook of the nature of each. Christ's doctrine of a Godhead is that of One whose unity is not the unity of a monad, but of an organism. That God could be God in the attributes which our modern consciousness ascribes to him, i.e., that He could be ethical, social, and paternal, involves the necessity of his nature containing subject and object, both of knowledge and feeling; in other words, of a subdivision of his essence into what we may speak of as persons."

Summary: In the ancient Egyptian religion, therefore, we have clearly depicted to us an unnamed almighty Deity who is uncreated and self-existent. He is at first represented by a battle-ax, and afterward by a dwarfish, embryonic-looking human figure, and as such He supplied materials (protoplasm) to Ra, the sun-god, to create the world with. God dwelt with man till man rebelled against Him. A god-man (Osiris), had to come to the earth to deliver and do good to man. He, however, was sacrificed, having been killed by the Evil Principle, but only in as far as his human body was concerned, for He afterward appeared in the next world as the judge of the dead, and his son, Horus, who came from his father's dead body, manifested himself on the earth as the sun at sunrise to dispel darkness and destroy the works of the Wicked One.

The ancient Egyptian hope, both for time and for eternity, was founded on faith in the Osirian myth and conformity to the code of morals laid down in the religious books. After death the condemned soul, according to the enormity of its guilt, was allowed a second probation or had such punishment inflicted as ultimately to end in annihilation; the justified soul was assimilated into Osiris, dwelt in his presence, and obeyed his commands, being helped by angelic servants (ushabti) in carrying on the mystic husbandry. The justified soul had to take part in the daily celestial work, and had daily to acquire more
knowledge and wisdom to help it in its progress through the mansions of the blest.

The illustrations for this paper graphically explain the influence the ancient Egyptian religion exerted over the religions that came in contact with it, more particularly by way of grafting a great deal of its symbolism on those religions; and many of our Biblical expressions are word for word the same as we find in the Egyptian mythological texts.

The evolution of the emblem now used to represent the Christian cross had its origin in ancient Egyptian symbols. The fore and middle fingers were used as a talisman by the ancient Egyptians to avert the evil eye. It was grafted on to the Christian religion as the symbol for conferring a divine blessing. The winged disk of the sun that overshadowed the gateways of the Egyptian temples and that represented the overruling Providence, was called by the Greeks the Agathodemon, and the Messiah is referred to in the Bible as the sun of righteousness, rising with healing in his wings.

Besides these similarities in symbolism between the Egyptian mythology and other religions, mention might also be made of the sameness in plan of an Egyptian temple and the tabernacle of the Israelites and temple of Solomon. There is also a singular similarity between the cherubim and the winged Isis, and Nephthys protecting Horus. The ostrich egg that one meets with so frequently suspended in Oriental places of worship, had its origin in the mundane egg that Ra, the sun-god, created, and out of which the world came when it was hatched.

The Pharaoh (who was always deified), like the Jewish high-priest, was the only one admitted into the Holy of Holies (Adytum), there to appear before the symbol of Deity to present the oblations of his people; for, be it remembered, no one could offer an oblation to the Deity but through the deified king. The temple processions and carrying of shrines, with symbols of gods in them, formed a conspicuous part of the ancient Egyptian ritual. Before the Pharaoh entered upon a warlike campaign, the image that symbolized the warlike attribute of the Deity was carried in a shrine at the head of a grand procession of priests and adherents of the temple, and the people bowed the head as it passed and sent up a prayer for a
blessing on the campaign. The "immaculate conception" was accepted by the ancient Egyptians without a dissenting voice; for Isis was a goddess, and, therefore immaculate, and her conception of Horus was miraculous.

Many of the Mohammedan social and religious customs are decidedly ancient Egyptian in their origin. This can easily be accounted for from the fact that the prophet Mohammed had a Coptic (descended from the ancient Egyptian) scribe (the prophet himself was illiterate, for he could neither read nor write) as well as a Coptic wife, who must have exerted some influence over him; but, apart from this, we must not forget that, after the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt, a large proportion of the half-Christianized Egyptians were compelled nolens volens to become Moslems, and, as there was no change of heart, they still clung to as many of their religious customs and superstitious beliefs as they dared to, and in this respect the Mohammedan faith is very elastic.

Much more might have been written on this subject, and by a more competent hand than mine, but sufficient, I hope, has been brought to light to show the importance of a careful study of the dead religions that probably had a revelation from God as their basis, for we believe that God never left himself without a witness.

II.—THE GREEK PHILOSOPHY AND THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION,
BY PROFESSOR MAX MULLER OF OXFORD UNIVERSITY.
(READ BY DR. BARROWS.)

Easter Sunday, April 2, 1893. Dear Sir:—What I have aimed at in my Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion is to show that all religions are natural, and you will see from my last volume on Theosophy or Psychological Religion that what I hope for is not simply a reform, but a complete revival of religion, more particularly of the Christian religion. You will hardly have time to read the whole of any volume before the opening of your Religious Congress at Chicago, but you can easily see the drift of it. I had often asked myself the question how independent thinkers and honest men, like St. Clement and Origen, came to embrace Christianity, and to elaborate the first system of Christian Theology. There was noth-
ing to induce them to accept Christianity or to cling to it if they had found it in any way irreconcilable with their philosophical convictions. They were philosophers first, Christians afterward. They had nothing to gain and much to lose by joining and remaining in this new sect of Christians. We may safely conclude, therefore, that they found their own philosophical convictions, the final outcome of the long preceding development of philosophical thought in Greece, perfectly compatible with the religious and moral doctrines of Christianity as conceived by themselves.

Now, what was the highest result of Greek philosophy as it reached Alexandria, whether in its Stoic or Neo-Platonic garb? It was the ineradicable conviction that there is reason or logos in the world. When asked whence that reason, as seen by the eye of science in the phenomenal world, they said: “From the cause of all things which is beyond all names and comprehension, except so far as it is manifested or revealed in the phenomenal world.”

What we call the different types, or ideas, or logoi in the world are the logoi or thoughts or wills of that being whom human language has called God. These thoughts, which embrace everything that is, existed at first as thoughts, as a thought-world, before, by will and force, they could become what we see them to be, the types or species realized in the visible world. So far all is clear and incontrovertible, and a sharp line is drawn between this philosophy and others, likewise powerfully represented in the previous history of Greek philosophy, which denied the existence of that eternal reason, denied that the world was thought and willed, as even the Klamaths, a tribe of red Indians, professed, and ascribed the world, as we see it as men of science, to purely mechanical causes, to what we now call uncreate protoplasm, assuming various casual forms by means of natural selection, influence of environment, survival of the fittest, and all the rest.

The critical step which some of the philosophers of Alexandria took, while others refused to take it, was to recognize the perfect realization of the divine thought or logos of manhood in Christ, as in the true sense the son of God; not in the vulgar, mythological sense, but
in the deep metaphysical meaning which had long been possessed in the Greek philosophy. Those who declined to take that step, such as Celsus and his friends, did so, either because they denied the possibility of any divine thought ever becoming fully realized in the flesh or in the phenomenal world, or because they could not bring themselves to recognize that realization in Jesus of Nazareth. Clement's conviction that the phenomenal world was a realization of the divine reason was based on purely philosophical ground, while his conviction that the ideal or the divine conception of manhood had been fully realized in Christ and in Christ only, dying on the cross for the truth as revealed to Him and by Him, could have been based on historical grounds only.

Everything else followed. Christian morality was really in complete harmony with the morality of the stoic school of philosophy, though it gave to it a new life and a higher purpose. But the whole world assumed a new aspect. It was seen to be supported and pervaded by reason or logos, it was throughout teleological, thought and willed by a rational power. The same divine presence had now been perceived for the first time in all its fullness and perfection in the one Son of God, the pattern of the whole race of men, henceforth to be called "the sons of God."

This was the ground-work of the earliest Christian theology, as presupposed by the author of the fourth gospel, and likewise by many passages in the Synoptical gospels, though fully elaborated for the first time by such men as St. Clement and Origen. If we want to be true and honest Christians, we must go back to those earliest ante-Nicene authorities, the true fathers of the Church. Thus only can we use the words: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word became flesh," not as thoughtless repeaters, but as honest thinkers and believers. In the first sentence, "In the beginning was the Word," requires thought, and thought only; the second, "and the logos became flesh," requires faith—faith such as those who knew Jesus had in Jesus, and which we may accept, unless we have any reasons for doubting their testimony.

There is nothing new in all this, it is only the earliest Christian theology restated, restored, and revised. It gives us at the same time a truer conception of the history
of the whole world, showing that there was a purpose in
the ancient religions and philosophies of the world, and
that Christianity was really from the beginning a syn-
thesis of the best thoughts of the past, as they had been
slowly elaborated by the two principal representatives of
the human race, the Aryan and the Semitic.
On this ancient foundation which was strangely neg-
lected, if not purposely rejected at the time of the reform-
ation, a true revival of the Christian religion and a reunion
of all its divisions may become possible, and I have no
doubt that your congress of the religions of the world
might do excellent work for the resuscitation of pure and
primitive ante-Nicene Christianity.

Yours very truly,

F. Max Muller.
CHAPTER III.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I.—THE NEEDS OF HUMANITY SUPPLIED BY THE CATHOLIC RELIGION—BY CARDINAL GIBBONS—(READ BY BISHOP KEANE.)

We live and move and have our being in the midst of a civilization which is the legitimate offspring of the Catholic religion. The blessings resulting from our Christian civilization are poured out so regularly and so abundantly on the intellectual, moral, and social world, like the sunlight and the air of heaven and the fruits of the earth, that they have ceased to excite any surprise except to those who visit lands where the religion of Christ is little known. In order to realize adequately our favored situation we should transport ourselves in spirit to ante-Christian times and contrast the condition of the pagan world with our own.

Before the advent of Christ the whole world, with the exception of the secluded Roman province of Palestine, was buried in idolatry. Every striking object in nature had its tutelary divinities. Men worshiped the sun and moon and stars of heaven. They worshiped their very passions. They worshiped everything except God, to whom alone divine homage is due. In the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles: "They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the corruptible man, and of birds and beasts and creeping things. They worshiped and served the creature rather than the creator, who is blessed forever."

But at last the great Light for which the prophets of Israel had sighed and prayed, and toward which even the pagan sages had stretched forth their hands with eager longing, arose and shone unto them "that sat in darkness and the shadow of death." The truth concerning our
Creator, which had hitherto been hidden in Judea that there it might be sheltered from the world-wide idolatry, was now proclaimed, and in far greater clearness and fullness, unto the whole world. Jesus Christ taught all mankind to know the one true God—a God existing from eternity to eternity, a God who created all things by His power, who governs all things by His wisdom, and whose superintending Providence watches over the affairs of nations as well as of men, "without whom not even a bird falls to the ground." He proclaimed a God infinitely holy, just, and merciful. This idea of the deity so consonant to our rational conceptions was in striking contrast with the low and sensual notions which the pagan world had formed of its divinities.

The religion of Christ imparts to us not only a sublime conception of God, but also a rational idea of man and of his relations to his Creator. Before the coming of Christ man was a riddle and a mystery to himself. He knew not whence he came nor whither he was going. He was groping in the dark. All he knew for certain was that he was passing through a brief phase of existence. The past and the future were enveloped in a mist which the light of philosophy was unable to penetrate. Our Redeemer has dispelled the cloud and enlightened us regarding our origin and destiny and the means of attaining it. He has rescued man from the frightful labyrinth of error in which paganism had involved him.

The Gospel of Christ, as propounded by the Catholic Church, has brought not only light to the intellect, but comfort also to the heart. It has given us "that peace of God which surpasseth all understanding"—the peace which springs from the conscious possession of truth. It has taught us how to enjoy that triple peace which constitutes true happiness as far as it is attainable in this life—peace with God by the observance of His commandments; peace with our neighbor by the exercise of charity and justice toward him, and peace with ourselves by repressing our inordinate appetites and keeping our passions subject to the law of reason, and our reason illumined and controlled by the law of God.

All other religious systems prior to the advent of Christ were national like Judaism, or state religions like Paganism. The Catholic religion alone is world-wide and
cosmopolitan, embracing all races and nations and peoples and tongues.

Christ alone of all religious founders had the courage to say to His disciples: "Go, teach all nations." "Preach the Gospel to every creature." "You shall be witness to Me in Judea and Samaria and even to the uttermost bounds of the earth." Be not restrained in your mission by national or state lines. Let My gospel be as free and universal as the air of heaven. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." All mankind are the children of My Father and My brethren. I have died for all, and embrace all in My charity. Let the whole human race be your audience and the world be the theater of your labors.

It is this recognition of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of Christ that has inspired the Catholic Church in her mission of love and benevolence. This is the secret of her all-pervading charity. This idea has been her impelling motive in her work of the social regeneration of mankind. I behold, she says, in every human creature a child of God and a brother and sister of Christ, and, therefore, I will protect helpless infancy and decrepit old age. I will feed the orphan and nurse the sick. I will strike the shackles from the feet of the slave, and will rescue degraded woman from the moral bondage and degradation to which her own frailty and the passions of the stronger sex had consigned her.

Montesquieu has well said that the religion of Christ, which was instituted to lead men to eternal life, has contributed more than any other institution to promote the temporal and social happiness of mankind. The object of this parliament of religions is to present to thoughtful, earnest, and inquiring minds the respective claims of the various religions, with the view that they would "prove all things, and hold that which is good," by embracing that religion which, above all others, commends itself to their judgment and conscience. I am not engaged in this search for the truth, for, by the grace of God, I am conscious that I have found it, and, instead of hiding this treasure in my own breast, I long to share it with others, especially as I am none the poorer in making others the richer.

But, for my part, were I occupied in this investigation,
much as I would be drawn toward the Catholic Church by her admirable unity of faith which binds together 250,000,000 of souls; much as I would be attracted toward her by her sublime moral code, by her world-wide catholicity, and by that unbroken chain of apostolic succession which connects her indissolubly with apostolic times, I would be drawn still more forcibly toward her by that wonderful system of organized benevolence which she has established for the alleviation and comfort of suffering humanity.

Let us briefly review what the Catholic Church has done for the elevation and betterment of society.

1. The Catholic Church has purified society in its very fountain, which is the marriage bond. She has invariably proclaimed the unity and sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage tie by saying with her founder, "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." Wives and mothers, never forget that the inviolability of the marriage contract is the palladium of your womanly dignity and of your Christian liberty. And if you are no longer the slaves of man and the toy of his caprice, like the wives of Asiatic countries, but the peers and partners of your husbands; if you are no longer tenants at will, like the wives of pagan Greece and Rome, but the mistresses of your household; if you are no longer confronted by usurping rivals, like Mohammedan and Mormon wives, but the queens of the domestic kingdom, you are indebted for this priceless boon to the ancient Church, and particularly to the Roman pontiffs, who inflexibly upheld the sacredness of the nuptial bond against the arbitrary power of kings, the lust of nobles, and the lax and pernicious legislation of civil governments.

2. The Catholic religion has proclaimed the sanctity of human life as soon as the body is animated by the vital spark. Infanticide was a dark stain on pagan civilization. It was universal in Greece, with the possible exception of Thebes. It was sanctioned and even sometimes enjoined by such eminent Greeks as Plato and Aristotle, Solon and Lycurgus. The destruction of infants was also very common among the Romans. Nor was there any legal check to this inhuman crime, except at rare intervals. The father had the power of life and death over his child. And as an evidence that human
nature does not improve with time, and is everywhere the same, unless permeated with the leaven of Christianity, the wanton sacrifice of infant life is probably as general today in China and other heathen countries as it was in ancient Greece and Rome. The Catholic Church has sternly set her face against this exposure and murder of innocent babes. She has denounced it as a crime more revolting than that of Herod, because committed against one's own flesh and blood. She has condemned with equal energy the atrocious doctrine of Malthus, who suggested unnatural methods for diminishing the population of the human family. Were I not restrained by the fear of offending modesty, and of imparting knowledge where "ignorance is bliss," I would dwell more at length on the social plague of ante-natal infanticide, which is insidiously and systematically spreading among us in defiance of civil penalties and of the divine law which says, "Thou shalt not kill."

3. There is no phase of human misery for which the church does not provide some remedy or alleviation. She has established infant asylums for the shelter of helpless babes, who have been cruelly abandoned by their own parents or bereft of them in the mysterious dispensations of Providence before they could know or feel a mother's love. These little waifs, like the infant Moses drifting in the turbid Nile, are rescued from an untimely death and are tenderly raised by the daughters of the Great King, those consecrated virgins who become nursing mothers to them. And I have known more than one such motherless babe who, like Israel's law-giver, in after years became a leader among his people.

4. As the church provides homes for those yet on the threshold of life so, too, does she secure retreats for those on the threshold of death. She has asylums in which the aged, men and women, find at one and the same time a refuge in their old age from the storms of life, and a novitiate to prepare them for eternity. Thus, from the cradle to the grave, she is a nursing mother. She rocks her children in the cradle of infancy and she soothes them to rest on the couch of death.

Louis XIV. erected in Paris the famous Hotel des Invalides for the veteran soldiers of France who had fought in the service of their country. And so has the Catholic
religion provided for those who have been disabled in the battle of life a home in which they are tenderly nursed in their declining years by devoted sisters.

The Little Sisters of the Poor, whose congregation was founded in 1840, have now charge of 250 establishments in different parts of the globe, the aged inmates of those houses numbering 30,000; upward of 70,000 having died under their care up to 1889. To the asylums are welcome, not only the members of the Catholic religion, but those also of every form of Christian faith, and even those without any faith at all. The Sisters make no distinction of persons or nationality or color or creed, for true Christianity embraces all. The only questions proposed by the Sisters to the applicant for shelter is this: Are you oppressed by age and penury? If so, come to us and we will provide for you.

5. She has orphan asylums where children of both sexes are reared and taught to become useful and worthy members of society.

6. Hospitals were unknown to the pagan world before the coming of Christ. The copious vocabularies of Greece and Rome had no word even to express that term.

The Catholic Church has hospitals for the treatment and cure of every form of disease. She sends her daughters of charity and of mercy to the battlefield and to the plague-stricken city. During the Crimean war I remember to have read of a sister who was struck dead by a ball while she was in the act of stooping down and bandaging the wound of a fallen soldier. Much praise was then deservedly bestowed on Florence Nightingale for her devotion to the sick and wounded soldiers. Her name resounded in both hemispheres. But in every sister you have a Florence Nightingale, with this difference—that, like ministering angels, they move without noise along the path of duty; and, like the angel Raphael, who concealed his name from Tobias, the sister hides her name from the world.

Several years ago I accompanied to New Orleans eight Sisters of Charity, who were sent from Baltimore to reinforce the ranks of their heroic companions or to supply the places of their devoted associates who had fallen at the post of duty in the fever-stricken cities of the south. Their departure for the scene of their labors was neither
announced by the press nor heralded by public applause. They rushed calmly into the jaws of death, not bent on deeds of destruction like the famous 600, but on deeds of mercy. They had no Tennyson to sound their praises. Their only ambition was—and how lofty is that ambition,—that the recording angel might be their biographer; that their names might be inscribed in the Book of Life, and that they might receive their recompense from Him who has said: “I was sick and ye visited Me, for as often as ye did it to one of the least of My brethren ye did it to Me.” Within a few months after their arrival six of the eight sisters died, victims of the epidemic.

These are a few of the many instances of heroic charity that have fallen under my own observation. Here are examples of sublime heroism not culled from the musty pages of ancient martyrologies or books of chivalry, but happening in our own day and under our own eyes. Here is a heroism not aroused by the emulation of brave comrades on the battlefield, or by the clash of arms or for the strains of martial hymns, or by the love of earthly fame, but inspired only by a sense of Christian duty and by the love of God and her fellow-beings.

7. The Catholic religion labors not only to assuage the physical distempers of humanity, but also to reclaim the victims of moral disease. The redemption of fallen women from a life of infamy was never included in the scope of heathen philanthropy; and man’s unregenerate nature is the same now as before the birth of Christ.

He worships woman as long as she has charms to fascinate, but she is spurned and trampled upon as soon as she has ceased to please. It was reserved for Him who knew no sin to throw the mantle of protection over sinning woman. There is no page in the Gospel more touching than that which records our Saviour’s merciful judgment on the adulterous woman. The Scribes and Pharisees, who had perhaps participated in her guilt, asked our Lord to pronounce sentence of death upon her in accordance with the Mosaic law. “Hath no one condemned thee?” asked our Saviour. “No one, Lord,” she answered. “Then,” said He, “neither will I condemn thee. Go, sin no more.”

Inspired by this divine example, the Catholic Church shelters erring females in homes not inappropriately called
Magdalena Asylums and Houses of the Good Shepherd. Not to speak of other institutions established for the moral reformation of women, the congregation of the Good Shepherd at Angers, founded in 1836, has charge to-day of 150 houses, in which upward of 4,000 sisters devote themselves to the care of over 20,000 females who had yielded to temptation or were rescued from impending danger.

8. The Christian religion has been the unvarying friend and advocate of the bondman. Before the dawn of Christianity, slavery was universal in civilized as well as in barbarous nations. The apostles were everywhere confronted by the children of oppression. Their first task was to mitigate the horrors and alleviate the miseries of human bondage. They cheered the slave by holding up to him the example of Christ, who voluntarily became a slave that we might enjoy the glorious liberty of children of God. The bondman had an equal participation with his master in the sacraments of the church and in the priceless consolation which religion affords.

Slave-owners were admonished to be kind and humane to their slaves by being reminded with apostolic freedom that they and their servants had the same Master in heaven, who had no respect of persons. The ministers of the Catholic religion down the ages sought to lighten the burden and improve the condition of the slave as far as social prejudices would permit, till at length the chains fell from their feet.

Human slavery has, at last, thank God, melted away before the noonday sun of the gospel. No Christian country contains to-day a solitary slave. To paraphrase the words of a distinguished Irish jurist, as soon as the bondman puts his foot in a Christian land he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled on the sacred soil of Christendom.

9. The Saviour of mankind never conferred a greater temporal boon on mankind than by ennobling and sanctifying manual labor, and by rescuing it from the stigma of degradation which had been branded upon it. Before Christ appeared among men, manual, and even mechanical work was regarded as servile and degrading to the freeman of pagan Rome, and was consequently relegated to slaves. Christ is ushered into the world, not amid the pomp and splendor of imperial majesty, but amid the en-
virobenents of an humble child of toil. He is the reputed son of an artisan, and his early manhood is spent in a mechanic's shop. "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" The primeval curse attached to labor is obliterated by the toilsome life of Jesus Christ. Ever since He pursued His trade as a carpenter He has lightened the mechanic's tools and has shed a halo around the workshop.

If the profession of a General, a Jurist, and a Statesman is adorned by the example of a Washington, a Taney, and a Burke, how much more is the calling of a workman ennobled by the example of Christ. What De Tocqueville said sixty years ago of the United States is true to-day—that with us every honest labor is laudable, thanks to the example and teaching of Jesus Christ.

To sum up: The Catholic Church has taught man the knowledge of God and of himself, she has brought comfort to his heart, by instructing him to bear the ills of life with Christian philosophy, she has sanctified the marriage bond, she has proclaimed the sanctity and inviolability of human life from the moment that the body is animated by the spark of life till it is extinguished, she has founded asylums for the training of children of both sexes and for the support of the aged poor, she has established hospitals for the sick and homes for the redemption of fallen women, she has exerted her influence toward the mitigation and abolition of human slavery, she has been the unwavering friend of the sons of toil. These are some of the blessings which the Catholic Church has conferred on society.

I will not deny, on the contrary I am happy to avow, that the various Christian bodies outside the Catholic Church have been, and are to-day, zealous promoters of most of these works of Christian benevolence which I have enumerated. Not to speak of the innumerable humanitarian houses established by our non-Catholic brethren throughout the land, I bear cheerful testimony to the philanthropic institutions founded by Wilson and Shepherd, by John Hopkins, Enoch Pratt, and George Peabody in the city of Baltimore. But will not our separated brethren have the candor to acknowledge that we had first possession of the field, that these beneficent movements have been inaugurated by us, and that the other
Christian communities, in their noble efforts for the moral and social regeneration of mankind, have, in no small measure, been stimulated by the example and emulation of the ancient church?

Let us do all we can in our day and generation in the cause of humanity. Every man has a mission from God to help his fellow-being. Though we differ in faith, thank God, there is one platform on which we stand united, and that is the platform of charity and benevolence. We cannot indeed, like our Divine Master, give sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb, and strength to the paralyzed limb; but we can work miracles of grace and mercy by relieving the distress of our suffering brethren. And never do we approach nearer to our Heavenly Father than when we alleviate the sorrows of others. Never do we perform an act more godlike than when we bring sunshine to hearts that are dark and desolate. Never are we more like to God than when we cause the flowers of joy and gladness to bloom in souls that were dry and barren before. "Religion," says the apostle, "pure and undefiled before God and the Father, is this: to visit the fatherless and the widow in their tribulation, and to keep oneself unspotted from this world." Or, to borrow the words of the pagan Cicero: "Hominem ad Deos nulla re propius accedunt quam salutem hominibus dando." "There is no way by which man can approach nearer to the gods than by contributing to the welfare of his fellow-creatures."

II.—THE INCARNATION IDEA IN HISTORY AND IN JESUS CHRIST,
BY RT. REV. JOHN J. KEANE, D.D., OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

The subject assigned to me is so vast that an hour would not suffice to do it justice. Hence, in the space of thirty minutes, I can only point out certain lines of thought, trusting, however, that their truth will be so manifest and their significance so evident that the conclusion to which they lead may be clearly recognized as a demonstrated fact.

Cicero has truly said that there never was a race of atheists. Cesare Balbo has noted with equal truth that there never has been a race of deists. Individual atheists and
individual deists there have always been, but they have always been recognized as abnormal beings. Humanity listens to them, weighs their utterances in the scales of reason, smiles sadly at their vagaries, and holds fast the twofold conviction that there is a Supreme Being, the Author of all else that is; and that man is not left to the mercy of ignorance or of guess-work in regard to the purpose of his being, but has knowledge of it from the great Father.

This sublime conception of the existence of God and of the existence of revelation is not a spontaneous generation from the brain of man. Tyndal and Pasteur have demonstrated that there is no spontaneous generation from the inorganic to the organic. Just as little is there, or could there be, a spontaneous generation of the idea of the Infinite from the brain of the finite. The fact, in each case, is the result of a touch from above. All humanity points back to a golden age, when man was taught of the Divine by the Divine, that in that knowledge he might know why he himself existed, and how his life was to be shaped.

Curiously, strangely, sadly as that primitive teaching of man by his Creator has been transformed in the lapse of ages, in the vicissitudes of distant wanderings, of varying fortunes, and of changing culture, still the comparative study of ancient religions shows that in them all there has existed one central, pivotal concept, dressed, indeed, in various garbs of myth and legend and philosophy, yet ever recognizably the same—the concept of the fallen race of man and of a future restorer, deliverer, redeemer, who, being human, should yet be different from and above the merely human.

Again we ask, whence this concept? And again the sifting of serious and honest criticism demonstrates that it is not a spontaneous generation of the human brain, that it is not the outgrowth of man's contemplation of nature around him, and of the sun and stars above him, although, once having the concept, he could easily find in all nature symbols and analogies of it. It is part, and the central part, of the ancient memory of the human race, telling man what he is and why he is such, and how he is to attain to something better as his heart yearns to do.
Glancing now, in the light of the history of religions, at that stream of tradition as it comes down the ages, we see it divide into two clearly distinct branches, one shaping thought, or shaped by thought, in the eastern half of Asia, the other in the western half. And these two separate streams receive their distinctive character from the idea prevalent in the east and west of Asia concerning the nature of man, and, consequently, concerning his relation to God.

In the west of Asia, the Semitic branch of the human family, together with its Aryan neighbors of Persia, considered man as a substantial individuality, produced by the Infinite Being, and produced as a distinct entity, distinct from his Infinite Author in his own finite personality, and, through the immortality of the soul, preserving that distinct individuality forever.

Eastern Asia, on the contrary, held that man had not a substantial individuality, but only a phenomenal individuality. There is, they said, only one substance—the Infinite; all things are but phenomena, emanations of the Infinite. "Behold," say the Laws of Manou, "how the sparks leap from the flame and fall back into it; so all things emanate from Brahma and again lose themselves in him." "Behold," says Buddhism, "how the dewdrop lies on the lotus leaf, a tiny particle of the stream, lifted from it by evaporation and slipping off the lotus leaf to lose itself in the stream again." Thus they distinguished between being and existence; between persisting substance, the Infinite, and the evanescent phenomena emanating from it for a while, namely, man and all existent things.

From these opposite concepts of man sprang opposite concepts of the nature of good and evil. In western Asia, good was the conformity of the finite will with the will of the Infinite which is wisdom and love; evil was the deviation of the finite will from the eternal norma of wisdom and love. Hence individual accountability and guilt, as long as the deviation lasted; hence the cure of evil when the finite will is brought back into conformity with the Infinite; hence the happiness of virtue and the bliss of immortality, and the value of existence.

Eastern Asia, on the contrary, considered existence as simply and solely an evil, in fact the sole and all-pervad-
ing evil, and the only good was deliverance from existence, the extinction of all individuality in the oblivion of the Infinite. Although existence was conceived as the work of the Infinite—nay, as an emanation coming forth from the Infinite—yet it was considered simply a curse, and all human duty had this for its meaning and its purpose, to break loose from the fetters of existence and to help others with ourselves to reach non-existence.

Hence again, in Western Asia, the future redeemer was conceived as one masterful individuality, human, indeed, type and head of the race, but also pervaded by the Divinity in ways and degrees more or less obscurely conceived and used by the Divinity to break the chains of moral evil and guilt—nay, often they supposed of physical and national evils as well—and to bring man back to happiness, to holiness, to God. Thus, vaguely or more clearly, they held the idea of an incarnation of the Deity for man's good; and His incarnation was naturally looked forward to as the crowning blessing and glory of humanity.

In Eastern Asia, on the contrary, as man and all things were regarded as phenomenal emanations of the Infinite, it followed that every man was an incarnation. And since this phenomenal existence was considered a curse, which metempsychosis dragged out pitifully. And if there was room for the notion of a Redeemer, he was to be one recognizing more clearly than others what a curse existence is, struggling more resolutely than others to get out of it, and exhorting and guiding others to escape from it with him.

We pause to estimate these two systems. We easily recognize that their fundamental difference is a difference of philosophy. The touchstone of philosophy is human reason, and we have a right to apply it to all forms of philosophy. With no irreverence, therefore, but in all reverence and tenderness of religious sympathy, we apply to the philosophies underlying those two systems the touchstone of reason.

We ask eastern Asia: How can the phenomena of the Infinite Being be finite? For phenomena are not entities in themselves, but phases of being. We have only to look calmly in order to see here a contradiction in terms, an incompatibility in ideas, an impossibility.

We ask again: How can the emanations of the Infinite
Being be evil? For the Infinite Being must be essentially good. Zoroaster declared that Ahriman, the Evil One, had had a beginning and would have an end, and was, therefore, not eternal nor infinite. And if there is but one substance, then the emanations, the phenomena, of the Infinite Being are Himself; how can they be evil? How can His incarnation be the one great curse to get free from?

Again we ask: How can this human individuality of ours, so strong, so persistent in its self-consciousness and self-assertion, be a phenomenon without a substance? Or if it have as its substance the Infinite Being himself, then how can it be, as it too often is, so ignorant and erring, so weak and changeful, so lying, so dishonest, so mean, so vile? For let us remember that acts are predicated not of phenomena, but of substance, of being.

Once more we ask: If human existence is but a curse, and if the only blessing is to restrain, to resist, to thwart and get rid of all that constitutes it, then what a mockery and a lie is that aspiration after human progress which spurs noble men to their noblest achievements?

To these questions pantheism, emanationism, has no answer that reason can accept. It can never constitute a philosophy, because its bases are contradictions. Shall we say that a thing may be false in philosophy and yet true in religion? That was said once by an inventor of paradoxes; but reason repudiates it as absurd, and the Apostle of the Gentiles has well said that religion must be "our reasonable service." Human life, incarnation, redemption, must mean something different from this. For the spirit that breathes through the tradition of the East, the spirit of profound self-annihilation in the presence of the Infinite and of ascetic self-immolation as to the things of sense, we not only may, but ought to entertain the tenderest sympathy, nay, the sincerest reverence. Who that has looked into it but has felt the fascination of its mystic gloom? But religion means more than this; it is meant, not for man's heart alone, but for his intellect also. It must have for its foundation a bed-rock of solid philosophy. Turn we then and apply the touchstone to the tradition of the West.

Here it needs no lengthy philosophic reflection to recognize how true it is that what is not self-existent, what has a beginning must be finite, and that the finite must be
substantially distinct from the Infinite. We recognize that no multiplication of finite individualities can detract from the Infinite nor could their addition add to the Infinite; for infinitude resides not in multiplication of things, but in the boundless essence of Being, in whose simple and all-pervading immensity the multitude of finite things have their existence gladly and gratefully.

"What have you that you have not received? And if you have received it why should you glory as if you had not received it?" This is the keynote not only of their humble dependence, but also of their gladsome thankfulness.

We recognize that man's substantial individuality, his spiritual immortality, his individual power of will and consequent moral responsibility, are great truths linked together in manifest logic, great facts standing together immovably.

We see that natural ills are the logical result of the limitations of the finite, and that moral evil is the result of the deviation of humanity from the norma of the Infinite, in which truth and rectitude essentially reside.

We see that the end and purpose and destiny, as well as the origin of the finite must be in the Infinite—not in the extinction of the finite individuality—else why should it receive existence at all—but in its perfection and beatitude. And therefore we see that man's upward aspiration for the better and the best is no illusion, but a reasonable instinct for the right guidance of his life.

All this we find explicitly stated or plainly implied in the tradition of the west. Here we have a philosophy concerning God and concerning man which may well serve as the rational basis of religion. What, then, has this tradition to tell us concerning the incarnation and the redemption?

From the beginning, we see every finger pointing toward "the Expected of the nations, the Desired of the everlasting hills." One after another, the patriarchs, the pioneer fathers of the race, remind their descendants of the promise given in the beginning. Revered as they were, each of them says: "I am not the expected One; look forward and strive to be worthy to receive Him."

Among all those great leaders, Moses stands forth in special grandeur and majesty. But in his sublime humil-
ity and truthfulness Moses also exclaims: "I am not the Messiah; I am only His type and figure and precursor. The Lord hath used me to deliver His people from the land of bondage, but hath not permitted me to enter the promised land because I trespassed against Him in the midst of the children of Israel at the waters of contradiction; I am but a figure of the sinless One who is to deliver mankind from the bondage of evil and lead them into the promised land of their eternal inheritance. Look forward and prepare for Him."

One after another the prophets, the glorious sages of Israel arise, and each, like Moses, points forward to Him that is to come. And each brings out in clearer light who and what He is to be, the nature of the Incarnation. "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and shall bring forth a son and he shall be called Emmanuel." That is, God with us. "A little child is born to us, and a son is given to us, and the principality is on his shoulder, and he shall be called the Wonderful, the Counselor, the Mighty God, the Father of the World to come, the Prince of Peace."

Outside of the land of Israel the nations of the Gentiles were stirred with similar declarations and expectancies. Soon after the time of Moses, Zoroaster gives to Persia the prediction of a future Saviour and Judge of the world.

Greece hears the olden promise that Prometheus shall yet be delivered from his chains re-echoed in the prayer of dear old Socrates that One would come from heaven to teach his people the truth and save them from the sensualism to which they clung so obstinately. And pagan Rome, the inheritor of all that had preceded her, hears the Sibyl's chanting of the Divine One that was to be given to the world by the wonderful Virgin Mother, and feels the thrill of that universal expectancy concerning which Tacitus testifies that all were then looking for a great leader who was to rise in Judea and to rule the world.

And the expectation of the world was not to be frustrated. At the very time foretold by Daniel long ages before, of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David, in the little town of Bethlehem, with fulfillment of all the predictions of the prophets, the Messiah appears. "Behold," says the messenger of the Most High to the Virgin of Nazareth, "Thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name
Jesus. He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David, His Father, and He shall reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end." "How shall this be done, because I know not man?" "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; and therefore, also, the Holy One that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to thy word."

And what then? "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth, and of His fullness we all have received." And concerning Him all subsequent ages were to chant the canticle of faith: "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, and in One Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all ages, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, co-substantial with the Father, through whom all things were made, who, for us, men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven and was incarnated by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man."

But, again, to this tremendous declaration, which involves not only a religion but a philosophy also, we may, and we should, apply the touchstone of reason, and ask, "Is this possible or is it impossible things that are here told us? For we never can be expected to believe the impossible. Let us analyze the ideas comprised in it. Can God and man thus become one?"

Now, first, reason testifies as to man that in him two distinct, and, as it would seem, opposite substances are brought into unity, namely—spirit and matter, the one not confounded with the other, yet both linked in one, thus completing the unity and harmony of created things.

Next reason asks, Can the creature and the Creator, man and God, be thus united in order that the unity and the harmony may embrace all?

Reason sees that the finite could not thus mount to the Infinite any more than matter of itself could mount to spirit. But could not the Infinite stoop to the finite and
lift it to His bosom and unite it with Himself, with no confounding of the finite with the Infinite, nor of the Infinite with the finite, yet so that they shall be linked in one? Here reason can discern no contradiction of ideas, nothing beyond the power of the Infinite. But could the Infinite stoop to this? Reason sees that to do so would cost the Infinite nothing, since He is ever His unchanging Self; it sees, moreover, that since creation is the offspring not of His need, but of His bounty, of His love, it would be most worthy of Infinite love to thus perfect the creative act, to thus lift up the creature, and bring all things into unity and harmony. Then must reason declare it is not only possible, but it is most fitting that it should be so.

Moreover, we see that it is this very thing that all humanity has been craving for, whether intelligently or not. This very thing all religions have been looking forward to, or have been groping for in the dark. Turn we then to Himself and ask: "Art thou He who is to come, or look we for another?" To that question He must answer, for the world needs and must have the truth. Meek and humble of heart though He be, the world has a right to know whether He be indeed "the Expected of the nations, the Emmanuel, Lord with us." Therefore does He answer clearly and unmistakably:

"Abraham rejoiced that he should see My day. He saw it and was glad."
"Art Thou then older than Abraham?"
"Before Abraham was I am."
"Who art Thou, then?"
"I am the beginning, who also speak to you."
"Whosoever seeth Me seeth the Father; I and the Father are one."
"No one cometh to the Father but by Me."
"I am the way and the truth and the life."
"I am the light of the world; he that followeth Me walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life."
"I am the vine; you are the branches. Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you unless you abide in Me, for without Me you can do nothing."

He asks His disciples to declare who He is, Simon replies: "Thou are the Christ, the Son of the Living God."
He answers; “Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonah, because flesh and blood have not revealed this to thee, but My Father who is in heaven.”

Thomas falls on his knees before Him, exclaiming, “My Lord and my God!” He answers: “Because thou hast seen Me, Thomas, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen and have yet believed.”

His enemies threaten to stone Him, “because,” they said, “being man He maketh Himself God.” They demand that for this reason He shall be put to death. The high priest exclaims: “I adjure Thee by the living God that Thou tell us if Thou be the Christ, the Son of the living God.” He answers: “Thou hast said it. I am; and one day you shall Me sitting on the right hand of the power of God and coming in the clouds of heaven.”

In fulfillment of the prophecies He is condemned to death. He declares that it is for the world’s redemption; “I lay down My life for My sheep. No one taketh My life from Me, but I lay down My life, and I have power to lay down My life, and I have power to take it up again.”

As proof of all He said He foretold His resurrection from death on the third day, and in the glorious evidence of the fulfillment of the pledge His Church has ever since been chanting the Easter anthem throughout the world.

To that Church He gives a commission of spiritual authority extending to all ages, to all nations, to every creature—a commission that would be madness in any mouth save that of God Incarnate.

This is the testimony concerning Himself given to an inquiring and needy world by Him whom no one will dare accuse of lying or imposture, and the loving adoration of the ages proclaims that His testimony is true.

In Him are fulfilled all the figures and predictions of Moses and the prophets; all the expectation and yearning of Israel. In him is the fullness of grace and of truth toward which the sages of the Gentiles, with sad or with eager longing, stretched forth their hands. In each of them there was much that was true and good; in Him is all they had, and all the rest that they longed for; in him alone is the fullness, and to all of them and all of their disciples we say: “Come to the Fullness.”

Edwin Arnold, who in his “Light of Asia” has pictured in all the colors of poesy the sage of the far east, has in
his later "Light of the World" brought that wisdom of the east in adoration to the feet of Jesus Christ. May his words be a prophecy.

O Father, grant that the words of thy Son may be verified, that all, through Him, may at last be made one in Thee.
CHAPTER IV.

Woman's Work.

I.—A WHITE LIFE FOR TWO, BY MISS FRANCES E. WILLARD,
   PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD'S WOMAN'S TEMPERANCE UNION.

I dare affirm that the reciprocal attraction of two natures, out of a thousand million, for each other, is the strongest, though one of the most unnoted proofs of a beneficent Creator. It is the fairest, sweetest rose of time, whose petals and whose perfume expand so far that we are inclosed and sheltered in their tenderness and beauty. For, folded in its heart, we find the germ of every home; of those beatitudes, fatherhood and motherhood; the brotherly and sisterly affection, the passion of the patriot, the calm and steadfast love of the philanthropist. For the faithfulness of two, each to the other, alone makes possible the true home, the pure church, the righteous nation, the great, kind brotherhood of man. These are the days when creeds are discounted, but here is a creed to which we all subscribe:

"Comfort our souls with love,
   Love of all human kind,
   Love special, close, in which, like sheltered dove,
   Each heart its own safe nest may find;
   And love that turns above adoringly, contented to resign
   All loves, if need be, for the love divine."

Marriage is not, as some surface-thinkers have endeavored to make out, an episode in man's life and an event in woman's. Any who hold this view should sup their fill of horrors on the daily records of suicides by young men who are lovers, of sweethearts shot, and murdered wives. Marriage is no unequal covenant; it is the sum of earthly weal or woe to him or her who shares its mystic sacrament. Doubtless there are, in modern lands, and in this
age of transition almost as many noble men unmated because they had to be as there are women. Because of a memory cherished, an estrangement unexplained, an ideal unrealized, a duty bravely met, many of the best men living go their way through life alone. Sometimes I think that of the two it is man who loves home best; for, while woman is hedged into it by a thousand considerations of expediency and prejudice, he, "with all the world before him where to choose," still chooses home freely and royally for her sake, who is to him the world's supreme attraction.

The past has bequeathed us no records more sublime than the heart-histories of Dante, of Petrarch, of Michael Angelo, and, in our own time, of Washington Irving and Henry Martyn and others whom we dare not name. It was a chief among our own poets who said:

"I look upon the stormy wild,
I have no wife, I have no child;
For me there gleams no household hearth,
I've none to love me on the earth."

We know that "he who wrote home's sweetest song ne'er had one of his own," and our household poet, Will Carleton, sang concerning John Howard Payne—

"Sure, when thy gentle spirit fled
To lands beyond the azure dome,
With arms outstretched, God's angel said,
'Welcome to heaven's home, sweet home.'"

There are men and women—some of them famous, some unknown—the explanation of whose unaccompanied lives may be found in the principle that underlies those memorable words applied to Washington: "Heaven left him childless that a nation might call him father." In such considerations as I have here urged, and in this noblest side of human nature, a constant factor always to be counted on, I found my faith in the response of the people to the worth of promoting social purity. "Sweet bells jangled out of tune," now fill the air with minor cadences, often, alas, with discords that are heartbreaks, but all the same they are "sweet bells," and shall chime the gladdest music heaven has
heard, "some sweet day, by and by." This gentle age into which we have happily been born is attuning the twain whom God hath made for such great destiny to higher harmonies than any other age has known by a reform in the denaturalizing methods of a civilization largely based on force by which the boy and girl have hitherto been sedulously trained apart. They are now being set side by side in school, in church, in government, even as God sets male and female everywhere side by side throughout His realm of law, and has declared them one throughout His realm of grace.

Meanwhile the conquest, through invention, of matter by mind lifts woman from the unnatural subjugation of the age of force. In the presence of a steam-engine, which she could guide as well as he, but which is an equal mystery to both, the man and woman learn that they are fast equalizing on the plane of matter, as a prediction of their confessed equalization upon the planes of mind and of morality.

We are then beginning to train those with each other who were formed for each other, and the English-speaking home, with its Christian method of a twofold headship, based on laws natural and Divine, is steadily rooting out all that remains of the mediæval, continental, and harem philosophies concerning this greatest problem of all time. The true relations of that complex being whom God created by uttering the mystic thought that had in it the potency of paradise. "In our own image let us make man and let him have dominion over all the earth," will ere long be ascertained by means of the new correlation and attuning, each to other of a more complete humanity upon the Christ-like basis that "there shall be no more curse." The temperance reform is this correlation's necessary and true forerunner, for while the race brain is bewildered it cannot be thought out. The labor reform is another part, for only under co-operation can material conditions be adjusted to a noncombatant state of society, and every yoke lifted from the laboring man lifts one still heavier from the woman at his side. The equal suffrage movement is another part, for a government organized and conducted by one-half of the human unit, a government of the minority, by the minority, for the minority, must always bear unequally upon the whole. The social
purity movement could only come after its heralds, the other three reforms I have mentioned were well under way, because alcoholized brains would not tolerate its expression: women who had not learned to work would lack the individuality and intrepidity required to organize it, and women perpetually to be disfranchised could not hope to see its final purposes wrought out in law. But back of all were the father and mother of all reform—Christianity and education—to blaze the way for all these later comers.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union is doing work more important than that of reconstructing the ideal of womanhood. The sculptor, Hart, told me, when I visited his studio in Florence many years ago, that he was investing his life in the attempt to work into marble a new feminine type which should "express, unblamed, the twentieth century's womanhood." The Venus de Medici, with its small head and buttonhole eyelids, matched the Greek conception of woman well, he thought, but America was slowly evolving another and a loftier type. A statue, named by him "Woman Triumphant," and purchased by patriotic ladies of his native state, Kentucky, adorns the city hall at Lexington and shows

"A perfect woman, nobly planned,
To warn, to comfort and command;
A creature not too bright or good
For human nature's daily food,
And yet a spirit, pure and bright,
With something of an angel's light."

She is the embodiment of what shall be. In an age of force, woman's greatest grace was to cling; in this age of peace she doesn't cling much, but is every bit as tender and as sweet as if she did. She has strength and individuality, a gentle seriousness; there is more of a sister, less of the syren—more of the duchess, and less of the doll. Woman is becoming what God meant her to be, and Christ's gospel necessitates her being the companion and counselor, not the encumbrance and toy of men.

To meet this new creation, how grandly men themselves are growing; how considerate and brotherly, how pure in word and deed! The world has never yet known half the aptitude of character and life to which men will attain
when they and women live in the same world. It doth not yet appear what they shall be, or we either, for that matter, but in many a home presided over by a temperance voter and a white-ribbon worker, I have thought the heavenly vision was really coming down to terrà firma. With all my heart, I believe, as do the best men of the nation, that woman will bless and brighten every place she enters, and that she will enter every place. Its welcome of her presence and her power will be the final test of any institution's fitness to survive.

Happily for us, every other genuine reform helps to push forward the white car of social purity. The great peace-movement, seeking as its final outcome a court of international arbitration as a substitute for war, promises more momentum to our home-cause than to almost any other. For as the chief corner-stone of the peaceful state is the hearthstone, so the chief pulverizer of that corner-stone is war.

The personal habits of men and women must reach the same high level. On a low plane and for selfish ends, primeval and mediaeval, man wrought out, with fiercest cruelty, virtue as the only tolerated estate of one-half the human race. On a high plane, Christianity, working through modern womanhood, shall yet make virtue the only tolerated estate of the other half of the human race, and may heaven speed that day! To-day a woman knows that she must walk the straight line of a white life or men will look upon her with disdain. A man needs, for his own best good, to find that in the eyes of woman, just the same is true of him—and evermore be it remembered, this earnest effort to bring in the clay of "sweeter manners, purer laws," is as much in man's interest as our own.

Why are the laws so shamelessly unequal now? Why do they bear so heavily upon the weaker, making the punishment for stealing away a woman's honor no greater than that for stealing a silk gown: purloining her character at a smaller penalty than the picking of a pocket would incur? Why is the age of protection or consent but ten years in twenty states of America, and in one only seven years? Who would have supposed, when man's great physical strength is considered, that he would have fixed upon an age so tender, and declared that after a
child had reached it she could be held equally accountable with her doughty assailant for a crime in which he was the aggressor? And who would not suppose that the man who had been false to one woman would be socially ostracized by all the rest of womankind? What will explain the cruelty of man and the heartlessness of woman in this overmastering issue of womanhood’s protection and manhood’s loyalty?

The answer is not far to seek. Woman became, in barbarous ages, the subject of the stronger. Besides, what suits one age becomes a hindrance to the next, and as Christianity went on individualizing woman, lifting her to higher levels of education and hence of power, the very laws which good men in the past had meant for her protection became to her a snare and danger. But while all this heritage of a less developed past has wrought such anguish and injustice upon woman as she is to-day, it has been even more harmful to man, for it is always worse for character to be sinning than to be sinned against. Our laws and social customs make it too easy for men to do wrong. They are not sufficiently protected by the strong hand of penalty, from themselves, from the sins that do most easily beset them, and from the mad temptations that clutch at them on every side. Suppose the trampleers of wives and outragers of women, whose unutterable abominations crowd the criminal columns of our newspapers each day, knew that lifelong imprisonment might be the penalty that they must pay, would not the list of their victims rapidly diminish? The World’s Christian Temperance Union has taken up this sacred cause of protection of the home, and we shall never cease our efforts until women have all the help that law can furnish them throughout the world. We ask for heavier penalties, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; we ask for the total prohibition of the liquor traffic, which is leagued with every crime that is perpetrated against the physically weaker sex, and ask for the ballot that law and lawmaker may be directly influenced by our instincts of self-protection and home-protection.

We hear much of physical culture for boys, but it is girls that need this most. We hear much of manual training schools to furnish every boy at school with a
bread-winning weapon, but, in the interest of boys and girls alike, girls need this most. Hence it is in our plans to work for these. But, as I have said, we are not working for ourselves alone in this great cause of social purity. As an impartial friend to the whole human race in both its fractions, man and woman, I, for one, am not more in earnest for this great advance because of the good it brings to the gentler, than because of the blessing that it prophesies for the stronger sex. I have long believed that when that greatest of all questions, the question of a life-companionship, shall be decided on its merits, pure and simple, and not complicated with the other questions, "Did she get a good home?" "Is he a generous provider?" "Will she have plenty of money?" then will come the first fair chance ever enjoyed by young manhood for the building up of genuine character and conduct. For it is an immense temptation to the "sowing of wild oats," when the average youth knows that the smile he covets most will be his all the same, no matter whether he smokes, swears, drinks beer, and leads an impure life or not. The knowledge on his part that the girls of his village, or "set," have no way out of dependence, reproach or oddity, except to say "yes," when he chooses to "propose;" that they dare not frown on his lower mode of life; that the world is, indeed, all before him where to choose; that not one girl in one hundred is endowed with the talent and pluck that make her independent of him and his ilk. All this gives him a sense of freedom to do wrong, which, added to inherited appetite and outward temptation, is impelling to ruin the youth of our day with force strong as gravitation and relentless as fate.

Besides all this, the utterly false sense of his own value and importance which "young England" or "young America" acquires by seeing the sweetest and most attractive beings on the face of the earth thus virtually subject to him, often develops a lordliness of manner which is ridiculous to contemplate in boys who otherwise would be modest, sensible and brotherly young fellows, such as we are, most of all, likely to find in co-educational schools, where girls take their full share of prizes, and where many young women have in mind a world trip with some girl-friend, or mayhap a "career."

Multiplied forces of law and gospel are to-day con-
spiring for the deliverance of our young men from the
snares of their present artificial environment and exag-
gerated estimate of their own value; but the elevation of
their sisters to the plane of perfect financial and legal in-
dependence, from which the girls can dictate the equi-
table terms: “You must be as pure and true as you require
me to be, ere I give you my hand,” is the brightest hope
that gleams in the sky of modern civilization for our
brother; and the greater freedom of women to make of
marriage an affair of the heart and not of the purse is the
supreme result of Christianity up to this hour.

There is no man whom women honor so deeply and
sincerely as the man of chaste life—the man who breasts
the buffetings of temptation’s swelling waves, like some
strong swimmer in his agony and makes the port of per-
fected self-control. Women have a thousand guarantees
and safeguards for their purity of life. “Abandon hope,
all ye who enter here,” is written in letters of flame for
them above the haunt of infamy, while men may come and
go and are yet similarly received in the most attractive
homes. And yet, thank God, in spite of this accursed
latitude how many men are pure and true.

It is said that when darkness settles on the Adriatic sea,
and fishermen are far from land, their wives and
daughters, just before putting out the lights of their
humble cottages, go down by the shore, and in their clear,
sweet voices sing the first lines of the “Ave Maria.”
Then they listen eagerly, and across the sea are borne to
them the deep tones of those they love, singing the strains
that follow, “Oro pro nobis,” and thus each knows that
with the other all is well. I often think that from the
home-life of the nation, from its mothers and sisters,
daughters and sweethearts, there sound through the dark-
ness of this transition age the tender notes of a dearer
song, whose burden is being taken up and echoed back to
us from those far out amid the billows of temptation, and
its sacred words are, “Home, Sweet Home.” God grant
that deeper and stronger may grow that heavenly chorus
from men’s and women’s lips and lives. For, with all its
faults, and they are many, I believe the present marriage
system to be the greatest triumph of Christianity, and
that it has created and conserves more happy homes than
the world has ever before known.
Any law that renders less binding the mutual lifelong loyalty of one man and woman to each other, which is the central idea of every home, is an unmitigated curse to that home and to humanity. Around this union, which alone renders possible a pure society and a permanent state, the law should build its utmost safeguards, and upon this union the gospel should pronounce its most sacred benedictions. But, while I hold these truths to be self-evident, I believe that a constant evolution is going forward in the home, as in every other place, and that we may have but dimly dreamed the good in store for those whom God for holiest love hath made. In the nature of the case the most that even Christianity itself could do at first, though it is the strongest force ever let loose upon the planet, was to separate one man and woman from the common herd into each home, telling the one woman to work there in grateful quietness, while the man stood at the door to defend its sacred shrine with fist and spear, to insist upon its rights of property, and later on to represent it in the state.

Thus, under the conditions of a civilization, crude and material, grew up that well-worn maxim of the common law, “Husband and wife are one, and that one is the husband.” But such supreme power as this brought to the man supreme temptation. By the laws of mind he legislated first for himself and afterward for the physically weaker one within “his” home. The femme couverte is not a character appropriate to our peaceful, home-like communities, although she may have been, and doubtless was, a necessary figure in the days when women were safe only as they were shut up in castles, and when they were the booty chiefly sought in war. To-day a woman may circumnavigate the world alone and yet be unmolested. Our marriage laws and customs are changing to meet these new conditions.

It will not do to give the husband of the modern woman power to whip his wife, “provided the stick he uses is not larger than his finger;” to make all the laws under which she is to live, adjudicate all her penalties, try her before juries of men, conduct her to prison under the care of men, cast the ballot for her, and, in general, hold her in the estate of a perpetual minor. It will not do to let the modern man determine the age of “consent,” settle the
penalties that men shall suffer whose indignities and outrages upon women are worse to them than death, and by his exclusive power to make all laws and choose all officers, legislative, judicial and executive, thus leaving his case wholly in his own hands. To continue this method is to make it as hard as possible for men to do right, and as easy as possible for them to do wrong; the magnificent possibilities of manly character are best prophesied from the fact that under such a system so many men are good and gracious. My theory of marriage in its relation to society would give this postulate: Husband and wife are one, and that one is husband and wife. I believe they will never come to the heights of purity, of power and peace for which they were designed in heaven until this better law prevails. One undivided half of the world for wife and husband equally; co-education to mate them on the plane of mind; equal property rights to make God's own free woman, not coerced into marriage for the sake of support, nor a bond-slave after she is married, who asks her master for the price of a paper of pins, and gives him back the change.

I believe in uniform national marriage laws; in divorce for one cause only; in legal separation on account of drunkenness and other abominations, but I would guard, for the children's sake, the marriage tie by every guarantee that could make it at the top of society, the most coveted estate of the largest natured and most endowed, rather than at the bottom, the necessary refuge of the smallest natured and most dependent women. Besides all this, in the interest of men, in order that their incentives to the best life might be raised to the highest power, I would make women so independent of marriage that men who, by bad habits and niggardly estate, whether physical, mental or moral, were least adapted to help build a race of human angels, should find the facility with which they now enter its hallowed precincts reduced to the lowest minimum.

Until God's laws are better understood and more reverently obeyed, marriage cannot reach its best. The present abnormal style of dress among women heavily mortgages the future of their homes and more heavily discounts that of their children. Add to this the utter recklessness of immoral consequences that characterizes the
mutual conduct of so many married pairs, and only the everlasting tendencies toward good that render certain the existence and supremacy of a goodness that is infinite, can explain so much health and happiness as our reeling old world persists in holding while it rolls onward toward some far-off perfection, bathed in the sunshine of God's omnipotent love. Our Boston woman poet, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, has given us the noblest motto for social purity:

"In the beauty of the lilies, Christ was born across the sea;  
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;  
As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,  
While God is marching on."

II.—THE WORSHIP OF GOD IN MAN, BY ELIZABETH STANTON.

As we have not yet reached the ultimatum of religious faith it may be legitimate to ask, What will the next step be? As we are all alike interested in the trend of religious thought no one should feel aggrieved in hearing his creed fairly analyzed or in listening to speculations as to something better in the near future. As I read the signs of the times, I think the next form of religion will be the "religion of humanity," in which men and women will worship what they see of the divine in each other, the virtues, the beatitudes, the possibilities ascribed to deity, reflected in mortal beings.

To stimulate our reverence for the great spirit of life that sets all things in motion and holds them forever in their places, our religious teachers point us to the grandeur of nature in all her works. We tremble at the earthquake, the hurricane, the rolling thunder and vivid lightning, the raging tempests by sea and land; we are filled with awe and admiration by the splendor of the starry heavens, the boundless oceans and vast continents, the majestic forests, lakes and rivers, and snow-capped mountains that in their yearnings seem to touch the heavens. From all these grand and impressive forces in nature we turn with relief to the gentle rain and dew, the genial sunshine, the singing birds and fragrant flowers—to the love and tenderness we find in every form of life; we see order and beauty, too, in the changing seasons, the planetary
world in the rising sun, moon and stars, in day with its glorious dawn and night with its holy mysteries, which all together thrill with emotion every chord of the human soul.

By all the wonders and mysteries that surround us we are led to question the source of what we see and to judge the powers and possibilities of the Creator by the grandeur and beauty of His works. Measuring man by the same standard, we find that all the forces and qualities the most exalted mind ascribes to his ideal God are reproduced in a less degree in the noble men and women who have glorified the race. Judging man by his works, what shall we say to the seven wonders of the world, of the Colossus of Rhodes, Diana's Temple at Ephesus, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the Pyramids of Egypt, the Pharos at Alexandria, the Hanging Gardens at Babylon and the Olympian Zeus? True, these are all crumbling to dust, but change is law too, in all nature's works.

The manifestation of man's power is more varied and wonderful as the ages roll on. Who can stand in St. Peter's at Rome, and listen to the deep-toned organ reverberating from arch to arch with a chorus of human voices alike pathetic and triumphant in their hymns of praise, without feeling the divine harmony in architecture, poetry and song? And yet man, so small in stature, conceived and perfected that vast cathedral, with its magnificent dome, strung every key in that grand organ to answer to a master's touch and trained every voice in that great choir to melody to perfect time and tune—a combination in grandeur surpassing far the seven wonders of the world.

And what shall we say of the discoveries and inventions of the past fifty years, by which the labors of the world have been lifted from the shoulders of men, to be done henceforth by the tireless machines. Behold the magnitude of the works accomplished by man in our day and generation. He has leveled mountains and bridged chasms; with his railroads he has linked the Atlantic and Pacific, the Rocky and the Alleghany mountains together; with steam and the ocean cable he has anchored continents side by side and melted the nations of the earth in one. With electricity man has opened such vistas of wonder and mystery that scientists and philosophers
stand amazed at their own possibilities, and in the wake of all these triumphs we are startled with new mysteries revealed by physical researches into what has hitherto been the unseen universe.

Man has manifested wisdom too, as well as power. In fact, what cardinal virtue has he not shown, through all the shifting scenes of the passing centuries? The page of history glows with the great deeds of noble men and women. What courage and heroism, what self-sacrifice and sublime faith in principle have they not shown in persecution and death, 'mid the horrors of war, the sorrows of exile, and the weary years of prison life? What could sustain mortal man in this awful "solitude of self" but the fact that the great moral forces of the universe are bound up in his organization? What are danger, death, exile and dungeon walls to the great spirit of life incarnate in him?

The old idea of mankind as "totally depraved," his morality "but filthy rags," his heart "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked," his aspirations "but idle dreams of luxury and selfishness" are so many reflections on the creator, who is said to be perfect and to have made man in his own image. The new religion will teach the dignity of human nature and its infinite possibilities for development. Its believers will not remain forever in the valley of humiliation, confessing themselves in the church service on each returning Sabbath day to be "miserable sinners" imploring the good Lord to deliver them from the consequences of violated law, but the new religion will inspire its worshipers with self-respect, with noble aspirations to attain diviner heights from day to day than they yet have reached. It will teach individual honesty and honor in word and deed, in all relations of life. It will teach the solidarity of the race that all must rise or fall as one. Its creed will be Justice, Liberty, Equality for all the children of earth. It will teach our practical duties to man in this life, rather than sentimental duties to God in fitting ourselves for the next life. A loving human fellowship is the real divine communion. The spiritual life is not a mystical contemplation of divine attributes, but the associated development of all that is good in human character.

The Old and New Testaments, which Christians accept
as their rule of life, are full of these lessons of universal benevolence. "If you love not man whom you have seen, how can you love God whom you have not seen?" Jesus said to his disciples, "Whatsoever you have done unto these, My brethren, ye have done unto Me." "When I was hungry ye gave me meat, when naked ye clothed me, when in prison ye ministered unto me." When the young man asked what he should do to be saved, Jesus did not tell him he must believe certain dogmas and creeds, but to go and sell all that he had and give to the poor.

The prophets and apostles alike taught a religion of deeds rather than forms and ceremonies. "Away with your new moons, your Sabbaths, and your appointed feasts; the worship God asks is that you do justice and love mercy." "God is no respecter of persons." "He has made of one blood all the nations of the earth. When the pulpits in our lands shall preach from these texts and enforce these lessons, the religious conscience of the people will take new form of expression, and those, who in very truth accept the teachings of Jesus, will make it their first duty to look after the lowest stratum of humanity.

To build a substantial house, we begin with the cellar and lay the foundations strong and deep, for on it depends the safety of the whole superstructure. So in race-building, for noble specimens of humanity, for peace and prosperity in their conditions, we must begin with the lowest stratum of society and see that the masses are well fed, clothed, sheltered, educated, elevated, and enfranchised. Social morality, clean, pleasant environments, must precede a spiritual religion that enables man to understand the mysteries binding him to the seen and unseen universe.

This radical work cannot be done by what is called charity, but by teaching sound principles of domestic economy to our educated classes, showing that by law, custom, and false theories of natural rights they are responsible for the poverty, ignorance and vice of the masses. Those who train the religious conscience of the people must teach the lesson that all these artificial distinctions in society must be obliterated by securing equal conditions and opportunities for all; this cannot be done in a day; but this is the goal for which we must strive. The first step to this end is to educate the people into the idea that such a moral revolution is possible.
It is folly to talk of a just government and a pure religion where the state and the church alike sustain an aristocracy of wealth and ease, while those who do the hard work of the world have no share in the blessings and riches that their continued labors have made possible for others to enjoy. Is it just that the many should ever suffer that the few may shine?

To reconcile men to things as they are, we have sermons from the texts, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;" "The poor ye have always with you;" "Servants, obey your masters;" "Wives submit yourselves unto your husbands;" "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s"—as if poverty, servility, and authority were decrees of heaven.

Such decrees will not do for our day and generation. The schoolmaster is abroad. Webster’s spelling-book is a classic. The laboring classes have tasted the tree of knowledge, and, like the gods, they begin to know good from evil. With new liberties and education they demand corresponding improvements in their environments. As they reach new vantage ground from time to time and survey broader fields of usefulness they learn their rights and duties, their relations to one another, and their true place in the march of civilization.

"Equal rights for all" is the lesson of this hour. "That cannot be," says some faithless conservative: "if you should distribute all things equally to-day they would be in the hands of the few to-morrow." Not if the religious conscience of the people were educated to believe that the way to salvation was not in creed and greed, but in doing justice to their fellow-men. Not if altruism, instead of egoism, were the law of social morals. Not if co-operation, instead of competition, were the rule in the world of work. Not if legislation were ever in the interest of the many, rather than the few. Educate the rising generation into these broader principles of government, religion, and social life, and then ignorance, poverty, and vice will disappear.

The reconciliation of man to his brother is a more practical religion than that of man to his father and the process is more easily understood. The word religion means to bind again, to unite those who have been separated, to harmonize those who have been in antagonism.
Thus far the attitude of man to man has been hostile—ever in competition, trying to over-reach and enslave each other. With hope we behold the dawn of the new day in the general awakening to the needs of the laboring masses. We hail the work of the Salvation Army, the King’s Daughters, the kindergarten and ragged schools for children of the poor, the university settlements, etc. All these, added to our innumerable charities, show that the trend of thought is setting in the right direction for the health, happiness, and education of the lowest classes of humanity.

III.—THEOSOPHY AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS, BY MRS. ANNIE BESANT, OF LONDON, ENGLAND.

Mrs. Annie Besant, of London, spoke of theosophy and modern social problems. Social evils originate in mental error, she said, and besides legislative, educational, and social improvement, the truths and laws of being must be taught for the regeneration of society. She held that the recognition of Karma and reincarnation must be made the basis of concerted public as well as private efforts. Continuing, she said:

The subject is one which seems to take us to a different level of thought from that occupied yesterday and to-day. It seems like a coming down from the spiritual plane to a plane requiring the use of more material energy. It looks as if we were to deal with transitory and impermanent things, and that the lower work should be dealt with in a lower fashion, but I, who have spent so many years of life dealing with these problems of the lower plane, take it to be my duty to bear witness that the employment of one hour daily in spiritual devotion for the laborer will work more good to him than one hundred years of mere materialistic processes for his relief.

Let us first look to the Genesis of action. In the first place there is the thought, then there is the image of the thought in the eternal astral light. Lastly, there is the precipitation of the image into action and material effort. It is only because we are blinded that we lay so much stress on the empty action and so little on the mental cause of the action. Theosophists can never forget that
relief on the physical plane is and can be but palliative. Relief is not on the material plane, but on the plane of mentality. If to-day the social conscience is beginning to awaken, if social compunction is beginning to show itself, if instead of saying “Am I my brother’s keeper,” there is beginning to arise the cry, “Let me help my brother wherever I am strong, or wherever there is need;” if men are beginning to give some help to humanity; if men are beginning to sorrow for the miseries of humanity, it is because there has been formed first the beneficent thought, then the beneficent image of the thought in the astral light, and finally because this thought has become a beneficent deed; it is because the seer has seen a vision of Utopia and out of it has come the better condition which we see. For the Utopia of yesterday is really the condition of to-day, and as relief can be only the outcome of mental changes, the law ought to be the expression of a condensed public opinion.

We have laws enough, a mass of enactment, which, if carried out, would make the frightful poverty of to-day impossible, and our present misery only a nightmare of the past. This mass of law is the outcome of the thought of a few enlightened men, which originated in the mind of a thoughtful few, and, passing through the astral light became embodied in our statutes and in our laws. As to the evil of sweating there are enough enactments to make it impossible if they were carried out, but the law is evaded, and sweating goes on as if there were no law. Those who are oppressed by it are themselves accomplices to the evasion. Every man who is willing to take more than he gives, and who grasps more than he deserves, who lives on his neighbor without making any compensation, who preys with his strength upon the weakness of others, who wears clothing which he knows has cost the life-blood of thousands of poor innocent women, is a sweater at heart and sets up causes which effectually prevent the operation of the law. Such is the effect of thought upon our social condition. It is valueless to denounce the sweater when a man in his heart desires the continuation of sweating.

We should give up selfish competition in the schools. We should abolish competition for prizes merely for the sake of gaining the advantage of another. Such competi-
tions distort the dwelling of the soul, which education is
designed to expand. It makes a child rejoice in those
things which cause another to stumble, and warps
and distorts the whole spiritual nature of the child. The
faculties of the mind are given to us for help and not for
domination. We are all guilty for our brother's blood—
the slum-dweller and the prince, and the poor artisan, and
the middle-class man are responsible for the misery and
the poverty of the present. For they are but the outcome
of ignorance and of crime for which the whole community
is blameworthy. Let us not perpetrate these wrongs by
continuing the hatred which has made the slums possible
Hatred mends nothing. Let us say that we have sinned
in the past, and that we shall avoid sin in the future. If
you force into slums those who, being miserable, most
need your sympathy, you but prepare conditions and
dwellings for the host of evil souls, waiting for just such
dwellings and such conditions, and you foster thereby
forces which must surely lead to the disintegration of the
nation.

What will you have? Gold or wisdom? Will you
choose gold, material, or will you choose wisdom, spiritu-
ality? Yours is the choice. Will you take material, or
will you take spirit? Will you spend less time in the
body and more in the spirit, or will you not? If you
choose soul rather than gold, then will the nation of the
future be grander than any nation of the past. But if you
choose gold you must pay the awful price.

IV.—THE WOMEN OF INDIA,—BY MISS JEANNE SERABJI OF
BOMBAY.

I would ask you to travel with me in thought over 13,-
000 miles across the seas to have a glimpse at India, the
land of glorious sunsets, the continent inhabited by peo-
ples differing from each other almost as variously as their
numbers in language, caste, and creed, and yet I may
safely say I can hear voices in concord from my country
saying: "Tell the women of America we are being en-
lightened, we thirst after knowledge, and we are awaken-
ing to the fact that there is no greater pleasure than that
of increasing our information, training our minds, and
reaching after the goal of our ambitions." It has been said to me more than once in America that the women of my country prefer to be ignorant and in seclusion; that they would not welcome anybody who would attempt to change their mode of life. To these I would give answer as follows: The nobly-born ladies, Zananas, shrink, not from thirst for knowledge, but from contact with the outer world. If the customs of the country, their castes and creeds allowed it, they would gladly live as other women do. They live in seclusion, not ignorance. Highly cultured British women with love for the Master burning in their hearts, have the exceptional privileges of being their companions and teachers, and they have marveled at the intelligence of some of them.

"Tis religion that does give
Sweetest comfort."

These secluded ladies make perfect business women. They manage their affairs of state with a grace and manner worthy consideration. Do we wish these women to give up seclusion and live as other women do? Let us, the Christian women of the world, live up to our high and holy calling in Christ Jesus; let our lights shine out brilliantly, for it is the life that speaks with far greater force than any words from our lips, and let us with solemnity grasp the thought that we may be obstacles in the paths of others. Are we living what we preach about? Do we know that some one is better for our being in the world? If not, why is it not so? Let us attend to our lamps and keep them burning.

The women of India are not all secluded, and it is quite a natural thing to go into homes and find that much is being done for the uplifting of women. Schools and colleges are open where the women may attain to heights at first thought impracticable. The Parsee and Brahman women in Bombay twenty years ago scarcely moved out of their houses, while to-day they have their libraries and reading-rooms; they can converse on politics, enjoy conversation, and show in every movement culture and refinement above the common. Music, painting, horsemanship come as easily to them as spelling the English language correctly. The princes of the land are interest-
ing themselves in the education of the women around them. Foremost among these is the Maharajah of Mysore, who has opened a college for women, which has for its pupils Hindu ladies, maidens, matrons, and widows of the highest caste. This college is superintended by an English lady, and has all the departments belonging to the ladies' colleges of Oxford and Cambridge of England. It is the only college where the zither, the vena, and the violin are taught. The founder had to work three long years before he was able to introduce these instruments, for the simple reason that these nobly born, high caste women associated the handling of musical instruments with the stage and women of no repute.

There are schools and colleges for women in Bombay, Poona and Guzerat; also Calcutta, Alahabad, Missoorie and Madras. The latter college has rather the lead in some points by conferring degrees upon women. The Victoria high school has turned out grand and noble women, so also has the new high school for women in the native city of Poona. These schools have Christian women as principals. The college of Ahmedabad has a Parsee (Christian) lady at its head. What women have done women can do.

Do you wish to see purity as white as the driven snow in woman? Allow me to bring before you in thought, that form of a beautiful woman of India, the Pundita Ramabai, who has opened the Sharida Sadan, or widows' home, in India. She has traveled a great deal, and was in America for awhile, taking from you sympathy, affection, and funds for her noble work. Do you wish to hear of learned women? Again let me mention the Pundita Ramabai, and in companionship with her Cornelia Sorabji, B. A., LL. D. Men and women have written of these in prose and song; their morality is unquestionable, their religion beautiful (for they belong to Christ Jesus), their humility proverbial. These are women for a nation to be proud of. Having prepared themselves to fill important posts, they have gone back to their country and their life to glorify their Maker. These good women must have had good mothers. I can speak of one who lives the life of which she is so great an advocate; with her godliness and refinement go hand in hand; her faith in God is wonderful, and her children will look back in years
to come and call her blessed. There are others worthy of your notice—the poet, Sumibai Goray; the physician, Dr. Ananbibai Joshi, whom death removed from our midst just as she was about starting her grand work, and the artist of song, Mme. Thérze Langrana, whose God-given voice thrills the hearts of men and women in London. My countrywomen have been at the head of battles, guiding their men with word and look of command. My countrywomen will soon be spoken of as the greatest scientists, artists, mathematicians, and preachers of the world.

Instead of the absurd saying, "a woman is at the bottom of every evil," let us rather say all great works are due to good women, noble women, true women, pure women, the greatest as well as the least of God's creatures.

"A woman? Yes, I thank the day,
When I was made to live,
To cast a bright or shining ray,
To love, to live, to give;
To draw aside from paths of sin,
The halt, the lame, the blind;
A woman, glorious, noble, grand,
A woman I would be,
To live, to conquer, to command,
To lessen misery.
To glorify, in word, in deed,
The Maker I adore!
To help, regardless caste or creed,
The sad, the lone, the poor."

V.—WHAT IS RELIGION? BY MRS. JULIA WARD HOWE.

I only hope you may be able not only to listen, but also to hear me. Your charity must multiply my small voice and do some such miracle as was done when the loaves and fishes fed the multitude in the ancient time which has just been spoken of. I have been listening to what our much honored friend (Professor Wilkinson) has said, and yet, before I say anything on my own account, I want to take the word Christianity back to Christ himself, back to that mighty Heart whose pulse seems to throb through the world to-day, that endless Fountain of charity, out of which I believe has come all true progress and all civilization that deserves the name. As a woman, I do not wish
to dwell upon any trait of exclusiveness in the letter which belongs to a time when such exclusiveness, perhaps, could not be helped, and which may have been put in where it was not expressed. I go back to that great spirit which contemplated a sacrifice for the whole of humanity. That sacrifice is not one of exclusion, but of an infinite and endless and joyous inclusion. And I thank God for it.

I have turned my back to-day upon the great show in Jackson Park in order to see a greater spectacle here. The daring voyage of Columbus across an unknown sea we all remember with deep gratitude. All that we have done and all that we are now doing is not too much to do honor to the loyalty and courage of that one inspired man. But the voyages of so many valorous souls into the unknown infinite of thought, into the deep questions of the soul between men and God—Oh, what a voyage is that! Oh, what a sea to sail! And I thought, coming to this parliament of religions, we shall have found a port at last; after many wanderings we shall have come to the one great harbor where all the fleets can ride, where all the banners can be displayed, and on each banner will be written, so bright that it will efface the herald's blazon, these words that Paul uttered in Athens, "to the Unknown God": to the God who is not unknown because we doubt Him, not unknown because we do not feel that He is the life of our life, the soul of our soul, the light of the world in which we live and move; but because He, being Infinite, transcends our powers, and all humanity, speaking from every standpoint, saying all it can, and all that it knows, cannot say that it knows Him.

I hoped and still hope that from this parliament something very positive in the way of agreement and of practical action will come forth. It has certainly been very edifying. My limited strength has not allowed me to attend here very much, but I know and we all know the drift of what has been going on here. It has been extremely edifying, to hear of the good theories of duty and morality and piety which the various religions advocate. I will put them all on one basis, Christian and Jewish and Ethnic, which they all promulgate to mankind. But what I think we want now to do is to inquire why the practice of all nations, our own as well as any other, is so much at variance with these noble precepts? These great founders
of religion have made the true sacrifice. They have taken a noble human life, full of every human longing and passion and power and aspiration, and they have taken it all to try and find out something about this question of what God meant man to be and does mean him to be. But while they have made this great sacrifice, how is it with the multitude of us? Are we making any sacrifice at all? We think it was very well that those heroic spirits should study, should agonize and bleed for us. But what do we do?

Now, it seems to me very important that from this parliament should go forth a fundamental agreement as to what is religion and as to what is not religion. I need not stand here to repeat any definition of what religion is. I think you will all say that it is aspiration, the pursuit of the divine in the human; the sacrifice of everything to duty for the sake of God and of humanity and of our own individual dignity. What is it that passes for religion? In some countries magic passes for religion, and that is one thing I wish, in view particularly of the ethnic faiths, could be made very prominent—that religion is not magic. I am very sure that in many countries it is supposed to be so. You do something that will bring you good luck. It is for the interests of the priesthood to cherish that idea. Of course the idea of advantage in this life and in another life is very strong, and rightly very strong in all human breasts. Therefore, it is for the advantage of the priesthoods to make it to be supposed that they have in their possession certain tricks, certain charms, which will give you either some particular prosperity in this world or possibly the privilege of immortal happiness. Now, this is not religion. This is most mischievous irreligion, and I think this parliament should say, once for all, that the name of God and the names of his saints are not things to conjure with.

Europe to-day is afflicted with a terrible scourge. Europe and, I think, other continents. This scourge is generated by a pilgrimage which pious Mohammedans—there may be some present—are led to suppose is for the benefit of their souls. They go to a spot which they consider sacred; they die; they perish by thousands; their animals perish; a terrible atmosphere is generated which flies all over the globe, and we do not know how soon this
pestilence will reach us. It seems to me that we, at this parliament of religions, can ask any who represent that religion here to say that this pilgrimage is not religion; a pilgrimage which poisons whole continents and sweeps away men, women, and children by thousands has nothing to do with religion at all. It would be for the benefit of the whole world if we could take that stand.

Then I may say another thing. I think nothing is religion which puts one individual absolutely above others, and surely nothing is religion which puts one sex above another. Religion is primarily our relation to the Supreme, to God himself. It is for Him to judge; it is for Him to say where we belong, who is highest and who is not; of that we know nothing. And any religion which will sacrifice a certain set of human beings for the enjoyment or aggrandizement or advantage of another is no religion. It is a thing which may be allowed, but it is against true religion. Any religion which sacrifices women to the brutality of men is no religion.

From this parliament let some valorous, new, strong, and courageous influence go forth, and let us have here an agreement of all faiths for one good end, for one good thing—really for the glory of God, really for the salvation of humanity from all that is low and animal and unworthy and undivine.

VI.—LETTER FROM LADY HENRY SOMERSET OF ENGLAND, READ BY DR. BARROWS.

Erstnor Castle, England, Sept. 8, 1893. Rev. Dr. John Henry Barrows, Chairman of the World's Religious Congresses, Chicago. Honored Friend:—You have doubtless been told, with fatiguing reiteration, by your world-wide clientele of correspondents that they considered the religious congresses immeasurably more significant than any others to be held in connection with the Columbian Exposition. You must allow me, however, to repeat this statement of opinion, for I have cherished it from the time when I had a conversation with you in Chicago and learned the vast scope and Catholicity of the plans whose fulfillment must be most gratifying to you and your associates, for, with but few exceptions among
the religious leaders of the world, there has been, so far as I have heard and read, the heartiest sympathy in your effort to bring together representatives of all those immeasurable groups of men and women who have been united by the magnetism of some great religious principle, or the more mechanical efforts that give visible form to some ecclesiastical dogma. The keynote you have set has already sounded forth its clear and harmonious strain, and the weary multitudes of the world have heard it and have said in their hearts: “Behold how good and how pleasant it would be if brethren would dwell together in unity.”

I have often thought that the best result of this great and unique movement for a truly pan-religious congress was realized before its members met, for in these days the press, with its almost universal hospitality toward new ideas, helps beyond any other agency to establish an equilibrium of the best thought, affection, and purpose of the world, and is the only practical force adequate to bring this about.

By nature and nurture I am in sympathy with every effort by which men may be induced to think together along the lines of their agreement rather than of their antagonism, but we all know that it is more easy to get them together than to think together. For this reason the congresses, which are to set forth the practical workings of various forms of religion, were predestined to succeed and their influence must steadily increase as intelligent men and women reflect upon the record of the results. It is the earnest hope of thoughtful religious people throughout the world, as all can see who study the press from a cosmopolitan point of view, that out of the nucleus of influence afforded by the congress may come an organized movement for united activity based on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

The only way to unite is never to mention subjects on which we are irrevocably opposed. Perhaps the chief of these is the historic Episcopate; but the fact that he believes in this while I do not would not hinder that good and great prelate Archbishop Ireland from giving his hearty help to me, not as a Protestant woman but as a temperance worker. The same was true in England of that lamented leader, Cardinal Manning, and is true to-
day of Mgr. Nugent, of Liverpool, a priest of the people universally revered and loved. A consensus of opinion on the practical outline of the golden rule, declared negatively by Confucius and positively by Christ, will bring us all into one camp, and that is precisely what the enemies of liberty, worship, purity and peace do not desire to see; but it is this, I am persuaded, that will be attained by the great conclave soon to assemble in the White City of the west.

The congress of religions is the mightiest ecumenical council the world has ever seen; Christianity has from it everything to hope; for as the plains, the tablelands, the foothills, the mountain ranges, all conduct alike, slowly ascending to the loftiest peak of the Himalayas, so do all views of God tend toward and culminate in the character, the life and work of Him who said: “And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me.”

Believe me, yours in humble service for God and humanity.

Isabel Somerset.
CHAPTER V.

THE JEWISH CHURCH.

I.—ORTHODOX OR HISTORICAL JUDAISM—ITS ATTITUDE AND RELATION TO THE PAST AND ITS FUTURE—RAVBI H. PEIRIRA MENDES OF NEW YORK.

Our history may be divided into three eras—the biblical; the era from the close of the Bible record to the present day; the future. The first is the era of the announce-ment of those ideals which are essential for mankind’s happiness and progress. The Bible contains for us and for humanity all ideals worthy of human effort to attain. I make no exception. The attitude of historical Judaism is to hold up these ideals for mankind’s inspiration and for all men to pattern life accordingly.

The first divine message to Abraham, contains the ideal of righteous Altruism—"Be a source of blessing." And in the message announcing the Covenant is the ideal of righteous egotism. "Walk before Me and be perfect," "Recognize Me, God, be a blessing to thy fellow-man, be perfect thyself." Could religion ever be more strikingly summed up?

The life of Abraham, as we have it recorded, is a logical response, despite any human feeling. Thus he refused booty he had captured. It was an ideal of warfare not yet realized—that to the victor the spoils did not necessarily belong. Childless and old, he believed God’s promise that his descendants should be numerous as the stars. It was an ideal faith; that also, and more, was his readiness to sacrifice Isaac—a sacrifice ordered, to make more public his God’s condemnation of Canaanite child-sacrifice. It revealed an ideal God, who would not allow religion to cloak outrage upon holy sentiments of humanity.

To Moses next were high ideals imparted for mankind
to aim at. On the very threshold of his mission the ideal of "the Fatherhood of God" was announced—"Israel is My son, My first born," implying that other nations are also His children. Then at Sinai were given him those ten ideals of human conduct, which, called the "ten commandments," receive the allegiance of the great nations of to-day. Magnificent ideals! Yes, but not as magnificent as the three ideals of God revealed to him—God is mercy, God is love, God is holiness.

"The Lord thy God loveth thee." The echoes of this are the commands to the Hebrews and to the world. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy might." "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; ye shall love the stranger." God is holiness! "Be holy! for I am holy." "It is God calling to man to participate in his divine nature."

To the essayist on Moses belongs the setting forth of other ideals associated with him. The historian may dwell upon his "proclaim freedom throughout the land to its inhabitants." It is written on Boston's Liberty Bell, which announced "Free America." The politician may ponder upon his land-tenure system; his declaration that the poor have rights; his limitation of priestly wealth; his separation of Church and State. The preacher may dilate upon that Mosaic ideals so bright with hope and faith—wings of the human soul as it flies forth to find God—that God is the God of the spirits of all flesh; it is a flashlight of immortality upon the storm-tossed waters of human life. The physician may elaborate his dietary and health laws, designed to prolong life and render man more able to do his duty to society.

The moralist may point to the ideal of personal responsibility, not even a Moses can offer himself to die to save sinners. The exponent of natural law in the spiritual world is anticipated by his "Not by bread alone does man live, but by obedience to divine law." The lecturer on ethics may enlarge upon moral impulses, their co-relation, free will, and such like ideas, it is Moses who teacheth the quickening cause of all is God's revelation, "Our wisdom and our understanding," and who sets before us, "Life and death, blessing and blighting," to choose either, though he advises "choose the life." Tenderness to brute crea-
tion, equality of aliens, kindness to servants, justice to the employed; what code of ethics has brighter gems of ideal than those which make glorious the law of Moses!

As for our other prophets, we can only glance at their ideals of purity in social life, in business life, in personal life, in political life and in religious life. We need no Bryce to tell us how much or how little they obtain in our commonwealth to-day. So, also, if we only mention the ideal relation which they hold up for ruler and the people, and the former "should be servants to the latter," it is only in view of the tremendous results in history.

For these very words license the English revolution. From that very chapter of the Bible the cry, "To your tents, O Israel," was taken by the Puritans, who fought with the Bible in one hand. Child of that English revolt, which soon consummated English liberty, America was born—herself the parent of the French revolution, which has made so many kings the servants of their peoples. English liberty, America's birth, French revolution! Three tremendous results truly! Let us, however, set these aside, great as they are, and mark those grand ideals which our prophets were the first to preach.

1. Universal peace, or settlement of national disputes by arbitration. When Micah and Isaiah announced this ideal of universal peace, it was the age of war, of despotism. They may have been regarded as lunatics. Now, all true men desire it, all good men pray for it, and bright among the jewels of Chicago's coro- net this year is her universal peace convention.

2. Universal brotherhood. If Israel is God's first-born and other nations are, therefore, His children, Malachi's "Have we not all one Father?" does not surprise us. The ideal is recognized to-day. It is prayed for by the Catholics, by the Protestants, by Hebrews, by all men.

3. The universal happiness. This is the greatest. For the ideal of universal happiness includes both universal peace and universal brotherhood. It adds being at peace with God, for, without that, happiness is impossible. Hence the prophet's bright ideal that one day "All shall know the Lord, from the greatest to the least," "Earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea," and "All nations shall come and bow down before God and honor His name."
Add to those prophet ideals, those of our Ketubim. The "seek wisdom" of Solomon, of which the "Know thyself" of Socrates is but a partial echo; Job's "Let not the finite creature attempt to fathom the infinite Creator"; David's reachings after God! And then let it be clearly understood that these and all ideals of the Bible era are but a prelude and overture. How grand then must be the music of the next era which now claims our attention.

The era from Bible days to these is the era of the formation of religious and philosophic systems throughout the Orient and the classic world. What grand harmonies, but what crashing discords sound through these ages! Melting and swelling in mighty diapason, they come to us to-day as the music which once swayed men's souls, now lifting them with holy emotion, now mocking, now soothing, now exciting. For those religions, those philosophies were mighty plectra in their day to wake the human heart-strings. Above them all rang the voice of historical Judaism, clear and lasting, while other sounds blended or were lost. Sometimes the voice was in harmony; most often it was discordant as it clashed with the dominant note of the day. For it sometimes met sweet and elevating strains of morality, of beauty, but more often it met the debasing sounds of immorality and error.

Thus Kuenan speaks of "the affinity of Judaism and Zoroastrianism in Persia to the affinity of a common atmosphere of lofty truth, of a simultaneous sympathy in their view of earthly and heavenly things." If Max Muller declares Zoroastrianism originally was monotheistic, so far historic Judaism could harmonize. But it would raise a voice of protest when Zoroastrianism became a dualism of Ormuzd, light or good, and Ahimran, darkness or evil. Hence the anticipatory protest proclaimed by Isaiah in God's very message to Cyrus, King of Persia, "I am the Lord, and there is none else." "I form the light and create darkness." "I make peace and create evil." "I am the Lord, and there is none else; that is, I do these things, not Ormuzd or Ahriman."

Interesting as would be a consideration of the mutual debt between Judaism and Zoroastrianism, with the borrowed angelology and demonology of the former compared with the "ahmiyat ahmi Mazdan anma" of the
latter manifestly borrowed from the "I am that I am" of the former, we cannot pause here for it.

Similarly historical Judaism would harmonize with Confucius' instance of belief in a Supreme Being, filial duty, his famous "What would you do not like when done to you, do not unto others," and of the Buddhistic teachings of universal peace. But against what is contrary to Bible ideal it would protest, and from it it would hold separate.

In 521 B.C. Zoroastrianism was revived. Confucius was then actually living. Gotama Buddha died in 543. Is the closeness of the dates mere chance? The Jews had long been in Babylon. As Gesenius and Movers observe, there was traffic of merchants between China and India via Babylonia with Phoenicia, and not unworthy of mark is Ernest Renan's observation that Babylon had long been a focus of Buddhism and that Boudasy was a Chaldean sage. If future research should ever reveal an influence of Jewish thought on these three great Oriental faiths, all originally holding beautiful thoughts, however later ages might have obscured them, would it not be partial fulfillment of the prophecy, so far as concerns the Orient, "that Israel shall blossom into bud and fill the face of the earth with fruit?"

In the west as in the east, historical Judaism was in harmony with any ideals of classic philosophy which echoed those of the Bible. It protested where they failed to do so, and because it failed most often historical Judaism remained separate.

Thus, as Dr. Drummond remarks, Socrates was "in a certain sense monotheistic, and in distinction from the other gods mentions Him who orders and holds together the entire Kosmos," "in whom are all things beautiful and good," "who from the beginning makes men"—historical Judaism commends.

Again, Plato, his disciple, taught that God was good or that the planets rose from the reason and understanding of God. Historical Judaism is in accord with its ideal "God is good," so oft repeated and its thought hymned in the almost identical words. "Good are the luminaries which our God created; He formed them with knowledge, understanding and skill." But when Plato condemns studies except as mental training and desires no practical
results; when he even rebukes Arytas for inventing machines on mathematical principles, declaring it was worthy only of carpenters and wheelwrights and when his master, Socrates, says to Glaucon, "It amuses me to see how afraid you are lest the common herd accuse you of recommending useless studies"—the useless study in question being astronomy—historical Judaism is opposed and protests. For it holds that even Bezaleel and Aholiab are filled with the spirit of God. It bids us study astronomy to learn of God thereby. "Lift up your eyes on high and see who hath created these things, who bringeth out their host by number. He calleth them all by name, by the greatness of His might, for He is strong in power; not one faileth." Even as later sages practically teach the dignity of labor by themselves engaging in it. And when Macaulay remarks "from the testimony of friends as well as of foes, from the confessions of Epictetus and Seneca, as well as from the sneers of Lucian and the invectives of Juvenal, it is plain that these teachers of virtue had all the vices of their neighbors with the additional one of hypocrisy," it is easy to understand the relation of historical Judaism to these with its ideal, "Be perfect."

Similarly the sophist school declared "there is no truth, no virtue, no justice, no blasphemy, for there are no gods; right and wrong are conventional terms." The skeptic school proclaimed "we have no criterion of action or judgment; we cannot know the truth of anything; we assert nothing; the Epicurean school taught pleasure's pursuit. But historical Judaism solemnly protested. What are those teachings of our Pirke Avoth but protests, formerly formulated by our religious heads? Said they, "The Torah is the criterion of conduct. Worship instead of doubting. Do philanthropic acts instead of seeking only pleasure. Society's safeguards are Law-Worship, and Philanthropy." So preached Simon Hatzadik. "Love labor," preached Shemangia to the votary of Epicurean ease. "Procure thyself an instructor," was Gamaliel's advice to any one in doubt. "The practical application, not the theory, is the essential," was the cry of Simon to Platonist or Pyrrhic. "Deed first, then creed." "Yes," added Abtalion, "Deed first, then creed, never greed." "Be not like servants who serve their
master for price; be like servants who serve without thought of price—and let the fear of God be upon you.”
“Separation and protest” was thus the cry against these thought-vagaries.

Brilliant instance of the policy and separation and protest was the glorious Maccabean effort to combat Helenist philosophy.

If but for Charles Martel and Poictiers, Europe would long have been Mohammedan, then but for Judas Maccabeus and Bethoron or Emmaus, Judaism would have been strangled. But no Judaism, no Christianity. Take either faith out of the world and what would our civilization be? Christianity was born—originally and as designed and declared by its founder, not to change or alter one tittle of the law of Moses.

If the Nazarene Teacher claimed tacitly or not the title “Son of God” in any sense save that which Moses meant when he said, “Ye are children of your God,” can we wonder that there was a Hebrew protest?”

Historical Judaism soon found cause to be separate and to protest. For sect upon sect arose—Ebionites, Gentile Christians, Jewish Christians, Nazarenes, Gnostic Christians, Masboteans, Basilidians, Valentinians, Carpocratians, Marcionites, Balaamites, Nicolaites, Emkratites, Cainites, Ophites or Nahasites; evangelos of these and of others were multiplied, new prophets were named, such as Pachor, Barkor, Barkoph, Armagil, Abraxos, etc. At last the Christianity of Paul rose supreme, but doctrines were found to be engrafted which not only caused the famous Christian heresies of Pelagius, Nestorius, Eutyches, etc., but obliged historical Judaism to maintain its attitude of separation and protest. For its Bible ideals were invaded. It could not join all the sects and all the heresies. So it joined none.

Presently the Crescent of Islam rose. From Bagdad to Granada, Hebrews prepared protests which the Christians carried to ferment in their distant homes. For through the Arabs and the Jews the old classics were revived and experimental science was fostered. The misuse of the former made the methods of the Academicians the methods of the Scholastic Fathers. But it made Aristotelian philosophy dominant. Experiment widened men’s views. The sentiment of protest was imbibed—
sentiment against scholastic argument, against bidding research for practical ends, against the supposition "that syllogistic reasoning could ever conduct men to the discovery of any new principle," or that such discoveries could be made except by induction, as Aristotle held; against the official denial of ascertained truth, as, for example, earth's rotundity. This protest sentiment in time produced the Reformation. Later it gave wonderful impulse to thought and effort, which has substituted modern civilization, with its glorious conquests, for mediæval semi-darkness.

Here the era of the past is becoming the era of the present. Still historical Judaism maintained its attitude.

As the new philosophies were born, it is said, with Bacon, let us have fruits, practical results, not foliage or mere words. But it opposed a Voltaire and a Paine when they made their ribald attacks. It could but praise the success of a Newton as he "crowned the long labors of the astronomers and physicists by co-ordinating the phenomena of solar motion throughout the visible universe into one vast system." So it could only cry "Amen" to a Kepler and a Galileo. For did they not all prove the long unsuspected magnificence of the Hebrew's God, who made and who ruled the Heavens and Heaven of Heavens, and who presides over the circuit of the earth, as Isaiah tells us? So it cried "Amen" to a Dalton, to a Linneus; for the "atomic notation of the former was as serviceable to chemistry as the binominal nomenclature and the classificatory schematism of the latter were to zoology and botany." What else could historic Judaism cry when the first message to man was to subdue earth, capture its powers, harness them, work? True historical Judaism means progress.

A word more as to the attitude of historic Judaism to modern thought. If Hegel's last work was a course of lectures on the proofs of the existence of God; if, in his lectures on religion, he turned his weapon against the rationalistic schools which reduced religion to the modicum compatible with an ordinary worldly mind and criticise the schools of Schleiermacher, who elevated feeling to a place in religion above systematic theology, we agree with him. But when he gives successive phases of religion and concludes with Christianity, the highest, be-
cause reconciliation is there in open doctrine, we cry, do justice also to the Hebrew. Is not the Hebrew's ideal God a God of Mercy, a God of reconciliation? It is said, "Not forever will He contend, neither doth He retain his anger forever." That is—He will be reconciled.

We agree with much of Comte, and with him elevate womanhood, but we do not, cannot, exclude woman, as he does, from public action; for beside the teachings of reverence and honor for motherhood—beside the Bible tribute to wifehood "that a good wife is a gift of God"—besides the grand tribute to womanhood offered in the last chapter of Proverbs, we produce a Deborah or a woman-president, a Huldah as worthy to give a Divine message.

If Darwin and the disciples of evolution proclaim their theory, the Hebrew points to Genesis ii. 3, where it speaks of what God has created "to make,"—infinitive mood, not "made," as erroneously translated. But historic Judaism protests when any source of life is indicated, save in the breath of God alone.

We march in the van of progress, but our hand is always raised, pointing to God. This is the attitude of historical Judaism. And now to sum up. For the future opens before us.

1. The "separatist" thought. Genesis tells us how Abraham obeyed it. Exodus illustrates it. We are "separated from all the people upon the face of the earth." Leviticus proclaims it: "I have separated you from the peoples." "I have severed you from the peoples." Numbers illustrates it. "Behold, the peoples shall dwell alone." And Deuteronomy declares it: "He hath avouched thee to be His special people."

The thought began as our nation; it grew as it grew. To test its wisdom, let us ask who have survived? The 7,000 separatists who did not bend to Baal or those who did? Those who thronged Babylonian schools at Pumbeditha or Nahardea, or those who succumbed to Magin influence? The Maccabees, who fought to separate, or the Helenists, who aped Greek or the Sectarians of their day? The Bnai Yisrael remnant, recently discovered in India, under the auspices of the Anglo-Jewish Association, the discovery of Theaou-Kin-Keaou, or "people-who-cut-out-
the-sinew," in China, point in this direction of separation as a necessity for existence.

And who are the Hebrews of to-day here and in Europe, the descendants of those who preferred to keep separate, and therefore chose exile or death, or those who yielded and were baptized? The course for historic Judaism is clear. It is to keep separate.

2. The protest thought. We must continue to protest against social, religious or political error with the eloquence of reason. Never by the force of violence. No error is too insignificant, none can be too stupendous for us to notice. The cruelty which shoots the innocent dove for sport—the crime of duellists who risk life which is not theirs to risk—for it belongs to country, wife or mother, to child or to society; the militarism of modern nations, the transformation of patriotism, politics, or service of one's country into a business for personal profit, until these and all wrongs be rectified, we Hebrews must keep separate, and we must protest.

And keep separate and protest, we will, until all error shall be cast to the moles and bats. We are told that Europe's armies amount to 22,000,000 of men. Imagine it! Are we not right to protest that arbitration and not the rule of might should decide? Yet, let me not cite instances which render protest necessary. "Time would fail, and the tale would not be told," to quote a rabbi.

How far separation and protest constitute our historical Jewish policy is evident from what I have said. Apart from this, socially, we unite whole-heartedly and without reservation with our non-Jewish fellow-citizens; we recognize no difference between Hebrew and non-Hebrew.

We declare that the attitude of Historical Judaism, and, for that matter, of the Reform School also, is to serve our country as good citizens, to be on the side of law and order and fight anarchy. We are bound to forward every humanitarian movement; where want or pain calls there must we answer; and condemned by all true men be the Jew who refuses aid because he who needs it is not a Jew. In the intricacies of science, in the pursuit of all that widens human knowledge, in the path of all that benefits humanity, the Jew must walk abreast with non-Jew, except he pass him in generous rivalry. With the non-Jew we must press onward, but for all men and for ourselves we
must ever point upward to the Common Father of all. Marching forward, as I have said, but pointing upward, this is the attitude of Historical Judaism.

Religiously the attitude of Historical Judaism is expressed in the creeds formulated by Maimonides, as follows:

We believe in God the Creator of all, a Unity, a Spirit who never assumed corporeal form, Eternal; and He alone ought to be worshiped. We unite with Christians in the belief that Revelation is inspired. We unite with the founder of Christianity that not one jot or tittle of the Law should be changed. Hence we do not accept a First Day Sabbath, etc. We unite in believing that God is omniscient and just, good, loving and merciful. We unite in the belief in a coming Messiah. We unite in our belief in immortality. In these Judaism and Christianity agree.

As for the development of Judaism, we believe in change in religious custom or idea only when effected in accordance with the spirit of God's Law and the highest authority attainable. But no change without. Hence we cannot, and may not, recognize the authority of any conference of Jewish Rabbis or ministers, unless those attending are formally empowered by their communities or congregations to represent them. Needless to add, they must be sufficiently versed in Hebrew law and lore; they must live lives consistent with Bible teachings and they must be sufficiently advanced in age so as not to be immature in thought.

And we believe, heart, soul, and might, in the restoration to Palestine, a Hebrew state, from the Nile to the Euphrates—even though as Isaiah intimates in his very song of restoration, some Hebrews remain among the Gentiles.

We believe in the future establishment of a Court of Arbitration, above suspicion, for a settlement of nations' disputes, such as could well be in the shadow of that temple which we believe shall one day arise to be a "house of prayer for all peoples," united at last in the service of one Father. How far the restoration will solve present pressing Jewish problems, how far such spiritual organization will guarantee man against falling into error, we cannot here discuss. What if doctrines, customs, and aims separate us now?
There is a legend that when Adam and Eve were turned out of Eden or earthly Paradise, an angel smashed the gates and the fragments flying all over the earth are the precious stones. We can carry the legend further.

The precious stones were picked up by the various religious and philosophers of the world. Each claimed and claims that its own fragment alone reflects the light of Heaven, forgetting the settings and incrustations which time has added. Patience, my brothers. In God's own time we shall, all of us, fit our fragments together and reconstruct the Gates of Paradise. There will be an era of reconciliation of all living faiths and systems, the era of all being in At-one-ment, or atonement, with God. Through the gates shall all people pass to the foot of God's throne. The throne is called by us the mercy-seat. Name of happy augury, for God's mercy shall wipe out the record of mankind's errors and strayings, the sad story of our unbrotherly actions. Then shall we better know God's ways and behold His glory more clearly, as it is written, "They shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord, for I will forgive their iniquity and I will remember their sins no more" (Jer. xxxi. 34).

What if the deathless Jew be present then among the earth's peoples? Would ye begrudge his presence? His work in the world, the Bible he gave it, shall plead for him. And Israel, God's first-born, who, as his prophets foretold, was for centuries despised and rejected of men, knowing sorrows, acquainted with grief, and esteemed stricken by God for his own backslidings, wounded besides through others' transgressions, bruised through others' injuries, shall be but fulfilling his destiny to lead back his brothers to the Father. For that we were chosen; for that we are God's servants or ministers. Yes, the attitude of Historical Judaism to the world will be in the future, as in the past—helping mankind with His Bible—until the gates of earthly Paradise shall be reconstructed by mankind's joint efforts, and all nations whom Thou, God, hast made shall go through and worship before Thee, O Lord, and shall glorify Thy name!
II.—THE THEOLOGY OF JUDAISM, BY RABBI ISAAC M. WISE OF CINCINNATI.

The theology of Judaism, in the opinion of many, is a new academic discipline. They maintain Judaism is identical with legalism, it is a religion of deeds without dogmas. Theology is a systematic treatise on the dogmas of any religion. There could be no theology of Judaism. The modern latitudinarians and syncretists on their part maintain we need more religion and less theology, or no theology at all, deeds and no creeds. For religion is undefinable and purely subjective; theology defines and casts free sentiments into dictatorial words. Religion unites and theology divides the human family not seldom into hostile factions.

Research and reflection antagonize these objections. They lead to convictions, both historically and psychologically. Truth unites and appeases; error begets antagonism and fanaticism. Error, whether in the spontaneous belief or in the scientific formulas of theology, is the cause of the distracting factionalism in the transcendent realm. Truth well defined is the most successful arbitrator among mental combatants. It seems, therefore, the best method to unite the human family in harmony, peace, and good will is to construct a rational and humane system of theology, as free from error as possible, clearly defined and appealing directly to the reason and conscience of all normal men. Research and reflection in the field of Israel's literature and history produce the conviction that a code of laws is no religion. Yet regalism and observances are but one form of Judaism. The underlying principles and doctrines are essentially Judaism, and these are material to the theology of Judaism, and these are essentially dogmatic.

Scriptures from the first to the last page advance the doctrine of divine inspiration and revelation. Ratiocinate this as you may, it always centers in the proposition: There exists an interrelation and a faculty of intercommunication in the nature of that universal, prior, and superior Being and the individualized being called man; and this also is a dogma.
Scriptures teach that the Supreme Being is also Sovereign Providence. He provides sustenance for all that stand in need of it. He foresees and foreordains all, shapes the destinies and disposes the affairs of man and mankind, and takes constant cognizance of their doings. He is the lawgiver, the judge and the executor of his laws. Press all this to the ultimate abstraction and formulate it as you may, it always centers in the proposition of “Die sittliche Weltordnung,” the universal, moral, just, benevolent, and beneficent theocracy, which is the cause, source, and text-book of all canons of ethics; and this again is a dogma.

Scriptures teach that virtue and righteousness are rewarded; vice, misdeeds, crimes, sins are punished, inasmuch as they are free-will actions of man; and adds thereto that the free and benevolent Deity under certain conditions pardons sin, iniquity, and transgression. Here is an apparent contradiction between justice and grace in the Supreme Being. Press this to its ultimate abstraction, formulate it as you may and you will always arrive at some proposition concerning atonement, and this also is a dogma.

As far back into the twilight of myths, the early dawn of human reason, as the origin of religious knowledge was traced, mankind was in possession of four dogmas. They were always present in men's consciousness, although philosophy has not discovered the antecedents of the syllogism, of which these are the conclusions. The exceptions are only such tribes, clans, or individuals that had not yet become conscious of their own sentiments, not being crystallized into conceptions, and in consequence thereof had no words to express them; but those are very rare exceptions. These four dogmas are:

1. There exists—in one or more forms of being—a superior Being, living, mightier, and higher than any other being known or imagined. (Existence of God.)

2. There is in the nature of this superior being, and in the nature of man, the capacity and desire of mutual sympathy, interrelation and intercommunication. (Revelation and worship.)

3. The good and the right, the true and the beautiful, are desirable, the opposites thereof are detestable and re-
pugnant to the superior being and to man. (Conscience, ethics, and æsthetics.)

4. There exists for man a state of felicity or torment beyond this state of mundane life. (Immortality, reward or punishment.)

These four dogmas of the human family are the postulate of all theology and theologies, and they are axiomatic. They require no proof, for what all men always knew is self-evident; and no proof can be adduced to them, for they are transcendent. Philosophy, with its apparatuses and methods of cogitation, cannot reach them, cannot expound them, cannot negate them, and none ever did prove such negation satisfactorily even to the individual reasoner himself.

All systems of theology are built on these four postulates. They differ only in the definitions of the quiddity, the extension and expansion of these dogmas in accordance with the progression or retrogression of different ages and countries. They differ in their derivation of doctrine or dogma from the main postulates; their reduction to practice in ethics and worship, forms and formulas; their methods of application to human affairs, and their notions of obligation, accountability, hope or fear.

These accumulated differences in the various systems of theology, inasmuch as they are not logically contained in these postulates, are subject to criticism; an appeal to reason is always legitimate, a rational justification is requisite. The arguments advanced in all these cases are not always appeals to the standard of reason—therefore the disagreements—they are mostly historical. “Whatever we have not from the knowledge of all mankind we have from the knowledge of a very respectable portion of it in our holy books and sacred traditions” is the main argument. So each system of theology, in as far as it differs from others, relies for proof of its particular conceptions and knowledges on its traditions, written or unwritten, as the knowledge of a portion of mankind; so each particular theology depends on its sources.

So also does Judaism. It is based upon the four postulates of all theology, and in justification of its extensions and expansions, its derivation of doctrine and dogma from the main postulates, its entire development, it points to its sources and traditions, and, at various
times also to the standard of reason, not, however, till the philosophers pressed it to reason in self-defense: because it claimed the Divine authority for its sources, higher than which there is none. And so we have arrived at our subject.

We know what theology is, so we must define here only what Judaism is. Judaism is the complex of Israel's religious sentiments ratiocinated to conceptions in harmony with its Jehovistic God-cognition.

These conceptions made permanent in the consciousness of this people are the religious knowledges which form the substratum to the theology of Judaism. The Thorah maintains that its "teaching and canon" are divine. Man's knowledge of the true and the good comes directly to human reason and conscience (which is unconscious reason) from the supreme and universal reason, the absolutely true and good: or it comes to him indirectly from the same source by the manifestations of nature, the facts of history, and man's power of induction. This principle is in conformity with the second postulate of theology, and its extension in harmony with the standard of reason.

All knowledge of God and His attributes, the true and the good, came to man by successive revelations, of the indirect kind first, which we may call natural revelation, and the direct kind afterward, which we may call transcendental revelation; both these revelations concerning God and His substantial attributes, together with their historical genesis, are recorded in the Thorah in the seven holy names of God, to which neither prophet nor philosopher in Israel added even one, and all of which constantly recur in all Hebrew literature.

What we call the God of revelation is actually intended to designate God as made known in the transcendental revelations including the successive God-ideas of natural revelation. His attributes of relation are made known only in such passages of the Thorah, in which He Himself is reported to have spoken to man of Himself, His name and His attributes, and not by any induction or reference from any law, story or doing ascribed to God anywhere. The prophets only expand or define those conceptions of deity which these passages of direct transcendental revelation in the Thorah contain. There exists no other
source from which to derive the cognition of the God of revelation.

Whatever theory or practice is contrary or contradictory to Israel's God-cognition can have no place in the theology of Judaism. It compromises necessarily:

The doctrine concerning Providence, its relations to the individual, the nations and mankind. This includes the doctrine of covenant between God and man, God and the fathers of the nation, God and the people of Israel or the election of Israel.

The doctrine concerning atonement. Are sins expiated, forgiven or pardoned, and which are the conditions or means for such expiation of sins?

This leads us to the doctrine of divine worship generally, its obligatory nature, its proper means and forms, its subjective or objective import, which includes also the precepts concerning holy seasons, holy places, holy convocations and consecrated or specially appointed persons to conduct such divine worship, and the standard to distinguish conscientiously in the Thorah the laws, statutes and ordinances which were originally intended to be always obligatory, from those which were originally intended for a certain time and place, and under special circumstances.

The doctrine concerning the human will; is it free, conditioned or controlled by reason, faith or any other agency? This includes the postulate of ethics.

The duty and accountability of man in all his relations to God, man and himself, to his nation and to his government and to the whole of the human family. This includes the duty we owe to the past, to that which the process of history developed and established.

This leads to the doctrine concerning the future of mankind, the ultimate of the historical process, to culminate in a higher or lower status of humanity. This includes the question of perfectibility of human nature and the possibilities it contains, which establishes a standard of duty we owe to the future.

The doctrine concerning personal immortality, future reward and punishment, the means by which such immortality is attained, the condition on which it depends, what insures reward or punishment.

The theology of Judaism as a systematic structure must
solve these problems on the basis of Israel's God-cognition. This being the highest in man's cognition, the solution of all problems upon this basis, ecclesiastical, ethical or in eschatology, must be final in theology, provided the judgment which leads to this solution is not erroneous. An erroneous judgment from true antecedents is possible. In such cases the first safeguard is an appeal to reason, and the second, though not secondary, is an appeal to holy writ and its best commentaries. Wherever these two authorities agree, reason and holy writ, that the solution of any problem from the basis of Israel's God-cognition is correct, certitude is established, the ultimate solution is found.

This is the structure of a systematic theology. Israel's God-cognition is the sustratum, the substance: holy writ and the standard of reason are the desiderata, and the faculty of reason is the apparatus to solve the problems which in their unity are the theology of Judaism, higher than which none can be.

III.—THE VOICE OF THE MOTHER OF RELIGIONS ON THE SOCIAL QUESTION, BY RABBI H. BERKOWITZ, D. D. OF PHILADELPHIA.

Here in the assembly of so many of her spiritual children, in the midst of the religions which have received from her nurture and loving care, Judaism, the fond mother, may well lift up her voice and be heard with reverent and affectionate attention. It has been asked: "What has Judaism to say on the Social Question?"

From earliest days she has set the seal of sanctity on all that question involves. From the very first she proclaimed the dignity, nay, the duty of labor by postulating God, the Creator, at work and setting forth the divine example unto all men for imitation, in the command: "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work." Industry is thus hallowed by religion, and religion in turn is made to receive the homage of industry in the fulfillment of the ordinance of Sabbath rest. Judaism thus came into the world to live in the world, to make the world more heavenly. Though aspiring unto the heavens she has always trod firmly upon the earth, abiding with men in their habitations, ennobling their toils, dignifying their
pleasures. Through all the centuries of her sorrowful life she has steadfastly striven with her every energy to solve, according to the eternal law of the Eternal. Righteous, every new phase of the ever-recurring problems in the social relationships of men.

When the son of Adam, hiding in the dismal covert of some primeval forest, heard the accusing voice of conscience in bitter tones upbraiding him, he defiantly made reply: "Am I my brother's keeper?" Then the social conflict began. To the question then asked, Judaism made stern reply in branding with the guilt-mark of Cain every transgression of human sight. From then until now unceasingly, through all the long and trying centuries she has never wearied in lifting up her voice to denounce wrong, and plead for right to brand the oppressor and uplift the oppressed. Pages upon pages of her Scriptures, folio upon folio of her massive literature, are devoted to the social question in its whole broad range and full of maxims, precepts, injunctions, ordinances, and laws aiming to secure the right adjustment of the affairs of men in the practical concerns of every day.

In the family, in the community, in the state, in all the forms of social organization, inequalities between man and man have arisen which have evoked the contentions of the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, the high and the low. Against the iniquity of self-seeking, Judaism has ever protested most loudly and none the less so against the errors and evils of an unjust self-sacrifice. "Love thyself," she says, "this is natural, this axiomatic; but remember it is never of itself a moral injunction. Egoism as an exclusive motive is entirely false, but altruism is not, therefore, exclusively and always right. It likewise may defeat itself, may work injury and lead to crime. The worthy should never be sacrificed for the unworthy. It is vain for you to give your hard-earned money to a vagabond and thus propagate vice, as much as it is sinful to withhold your aid from the struggling genius whose opportunity may yield to the world undeceived-of benefits."

In this reciprocal relation between the responsibility of the individual for society and of society for the individual, lies one of Judaism's prime characteristics. She has pointed the ideal in the conflict of social principles by
her golden precept. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself—I am God." (Leviticus xix., 18). According to this precept she has so arranged the inner affairs of the family that the purity, the sweetness, and tenderness of the homes of her children have become proverbial.

Honor thy father and thy mother (Ex. xx., 12).

The widow and the orphan thou shalt not oppress (Ex. xxii., 22).

Before the hoary head shalt thou rise and shalt revere the Lord thy God (Lev. xix., 32).

And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children (Deut. vi., 7).

These and hundreds of like injunctions have created the institutions of loving and tender care which secure the training and nurture, the education and rearing of the child, which sustain the man and the woman in rectitude in the path of life, and with the staff of a devout faith guide their downward steps in old age to the resting-place "over which the star of Immortality sheds its radiant light."

Judaism sets education before all things else and knows but one word for charity—Zedakah, i. e., Justice. She has made the home the basis of the social structure and has sought to supply the want of a home as a just due to every creature, guarding each with this motive, from the cradle to the grave. With her sublime maxim, "Love thy neighbor as thyself—I am God"—Judaism set up the highest ideal of society as a human brotherhood under the care of a divine Fatherhood. According to this ideal Judaism has sought, passing beyond the environments of the family, to regulate the affairs of human society at large. "This is the book of the generations of men"—was the caption of Genesis, indicating as the Rabbins taught, that all men, without distinction of race, caste, or other social difference, are entitled to equal rights as being equally the children of one Creator. The social ideal was accordingly the sanctification of men unto the noblest in the injunction to the "priest-people"—Holy shall ye be, for I, the Lord your God, am holy" (Ex. xix., 22).

The freedom of the individual was the prime necessary consequence of this precept. Grandly and majestically the Mosaic legislation swept aside all the fallacies which had given the basis to the heartless degradation of man
by his fellow-man. Slavery stood forever condemned when Israel went forth from the bondage of Egypt. Labor then for the first time asserted its freedom and assumed the dignity which at last the present era is vindicating with such fervor and power. Judaism established the freedom to select one's own calling in life irrespective of birth or other conditions. For each one a task according to his capacities was the rule of life. The laborer was never so honored as in the Hebrew Commonwealth. The wage-system was inaugurated to secure to each one the fruits of his toil. It was over the work of the laboring man that the master had control, not over the man. Indeed the evils of the wage system were scrupulously guarded against in that the employer was charged by the law, as by conscience, to have regard for the physical, moral, and spiritual well-being of his employés and their families.

To the solution of all the problems, which, under the varying conditions of the different lands and different ages, always have arisen and always will arise, the Jewish legislation in its inception and development affords an extraordinary contribution. It has studiously avoided the fallacies of the extremists of both the Communistic and Individualistic economic doctrines. Thus it was taught: He that saith, "What is mine is thine and what is thine is mine" (communism), he is void of a moral concept. He that saith, "What is mine is mine and what is thine is thine," he has the wisdom of prudence. But some of the sages declare that this teaching too rigidly held, oft leads to barbarous cruelties. He that saith, "What is mine is thine and what is thine shall remain thine," he has the wisdom of the righteous. He that says that, "What is mine is mine and what is thine is also mine," he is utterly Godless (Pirque Aboth, v., 13).

Judaism has calmly met the wild outbursts of extremists of the anti-poverty, nihilistic types with the simple confession of the fact which is a resultant of the imperfections of human nature: "The needy will not be wanting in the land" (Deut., xv. 11). The brotherly care of the needy is the common solicitude of the Jewish legislatures and people in every age. Their neglect or abuse evoke the wrath of prophet, sage, and councilor with such a fury that even to-day none but the morally dead can
withstand their eloquence. The effort of all legislation and instruction was directed to a harmonization of these two extremes.

The freedom of the individual was recognized as involving the development of unlike capacities. From this freedom all progress springs. But all progress must be made, not for the selfish advantage of the individual alone, but for the common welfare, "that thy brother with thee may live" (Lev. xxv. 36). Therefore private property in land or other possessions was regarded as only a trust, because everything is God's, the Father's, to be acquired by industry and perseverance by the individual, but to be held by him only to the advantage of all.

To this end were established all the laws and institutions of trade, of industry, and of the system of inheritance, the code of rentals, the Jubilee year that every fiftieth year brought back the land, which had been sold into the original patrimony, the seventh or Sabbatical year, in which the lands were fallow, all produce free to the consumer, the tithings of field and flock, the loans to the brother in need without usury, and the magnificent system of obligatory charities, which still hold the germ of the wisdom of all modern scientific charity. "Let the poor glean in the fields" (Lev. xix., 10), and gather through his own efforts what he needs, i.e., give to each one not support, but the opportunity to secure his own support.

A careful study of these Mosaic-Talmudic institutions and laws is bound more and more to be recognized as of untold worth to the present in the solution of the social question. True, these codes were adapted to the needs of a peculiar people, homogeneous in character, living under certain conditions and environments, which probably do not now exist in exactly the same order anywhere. We cannot use the statutes, but their aim and spirit, their motive and method we must adopt in the solution of the social problem even to-day. Consider that the cry of woe which is ringing in our ears now was never heard in Judea. Note that, in all the annals of Jewish history, there are no records of the revolts of slaves such as those which afflicted the world's greatest empire, and, under Spartacus, threatened the national safety; nor any uprisings like those of the Plebeians of Rome, the Demoi of Athens, or the Helots of Sparta; no wild scenes like
those of the Paris commune; no procession of hungry men, women, and children crying for bread, like those of London, Chicago, and Denver. Pauperism, that specter of our country, never haunted the ancient land of Judea. Tramps were not known there.

Because the worst evils which afflict the social body to-day were unknown under the Jewish legislation, we may claim that we have here the pattern of what was the most successful social system that the world has ever known. Therefore does Judaism lift up her voice and call back her spiritual children, that in her bosom they may find comfort and rest. "Come back to the cradle of the world, where wisdom first spake," she cries, "and learn again the message of truth, that for all times and unto all generations was proclaimed through Israel's precept, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself, for I am God'" (Lev. xix., 18).

The hotly-contested social questions of our civilization are to be settled neither according to the ideas of the capitalist, nor those of the laborer, neither according to those of the socialist, the communist, the anarchist, or the nihilist; but simply and only according to the eternal laws of morality of which Sinai is the loftiest symbol. The guiding principles of all true social economy are embodied in the simple lessons of Judaism. As the world has been redeemed from idolatry, and its moral corruption, by the vital force of Jewish ideas, so can it likewise be redeemed from social debasement and chaos.

Character is the basic precept of Judaism. It claims, as the modern philosopher declares (Herbert Spencer), that there is no political alchemy by which you can get golden conduct out of leaden instincts. Whatever the social system, it will fail unless the consciences of men and women are quick to heed the imperative orders of duty and to the obligations and responsibilities of power and ownership. The old truth of righteousness, so emphatically and rigorously insisted on from the first by Judaism, must be the new truth in every changing phase of economic and industrial life. Only thus can the social questions be solved. In her insistence on this doctrine, Judaism retains her place in the van of the religions of humanity.

Let the voice of the mother of religions be heard in the
parliament of all religions. May the voice of the mother not plead in vain. May the hearts of the nations be touched, and all the unjust and cruel restrictions of ages be removed from Israel in all lands, so that the emancipated may go in increasing colonies back to the native pursuits of agriculture and the industries so long denied them. May the colonies of the United States of America, Argentine, and Palestine, be an earnest to the world of the purity of Israel's motives; may the agricultural and industrial schools maintained by the Alliance Israelite Universelle, the Baron de Hirsch Trust, and the various Jewish organizations of the civilized world, from Palestine to California, prove Israel's ardor for the honors of industry; may the wisdom of her schools, the counsel of her sages, the inspiration of her law-givers, the eloquence of her prophets, the rapture of her psalmists, the earnestness of all her advocates, increasingly win the reverent attention of humanity to, and fix them unswervingly upon, the everlasting laws of righteousness which she has set as the only basis for the social structure.
CHAPTER VI.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

I.—CHRISTIANITY AND EVOLUTION, BY PROFESSOR HENRY DRUMMOND OF GLASGOW—(READ BY DR. FRANK M. BRISTOL).

No more fitting theme could be chosen for discussion at this congress than the relation of Christianity to evolution. By evolution I do not mean Darwinism, which is not yet proved, nor Spencerism, which is incomplete, nor Weismannism, which is in the hottest fires of criticism; but evolution as a great category of thought, as the supreme word of the nineteenth century. More than that, it is the greatest generalization the world has ever known. The mere presence of this doctrine in science has reacted as by an electric induction on every surrounding circle of thought. No truth can remain now unaffected by evolution. We see truth as a profound ocean still, but with a slow and ever-rising tide. Theology must reckon with this tide. We can stir this truth in our vessels for the formulation of doctrine, but the formulation of doctrine must never stop, and the vessels with their mouths open must remain in the ocean. If we take them out, the tide cannot rise in them, and we shall only have stagnant doctrines.

The average mind looks at science with awe. It is the breaking of a fresh seal. It is the one chapter of the world's history with which he is in doubt. What it contains for Christianity or against it he knows not. What it will do or undo he cannot tell. The problems to be solved are more in number and more intricate than were ever known before, and he waits almost in excitement for the next development. And yet this attitude of Christianity is as free from false hope as it is free from false fear.

The idea that religion is to be improved by reason of its relation with science is almost a new thing. Religion
and science began the centuries hand in hand. And, after a long separation, we ask what contributions has science to bestow? What God-given truths is science bringing now to lay at the feet of our Christ? True, science is as much the friend of true religion as any branch of truth, and in all the struggles between them in the past they have both come out of the struggles enriched, purified, and enlarged. The first fact to be restored, evolution, has swept over the doctrine of creation and left it untouched except for the better. Science has discovered how God made the world.

Fifty years ago Darwin wrote in dismay to Hooker that the old theory of specific creation, that God made all species apart and introduced them into the world one by one, was melting away before his eyes. One of the last books on Darwinism, that of Alfred Wallace, says in its opening chapter these words:

"The whole scientific and literary world, even the whole educated public, accepts as a matter of common knowledge the origin of species from other like species by the ordinary processes of natural birth."

Theology, after a period of hesitation, accepts this version. The hesitation was not due to prejudice, but for the arrival of the proof. The doctrine of evolution, no one will assert, is yet proved. It will be time for theology to be unanimous when science is unanimous. If science is satisfied in a general way with its theory of evolution as the method of creation, assent is a cold word with which those whose business it is to know and love the ways of God should welcome it. The theory of evolution fills a gap at the very beginning of our religion. As to its harmony with the question or the theory about the book of Genesis it may be that theology and science have been brought into perfect harmony, but the era of the reconcilers is to be looked upon as past. That was a necessary era.

Genesis was not a scientific but a religious book, and, there being no science there, theologians put it there, and their attempt to reconcile it would seem to be a mistake. Genesis is a presentation of one or two great elementary truths of the childhood of the world. It can only be read in the spirit in which it was written, with
its original purpose in view, and its original audience. Its object was purely religious, the point being not how certain things were made, which is a question for science, but that God made them. The book was not dedicated to science but to the soul. The misfortune is that there is no one to announce in the name of theology that the controversy between science and religion is at an end. Evolution has swept over the religious conception of origin and left it untouched except for the better. The method of creation; the question of origin is another. There is only one theory of creation in the field, and that is evolution. Evolution has discovered nothing new and professes to know nothing new. Evolution, instead of being opposed to creation, assumes creation. Law is not the cause of the order of the world, but the expression of it. Evolution only professes to give an account of the development of the world; it does not offer to account for it. This is what Professor Tyndal said:

"When I stand in the springtime and look upon the bright foliage, the lilies in the field, and share the general joy of opening life, I have often asked myself whether there is any power, any being or thing in the universe whose knowledge of that of which I am so ignorant, is greater than mine. I have said to myself, can it be possible that man's knowledge is the greatest knowledge, that man's life is the highest life. My friends, the profession of that atheism with which I am sometimes so lightly charged would, in my case, be an impossible answer to this question."

And, more pathetically, later, in connection with the charge of atheism, he said:

"Christian men are proved by their writings, to have their hours of weakness and of doubt as well as their hours of strength and conviction; and men like myself share in their own way these variations of mood and sense. I have noticed during years of self-observation, that it is not in hours of clearness and of vigor that this doctrine commends itself to my mind—it is in the hours of stronger and healthier thought that it ever dissolves and disappears as offering no solution to the mystery in which we dwell, and of which we form a part."

Some of the protests of science against theism are directed not against true theism, but against its superstitious and irrational forms, which it is the business of science to question. What Tyndal calls a fierce and distorted theism is as much the enemy of Christianity as of science; and if science can help Christianity to
destroy it, it does well. What we have really to fight against is both unfounded belief and unfounded unbelief, and there is perhaps just as much of the one as of the other floating in current literature. As Mr. Ruskin says: “You have to guard against the darkness of the two opposite prides—the pride of faith, which imagines that the character of the Deity can be proved by its convictions, and the pride of science, which imagines that the Deity can be explained by its analysis.” I may give, in passing, the authorized statement of a well-known fellow of the Royal Society of London, which, I need not remind you, is the representative party of British men of science. Its presidents are invariably men of the first rank. This gentleman said:

“I have known the British association, under forty-one different presidents, all leading men of science. On looking over those forty-one names, I count twenty who, judged by their private utterances, or private communications, are men of Christian belief and character, while, judging by the same test, I find only four who disbelieve in any divine revelation. Of the remaining seventeen, some have possibly been religious men, and others may have been opponents, but it is fair to suppose that the greater number have given no very serious thought to the subject. The figures indicate that religious faith rather than unbelief have characterized the leading men of the association.

Instead of robbing the world of God, science has done more than all the philosophies and natural theologies to sustain the theistic conception. It has made it impossible for the world to worship any other God. The sun and the moon and the stars have been found out; science has shown us exactly what they are. No man can worship them any more.

If science has not, by searching, found out God, it has not found any other God, nor anything else like a God that might continue to be a conceivable and rational object of worship in a scientific age. If, by searching, it has not found God it has found a place for God. As never before from the purely physical side of things it has shown there is room in the world for God. It has given us a more Godlike God. The new energies in the world demand a will and an ever-present will. To science God no longer made the world and then withdrew; He pervades the whole. Under the old view God was a non-resident God and an occasional wonder-worker. Now He is always here.
It is certain that every step of science discloses the attributes of the Almighty with a growing magnificence. The author of Natural Religion tells us that the average scientific man worships at present a more awful and, as it were, a greater Deity than the average Christian. Certain it is that the Christian view and the scientific view together form a conception of the object of worship such as the world in its highest inspiration never reached before. Never before have the attributes of eternity and immensity and infinity clothed themselves with language so majestic in its sublimity. Mr. Huxley tells us that he would like to see a Sunday-school established in every parish. If this only were to be taught we should be rich, indeed, to be qualified to be the teachers in those Sunday-schools.

One cannot fail to prophesy in view of the latest contributions of science, that before another half century has passed there will be a theological advance of moment. Under the new view the whole question of the Incarnation is beginning to assume a fresh development. Instead of standing alone an isolated phenomenon, its profound relations to the whole scheme of nature are opening up. The question of revelation is undergoing a similar expansion. The whole order and scheme of nature are seen to be only part of the manifold revelation of God.

As to the specific revelations, the Old and New Testaments, evolution has already given the world what amounts to a new Bible. Its peculiarity is, that in its form it is like the world in which it is found. It is a word, but its root is now known and we have other words from the same root. Its substance is still the unchanged language of Heaven, yet it is written in a familiar tongue. This Bible is not a book which has been made, it has grown. Hence, it is no longer a mere word-book nor a compendium of doctrines, but a nursery of growing truths.

Like nature, it has successive strata and valley and hilltop and atmosphere and rivers are flowing still, and here and there a place which is a desert, and fossils, whose true forms are the stepping-stones to higher things. It is a record of inspired deed as well as of inspired words, a series of inspired facts in the matrix of human history. This is not the product of any destruc-
tive movement, nor is this transformed book, in any sense, a mutilated Bible. All this change has taken place, it may be, without the elimination of a book or the loss of an important word. It is simply a transformation by a method whose main warrant is that the book lends itself to it. Other questions are moving the world just now, but one has only time to name them. The doctrine of immortality, the relation of the person of Christ to evolution, and the operation of the Holy Spirit are attracting attention, and lines of new thought have even been suggested.

Not least in interest is the possible contribution from science on some of the more practical problems of theology and the doctrine of sin. On the last point the suggestion has been made that sin is probably a relic of the animal caste, the undestroyed residuum of the animal, and the subject, ranked at least as an hypothesis, with proper safeguards, may one day yield some glimmering light to theology on its oldest and darkest problem. If this partial suggestion, and at present it is nothing more, can be followed out to any purpose, the result would be of much greater and speculative interest, or if science can help us in any way to know how sin came into the world, it may help us better to know how to get it out.

A better understanding of its genesis and nature may modify, at least, some of the attempts made to get rid of it whether in a national or individual life. But the time is not ripe to speak with more than the greatest caution and humility of these still tremendous problems. There is an intellectual covetousness abroad, which is neither the fruit nor the friend of a scientific age. The haste to be wise, like the haste to be rich, leads many to speculate in indifferent securities, and can only end in fallen fortunes. Theology must not be bound up with such speculations.

At the same time speculation must continue to be its life and its highest duty. We are sometimes warned that the scientific method has dangers, and are told not to carry it too far. But it is then, after all, that it becomes chiefly dangerous when we are warned not to carry it too far. Apart from all details, apart from the influence to modern science on points of Christian theology, that to which most of us look with eagerness and gratitude, is its contribution to applied Christianity. The true answer to
the question, is there any conflict between Christianity and theology, is that in practice, at all events, the two are one.

What is the object of Christianity? It is the evolving of men, the making of higher and better men in a higher and better world. That is also the object of evolution—what evolution has been doing since time began. Christianity is the further evolution. It is an evolution re-enforced with all the moral and spiritual forces that have entered the world and cleaved to humanity through Jesus Christ. Beginning with atoms and crystals, passing to plants and animals, evolution finally reaches man. But, unless it ceases to be scientific fact, it cannot stop there. It must go on to include the whole man, and all the work and thought and light and aspiration of man. The great moral facts, the moral forces, so far as they are proved to exist, the Christian consciousness, so far as it is real, must come within its scope. Human history is as much a part of it as natural history.

When all this is included it will be seen that evolution, organic evolution, is but the earlier chapter of Christianity, and that Christianity is but the later evolution. There can be but one verdict, then, as to the import of evolution, as to its bearings on the individual life and future of the race. The supreme message of science to this age is that all nature is on the side of the man who tries to rise. Evolution, development, and progress are not only on her programme: these are her programme. For all things are rising—all worlds, all planets, all stars, all suns. An ascending energy is the universe, and the whole moves on with one mighty ideal and anticipation. The aspiration of the human mind and heart is but the evolutionary tendency of the universe. Darwin's great discovery, or the discovery which he brought into prominence, is the same as that of Galileo, that the world moves. The Italian prophet says it moves from west to east. The English philosopher says it moves from low to high.

As in the days of Galileo, there are many now who do not see that the world moves, men to whom the world is an endless plane, a prison fixed in a purposeless universe, where untried prisoners await their unknown fate. It is not the monotony of life that destroys; it is the pointlessness. They can bear its weight; its meaninglessness crushes them. The same revolution that the discovery of
the axial rotation of the earth effected in the world of physics the doctrine of evolution will make in the moral world. Already a sudden and marvelous light has fallen upon the earth. Evolution is less a doctrine than a light. It is a light revealing in the chaos of the past a perfect and growing order, giving meaning even to the confusion of the present, discovering through all the denseness around us the paths to progress, and flashing its rays upon the coming goal.

Men begin to see an undivided ethical purpose in this material world, a tide that from eternity has never turned, making to perfectness, in that vast progression of nature, that vision of all things from the first of time, moving from low to high, from incompleteness to completeness, from imperfection to perfection. The moral nature recognizes in all its height and depth the eternal claim upon itself—wholeness and perfection to holiness and righteousness. These have always been required of man, but never before on the natural plan have they been proclaimed by voices so commanding or enforced by sanctions so great and rational.

II.—THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE, BY SIR WILLIAM DAWSON, F. R. S., OF MONTREAL.

Prevented by age and infirm health from being present at the parliament of religions, I accede to the request of the chairman, Rev. Dr. Barrows, to prepare a short summary of my matured conclusions on the subject of the relations of natural science to religion. In doing so I feel that little that is new can be said, and that, in the space at my disposal, I can merely state general principles suitable perhaps to constitute a basis for discussion.

For such a purpose the term natural science may be held to include our arranged and systematized knowledge of the earth and its living inhabitants. It will thus comprise not only geology and the biological sciences, but anthropology and psychology. On the other hand, one may take religion in its widest sense as covering the belief common to all the more important faiths, and more especially those general ideas which belong to all the races of men and are usually included under the term natural religion, though this, as we shall see, graduates impercep-
tibly into that which is revealed. Natural religion, if thereby we understand the beliefs fairly deducible from the facts of nature, is in truth closely allied to natural science, and, if reduced to a system, may even be considered as a part of it. Our principal inquiry should therefore be not so much "How do scientific results agree with religious beliefs or any special form of them?" but rather "How much and what particular portion of that which is held as religious belief is inseparable from or fairly deducible from the results of natural science?"

All scientific men are probably prepared to admit that there must be a first cause for the phenomena of the universe. We cannot, without violating all scientific probability, suppose these to be causeless, self-caused or eternal. Some may, however, hold that the first cause, being an ultimate fact, must on that account be unknowable. But though this may be true of the first cause as to origin and essence, it cannot be true altogether as to qualities. The first cause must be antecedent to all phenomena. The first cause must be potent to produce all resulting effects, and must include potentially the whole fabric of the universe. The first cause must be immaterial, independent and in some sense self-contained or individual. These properties, which reason requires us to assign to the first cause, are not very remote from the theological idea of a self-executed, all-powerful and personal Creator.

Even if one failed to apprehend these properties of the first cause, we are not necessarily shut up to absolute agnosticism, for science is familiar with the idea that causes may be entirely unknown to us in themselves, yet well known to us in their laws and their effects. Since, then, the whole universe must in some sense be an illustration and development of its first cause, it must reflect light on this primitive power, which must thus be known to us at least in the same manner in which such agencies as gravitation and the ethereal medium occupying space are known. That mutual attraction of bodies at a distance which we call gravitation, is unknown to us in its origin and nature, and indeed unthinkable as to its manner of operation; but we know well its all-prevailing laws and effects. The ether, which seems to occupy all space, and which transmits to us by its undulations the light of the
heavenly bodies, is, at present, in its nature and constitution, not only unknown but inconceivable; science would not justify us in assuming the position of agnostic either with reference to gravitation or ether.

Nor can we interpret these analogies in a pantheistic sense. The all is itself a product of the first cause which must have existed previously, and of which we cannot affirm any extension in a material sense. The extension is rather like that of the human will, which, though individual and personal, may control and animate a vast number of persons and agencies—may, for example, pervade and regulate every portion of a great army or of a great empire. There again we are brought near to a theological doctrine, and can perceive that the first cause may be the will of an Almighty Being, or at least something which, relating to an eternal and infinite existence, may be compared with what will is in the lesser sphere of human consciousness. In this way we can at least form a conception of a former all-pervading yet personal agency, free, yet determined by its own innate constitution.

Thus science seems to have no place for agnosticism, except in that sense in which the essence of all energies and even of matter is unknown; and it has no place for pantheism except in that sense in which energies, like gravitation, apparently localized in a central body, are extended in their effects throughout the universe. In this way science merges into rational theism and its first cause becomes the will of a Divine Being, inscrutable in essence yet universal in influence and manifested in His works. In this way science tends to be not only theistic, but monotheistic, and corrects those ideas of the unity of nature which it derives from the uniformity and universality of natural laws with the will of one lawmaker.

Nor does law exclude volition. It becomes the expression of the unchanging will of infinite wisdom and foresight. Otherwise we should have to believe that the laws of nature are either necessary or fortuitous, and we know that neither of these alternatives is possible. All animals are actuated by instincts adapted to their needs and place in nature, and we have a right to consider such instincts as in accordance with the will of their Creator. Should we not regard the intuition of man in the same light, and also what may be called his religious and
moral instincts? Of these, perhaps one of the most universal, next to the belief in a God or gods, is that in a future life. It seems to have been implanted in those antediluvian men whose remains are found in caverns and alluvial deposits, and it has continued to actuate their descendants ever since. This instinct of immortality should surely be recognized by science as constituting one of the inherent and essential characters of humanity.

So far in the direction of religion the science of nature may logically carry us without revelation, and we may agree with the Apostle Paul that even the heathen may learn that God's power and divinity prove the things that he has made. In point of fact, without the aid of either formal science or theology, and in so far as known without any direct revelation, the belief in God and immortality has actually been the common property of all men in some form more or less crude and imperfect. There are numerous special points in revealed religion respecting which the study of nature may give some testimony.

When natural science leaves merely material things and animal instincts and acquaints itself with the rational and ethical nature of man it raises new questions with reference to the first cause. This must include potentially all that is developed from it. Hence the rational and moral powers of man must be emanations from those inherent in the first cause, which thus becomes a divinity, having a rational and moral nature comparable with that of man but infinitely higher.

On this point a strange confusion, produced apparently by the philosophy of evolution, seems to have affected some scientific thinkers, who seek to read back moral ideas into the history of the world at a time when no mundane moral agent is known to have been in existence. They forget that it is no more immoral for a wolf to eat a lamb than for the lamb to eat the grass, and regarding man as if he were derived by the "cosmic process" of struggle for existence from savage wild beasts rather than, as Darwin has it, from harmless apes, represent him as engaged in an almost hopeless and endless struggle against an inherited "cosmic nature," evil and immoral.

This absurd and atheistic exaggeration of the theological idea of original sin, and the pessimism which springs from it, have absolutely no foundation in nature, since, even on
the principle of evolution, no moral distinctions could be set up until men acquired a moral sense, and if, as Darwin held, they originated in apes, the descent from the single habits and inoffensive ways of these animals to war and violence and injustice, would be as much a "fall of man" as that recorded in the Bible, and could have no connection with a previous inheritance of evil. But such notions are merely the outcome of distorted philosophical ideas, and have no affinity with science properly so called.

Natural science does, moreover, perceive a discord between man, and especially his artificial contrivances, and nature, and the cruel tyranny of man over lower beings, and interference with natural harmony and symmetry. In other words, the independent will, free agency and inventive powers of man have set themselves to subvert the nice and delicate adjustments of natural things in a way to cause much evil and suffering to lower creatures and ultimately to man himself. How this has occurred science has not the means of knowing, except conjecturally, and it can do little by way of remedy. Indeed, the practical results of scientific knowledge seem in the first instance usually to aggravate the evil, though in some directions at least they diminish the woes of humanity.

Science sees, moreover, a great moral need, which it cannot supply and for which it can appeal only to the religious idea of a Divine redemption. On this account, if on no other, science should welcome the belief in a Divine revelation to humanity: on other grounds also it can see no objection to this as to the idea of Divine inspiration. The first cause manifests himself hourly before our eyes in the instincts of the lower animals, which are regulated by his laws. It is the inspiration of the Almighty which gives man his rational nature. It is probable then that the mind of man is the only part of nature shut out from the agency and communications of the all-pervading mind? This is evidently infinitely improbable. If so, have we not the right to believe that Divine inspiration is present in genius and inventive power; and that in a higher degree it may animate the prophet and the seer, or that God himself may have been directly manifested as a Divine Teacher? Science cannot assure us of this, but it makes no objection to it.

This, however, raises the generation of miracles and the
supernatural, but in opposition to these science cannot consistently place itself. It has by its own discoveries made us familiar with the fact that every new acquisition of knowledge of nature confers powers which, if exercised previously, would have been miraculous, that is, would have been evidence of, for the time, superhuman powers. We know no limit to this as to the agency of intelligences higher than man or as to God himself. Nor does miracle in this aspect counteract natural law. The scope for it, within the limits of natural law and the properties of natural objects, is practically infinite. All the metaphysical arguments of the last generation against the possibility of miracles have in fact been destroyed by the process of science, and no limit can be set to Divine agency in this respect provided the end is worthy of the means. On the other hand science has rendered human imitations of Divine miracles impostures, too transparent to be credited by intelligent persons.

In like manner the attitude of science to Divine revelation is not one of antagonism except in so far as any professed revelation is contradictory to natural facts and laws. This is a question on which I do not propose to enter, but may state my convictions, that the Old and New Testaments of the Christian faith, while true to nature in their reference to it, infinitely transcend its teachings in their sublime revelations respecting God and His purposes toward man.

Finally, we have thus seen that natural science is hostile to the old materialistic worship of natural objects, as well as to the worship of heroes, of humanity generally and of the state, or indeed of anything short of the great First Cause of all. It is also hostile to that agnosticism which professes to be unable to recognize a first cause and to the pantheism which confounds the primary cause with the cosmos resulting from his action. On the contrary it has nothing to say against the belief in a Divine First Cause, against Divine miracles or inspiration, against the idea of a future life, or against any moral or spiritual means for restoring man to harmony with God and nature. As a consequence it will be found that a large proportion of the more distinguished scientific men have been good and pious in their lives, and friends of religion.
CHAPTER VII.

Religious Unity of the Race.


The reunion of Christendom presupposes an original union which has been marred and obstructed, but never entirely destroyed. The theocracy of the Jewish dispensation continued during the division of the kingdom and during the Babylonian exile. Even in the darkest time, when Elijah thought that Israel was wholly given to idolatry, there were 7,000—known only to God—who had never bowed their knees to Baal. The Church of Christ has been one from the beginning, and He has pledged to her His unbroken presence "all the days to the end of the world." The one invisible Church is the soul which animates the divided visible Churches. All true believers are members of the mystical body of Christ.

'The saints in heaven and on earth
But one communion make:
All join in Christ, their living Head,
And of His grace partake.'

Let us briefly mention the prominent points of unity which underlie all divisions.

Christians differ in dogmas and theology, but agree in the fundamental articles of faith which are necessary to salvation: they believe in the same Father in heaven, the same Lord and Saviour, and the same Holy Spirit, and can join in every clause of the apostles' creed, of the Gloria in Excelsis and the Te Deum.

They are divided in church government and discipline, but all acknowledge and obey Christ as the head of the Church and chief Shepherd of our souls.
They differ widely in modes of worship, rites, and ceremonies, but they worship the same God manifested in Christ, they surround the same throne of grace, they offer from day to day the same petitions which the Lord has taught them, and can sing the same classical hymns, whether written by Catholic or Protestant, Greek or Roman, Lutheran or Reformed, Calvinist or Methodist, Episcopalian or Presbyterian, Paedo-Baptist or Baptist. Some of the best hymn-writers—such as Toplady and Charles Wesley—were antagonistic in theology; yet their hymns, “Rock of Ages” and “Jesus, Lover of My Soul,” are sung with equal fervor by Calvinists and Methodists. Newman’s “Lead, Kindly Light” will remain a favorite hymn among Protestants, although the author left the Church of England and became a cardinal of the Church of Rome. “In the Cross of Christ I Glory” and “Nearer, My God, to Thee” were written by devout Unitarians, yet have an honored place in every trinitarian hymnal.

There is a unity of Christian scholarship of all creeds, which aims at the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. This unity has been strikingly illustrated in the Anglo-American revision of the authorized version of the Scriptures, in which about one hundred British and American scholars—Episcopalian, Independents, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Friends, and Unitarians, have harmoniously co-operated for fourteen years (from 1870 to 1884).

It was my privilege to attend almost every meeting of the American revisers in the Bible House at New York, and several meetings of the British revisers in the Jerusalem chamber of Westminster Abbey, and I can testify that, notwithstanding the positive convictions of the scholars of the different communions, no sectarian issue was ever raised, all being bent upon the sole purpose of giving the most faithful idiomatic rendering of the original Hebrew and Greek. The English version, in its new as well as its old form, will continue to be the strongest bond of union among the different sections of English-speaking Christendom—a fact of incalculable importance for private devotion and public worship.

Formerly, exegetical and historical studies were too much controlled by, and made subservient to, apologetic
and polemic ends; but now they are more and more carried on without prejudice and with the sole object of ascertaining the meaning of the text and the facts of history upon which creeds must be built.

Finally, we must not overlook the ethical unity of Christendom, which is much stronger than its dogmatic unity, and has never been seriously shaken. The Greek, the Latin, and the Protestant churches, alike accept the ten commandments as explained by Christ, or the law of supreme love to God and love to our neighbor, as the sum and substance of the law, and they look up to the teaching and example of our Saviour as the purest and most perfect model for universal imitation.

Before we discuss reunion we should acknowledge the hand of Providence in the present divisions of Christendom. There is a great difference between denominationalism and sectarianism; the first is consistent with church unity as well as military corps are with the unity of an army, or the many monastic orders with the unity of the papacy; the second is nothing but extended selfishness and bigotry. Denominationalism is a blessing; sectarianism is a curse.

We must remember that denominations are most numerous in the most advanced and active nations of the world. A stagnant church is a sterile mother. Dead orthodoxy is as bad as heresy, or even worse. Sects are a sign of life and interest in religion. The most important periods of the Church—the Nicene age, and the age of the Reformation—were full of controversy. There are divisions in the church which cannot be justified, and there are sects which have fulfilled their mission and ought to cease. But the historic denominations are permanent forces, and represent various aspects of the Christian religion, which supplement each other.

As the life of our Saviour could not be fully exhibited by one gospel, nor his doctrine set forth by one apostle, much less could any one Christian body comprehend and manifest the whole fullness of Christ and the entire extent of his mission to mankind.

Every one of the great divisions of the Church, has had, and still has its peculiar mission, as to territory, race, and nationality, and modes of operation.

The Greek Church is especially adapted to the east, to
the Greek and Slavonic peoples; the Roman to the Latin races of southern Europe and America; the Protestant to the Teutonic races of the north and west.

Among the Protestant churches again, some have a special gift for the cultivation of Christian science and literature; others for the practical development of the Christian life; some are most successful among the higher, others among the middle, and still others among the lower classes. None of them could be spared without great detriment to the cause of religion and morality, and without leaving its territory and constituency spiritually destitute. Even an imperfect church is better than no church.

No schism occurs without guilt on one or on both sides. "It must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh." Yet God overrules the sins and follies of man for His own glory.

The separation of Paul and Barnabas, in consequence of their "sharp contention" concerning Mark, resulted in the enlargement of missionary labor. If Luther had not burned the Pope's bull, or had recanted at Worms, we would not have had a Lutheran Church, but be still under the spiritual tyranny of the papacy. If Luther had accepted Zwingli's hand of fellowship at Marburg the Protestant cause would have been stronger at the time, but the full development of the characteristic features of the two principal churches of the Reformation would have been prevented or obstructed.

If John Wesley had not ordained Coke we would not have a Methodist Episcopal Church, which is the strongest denomination in the United States. If Chalmers and his friends had not seceded from the general assembly of the Kirk of Scotland in 1843, forsaking every comfort for the sake of the whole headship of Christ, we would miss one of the grandest chapters in modern Church history.

All divisions of Christendom will, in the providence of God, be made subservient to a greater harmony. Where the sin of schism has abounded, the grace of future reunion will much more abound.

Taking this view of the division of the Church, we must reject the idea of a negative reunion, which would destroy all denominational distinction and thus undo the work of the past.
History is not like "the baseless fabric of a vision" that leaves "not a rack behind." It is the unfolding of God's plan of infinite wisdom and mercy to mankind. He is the chief actor, and rules and overrules the thoughts and deeds of His servants. We are told that our heavenly Father has numbered the very hairs of our head, and that not a sparrow falleth to the ground without His will. The labors of confessors and martyrs, of missionaries and preachers, of fathers, school-men, and reformers, and of the countless host of holy men and women of all ranks and conditions who lived for the good of the world, cannot be lost. They constitute a treasure of inestimable value for all the future time.

Variety in unity and unity in variety is the law of God in nature, in history, and in his kingdom. Unity without variety is dead uniformity. There is beauty in variety. There is no harmony without many sounds, and a garden incloses all kinds of flowers. God has made no two nations, no two men or women, nor even two trees or two flowers alike. He has endowed every nation, every church, yea, every individual Christian, with peculiar gifts and graces. His power, His wisdom, and His goodness are reflected in ten thousand forms.

"There are diversities of gifts," says St. Paul, "but the same spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all. But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal."

We must, therefore, expect the greatest variety in the Church of the future. There are good Christians who believe in the ultimate triumph of their own creed, or form of government and worship, but they are all mistaken and indulge in a vain dream. The world will never become wholly Greek, nor wholly Roman, nor wholly Protestant, but it will become wholly Christian, and will include every type and every aspect, every virtue and every grace of Christianity—an endless variety in harmonious unity, Christ being all in all.

Every denomination which holds to Christ the head will retain its distinctive peculiarity, and lay it on the altar of reunion, but it will cheerfully recognize the excellencies and merits of the other branches of God's kingdom. No
sect has the monopoly of truth. The part is not the whole; the body consists of many members, and all are necessary to each other.

Episcopalian will prefer their form of government as the best, but must concede the validity of the non-Episcopal ministry.

Baptists, while holding fast to the primitive mode of immersion, must allow pouring or affusion to be legitimate baptism.

Protestants will cease to regard the Pope as the antichrist predicted by St. Paul and St. John and will acknowledge him as the legitimate head of the Roman Church, while the Pope ought to recognize the respective rights and privileges of the Greek patriarchs and evangelical bishops and pastors.

Those who prefer to worship God in the forms of a stated liturgy ought not to deny others the equal right of free prayer as the spirit moves them. Even the silent worship of the Quakers has Scripture authority, for there was "a silence in heaven for the space of half an hour."

Doctrinal differences will be the most difficult to adjust. When two dogmas flatly contradict each other, the one denying what the other asserts, one or the other, or both, must be wrong. Truth excludes error, and admits of no compromise.

But truth is many-sided, and all-sided, and is reflected in different colors. The creeds of Christendom, as already remarked, agree in the essential articles of faith, and their differences refer either to minor points, or represent only various aspects of truth, and supplement one another.

Calvinists and Armenians are both right, the former in maintaining the sovereignty of God, the latter in maintaining the freedom and moral responsibility of man; but they are both wrong, when they deny one or the other of these two truths, which are equally important, although we may not be able to reconcile them satisfactorily. The conflicting theories on the Lord's Supper, which have caused the bitterest controversies, among medieval schoolmen and Protestant reformers, turn, after all, only on the mode of Christ's presence, while all admit the essential fact that He is spiritually and really present and partaken of by believers as the Bread of Life from heaven. Even the two chief differences between Romanists and
Protestants concerning Scripture and tradition, as rules of faith, and concerning faith and good works, as conditions of justification, admit of an adjustment by a better understanding of the nature and relationship of Scripture and tradition, of faith and works. The difference is no greater than that between St. Paul and St. James in their teaching on justification; and yet the epistles of both stand side by side in the same canon of Holy Scripture.

We must remember that the dogmas of the Church are earthly vessels for heavenly treasures, or imperfect human definitions of divine truths, and may be proved by better statements with the advance of knowledge. Our theological systems are but dim rays of the sun of truth which illuminates the universe. Truth first, doctrine next, dogma last.

The reunion of the entire Catholic church, Greek and Roman, with the Protestant churches, will require such a restatement of all the controverted points by both parties as shall remove misrepresentations, neutralize the anathemas pronounced upon imaginary heresies, and show the way to harmony in a broader, higher, and deeper consciousness in God's truth and God's love.

In the heat of controversy, and in the struggle for supremacy, the contending parties mutually misrepresented each other's views, put them in the most unfavorable light, and perverted partial truths into unmixed errors. Like hostile armies engaged in battle, they aimed at the destruction of the enemy. Protestants, in their confessions of faith and polemical works, denounced the Pope as "the antichrist," the papists as "idolaters," the Roman mass as an "accursed idolatry," and the Roman church as "the synagogue of Satan" and "the Babylonian harlot"—all in perfect honesty, on the ground of certain misunderstood passages of St. Paul and St. John, and especially of the mysterious book of the Revelation, whose references to the persecutions of pagan Rome were, directly or indirectly, applied to papal Rome. Rome answered by bloody persecutions; the Council of Trent closed with a double anathema on all Protestant heretics, and the Pope annually repeats the curse in the holy week, when all Christians should humbly and penitently meet around the cross on which the Saviour died for the sins of the whole world.
THE WORLD'S CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS.

When these hostile armies, after a long struggle for supremacy without success, shall come together for the settlement of terms of peace, they will be animated by a spirit of conciliation and single devotion to the honor of the great Head of the Church, who is the divine concord of all human discords.

The whole system of traditional orthodoxy, Greek, Latin and Protestant, must progress or it will be left behind the age and lose its hold on thinking men. The church must keep pace with civilization, adjust herself to the modern conditions of religious and political freedom, and accept the established results of biblical and historical criticism and natural science. God speaks in history and science as well as in the Bible and the Church, and he cannot contradict Himself. Truth is sovereign, and must and will prevail over all ignorance, error and prejudice.

Church history has undergone of late a great change, partly in consequence of the discovery of lost documents and deeper research, partly on account of the standpoint of the historian and the new spirit in which history is written.

Many documents on which theories and usages were built have been abandoned as untenable even by Roman Catholic scholars. We mention the legend of the literal composition of the apostles' creed by the apostles, and of the origin of the creed which was attributed to Athanasius, though it did not appear till four centuries after his death; the fiction of Constantine's donation; the apocryphal letters of pseudo-Ignatius, of pseudo-Clement, of pseudo-Isidorus, and other post-apostolic and mediæval falsifications of history, which were universally believed till the time of the Reformation, and even down to the eighteenth century.

Genuine history is being rewritten from the standpoint of impartial truth and justice. If facts are found to contravene a cherished theory, all the worse for the theory: for facts are truths, and truth is of God, while theories are of men.

Formerly, Church history was made a mere appendix to systematic theology, or abused and perverted for polemic purposes. The older historians, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, searched ancient and mediæval history for weapons to defeat their opponents and to establish their
own exclusive claims. Flacius, the first learned Protestant historian, saw nothing but antichristian darkness in the middle ages, with the exception of a few scattered testes veritatis and described the Roman Church from the fifth to the sixteenth century as the great apostacy of prophecy. But modern Protestant historians, following the example of Neander, who is called “the father of Church history,” regard the Middle Ages as the period of the conversion and the civilization of the barbarians, as a necessary link between ancient and modern Christianity and as the cradle of the reformation.

On the other hand, the opposite type of historiography, represented by Cardinal Baronius, traced the papacy to the beginning of the Christian era, maintained its identity through all ages, and denounced the reformers as arch-heretics and the reformation as the foul source of revolution, war, and infidelity, and of all the evils of modern society. But the impartial scholars of the Roman Catholic Church now admit the necessity of the reformation, the pure and unselfish motives of the reformers, and the beneficial efforts of their labors upon their own church.

A great change of spirit has also taken place among the historians of the different Protestant denominations. The early Lutheran abhorrence of Zwinglianism and Calvinism has disappeared from the best Lutheran manuals of church history. The bitterness between Prelatists and Puritans, Calvinists and Arminians, Baptists and Paedobaptists, has given way to a calm and just appreciation.

The impartial historian can find no ideal church in any age. It was a high priest in Aaron’s line who crucified the Saviour; a Judas was among the apostles; all sorts of sins among church members are rebuked in the epistles of the New Testament; there were “many antichrists” in the age of St. John, and there have been many since, even in the temple of God. Nearly all churches have acted as persecutors when they had a chance, if not by fire and sword, at least by misrepresentation, vituperation and abuse. For these and all other sins, they should repent in dust and ashes. One only is pure and spotless—the great Head of the Church, who redeemed it with His precious blood.

But the historian finds, on the other hand, in every age and in every church, the footprints of Christ, the abun-
dant manifestations of His spirit, and a slow but sure progress toward that ideal Church which St. Paul describes as "the fullness of Him who filleth all in all."

The study of church history, like travel in foreign lands, destroys prejudice, enlarges the mind, and deepens charity. Palestine, by its eloquent ruins, serves as a commentary on the life of Christ, and has not inaptly been called "the fifth Gospel." So also the history of the church furnishes the key to unlock the meaning of the church in all its ages and branches.

The study of history—"with malice toward none, but with charity for all"—will bring the denominations closer together in an humble recognition of their defects, and a grateful praise for the good which the same spirit has wrought in them and through them.

Important changes have also taken place in traditional opinions and practices once deemed pious and orthodox.

The Church in the Middle Ages first condemned the philosophy of Aristotle, but at last turned it into a powerful ally in the defense of her doctrines, and so gave to the world the Summa of Thomas Aquinas and the Divina Commedia of Dante, who regarded the great Stagirite as a forerunner of Christ, as a philosophical John the Baptist. Luther, likewise, in his wrath against scholastic theology, condemned "the accursed heathen Aristotle," but Melanchthon judged differently, and Protestant scholarship has long since settled upon a just estimate.

Gregory VII., Innocent III., and other popes of the Middle Ages claimed and exercised the power, as vicars of Christ, to depose kings, to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance, and to lay whole nations under the interdict for the disobedience of an individual. But no pope would presume to do such a thing now, nor would any Catholic king or nation tolerate it for a moment.

The strange mythical notion of the ancient fathers that the Christian redemption was the payment of a debt due to the devil, who had a claim upon men since the fall of Adam, but had forfeited it by the crucifixion, was abandoned after Anselm had published the more rational theory of a vicarious atonement in discharge of a debt due to God.

The un-Christian and horrible doctrine that all unbaptized infants, who never committed any actual transgres-
sion, are damned forever and ever, prevailed for centuries under the authority of the great and holy Augustine, but has lost its hold even upon those divines who defend the necessity of water baptism for salvation. Even high Anglicans and strict Calvinists admit that all children dying in infancy are saved.

The equally un-Christian and fearful theory and practice of religious compulsion and persecution by fire and sword, first mildly suggested by the same Augustine and then formulated by the master theologian of the Middle Ages (Thomas Aquinas) who deemed a heretic, or murderer of the soul more worthy of death than a murderer of the body, has given way at last to the theory and practice of toleration and liberty.

The delusion of witchcraft which extended even to Puritan New England, and has cost almost as many victims as the tribunals of the Inquisition, has disappeared from all Christian nations forever.

A few words about the relation of the Church to natural and physical science.

Protestants and Catholics alike unanimously rejected the Copernican astronomy as a heresy fatal to the geocentric account of the creation in Genesis, but, after a century of opposition which culminated in the condemnation of Galileo by the Roman Inquisition under Urban VIII., they have adopted it without a dissenting voice and “the earth still moves.”

Similar concessions will be made to modern geology and biology when they have passed the stage of conjecture and reached an agreement as to facts. The Bible does not determine the age of the earth or man, and leaves a large margin for difference of opinion even on purely exegetical grounds. The theory of the evolution of animal life, far from contradicting the fact of creation, presupposes it, for every evolution must have a beginning, and this can only be accounted for by an Infinite Intelligence and creative Will. God’s power and wisdom are even more wonderful in the gradual process of evolution.

The theory of historical development, which corresponds to the theory of physical evolution, and preceded it, was first denounced by orthodox divines (within my own recollection) as a dangerous error leading to infidelity, but
is now adopted by every historian, and is indorsed by Christ himself in the twin parables of the mustard seed and the leaven. "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear;" this is the order of the unfolding of the Christian life, both in the individual and the church. But there is another law of development no less important, which may be called the law of creative headships. Every important intellectual and religious movement begins with a towering personality which cannot be explained from antecedents, but marks a new epoch.

The Bible, we must all acknowledge, is not, and never claimed to be, a guide of chronology, astronomy, geology, or any other science, but solely a book of religion, a rule of faith and practice, a guide to holy living and dying. There is therefore no room for a conflict between the Bible and science, faith and reason, authority and freedom, the church and civilization.

Before the reunion of Christendom can be accomplished, we must expect providential events, new Pentecosts, new reformations—as great as any that have gone before. The twentieth century has marvelous surprises in store for the church and the world, which may surpass even those of the nineteenth. History now moves with telegraphic speed, and may accomplish the work of years in a single day. The modern inventions of the steamboat, the telegraph, the power of electricity, the progress of science and of international law (which regulates commerce by land and by sea, and will, in due time, make an end of war), link all the civilized nations into one vast brotherhood.

Let us consider some of the moral means by which a similar affiliation and consolidation of the different churches may be hastened.

The cultivation of an irenic and evangelical catholic spirit in the personal intercourse with our fellow-Christians of other denominations. We must meet them on a common rather than on disputed grounds, and assume that they are as honest and earnest as we in the pursuit of truth. We must make allowance for differences in education and surroundings, which, to a large extent, account for differences of opinion. Courtesy and kindness conciliate, while suspicion excites irritation and attack.
Controversy will never cease, but the golden rule of the most polemic among the apostles, to "speak the truth in love," cannot be too often repeated. Nor should we forget the seraphic description of love, which the same apostle commends above all other gifts and the tongues of men and angels—yea, even above faith and hope.

Co-operation in Christian and philanthropic work draws men together and promotes their mutual confidence and regard. Faith without works is dead. Sentiment and talk about union are idle without actual manifestation in works of charity and philanthropy.

Missionary societies should at once come to a definite agreement prohibiting all mutual interference in their efforts to spread the gospel at home and abroad. Every missionary of the cross should wish and pray for the prosperity of all other missionaries, and lend a helping hand in trouble. What then? Only that in every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.

It is preposterous, yea, wicked, to trouble the minds of the heathen or of Roman Catholic with our domestic quarrels, and to plant half a dozen rival churches in small towns where one or two would suffice, thus saving men and means. Unfortunately, the sectarian spirit and mistaken zeal for peculiar views and customs very materially interfere with the success of our vast expenditures and efforts for the conversion of the world.

The study of church history has already been mentioned as an important means of correcting sectarian prejudices and increasing mutual appreciation. The study of symbolic or comparative theology is one of the most important branches of history in this respect, especially in our country, where professors of all the creeds of Christendom meet in daily contact, and should become thoroughly acquainted with one another.

We welcome to the reunion of Christendom all denominations which have followed the divine Master and have done His work. Let us forgive and forget their many sins and errors, and remember only their virtues and merits.

The Greek Church is a glorious church, for in her language have come down to us the oracles of God, the septuagint, the gospels, and epistles: hers are the early confessors and martyrs, the Christian fathers, bishops,
patriarchs, and emperors; hers the immortal writings of Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius and Chrysostom; hers the Ecumenical councils and the Nicene creed, which can never die.

The Latin Church is a glorious church: for she carried the treasures of Christian and classical literature over the gulf of the migration of nations, and preserved order in the chaos of civil wars: she was the alma mater of the barbarians of Europe; she turned painted savages into civilized beings, and worshipers of idols into worshipers of Christ; she built up the colossal structures of the papal theocracy, the cathedrals, and the universities; she produced the profound systems of scholastic and mystic theology; she stimulated and patronized the Renaissance, the printing-press, and the discovery of a new world; she still stands, like an immovable rock, bearing witness to the fundamental truths and facts of our holy religion, and to the catholicity, unity, unbroken continuity, and independence of the church; and she is as zealous as ever in missionary enterprise and self-denying works of Christian charity.

We hail the Reformation which redeemed us from the yoke of spiritual despotism, and secured us religious liberty, the most precious of all liberties, and made the Bible in every language a book for all classes and conditions of men.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church, the first-born daughter of the Reformation, is a glorious church; for she set the word of God above the traditions of men, and bore witness to the comforting truth of justification by faith; she struck the keynote to thousands of sweet hymns in praise of the Redeemer; she is boldly and reverently investigating the problems of faith and philosophy, and is constantly making valuable additions to theological lore.

The Evangelical Reformed Church is a glorious church; for she carried reformation from the Alps and lakes of Switzerland to the end of the west” (to use the words of the Roman Clement about St. Paul; she furnished more martyrs of conscience in France and the Netherlands alone than any other church, even during the first three centuries; she educated heroic races, like the Huguenots, the Dutch, the Puritans, the Covenanters, the Pilgrim Fathers, who, by the fear of God, were raised above
the fear of tyrants and lived and died for the advancement of civil and religious liberty; she is rich in learning and good works of faith; she keeps pace with all true progress; she grapples with the problems and evils of modern society; and she sends the gospel to the ends of the earth.

The Episcopal Church of England, the most churchly of the reformed family, is a glorious church, for she gave to the English-speaking world the best version of the holy Scriptures and the best prayer-book; she preserved the order and dignity of the ministry and public worship; she nursed the knowledge and love of antiquity and enriched the treasury of Christian literature, and by the Anglo-Catholic revival under the moral, intellectual, and poetic leadership of three shining lights of Oxford—Pusey, Newman, and Keble—she infused new life into her institutions and customs and prepared the way for a better understanding between Anglicanism and Romanism.

The Presbyterian Church of Scotland, the most flourishing daughter of Geneva—as John Knox, “who never feared the face of man,” was the most faithful disciple of Calvin—is a glorious church, for she turned a barren country into a garden, and raised a poor and semi-barbarous people to a level with the richest and most intelligent nations; she diffused the knowledge of the Bible and a love of the Kirk in the huts of the peasants as well as the palaces of the noblemen; she has always stood up for Church order and discipline, for the rights of the laity, and first and last for the crown rights of King Jesus, which are above all earthly crowns, even that of the proudest monarch in whose dominion the sun never sets.

The Congregational Church is a glorious church, for she has taught the principle and proved the capacity of congregational independence and self-government based upon a living faith in Christ, without diminishing the effect of voluntary co-operation in the Master’s service; and has laid the foundation of New England, with its literary and theological institutions and high social culture.

The Baptist Church is a glorious church, for she has borne, and still bears, testimony to the primitive mode of baptism, to the purity of the congregation, to the separation of church and state, and the liberty of conscience:
and has given to the world the "Pilgrim's Progress," of Bunyan, such preachers as Robert Hall and Charles H. Spurgeon, and such missionaries as Carey and Judson.

The Methodist Church, the church of John Wesley, Charles Wesley, and George Whitefield—three of the best and most apostolic Englishmen, abounding in useful labors, the first as a ruler and organizer, the second as a hymnist, the third as an evangelist—is a glorious church, for she produced the greatest religious revival since the day of Pentecost; she preaches a free and full salvation to all; she is never afraid to fight the devil and she is hopefully and cheerfully marching on, in both hemispheres, as an army of conquest.

The Society of Friends, though one of the smallest tribes in Israel, is a glorious society, for it has borne witness to the inner Light which "lighteth every man that cometh into the world;" it has proved the superiority of the Spirit over all forms; it has done noble service in promoting tolerance and liberty, in prison reform, the emancipation of slaves, and other works of Christian philanthropy.

The Brotherhood of the Moravians, founded by Count Zinzendorf—a true nobleman of nature and of grace—is a glorious brotherhood; for it is the pioneer of heathen missions, and of Christian union among Protestant churches; it was like an oasis in the desert of German rationalism at home, while its missionaries went forth to the lowest savages in distant lands to bring them to Christ. I beheld with wonder and admiration a venerable Moravian couple devoting their lives to the care of hopeless lepers in the vicinity of Jerusalem.

Nor should we forget the services of many who are accounted heretics.

The Waldenses were witnesses of a pure and simple faith in times of superstition, and having outlived many bloody persecutions, are now missionaries among the descendants of their persecutors.

The Anabaptists and Socinians, who were so cruelly treated in the sixteenth century by Protestants and Romanists alike, were the first to raise their voices for religious liberty and the voluntary principle in religion. Unitarianism is a serious departure from the trinitarian faith of orthodox Christendom, but it did good service as
a protest against tritheism, and against a stiff, narrow, and uncharitable orthodoxy. It brought into prominence the human perfection of Christ's character and illustrated the effect of His example in the noble lives and devotional writings of such men as Channing and Martineau. It has also given us some of our purest and sweetest poets, as Emerson, Bryant, Longfellow, and Lowell, whom all good men must honor and love for their lofty moral tone.

Universalism may be condemned as a doctrine; but it has a right to protest against a gross materialistic theory of hell with all its Dantesque horrors, and against the once widely spread popular belief that the overwhelming majority of the human race, including countless millions of innocent infants, will forever perish. Nor should we forget that some of the greatest divines, from Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, down to Bengel and Schleiermacher, believed in, or hoped for, the ultimate return of all rational creatures to the God of love, who created them in His own image and for His own glory.

And, coming down to the latest organization of Christian work, which does not claim to be a church, but which is a help to all churches—the Salvation Army—we hail it, in spite of its strange and abnormal methods, as the most effective revival agency since the days of Wesley and Whitefield; for it descends to the lowest depths of degradation and misery, and brings the light and comfort of the gospel to the slums of our large cities. Let us thank God for the noble men and women who, under the inspiration of the love of Christ and unmindful of hardship, ridicule, and persecution, sacrifice their lives to the rescue of the hopeless outcasts of society. Truly these good Samaritans are an honor to the name of Christ and a benediction to a lost world.

There is room for all these and many other churches and societies in the kingdom of God, whose height and depth and length and breadth, variety and beauty surpass human comprehension.

II.—ELEMENTS OF UNIVERSAL RELIGION,—BY DR. EMIL G. HIRSCH.

The domain of religion is co-extensive with the confines of humanity. For man is by nature not only, as Aristotle
puts the case, the political—he is as clearly the religious creature. Religion is one of the natural functions of the human soul; it is one of the natural conditions of human, as distinct from mere animal life. To this proposition ethnology and sociology bear abundant testimony. Man alone, in the wide sweep of creation, builds altars. And, wherever man may tent there also will curve upward the burning incense of his sacrifice or the sweeter savor of his aspirations after the better, the diviner light. However rude the form of society in which he moves, or however refined and complex the social organism, religion never fails to be, among the determining forces, one of the most potent. It, under all types of social architecture, will be active as one of the decisive influences rounding out individual life and lifting it into significance for and under the swifter and stronger current of the social relations. Climatic and historical accidents may modify, and do, the action of this all-pervading energy. But under every sky it is vital, and under all temporary conjunctures it is quick.

A man without religion is not normal. There may be those in whom this function approaches atrophy. But they are undeveloped or crippled specimens of the completer type. Their condition recalls that of the color-blind or the deaf. Can they contend that their defect is proof of superiority? As well might those bereft of the sense of hearing insist that, because to them the reception of sound is denied, the universe around them is a vast ocean of unbroken silence. A society without religion has nowhere yet been discovered. Religion may then in very truth be said to be the universal distinction of man.

Still the universal religion has as yet not been evolved in the procession of the suns. It is one of the blessings yet to come. There are now even known to men, and revered by them, great religious systems which pretend to universality. And who would deny that Buddhism, Christianity, and the faith of Islam present many of the characteristic elements of the universal faith? In its ideas and ideals the religion of the prophets, notably as enlarged by those of the Babylonian exile, also deserves to be numbered among the proclamations of a wider outlook and a higher uplook. These systems are no longer ethnic. They thus, the three in full practice and the last-mentioned in spirited
intention, have passed beyond some of the most notable limitations which are fundamental in other forms created by the religious needs of man. They have advanced far on the road leading to the ideal goal; and modern man in his quest for the elements of the still broader universal faith will never again retrace his steps to go back to the mile posts these have left behind on their climb up the heights. The three great religions have emancipated themselves from the bondage of racial tests and national divisions. Race and nationality cannot circumscribe the fellowship of the larger communion of the faithful, a communion destined to embrace in one covenant all the children of man.

Race is accidental, not essential in manhood. Color is indeed only skin deep. No caste or tribe, even were we to concede the absolute purity of the blood flowing in their arteries, an assumption which could in no case be verified by the actual facts of the case, can lay claim to superior sanctity. None is nearer the heart of God than another. He, certainly, who takes his survey of humanity from the outlook of religion, and from this point of view remembers the serious possibilities and the sacred obligations of human life, cannot adopt the theory that spirit is the exponent of animal nature. Yet such would be the conclusion if the doctrine of chosen races and tribes is at all to be urged. The racial element is merely the animal substratum of our being. Brain and blood may be crutches which the mind must use. But mind is always more than the brain with which it works, and the soul's equation cannot be solved in terms of the blood corpuscles or the pigment of the skin or the shape of the nose or the curl of the hair.

Ezra with his insistence that citizenship in God's people is dependent on Abrahamitic pedigree, and therefore on the superior sanctity which by very birth the seed of the patriarch enjoys as Zea Kodesh, does not voice the broader and truer views of those that would prophesy of the universal faith. Indeed, the apostles of Christianity after Paul, the Pundits of Buddhism, the Imams of Islam and last, though not least, the rabbis of modern Judaism, have abandoned the narrow prejudice of the scribe. God is no respecter of persons. In his sight it is the black heart and not the black skin, the crooked deed and not the
curved nose which excludes. National affinities and memories, however potent for good and though more spiritual than racial bonds, are still too narrow to serve as foundation stones for the temple of all humanity.

The day of national religions is past. The God of the universe speaks to all mankind. He is not the God of Israel alone, not that of Moab, of Egypt, Greece or America. He is not domiciled in Palestine. The Jordan and the Ganges, the Tiber and the Euphrates hold water wherewith the devout may be baptized unto his service and redemption. "Whither shall I go from Thy spirit? Whither flee from Thy presence?" exclaims the old Hebrew bard. And before his wondering gaze unrolled itself the awful certainty that the heavenly divisions of morning and night were obliterated in the all-embracing sweep of Divine law and love. If the wide expanses of the skies and the abysses of the deep cannot shut out from the Divine presence, can the pigmy barriers erected by man and preserved by political intrigues and national pride dam in the mighty stream of Divine love? The prophet of Islam repeats the old Hebrew singer's joy when he says: "The east is God's and the west is His," as indeed the Apostle, true to the spirit of the prophetic message of Messianic Judaism, refused to tolerate the line of cleavage marked by language or national affinity. Greek and Jew are invited by him to the citizenship of kingdom come.

The Church universal must have the pentecostal gift of the many flaming tongues in it, as the rabbis say was the case at Sinai. God's revelation must be sounded in every language to every land. But, and this is essential as marking a new advance, the universal religion for all the children of Adam will not palisade its courts by the pointed and forbidding stakes of a creed. Creeds in time to come will be recognized to be indeed cruel barbed wire fences wounding those that would stray to broader pastures and hurting others who would come in. Will it, for this, be a Godless church? Ah, no; it will have much more of God than the churches and synagogues with their dogmatic definitions now possess. Coming man will not be ready to resign the crown of his glory which is his by virtue of his feeling himself to be the son of God. He will not exchange the church's creed for that still more presumptuous and deadening one of materialism which
would ask his acceptance of the hopeless perversion that the world which sweeps by us in such sublime harmony and order is not cosmos but chaos—is the fortuitous outcome of the chance play of atoms producing consciousness by the interaction of their own unconsciousness. Man will not extinguish the light of his own higher life by shutting his eyes to the telling indications of purpose in history, a purpose which when revealed to him in the outcome of his own career he may well find reflected also in the inter-related life of nature. But for all this man will learn a new modesty now woefully lacking to so many who honestly deem themselves religious. His God will not be a figment, cold and distant, of metaphysics, nor a distorted caricature of embittered theology. "Can man, by searching, find out God?" asks the old Hebrew poet. And the ages so flooded with religious strife are vocal with the stinging rebuke to all creed-builders that man cannot. Man grows unto the knowledge of God, but not to him is vouchsafed that fullness of knowledge which would warrant his arrogance to hold that his blurred vision is the full light and that there can be none other might which report truth as does his.

Says Maimonides, greatest thinker of the many Jewish philosophers of the Middle Ages: "Of God we may merely assert that He is; what He is in himself we cannot know. 'My thoughts are not your thoughts and My ways are not your ways.'" This prophetic caution will resound in clear notes in the ears of all who will worship in the days to come at the universal shrine. They will cease their futile efforts to give a definition of Him who cannot be defined in human symbols. They will certainly be astonished at our persistence—in their eyes very blasphemy—to describe by article of faith God, as though He were a fugitive from justice, and a Pinkerton detective should be enabled to capture Him by the identification laid down in the catalogue of his attributes. The religion universal will not presume to regulate God's government of this world by circumscribing the sphere of His possible salvation and declaring as though He had taken us into His counsel whom He must save and whom He may not save. The universal religion will once more make the God-idea a vital principle of human life. It will teach men to find Him in their own heart and to have Him with them in
whatever they may do. No mortal has seen God's face, but he who opens his heart to the message will, like Moses on the lonely rock, behold Him pass and hear the solemn proclamation.

It is not in the storm of fanaticism nor in the fire of prejudice, but in the still small voice of conscience that God speaks and is to be found. He believes in God who lives a Godlike, i.e., a goodly life. Not he that mumbles his credo, but he who lives it, is accepted. Were those marked for glory by the great Teacher of Nazareth who wore the largest phylacteries? Is the Sermon on the Mount a creed? Was the Decalogue a creed? Character and conduct, not creed, will be the keynote of the gospel in the Church of Humanity Universal.

But what then about sin? Sin, as a theological imputation, will perhaps drop out of the vocabulary of this larger communion of the righteous. But as a weakness to be overcome, an imperfection to be laid aside, man will be as potently reminded of his natural shortcomings as he is now of that of his first progenitor over whose conduct he certainly had no control and for whose misdeed he should not be held accountable. Religion will then, as now, lift man above his weaknesses by reminding him of his responsibilities. The goal before is Paradise, Eden is to rise. It has not yet been. And the lives of the great and good and saintly who went about doing good in their generations, and who died that others might live, will, for very truth, be pointed out as the spring from which have flown the waters of salvation by whose magic efficacy all men may be washed clean, if baptized in the spirit which was living within these God-appointed redeemers, of their infirmities.

This religion will indeed be for man to lead him to God. Its sacramental word will be duty. Labor is not the curse but the blessing of human life. For as man was made in the image of the Creator, it is his to create. Earth was given him for his habitation. He changed it from Tohu into his home. A theology and a Monotheism, which will not leave room in this world for man's free activity and dooms him to passive inactivity, will not harmonize with the truer recognition that man and God are the co-relates of a working plan of life. Sympathy and resignation are indeed beautiful flowers grown in the
garden of many a tender and noble human heart. But it is active love and energy which alone can push on the chariot of human progress, and progress is the gradual realization of the Divine spirit which is incarnate in every human being. This principle will assign to religion once more the place of honor among the redeeming agencies of society from the bondage of selfishness. On this basis every man is every other man's brother, not merely in misery, but in active work. "As you have done to the least of these you have unto Me," will be the guiding principle of human conduct in all the relations into which human life enters. No more than Cain's enormous excuse, a scathing accusation of himself, "Am I my brother's keeper?" no longer will be tolerated or condoned the double standard of morality, one for Sunday and the church, and another diametrically opposed for week-days and the counting-room. Not as now will be heard the cynic insistence that "business is business" and has as business no connection with the Decalogue or the Sermon on the Mount. Religion will, as it did in Jesus, penetrate into all the relations of human society. Not then will men be rated as so many hands to be bought at the lowest possible price, in accordance with a deified law of supply and demand, which cannot stop to consider such sentimentals, as the fact that these hands stand for souls and hearts.

An invidious distinction obtains now between secular and sacred.

It will be wiped away. Every thought and every deed of man must be holy or it is unworthy of men. Did Jesus merely regard the temple as holy? Did Buddha merely have religion on one or two hours of the Sabbath? Did not an earlier prophet deride and condemn all ritual religion? "Wash ye, make ye clean." Was this not the burden of Isaiah's religion? The religion universal will be true to these, its forerunners.

But what about death and hereafter? This religion will not dim the hope which has been man's since the first day of his stay on earth. But it will be most emphatic in winning men to the conviction that a life worthily spent here on earth is the best, is the only preparation for heaven. Said the old rabbis: "One hour spent here in truly good works and in the true intimacy with God is
more precious than all life to be.” The egotism which
now mars so often the aspirations of our souls, the
scramble for glory which comes while we forget duty,
will be replaced by a serene trust in the eternal justice of
Him “in whom we live and move and have our being.”
To have done religiously will be a reward sweeter than
which none can be offered. Yea, the religion of the future
will be impatient of men who claim that they have the
right to be saved, while they are perfectly content that
others shall not be saved, and while not stirring a foot
or lifting a hand to redeem brother men from hunger and
wretchedness, in the cool assurance that this life is des-
tined or doomed to be a free race of haggling, snarling
competitors in which by some mysterious will of Provi-
dence the devil takes the hindmost.

Will there be prayer in the universal religion? Man
will worship, but in the beauty of holiness his prayer will
be the prelude to his prayerful action. Silence is more
reverential and worshipful than a wild torrent of words
breathing forth not adoration, but greedy requests for
favors to self. Can an unforgiving heart pray “forgive
as we forgive?” Can one ask for daily bread when he
refuses to break his bread with the hungry? Did not the
prayer of the great Master of Nazareth thus teach all men
and all ages that prayer must be the stirring to love?

Had not that little waif caught the inspiration of our
universal prayer who, when first taught its sublime
phrases, persisted in changing the opening words to
“Your Father which is in heaven?” Rebuked time and
again by the teacher, he finally broke out, “Well, if it
is our Father, why, I am your brother.” Yea, the gates
of prayer in the church to rise will lead to the recognition
of the universal brotherhood of men.

Will this new faith have its Bible? It will. It retains
the old Bibles of mankind, but gives them a new luster
by remembering that “the letter killeth, but the spirit
giveth life.” Religion is not a question of literature, but
of life. God’s revelation is continuous, not contained in
tablets of stone or sacred parchment. He speaks to-day
yet to those who would hear him. A book is inspired
when it inspires. Religion made the Bible, not the book
religion.

And what will be the name of this church? It will be
known, not by its founders, but by its fruits. God replies to him who insists upon knowing His name: "I am He who I am." The church will be. If any name it will have, it will be "the Church of God," because it will be the church of man.

When Jacob, so runs an old rabbinical legend, weary and footsore the first night of his sojourn away from home, would lay him down to sleep under the canopy of the starset skies, and all the stones of the field exclaimed: "Take me for thy pillow." And because all were ready to serve him all were miraculously turned into one stone. This became Beth El, the gate of heaven. So will all religions, because eager to become the pillow of man, dreaming of God and beholding the ladder joining earth to heaven, be transformed into one great rock which the ages cannot move, a foundation stone for the all-embracing temple of humanity united to do God's will with one accord.

III.—PRIMITIVE AND PROSPECTIVE RELIGIOUS UNION OF THE HUMAN FAMILY.—BY REV. JOHN GMEINER OF ST. PAUL.

A deep thinker, Lord Bacon, truly said: "A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but much philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion." Just as naturally as the needle of a compass tends to point toward the magnetic pole, the human mind tends toward its supreme source and ultimate end—God. Hence another great thinker, St. Augustine, observed: "Thou, O God, hast made us for thee, and our heart is unquiet until it will rest in thee." The consciousness of our relation to God, including the corresponding duties toward him, ourselves and our fellow-men, is what we call religion. Religion is the most sublime gift of human nature, the crowning perfection of men's rational faculties. It is, next to God himself, the most fundamental, the most important and the most interesting matter which can engage the attention of a serious mind. It is the ever new and ever live question of questions of reflecting mankind, on the solution of which the solutions of all other great questions in science, philosophy, private morality and public policy ultimately depend. It is religion which gives the most characteristic coloring, and the most
decided direction to human life in all its phases—private, social and public.

It is not rivers or seas, mountains or deserts, language or race, that cause the deepest and widest separations between man and man—but religion. Differences of religion constitute the most marked dividing line between people of even the same language, same race and same country; but wherever people may meet, no matter what different language they may speak, to what different races they may belong, or what tint of color their features may exhibit, as soon as they know they are one in religion, a profoundly felt bond of sympathy unites them as members of one great family, as children of one great supreme power. Hence there is no greater means to promote among all men, than sincere fraternity, equality, peace and happiness, and no greater blessing on earth that could be conferred on human society, than religious union founded on truth. To promote the same as far as our limited ability may permit, we have assembled from all parts of the surface of the earth, here in the center of the great continent of human liberty, happiness and progress.

We have met here from various countries, various climes, various nations, to reconsider seriously what St. Paul declared centuries ago at Athens, when he said:

God, who made the world, and all things that are in it, hath made of one, all mankind, to dwell upon the whole face of the earth, determining appointed times and the limits of their inhabitation that they should seek God, if haply they may feel after Him or find Him, although He is not far from every one of us. For in Him we live, and we move, and we are, as some also of your own poets said: "For we are also His offspring."

These, then, are the great truths which are to engage our attention at present: First, God has made of one all mankind. As there was originally but one human family, so there was also but one primitive religion. Secondly, as mankind separated into various tribes and nations "to dwell upon the whole face of the earth," men became naturally estranged, and the primitive religious union was broken up in a great number of different religious forms. Thirdly, as mankind under the guidance of providence is nowadays becoming daily more united again, socially and intellectually, we may hopefully look to the
comparatively near future when this union of mankind will be fitly crowned by religious unity, and the first and greatest law will reign supreme all over the earth, "Love God above all and every fellow-man as thyself."

When did man first receive this religion? At the very instant when the Creator breathed into him the immortal soul, the germ of religion was implanted in his inmost nature. It is a great error to consider religion as something merely imparted to man by some external agency, like the knowledge of the alphabet or of the statute laws of a land. Religion is fundamentally inborn into every human soul. Hence St. Paul said that the Gentiles who have not the Mosaic law do by nature those things that are of the law; they are a law to themselves; they show the work of the law written in their hearts, or man's consciousness of his relations to his Creator, and of his consequent duties is fundamentally inborn in the very nature of man, filling him with high, noble, and indelible aspirations, or for infinite truth, goodness, beauty and immortality.

Centuries ago the wise men of Greece and Rome were forcibly struck by this potent and sublime fact. Thus Seneca observed: "In all men a belief concerning God is implanted." And Plutarch declared:

"When you visit countries you may find communities without walls, letters, laws, houses, wealth or money, ignorant of gymnasiaums and theaters, but a city without temples and gods, without the use of prayers, the oath, the oracle, without sacrifices to obtain favors or to avert evil nobody has ever seen."

If we turn our attention to the more recent or now living tribes of men, even those whom we may consider as little advanced in what we vaguely call civilization, we find the same to be true. Take, for illustration, the aborigines of our own country. There is one who has for years extensively traveled and carefully observed among them. George Catlin says:

"I fearlessly assert to the world, and I defy contradiction, that the North American Indian is everywhere, in his native state, a highly moral and religious being, endowed by his Maker with an intuitive knowledge of some great Author of his being and the universe, in dread of whose displeasure he constantly lives, with the apprehension before him of a future state where he expects to be rewarded or pun-
Such words may indeed be a revelation to many. Yet what is true of our aborigines is true of all tribes of men thus far discovered. Atheism may occasionally be met with, or rather professed by individuals or limited schools, as De Quaterfage observes, in an erratic condition, especially in France, and above all in the so-called higher classes of society in Paris. Yet even here we have again the testimony of Abbé Mullois, formerly chaplain to Emperor Napoleon III., that also in these cases the words of the Psalmist are true: “The fool hath said in his heart there is no God;” but he does not believe so.

As Lord Bacon observed, “Atheism is rather in the lip than in the heart of man.” “The man,” Abbé Mullois remarks, “who in all sincerity says, ‘I don’t believe,’ often deceives himself. There is in the depth of his heart a root of faith which never dies.” Hence, many centuries ago Tertullian truly declared that the human soul is by nature Christian. How delightfully pure must this light have illumined the souls of the first men as they had proceeded, as yet undefiled by uninherited depravity, from the hands of the Creator. Yet here I may answer briefly an objection that might be raised by some admirers of the theory of evolution, who claim that man has acquired all his faculties by slow forms of life, consequently also the so-called religious sentiment. Without entering deeply into the question of evolution at present I shall briefly state:

There are two leading views on the evolution of the visible universe. According to one, all existing beings have by some continuous, regular, and uniform progress from the less perfect to the more perfect, from the primitive cosmic nebula to man, been evolved from the potency of matter in accordance with certain fixed laws. The origin of these laws, as also of matter, is “unknowable.” This view is justly rejected, for reason of both science and sound philosophy, by others, who also maintain the theory of evolution as far as it accords with the principles of
sound reason and the establishment of facts of science. According to the second view the Creator has indeed brought His visible work of creation to its present perfection in accordance with the grand plan of evolution, yet not a monotonously uniform, but rather rhythmically diversified plan of evolution, in the progress of which various, we may say, critical periods or stages appear.

We know, for instance, that certain gases may, by a process of gradual development or cooling, be changed into water or ice. Is this done with monotonous uniformity of evolution? No! The gases may cool a long time and yet remain gases. Suddenly, when they, having become united, reach a certain degree of temperature they change into hot vapor. This hot vapor may cool again a long while. All of a sudden on reaching a certain point of temperature it changes into ordinary water. This water may again cool a long while till, reaching a certain point of the thermometer, it turns into ice.

Also the visible universe, as a whole, came to its present perfection, not by a monotonous, uniform evolution, but in accordance with a rhythmically, ordered plan. At first there was only what we call the chemical elements. Next appeared something inexplicably new, growing organisms or plants. Next appeared again something perfectly new and perfectly inexplicable, growing organism endowed with the feelings of pleasure, of pain, of appetite—animals. And after these had gone through a long cycle of evolution there suddenly appeared something again perfectly new, not merely an animal endowed with sensitive faculties, but an animal organism indeed, yet one endowed with something perfectly new—with reason, with the faculty of apprehending the true, the good, the beautiful, the eternal—and this something new was man, the crown of the visible universe.

In vain have theorists holding to the view of a monotonous uniformity of evolution been looking for years for the missing link between rational man and merely sensuous, irrational animals. In vain have they, to cover the weak spot in their view, been claiming an immense antiquity for the human race. After carefully sifting the mere assertions, opinions, or suppositions of certain scientists from the established facts of science, we find, too, that neither history, nor archaeology, nor geology has thus far
advanced any reasonably reliable proof that man has
appeared more than, let us say, ten thousand years ago.
And as we may infer from the generally rhythmical plan
of evolution, this happened suddenly at the appointed
critical period.

Hence we reject the unfounded assumption that the
religious faculty of man has been gradually evolved from
some animal faculties, but maintain that, like reason it-
self, of which it is the complement, it was a primitive gift
of his Creator. Besides, we have reason to believe, not
only on the authority of the inspired books, but also from
reliable historical data, that the primitive human family
were not only endowed with the religious faculty, but
that they had also received particular revelations from
their Creator, the acquisition of which transcended the
abilities of their merely natural faculties.

How was this knowledge and worship of the true God
gradually lost? In the first place the conception of God
became gradually obscured or diminished by the gradu-
ally changing general mental conceptions of the various
tribes. Even a child will form for itself a conception of
God different from that entertained by its more intelligent
parent. It has been said with much truth, "An honest
man is the noblest work of God." Secondly, to the same
God, often different names were given, and gradually the
different names were considered to denote different gods.
Thirdly, God was often honored under different symbols.
Thus the sun, moon, and stars were, as light or fire, at
first considered as symbols of the Deity; but gradually
the different symbols were construed to denote different
gods. Fourthly, at first the one God was worshiped by
different manifestations of His power and goodness in
nature, but gradually these different manifestations were
taken for the works of different gods.

In such and similar ways the primitive belief in the
one true God was gradually obscured and lost among
the great part of mankind; and with this fundamental
belief also other religious beliefs, for instance, concerning
prayer, sacrifice, or the state of immortality, were grad-
ually changed and vitiated. Yet in the midst of the chaos
of polytheism and idolatry, precious germs of religion, the
belief in the existence of invisible superior things, their
active interest in the affairs of men, the voice of con-
science admonishing to do right and to shun wrong, and
the conviction of immortality still remained indestructible
in every human soul.

While we profoundly respect the God-given sentiments
in every human heart, we, as children of one Heavenly
Father, cannot but deeply deplore the lamentable religious
disunion in the human family. Can it be the will of the
one good common Father of us all that this chaotic dishar-
mony of His children should be a permanent state? Cer-
tainly not. He whose guiding hand has led order and
harmony out of the discordant conflicting elements of
the universe, who has made a cosmos out of chaos, will
undoubtedly also lead His children on earth again to
religious unity, so that they will live together again as
members of one family, with but one heart and one soul,
as you read of the first Christians.

Judging the future by the past, we cannot but look
upon the religion of Christ as the one evidently predest-
tined from the very dawn of human history to become,
under the guiding hand of Providence, the religion which
will ultimately reunite the entire human family in the
bonds of truth, love, and happiness.

Thanks to the Eternal Father of us all the time has
come, as this ever memorable congress of religions proves,
when mankind will gradually cease to be divided into
mutually hostile camps by mere ignorance and blind
bigotry. A feeling of mutual respect and mutual frater-
nal charity is beginning to pervade, not only Christendom,
but the entire human family. With the gradual disap-
pearance of the mists and clouds of prejudices, ignorances,
and antipathies, there will be always more clearly seen
the heavenly majestic outlines of that house of God, pre-
pared on the top of the mountains for all to see, and
countless many on entering will be surprised how it was
possible that they had no sooner recognized this true
home for all under God, in which they so often professed
to believe when they reverently called it by its providen-
tially given and preserved name, known 'all over the
world—"the Holy Catholic Church."
CHAPTER VIII.

THE HINDOOS.

THE HINDU FAITH, BY SUANI VIVE KANADA, OF INDIA.

Three religions now stand in the world which have come down to us from time prehistoric—Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, and Indaism. These all have received tremendous shocks, and all of them prove by their revival, their eternal strength, but Indaism failed to absorb Christianity and was driven out of its place of birth by its all-conquering daughter. Sect after sect has arisen in India, and seemed to shake the religion of the Vedas to its very foundations, but, like the waters of the seashore, in a tremendous earthquake, it has receded only for a while, only to return in an all-absorbing flood, and when the tumult of the rush was over, these sects had been all sucked in, absorbed, and assimilated in the immense body of another faith.

From the high spiritual flights of philosophy, of which the latest discoveries of science seem like echoes, from the atheism of the Jains, to the low ideas of idolatry and the multifarious mythologies, each and all have a place in the Hindu's religion.

Where, then, the question arises, where then the common center to which all these widely diverging radii converge? Where is the common basis upon which all these seemingly hopeless contradictions rest? And this is the question which I shall attempt to answer.

The Hindus have received their religion through the revelation of the Vedas. They hold that the Vedas are without beginning and without end. It may sound ludicrous to this audience—how a book can be without beginning or end. But by the Vedas no books are meant. They mean the accumulated treasury of spiritual laws, discovered by different persons in different times. Just as the law of gravitation existed before its discovery, and
would exist if all humanity forgot it, so with the laws that govern the spiritual world; the moral, ethical, and spiritual relations between soul and soul, and between individual spirits and the Father of all spirits were there before their discovery and would remain even if we forgot them.

The discoverers of these laws are called Rishis, and we honor them as perfected beings, and I am glad to tell this audience that some of the very best of them were women.

Here it may be said that the laws as laws may be without end, but they must have had a beginning. The Vedas teach us that creation is without beginning or end. Science has proved to us that the sum total of the cosmic energy is the same throughout all time. Then, if there was a time when nothing existed, where was all this manifested energy? Some say it was in a potential form in God. But then God is sometimes potential and sometimes kinetic, which would make him mutable, and everything mutable is a compound, and everything compound must undergo that change which is called destruction. Therefore, God would die. Therefore, there never was a time when there was no creation.

Here I stand, and if I shut my eyes and try to conceive my existence, "I," "I," "I," "I," what is the idea before me? The idea of a body. Am I, then, nothing but a combination of matter and material substances? The Vedas declare, "No," I am a spirit living in a body. I am not the body. The body will die, but I will not die. Here am I in this body, and when it will fail, still I will go on living. Also I had a pass. The soul was not created from nothing, for creation means a combination, and that means a certain future dissolution. If, then, the soul was created, it must die. Therefore, it was not created. Some are born happy, enjoying perfect health, beautiful body, mental vigor, and with all wants supplied, Others are born miserable. Some are without hands or feet, some idiots, and only drag out a miserable existence. Why, if they are all created, why does a just and merciful God create one happy and the other unhappy? Why is He so partial? Nor would it mend matters in the least to hold that those who are miserable in this life will be perfect in a future life. Why should a man be miserable here in the reign of a just and merciful God?
In the second place it does not give us any cause, but simply a cruel act of an all-powerful Being, and therefore it is unscientific. There must have been causes, then, to make a man miserable or happy before his birth, and those were his past actions. Why may not all the tendencies of the mind and body be answered for by inherited aptitude from parents? Here are the two parallel lines of existence—one that of the mind,—the other that of matter.

If matter and its transformation answer for all that we have, there is no necessity of supposing the existence of a soul. But it cannot be proved that thought has been evolved out of matter. We cannot deny that bodies inherit certain tendencies, but those tendencies only mean the physical configuration through which a peculiar mind alone can act in a peculiar way. Those peculiar tendencies in that soul have been caused by past actions. A soul with a certain tendency will take birth in a body which is the fittest instrument of the display of that tendency, by the laws of affinity. And this is in perfect accord with science, for science wants to explain everything by habit, and habit is got through repetitions. So these repetitions are also necessary to explain the natural habits of a new-born soul. They were not got in this present life; therefore, they must have come down from past lives.

But there is another suggestion, taking all these for granted. How is it that I do not remember anything of my past life? This can be easily explained. I am now speaking English. It is not my mother tongue, in fact not a word of my mother tongue is present in my consciousness; but, let me try to bring such words up, they rush into my consciousness. That shows that consciousness is the name only of the surface of the mental ocean, and within its depths are stored up all our experiences. Try and struggle and they will come up and you will be conscious.

This is the direct and demonstrative evidence. Verification is the perfect proof of a theory, and here is the challenge, thrown to the world by Rishis. We have discovered precepts by which the very depths of the ocean of memory can be stirred up—follow them and you will get a complete reminiscence of your past life.
So, then, the Hindu believes that he is a spirit. Him the sword cannot pierce, him the fire cannot burn, him the water cannot melt, him the air cannot dry. He believes every soul is a circle whose circumference is nowhere, but whose center is located in a body, and death means the change of this center from body to body. Nor is the soul bound by the condition of matter. In its very essence it is free, unbound, holy and pure and perfect. But somehow or other it has got itself bound down by matter, and thinks of itself as matter.

Why should the free, perfect and pure being be under the thraldom of matter? How can the perfect be deluded into the belief that he is imperfect? We have been told that the Hindus shirk the question and say that no such question can be there, and some thinkers want to answer it by the supposing of one or more quasi perfect beings, and use big scientific names to fill up the gap. But naming is not explaining. The question remains the same. How can the perfect become the quasi perfect; how can the pure, the absolute, change even a microscopic particle of its nature? The Hindu is sincere. He does not want to take shelter under sophistry. He is brave enough to face the question in a manly fashion. And his answer is. "I do not know." I do not know how the perfect being, the soul, came to think of itself as imperfect, as joined and conditioned by matter. But the fact is a fact for all that. It is a fact in everybody's consciousness that he thinks of himself as the body. We will not attempt to explain why I am in this body.

Well, then, the human soul is eternal and immortal, perfect and infinite, and death means only a change of center from one body to another. The present is determined by our past actions, and the future will be by the present. The soul will go on evolving up or reverting back from birth to birth and death to death—like a tiny boat in a tempest, raised one moment on the foaming crest of a billow and dashed down into a yawning chasm the next, rolling to and fro at the mercy of good and bad actions—a powerless, helpless wreck in an ever-raging, ever-rushing, uncompromising current of cause and effect. A little moth placed under the wheel of causation which rolls on, crushing everything in its way and waits not for the widow's tears or the orphan's cry.
The heart sinks at the idea, yet this is the law of nature. Is there no hope? Is there no escape? The cry that went up from the bottom of the heart of despair reached the throne of mercy, and words of hope and consolation came down and inspired a Vedic sage and he stood up before the world and in trumpet voice proclaimed the glad tidings to the world. “Hear, ye children of immortal bliss, even ye that resisted in higher spheres. I have found the Ancient One, who is beyond all darkness, all delusion, and knowing him alone you shall be saved from death again.” “Children of immortal bliss,” what a sweet, what a hopeful name. Allow me to call you, brethren, by that sweet name—heirs of immortal bliss—yea, the Hindu refuses to call you sinners.

Ye are the children of God. The sharers of immortal bliss, holy and perfect beings. Ye divinities on earth, sinners? It is a sin to call a man so. It is a standing libel on human nature. Come up, live and shake off the delusion that you are sheep—you are souls immortal, spirits free and blest and eternal, ye are not matter, ye are not bodies. Matter is your servant, not you the servant of matter.

Thus it is the Vedas proclaim, not a dreadful combination of unforgiving laws, not an endless prison of cause and effect, but that, at the head of all these laws, in and through every particle of matter and force, stands One “through whose command the wind blows, the fire burns, the clouds rain, and death stalks upon the earth.” And what is his nature?

He is everywhere, the pure and formless One, the Almighty and the All-merciful. “Thou art our Father, thou art our Mother, Thou art our beloved Friend, Thou art the source of all strength. Thou art He that bearest the burdens of the Universe; help me bear the little burdens of this life.” Thus sang the Rishis of the Veda. And how to worship Him? Through love. “He is to be worshipped as the one beloved, dearer than everything in this and the next life.”

This is the doctrine of love preached in the Vedas, and let us see how it is fully developed and preached by Krishna, whom the Hindus believe to have been God incarnate on earth.

He taught that a man ought to live in this world like a
lotus leaf, which grows in water, but is never moistened by water—so a man ought to live in this world—his heart for God and his hands for work.

It is good to love God for hope of reward in this or the next world, but it is better to love God for love's sake, and the prayer goes, "Lord, I do not want wealth, nor children, nor learning. If it be Thy will, I will go to a hundred hells, but grant me this, that I may love Thee without the hope of reward—unselfishly love for love's sake." One of the disciples of Krishna, the then Emperor of India, was driven from his throne by his enemies, and had to take shelter in a forest in the Himalayas with his queen; and there, one day, the queen was asking him how it was that he, the most virtuous of men, should suffer so much misery, and Yuchistera answered: "Behold, my queen, the Himalayas, how grand and beautiful they are. I love them. They do not give me anything, but my nature is to love the grand, the beautiful; therefore, I love them. Similarly, I love the Lord. He is the source of all beauty, of all sublimity. He is the only object to be loved. My nature is to love Him, and therefore I love. I do not pray for anything. I do not ask for anything. Let Him place me wherever He likes. I must love Him for love's sake. I cannot trade in love."

The Vedas teach that the soul is divine, only held under bondage of matter, and perfection will be reached when the bond shall burst, and the word they use is, therefore, Mukto—freedom—freedom from the bonds of imperfection; freedom from death and misery.

And they teach that this bondage can only fall off through the mercy of God, and this mercy comes to the pure. So purity is the condition of His mercy. How that mercy acts! He reveals himself to the pure heart, and the pure and stainless man sees God, yea, even in this life, and then, and then, only. All the crookedness of the heart is made straight. Then all doubt ceases. Man is no more the freak of a terrible law of causation. So this is the very center, the very vital conception of Hinduism. The Hindu does not want to live upon words and theories—if there are existences beyond the ordinary sensual existence, he wants to come face to face with them. If there is a soul in him which is not matter, if there is an all-merciful universal Soul, he will go to Him direct. He
must see Him and that alone can destroy all doubts. So the best proof a Hindu sage gives, about the soul, about God, is, "I have seen the soul, I have seen God."

And that is the only condition of perfection. The Hindu religion does not consist in struggles and attempts to believe a certain doctrine or dogma, but in realizing—not in believing, but in being and becoming.

So the whole struggle in their system is a constant struggle to become perfect, to become divine, to reach God and see God; and in this reaching God, seeing God, becoming perfect, even as the Father in Heaven is perfect, consists the religion of the Hindus.

And what becomes of man, when he becomes perfect? He lives a life of bliss infinite. He enjoys infinite and perfect bliss, having obtained the only thing in which man ought to have pleasure—God—and enjoys the bliss with God.

So far all the Hindus are agreed. This is the common religion of all the sects of India, but then the question comes—perfection is absolute, and the absolute cannot be two or three. It cannot have any qualities. It cannot be an individual. And so when a soul becomes perfect and absolute, it must become one with the Brahman, and he would only realize the Lord as the perfection, the reality of his own nature and existence—existence absolute; knowledge absolute, and life absolute. We have often and often read about this being called the losing of individuality as in becoming a stock or a stone. "He jests at scars that never felt a wound."

I tell you it is nothing of the kind. If it is happiness to enjoy the consciousness of this small body, it must be more happiness to enjoy the consciousness of two bodies, or three, four, five—and the ultimate of happiness would be reached when it would become a universal consciousness.

Therefore, to gain this infinite universal individuality, this miserable little individuality must go. Then alone can death cease, when I am one with life. Then alone can misery cease, when I am with happiness itself. Then alone can all errors cease, when I am one with knowledge itself. And this is the necessary scientific conclusion. Science has proved to me that physical individuality is a delusion, that really my body is one little, continuously
changing body in an unbroken ocean of matter, and the Adwaitam is the necessary conclusion with my other counterpart, mind.

Science is nothing but the finding of unity, and as soon as any science can reach the perfect unity it will stop from further progress, because it will then have reached the goal. Thus, chemistry cannot progress farther when it shall have discovered one element out of which all others could be made. Physics will stop when it shall be able to discover one energy of which all others are but manifestations. The science of religion will become perfect when it discovers Him who is the one Life in a universe of death, who is the constant basis of an ever-changing world, who is the only Soul of which all souls are but manifestations. Thus through multiplicity and duality the ultimate unity is reached, and religion can go no further. This is the goal of all—again and again, science after science, again and again.

And all science is bound to come to this conclusion in the long run. Manifestation and not creation is the word of science of to-day, and the Hindu is only glad that what he has cherished in his bosom for ages is going to be taught in more forcible language and with further light by the latest conclusions of science.

Descend we now from the aspirations of philosophy to the religion of the ignorant? At the very outset, I may tell you that there is no Polytheism in India. In every temple, if one stands by and listens, he will find the worshippers apply all the attributes of God—including omnipresence—to these images. It is not Polytheism. "The rose called by any other name would smell as sweet." Names are not explanations.

I remember when a boy a Christian man was preaching to a crowd in India. Among other sweet things, he was asking the people, if he gave a blow to their idol with his stick, what could it do? One of his hearers sharply answered, "If I abuse your God what can he do?" "You would be punished," said the preacher, "when you die." "So my idol will punish you when you die," said the villager.

The tree is known by its fruits, and when I have been amongst them that are called idolatrous men, the like of whose morality and spirituality and love I have never
seen anywhere, I stop and ask myself, "Can sin beget holiness?"

Superstition is the enemy of man, but bigotry is worse. Why does a Christian go to church? Why is the cross holy? Why is the face turned toward the sky in prayer? Why are there so many images in the Catholic Church? Why are there so many images in the minds of Protestants when they pray? My brethren, we can no more think about anything without a material image than we can live without breathing. And by the law of association the material image calls the mental idea up and vice versa. Omnipresence, to almost the whole world, means nothing. Has God superficial area? If not, when we repeat the word we think of the extended earth, that is all.

As we find that somehow or other, by the laws of our constitution, we have got to associate our ideas of Infinity with the image of a blue sky, or a sea; some cover the idea of holiness with an image of a church or a mosque, or a cross. The Hindus have associated the ideas of holiness, purity, truth, Omnipresence, and all other ideas with different images and forms. But with this difference. Some devote their whole lives to their idol of a church and never rise higher, because with them religion means an intellectual assent to certain doctrines and doing good to their fellows. The whole religion of the Hindu is centered in realizations. Man is to become divine, realizing the divine, and, therefore, idol or temple or church or books, are only the supports, the helps, of his spiritual childhood; but on and on man must progress.

He must not stop anywhere. "External worship, material worship," says the Vedas, "is the lowest stage, struggling to rise high; mental prayer, is the next stage, but the highest stage is when the Lord has been realized—" Mark the same earnest man who was kneeling before the idol tell you, "Him the sun cannot express, nor the moon nor the stars, the lightning cannot express him, nor the fire; through him they all shine." He does not abuse the image or call it sinful. He recognizes in it a necessary stage of his life. "The child is father of the man." Would it be right for the old man to say that childhood is a sin or youth a sin? Nor is it compulsory in Hinduism.

If a man can realize his divine nature with the help of
an image, would it be right to call it a sin? Nor, even when he has passed that stage, should he call it an error? To the Hindu, man is not traveling from error to truth, but from truth to truth, from lower to higher truth. To him all the religions, from the lowest fetishism to the highest absolutism, mean so many attempts of the human soul to grasp and realize the Infinite, each determined by the conditions of its birth and association, and each of these marks a stage of progress, and every soul is a young eagle soaring higher and higher, gathering more and more strength till it reaches the glorious sun.

Unity and variety is the plan of nature, and the Hindu has recognized it. Every other religion lays down certain fixed dogmas, and tries to force society to adopt them. They lay down before society one coat which must fit Jack and Job and Henry, all alike. If it does not fit John or Henry, he must go without a coat to cover his body. The Hindus have discovered that the absolute can only be realized or thought of or stated through the relative; and the images, cross or crescent, are simply so many centers, so many pegs to hang the spiritual ideas on. It is not that this help is necessary for every one, but for many, and those that do not need it have no right to say that it is wrong.

One thing I must tell you. Idolatry in India does not mean anything horrible. It is not the mother of harlots. On the other hand, it is the attempt of undeveloped minds to grasp high spiritual truths. The Hindus have their faults, but mark this, they are always toward punishing their own bodies, and never toward cutting the throats of their neighbors. If the Hindu fanatic burns himself on the pyre, he never lights the fire of Inquisition. And even this cannot be laid at the door of religion any more than the burning of witches can be laid at the door of Christianity.

To the Hindu, then, the whole world of religions is only a traveling, a coming-up, of different men and women, through various conditions and circumstances, to the same goal. Every religion is only an evolution out of the material man, a God—and the same God is the inspirer of all of them. Why, then, are there so many contradictions? They are only apparent, says the Hindu. The contradictions come from the same truth adapting itself to the different circumstances of different natures.
It is the same light coming through different colors. And these little variations are necessary for that adaptation. But in the heart of everything the same truth reigns. The Lord has declared to the Hindu in his incarnation as Krishna, "I am in every religion as the thread through a string of pearls. And wherever thou seest extraordinary holiness and extraordinary power raising and purifying humanity, know ye, that I am there." And what was the result? Through the whole order of Sanscrit philosophy, I challenge anybody to find any such expression as that the Hindu only would be saved and not others. Says Vyas, "We find perfect men even beyond the pale of our caste and creed." How, then, can the Hindu whose whole idea centers in God, believe in the Buddhism which is agnostic, or the Jainism, which is atheist?

The whole force of Hindu religion is directed to the great central truth in every religion, to evolve a God out of man. They have not seen the Father, but they have seen the Son. And he that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father.

This, brethren, is a short sketch of the ideas of the Hindus. The Hindu might have failed to carry out all his plans. But, if there is ever to be a universal religion, it must be one which will hold no location in place or time; which will be infinite, like the God it will preach; whose sun shines upon the followers of Krishna or Christ, saints or sinners, alike; which will not be the Brahmin or Buddhist, Christian or Mohammedan, but the sum total of all these, and still have infinite space for development; which in its catholicity will embrace in its infinite arms and find a place for every human being, from the lowest groveling man, from the brute, to the highest mind, towering almost above humanity and making society stand in awe and doubt his human nature.

It will be a religion which will have no place for persecution or intolerance in its polity, which will recognize a divinity in every man or woman, and whose whole scope, whose whole force, will be centered in aiding humanity to realize its divine nature.

Aseka's council was a council of the Buddhist faith. Akbar's, though more to the purpose, was only a parlor meeting. It was reserved for America to proclaim to all quarters of the globe that the Lord is in every religion.
May He who is the Brahma of the Hindus, the Ahura Mazda of the Zoroastrians, the Buddha of the Buddhists, the Jehovah of the Jews, the Father in Heaven of the Christians, give strength to you to carry out your noble idea.

The star arose in the east, it traveled steadily toward the west, sometimes dimmed and sometimes effulgent, till it made a circuit of the world, and now it is again rising on the very horizon of the east, the borders of the Tasifu, a thousand-fold more effulgent than it ever was before. Hail, Columbia, motherland of liberty! It has been given to thee, who never dipped hand in neighbor’s blood, who never found out that shortest way of becoming rich by robbing one’s neighbors—it has been given to thee, to march on in the vanguard of civilization with the flag of harmony.
CHAPTER IX.

THE BUDDHISTS.

I.—THE WORLD'S DEBT TO BUDDHA, BY H. DHARMAPALA.

It is difficult to properly comprehend the system of Buddha by a spiritual study of its doctrines. And especially by those who have been trained to think that there is no truth in other religions. When the scholar Vachcha, approaching Buddha, demanded a complete elucidation of his doctrines, he said: "This doctrine is hard to see, hard to understand, solemn and sublime, not resting on dialectic, subtle, and perceived only by the wise. It is hard for you to learn, who are of different views, different ideas of fitness, different choice, trained and taught in another school."

A systematic study of Buddha's doctrine has not yet been made by the western scholars, hence the conflicting opinions expressed by them at various times. The notion once held by the scholars that it is a system of materialism has been exploded. The positivists of France found in it a positivism. Buckner and his school of materialists thought it was a materialistic system. Agnostics found in Buddha an agnostic, and Dr. Rhys Davids, the eminent Pali scholar, used to call him the "agnostic philosopher of India." Some scholars have found an expressed monothelism therein. Arthur Lillie, another student of Buddhism, thinks it a theistic system. Pessimists identify it with Schopenhauer's pessimism. The late Mr. Buckle identified it with the pantheism of India. Some have found in it a monoism, and the latest dictum is Professor Huxley's, that it is an idealism supplying "the wanting half of Bishop Buckley's well-known idealist argument." Dr. Eikl says that "Buddhism is a system of vast magnitude, for it embraces all the various branches of science, which our western nations have been long accustomed to
divide for separate study. It embodies, in one living
structure, grand and peculiar views of physical science,
refined and subtle theories on abstract metaphysics, an'
edifice of fanciful mysticism, a most elaborate and far-
reaching system of practical morality, and, finally, a
church organization as broad in its principles and as
finely wrought in its most intricate network as any in the
world. All this is, moreover, confined in such a manner
that the essence and substance of the whole may be com-
pressed into a few formulas and symbols plain and sug-
gestive enough to be grasped by the most simple-minded
ascetic, and yet so full of philosophic depths as to provide
rich food for years of meditation to the metaphysicians,
the poet, the mystic, and pleasant pasturage for the most
fiery imagination of any poetical dreamer.”

In the religion of Buddha is found a comprehensive
system of ethics, and a transcendental metaphysic em-
bracing a sublime psychology. To the simple-minded it
offers a code of morality, to the earnest student a system
of pure thought. But the basic doctrine is the self-puri-
faction of man.

Spiritual progress is impossible for him who does not
lead a life of purity and compassion. The superstructure
has to be built on the basis of a pure life. So long as one
is fettered by selfishness, passion, prejudice, fear, so long
the doors of his higher nature are closed against the
truth. The rays of the sunlight of truth enter the mind
of him who is fearless to examine truth, who is free from
prejudice, who is not tied by the sensual passion, and who
has reasoning faculties to think. One has to be an atheist
in the sense employed by Max Muller:

"There is an atheism which is not death; there is another which is
the very life-blood of all true faith. It is the power of giving up
what, in our best, our most honest movements, we know to be no
longer true. It is the readiness to replace the less perfect, however
dear, however sacred it may have been to us, by the more perfect,
however much it may be detested as yet by the world. It is the
ture self-surrender, the true self-sacrifice, the truest trust in truth, the
truest faith.'

Without that atheism no new religion, no reform, no
reformation, no resuscitation would ever have been pos-
sible; without that atheism no new life is possible for
any one of us. The strongest emphasis has been put by
Buddha on the supreme importance of having an unprejudiced mind before we start on the road of investigation of truth. The least attachment of the mind to preconceived ideas is a positive hindrance to the acceptance of truth. Prejudice, passion, fear of expression of one's convictions and ignorance are the four biases that have to be sacrificed at the threshold. To be born as a human being is a glorious privilege. Man's dignity consists in his capability to reason and think and to live up to the highest ideal of pure life, of calm thought, of wisdom, without extraneous interventions. Buddha says that man can enjoy in this life a glorious existence, a life of individual freedom, of fearlessness and compassionateness. This dignified idea of manhood may be attained by the humblest, and this consummation raises him above wealth and royalty. "He that is compassionate and observes the law is My disciple."

Human brotherhood forms the fundamental teaching of Buddha—universal love and sympathy with all mankind and with animal life. Everyone is enjoined to love all beings as a mother loves her only child and takes care of it even at the risk of her life. The realization of the ideal of brotherhood is obtained when the first stage of holiness is realized. The idea of separation is destroyed and the oneness of life is recognized. There is no pessimism in the teachings of Buddha, for he strictly enjoins on his holy disciples not even to suggest to others that life is not worth living. On the contrary, the usefulness of life is emphasized for the sake of doing good to self and humanity.

From the fetish worshiping savage to the highest type of humanity man naturally yearns for something higher. And it is for this reason that Buddha inculcated the necessity for self-reliance and independent thought. To guide humanity in the right path, a Tathagata (Messiah) appears from time to time.

In the sense of a supreme Creator, Buddha says that there is no such being, accepting the doctrine of evolution as the only true one, with corollary, the law of cause and effect. He condemned the idea of a Creator, but the supreme God of the Brahmins and minor Gods are accepted. But they are subject to the law of cause and effect. This supreme God is all love, all merciful, all
gentle, and looks upon all beings with equanimity. Buddha teaches men to practice these four supreme virtues. But there is no difference between the perfect man and this supreme God of the present world:

The teachings of the Buddha on evolution are clear and expansive. We are asked to look upon the cosmos "as a continuous process unfolding itself in regular order in obedience to natural laws. We see in it all not a yawning chaos restrained by the constant interference from without of a wise and beneficent external power, but a vast aggregate of original elements perpetually working out their own fresh redistribution in accordance with their own inherent energies. He regards the cosmos as an almost infinite collection of material, animated by an almost infinite sum total of energy," which is called Akasa. I have used the above definition of evolution as given by Grant Allen in his "Life of Darwin," as it beautifully expresses the generalized idea of Buddhism. We do not postulate that man's evolution began from the protoplasmic stage; but we are asked not to speculate on the origin of life, on the origin of the law of cause and effect, etc. So far as this great law is concerned we say that it controls the phenomena of human life as well as those of external nature, the whole knowable universe forms one undivided whole.

Buddha promulgated his system of philosophy after having studied all religions. And in the Brahma-jola sutta sixty-two creeds are discussed. In the Kalama, the sutta, Buddha says:

Do not believe in what ye have heard. Do not believe in traditions because they have been handed down for many generations. Do not believe in anything because it is renowned and spoken of by many. Do not believe merely because the written statement of some old sage is produced. Do not believe in conjectures. Do not believe in that as truth to which you have become attached by habit. Do not believe merely on the authority of your teachers and elders. Often observation and analysis, when the result agrees with reason is conducive to the good and gain of one and all. Accept and live up to it.

To the ordinary householder, whose highest happiness consists in being wealthy here and in Heaven hereafter, Buddha inculcated a simple code of morality. The student of Buddha's religion far from destroying life, lays
The advance student of the religion of Buddha, when he has faith in him, thinks “full of hindrances in household life, is a path defiled by passion. Pure as the air is the life of him who has renounced all worldly things. How difficult it is for the man who dwells at home to live the higher life in all its fullness, in all its purity, in all its freedom. Let me then cut off my hair and beard, let me clothe myself in orange-colored robes, let me go forth from a household life into the homeless state.” Then before long, forsaking his portion of wealth, forsaking his circle of relatives, he cuts off his hair and beard, he clothes himself in the orange-colored robes, and he goes into the homeless state, and then he passes a life of self-restraint, according to the rules of the order of the blessed One. Uprightness is his object, and he sees danger in the least of those things he should avoid. He encompasses himself with holiness, in word and deed. He sustains his life by means that are quite pure. Good is his conduct, guarded the door of his senses, mindful and self-possessed, he is altogether happy.

The student of pure religion abstinates from earning a livelihood by the practice of low and lying arts, viz., all divination, interpretation of dreams, palmistry, astrology, crystal prophesying, charms of all sorts. Buddha also says:

“Just as a mighty trumpeter makes himself heard in all the four directions without difficulty, even so of all things that have life, there is not one that the student passes by or leaves aside, but regards them all with mind set free and deep-felt pity, sympathy and equanimity. He lets his mind pervade the whole world with thoughts of love.”

To realize the unseen is the goal of the student of
Buddha's teachings, and such a one has to lead an absolutely pure life. Buddha says:

"Let him fulfill all righteousness, let him be devoted to that quietude of heart which springs from within, let him not drive back the ecstasy of contemplation, let him look through things, let him be much alone. Fulfill all righteousness for the sake of the living, and for the sake of the blessed ones that are dead and gone."

Thought-transference, thought-reading, clair-audience, clairvoyance, projection of the sub-conscious self and all the higher branches of psychical science that just now engages the thoughtful attention of psychical researchers are within the reach of him who fulfills all righteousness, who is devoted to solitude and to contemplation.

Charity, observance of moral rules, purifying the mind, making others participate in the good work that one is doing, co-operating with others in doing good, nursing the sick, giving gifts to the deserving ones, hearing all that is good and beautiful, making others learn the rules of morality, accepting the laws of cause and effect, are the common appanage of all good men.

Prohibited employments include slave-dealing, sale of weapons of warfare, sale of poisons, sale of intoxicants, sale of flesh—all deemed the lowest of professions.

The five kinds of wealth are: Faith, pure life, receptivity of the mind to all that is good and beautiful, liberality, and wisdom. Those who possess these five kinds of wealth in their past incarnations are influenced by the teachings of Buddha.

Besides these, Buddha says in his universal precepts: He who is faithful and leads the life of a householder, and possesses the following four (Dhammas) virtues: Truth, justice, firmness, and liberality, such a one does not grieve when passing away. Pray ask other teachers and philosophers, far and wide, whether there is found anything greater than truth, self-restraint, liberality and forbearance.

The pupil should minister to his teacher; he should rise up in his presence, wait upon him, listen to all that he says with respectful attention, perform the duties necessary for his personal comfort and carefully attend to his instruction. The teacher should show affection for his pupil. He trains him in good virtue and good
manners, carefully instructs him, imparts to him a knowledge of the sciences and wisdom of the ancients, speaks well of him to relatives and guards him from danger.

The honorable man ministers to his friends and relatives by presenting gifts, by courteous language, by promoting as his equals and by sharing with them his prosperity. They should watch over him when he has negligently exposed himself, guard his property when he is careless, assist him in difficulties, stand by him and help to provide for his family.

The master should minister to the wants of his servants, as dependents; he assigns them labor suitable to their strength, provides for their comfortable support; he attends them in sickness, causes them to partake of any extraordinary delicacy he may obtain and makes them occasional presents. The servants should manifest their attachment to the master; they rise before him in the morning and retire later to rest; they do not purloin his property, do their work cheerfully and actively and are respectful in their behavior toward him.

The religion teachers should manifest their kind feelings toward laymen. They should dissuade them from vice, excite them to virtuous acts—being desirous of promoting the welfare of all. They should instruct them in the things they had not previously learned, confirm them in the truths and point out to them the way to heaven. The lawyers should minister to the teachers by respectful attention manifested in their words, actions and thoughts; and by supplying them their temporal wants and by allowing them constant access to them.

The wise, virtuous, prudent, intelligent, teachable, docile man will become eminent. The persevering, diligent man, unshaken in adversity and of inflexible determination, will become eminent. The well informed, friendly disposed, prudent speaking, generous-minded, self-controlled, self-possessed man, will become eminent.

In this world generosity, mildness of speech, public spirit and courteous behavior are worthy of respect under all circumstances and will be valuable in all places. If these be not possessed the mother will receive neither honor nor support from the son, neither will the father receive respect nor honor. Buddha also says:
Know that from time to time a Tathagata is born into the world, fully enlightened, blessed and worthy, abounding in wisdom and goodness, happy with knowledge of the world, unsurpassed as a guide to erring mortal, a teacher of Gods and men, a blessed Buddha. He, by himself thoroughly understands and sees, as it were face to face, this universe, the world below with all its spirits and the worlds above, and all creatures, all religious teachers, Gods and men, and he then makes his knowledge known to others. The truth doth he proclaim, both in its letter and its spirit, lovely in its origin, lovely in its progress, lovely in its consummation; the higher life doth he proclaim, in all its purity and in all its perfectness.

1. He is absolutely free from all passions, commits no evil even in secrecy and is the embodiment of perfection. He is above doing anything wrong.

2. Self-introspection—by this has he reached the state of supreme enlightenment.

3. By means of his divine eye he looks back to the remotest past and future. Knows the way of emancipation, and is accomplished in the three great branches of divine knowledge, and has gained perfect wisdom. He is in possession of all psychic powers, always willing to listen, full of energy, wisdom and dhyana.

4. He has realized eternal peace and walks in the perfect path of virtue.

5. He knows three states of existence.

6. He is incomparable in purity and holiness.

7. He is teacher of gods and men.

8. He exhorts gods and men at the proper time according to their individual temperaments.

9. He is the supremely enlightened teacher and the perfect embodiment of all the virtues he teaches. The two characteristics of Buddha are wisdom and compassion.

Buddha also gave a warning to his followers when he said:

He who is not generous, who is fond of sensuality, who is disturbed at heart, who is of uneven mind, who is not reflective, who is not of calm mind, who is discontented at heart, who has no control over his senses—such a disciple is far from me, though he is in body near me.

The attainment of salvation is by the perception of self through charity, purity, self-sacrifice, self-knowledge, dauntless energy, patience, truth, resolution, love and equanimity. The last words of Buddha were these:

Be ye lamps unto yourselves; be ye a refuge to yourselves; betake yourselves to an eternal voyage; hold fast to the truth as a lamp; hold fast as a refuge to the truth; look not for refuge to any one besides yourselves. Learn ye, then, that knowledge which I have attained and have declared unto you and walk ye in it, practice and increase in order that the path of holiness may last and long endure for the
blessing of many people, to the relief of the world, to the welfare, the blessing, the joy of Gods and men.

II.—THE HISTORY OF BUDDHISM AND ITS SECTS IN JAPAN, BY HORIN TOKI, A BUDDHIST PRIEST.

Bhagavat Sakyamuni, to whom 500,000,000 human beings on earth at the present age pay respect, was born 2,920 years ago, according to the chronology handed down to us, in the royal family of Kapitarastu in India. It is said that at his birth he manifested extraordinary signs of greatness, saying: “I am the only one respectable in heaven and earth.” At the age of nineteen he left the palace and went into the mountain and attained his enlightenment at the age of thirty in Buddhagaya. During the fifty years after that time he developed innumerable disciples and converted all followers of Brahminism, elucidating and giving the light with the truth of Buddhism to the whole world. He died on the bank of a river in the city of Kushi at the age of seventy-nine.

The doctrines of Buddha, taught during his lifetime, are divided into two—Mahayana and Hinayana. He intended to make this distinction from his great humanity to develop his disciples according to their plane of intellect, and the method of enlightenment eventually reverts back to the truth taught in Mahayana; therefore, into whatever number the sects are divided, there is no distinction in their truth.

Those countries where the Hinayana doctrine prevails are the southern and central parts of Asia; as Siam, Anam, Burmah, Ceylon, Chittagong, Aracan, etc., and the teaching is called Southern Buddhism. And those countries where the Mahayana doctrine prevails are Japan, China, Corea, Manchuria; and Thibet. But that Buddhism which is met in the last two countries is called Lamaism and differs greatly in its origin from the Mahayana doctrine in Japan; and, though it is comprised in the list of Northern Mahayana, in comparison to the Southern Hinayana, really it is not the same as the Mahayana.

Japan has handed down Mahayana together with Hinayana doctrine, but the latter is only studied as the side study of the former, and there was never a dissemi-
The first introduction of Buddhism into Japan was 552 A. D. The King of Corea sent his ambassador, together with the priest of Doshin and seven others, and offered for the first time the copper image of Buddha and all the scriptures of Buddhism to the Japanese imperial court. A court official called Iname changed his villa in Narkawara Yamato into a temple and the image was put in it. This is the first Buddhist temple and was named after the place. But there was yet no distinction of sects.

I will now proceed to describe the distinction of sects according to the age of their foundation, for the sake of convenience dividing them into two ages, the Ancient and Modern.

Seventy-three years after the offer of the image and scriptures from the Corean king a Corean priest, called Ekwan, came to Japan, and staying in the temple called Gwangoji, in Aska, Yamato, founded a sect called Sanvon. This is the first time that Japanese Buddhism was called with the name of the sect. He taught at the same time Jojokn doctrine. At present there are Buddhist students of other sects who study, as the side study, the above two sects, but there is no especial believer in Japan.

Twenty-four years after the foundation of the above sect, in 653 A. D., a priest called Dosho went to China and learned under the famous Genjo Sanzo. After the return of Dosho to Japan he dwelt in Gwangoji, previously mentioned, and founded the Hosso sect. After over sixty years another priest called Gembo went to China and learned under Chishu. After his return he dwelt in Kobukji, a large temple in Nara, Yamato, and taught also in the Hosso sects. Thus there were two priests who taught the same doctrine, one following the other. The former was called the southern order and the latter the northern; the appellations being afterwards applied. They are not different in truth of the doctrine from Yuishiki Mahayan; the difference is only in the genealogy of transmission. Though they seem as if two different sects, they are but one in reality.

Dosho transmitted the doctrine of the Kusha sect to his followers. At present the doctrine of the Hosso and Kusha are widely understood by the Buddhists of the other
sects, and the only temples which belong to this sect are forty-eight branch temples, having fourteen priests under the Temple of Kobukji, of the northern order. But the first introduction of Buddhism from China was this Hosso sect.

Eighteen years before the foundation of the Hosso sect by Gambo, in 600 A.D., the priest En No Shokak founded the Shugen sect in the Mountain Kazaraki, in Kawachi. The origin of this sect is very peculiar. When the founder was yet disciplining himself he dreamed that, while bathing in the waterfall of Nina mountain, in Seku, he obtained the audience of Buddhistava Rinju and received from him the hermetic truth, and he founded this sect. Therefore it is not a religion of historical transmission; yet the conduct of the founder, especially, and that of the followers—clearing the high mountains, opening the deep valleys, bridging the impassable rivers, and all the other grand beneficial works—are very much like that of the Shingon sect. After the death of the founder the number of disciples was very much diminished, and the doctrine itself was almost extinguished. However, 160 years after his death, in about 360 A.D., Shobo, the high priest of the Shingon sect, reanimated this sect. At present it is a part of the Shingon and Tendai sects and is not independent.

In 843 a priest called Ryoben founded the Kegon sect in Todaiji, a large temple in Nara. Before this a Chinese priest called Doyai brought Kegon Scripture (Avatamsaka-sutra) to Japan and taught it in that temple, and Ryoben was his first disciple. Also a priest called Jikum of Kobukji went to China and learned under Genju and received the truth of Kegon. After his return he taught it to Kyoben, who was thus taught by the two teachers with complete results. At present this doctrine is mixed widely with that of other sects, and its independent temple is only Todaiji, together with its twenty-one sub-temples, the number of priests being only ten, and it has but few believers. This temple is a famous one in Nara, where is an immense bronze statue of Buddha.

In 754 a Chinese priest, Ganjin, organized the system of moral precept ordination and founded the Ritsu (Vinay or Moral Precept) sect. At this time the ex-Emperor Shomu, the Empress Koken, the princes, nobles, and high officials, over four hundred in number, took vows of disci-
pleship and received the moral precepts. This is the first time a Japanese emperor became a disciple and received the moral precept of Gautama Buddha. This precept is now widely given to the Buddhist disciple, yet at present, it is not an independent sect, being a part of the Kegon and Shingon sects.

In 805 a high priest called Saictio, well known as Dengyo Daishi, opened Iiyei mountain in Kiyoto, and built Enryakji founding the Tendai sect. Before this the founder wanted to establish this sect according to the doctrine contained in Saddhanna-pundariki-Sutra, and went to China twice. On his second visit there, he took his friend Gishin and learned under Dosui of Tendia mountain and received the deepest truth of Saddhanna-pundariki-Sutra. That is the reason why he called this new doctrine with the name of Tendai. His friend Gishin taught the same doctrine in Onjojo of Omi. Afterwards the former was called Tendai of Sammon and the latter the Tendai of Jimon, but both are the same in doctrine. At present the temples of this sect amount to over 4,800, the priests are 2,800, and the believers are consequently not few.

In 806 a high priest, Kukai, well-known as Kobo Daishi, founded the Shingon (True word) sect. Before this he met with a difficult point in the Buddhistic scriptures—Buddha, human beings and all other things are one. He could not find a teacher who could explain this problem to him. At last he went to China and learned under Keiwa of Choan and received the mystic Shingon (Mautra, or true word), and all his previous doubts were cleared. After his return he manifested the wonderful miracles of the law in the imperial court and received the edict from the Empress which authorized him to found the Shingon sect.

After sixteen years he received a magnificent building which belonged to the imperial court, and it was the state temple and was called Gokokjji, which means the temple protecting the country. It is now the principal temple of the sect. There are many other head-temples of the same sect besides this, as Kimbuji, of Koya mountain in Kishu, which was built by the founder, Kukai himself. Three hundred years afterward a priest called Kakso came out from the Koya mountain and built Negoroji in Kii. This afterward became the head temple of the
Shingon sect of Shangi or New Order. But the truth of
the doctrine is the same in both, and they are not inde-
pendent of each other. The temples of this sect at present
are over 13,600, and the number of priests are over 7,060.
The number of believers will cover probably over half of
the whole country. Kukai also brought back Vinaya Ubu,
but it is not the especial sect.

The above-named sects, Sanron, Jojiku, Hosso, Kusha,
Shugen, Kegon, Riku, Tendai and Shingon, are the ae-
cent sects founded during the 160 years from the Emperor
Suiko to the Emperor Heijo. Among them Jojitsu and
Kusha are Hinayana and all the others are Mahayana.
Some may argue that the Kitsu (Vinaya) is Hinayana;
but it is not, because Kaizuiin of Nara transmits Mahay-
ana Vinaya, and that which is called Shibun Hinayana
is only the name applied to the regulations of behavior
and etiquette of the priests of the temple. On the con-
trary, the substance of Vinaya is real Mahayana. These
ancient sects, except those of Sanron, Jojiku and Kusha,
are at present the independent sects and have temples
and believers. The name of Shugen sect is now extinct,
yet the doctrine is transmitted without change. The
Shingon sect is the mystic Yogiisen, therefore the doctrine
which is taught in this sect is different from the non-
mystic doctrine. As this mystic teaching is the highest
point of Mahayana, it cannot be discussed in this short
space, and as the historical transmission of Buddhism to
Japan refers only to that from China and Corea, nothing
is mentioned here regarding the introduction of Buddhism
from India to China, for sake of abbreviation. The
Shugen sect, among the nine sects enumerated above, is
the manifested religion in Japan without being trans-
mited from foreign countries.

Three hundred and eleven years after the foundation
of the Shingon sect, in 1118, a high priest called Kyonin
founded the Yuzunbuk sect in the temple of Raikoji of
Ohara, Yamashiro. At present, Dainembukji of Hirano,
Setsu, is the head-temple. The founder began this sect,
receiving the doctrine from a hermit. It is to interchange
the virtue of self with that of others reciting the name of
Nuda, or eternal truth. At present, though, this is not a
prosperous sect; the temples are 357 and the number of
priests over 200.
Forty-seven years after the foundation of this sect, in 1175, a high priest of Honen founded the Jodo (Pure land) sect. The founder was originally a priest and student of the Tendai sect. He read through the whole scripture of Buddha five times, and agreed with the theory of enlightenment attainable by the contemplation of Buddha, which was already disseminated by the Chinese priest Zento. Honen changed from the Tendai to the Jodo theory and founded this sect. The head temple of this sect is in Chionin in Kioto and has under it 8,300 temples and over 5,500 priests with numerous followers. There were derived the two orders of Seizen and Chinzei from this sect, and, as each of them has independent head temples, the latter is not so prosperous as the former.

Twenty-eight years after the foundation of the Jodo sect, in 1201, a high priest called Yeisai founded the order of Rinzai of Zen or Dhiyana (Meditation) sect, and its head-temple is Kenumji, in Kioto. The founder was originally a scholar of the Tendai sect, but was not satisfied and went to China twice. Finally he met a Zen priest, Koan, of Mannenji, and received the truth of transmission from mind to mind without the use of scripture, and understood the methods of becoming enlightened instantaneously. He had many prominent disciples who presided in different temples, as Keuchoji and Engakji in Sagami, Nauzenji, Tuerinji, Tofukji, Daitokji, Mysshinji, Shokokji in Kioto, and Eigenji in Omi. These are the head-temples, but they are all one order of Rinzai, with no difference in any point of view.

They are called the ten head-temples of the Rinzai order and contain over 6,100 temples under them. The number of priests is 4,250, with certain believers. Over forty years after the beginning of the Rinzai order, in about 1245, a Zen priest called Dogen founded the Soto order and the head-temple is Yeiheji in Echizen. He was originally a scholar of the Tendai sect, but afterward he went to China and learned also the method of direct enlightenment of the Buddhist mind from Jojo. Shokin, the disciple of the fourth generation from Dogen, built Sojiji in Noto, but the method of the transmission of thought is exactly the same as the former. At present this Zen order contains 14,070 temples and 11,050 priests, and consequently a great number of believers.
In 1663 a high priest called Ingen came from China and the Shogun Iyemiku inclined to his views and built the temple of Mampukji in Nji, near Kioto, and helped him to found the Nobak order of the Zen sect. The priest was originally a high priest of the Rinzai order, therefore the methods of the transmission of the truth is not different from the latter. As he presided over the Nobak temple in China, the name was applied to the temple in Japan. At present this order contains 600 temples and over 310 priests with a certain number of believers. Though the above-mentioned three orders of Rinzai, Soto and Nobak differ in their names, the idea of the sects is one, and they are called together the three Zen sects in Japan.

In 1224 Priest Shiuran founded the Shiuthu or True sect. He was originally a scholar of the Tendai sect, and afterward learned Jodo (Pure land) doctrine from Honen, and finally established his own teaching that all persons can obtain enlightenment by the external power of truth that promises to deliver all things. In this sect the priests may marry and eat flesh. The head-temples are Hongwanji, Otani Hongwanji, Koshoji, Bukkiji in Kioto, Senshuji in Ise, Kibeji in Omi, Gosetsuji, Seishoji, Shoshoji, Senshoji in Echizen, and the temples which belong to them are over 19,100 in number and the priests over 18,700, with a great many believers.

In 1261 Priest Nichiren founded the Nichiren sect. He was also a scholar of the Tendai sect. Afterward he confessed that he had something that corresponds with the truth of Saddhanna-pundarika-Sutra, and reciting the title of that scripture, taught that theory everywhere. The head-temple is in the Mountain of Minobu in Kai. This sect has over 3,060 temples and 2,500 priests and numerous believers. There are independent head temples besides this, as Myomanji, Houseiji, etc., together with their sub-temples, priests, and believers.

In 1275 a high priest called Ippan founded the Jishu sect in Fujisawadera, in Saganni. Three hundred and twenty-six years after this, a prince, the son of Emperor Daigo, became a priest called Kuyu, and he began to promulgate the same idea of this sect, but the time was not yet ripe. This Ippan in one night became inspired with the truth of Kuyu and traveled through the whole
country, teaching the theory of enlightenment to the pure land, the praise address and the recitation in the name of truth. Since that time the presiding priests of all the generations have traveled in the same manner. The temples are 735 in number and the priests 200, with a certain number of believers.

The above-mentioned six modern sects of Yuzenembuku, Jodo, Zen (Rinzai), Nobak, Shinshu, Nichiren and Jisbu, were founded during the 150 years from the reign of the Emperor Toba to the reign of the Emperor Gouda. (The order of Nobak was begun in an after age, but as it is an order of the Zen sect it is not especially described.) They are all Mahayana, and have their temples and believers, each under its own banner, and all of them were established by the Japanese priests by their own explanation of the scriptures; not being received from any other country, except the Zen sect. Though the Japanese Buddhism is divided as above into nine ancient, and six modern sects, for the sake of convenience, it seems rather strange that the former are all rather similar to each other in their traits, and the other six sects resemble each other also in their character. The former began in the time when the imperial power was at its height, and the latter when the military power was supreme. The former appeared during the 160 years in succession, while the latter during 159 years in succession; and during 311 years between the former and the latter there was no sect of any kind established.

From this it appears to me that the religious establishment and its modifications in a new form are confined to a certain age and chance. The present Japanese Buddhism has passed several hundred years since the last change. The past experience points out to us that it is time to remodel the Japanese Buddhism—that is, the happy herald is at our gates informing us that the Buddhism of perfected intellect and emotion, synthesizing the ancient and modern sects, is now coming.

The Japanese Buddhists have many aspirations, and at the same time great happiness, and we cannot but feel rejoiced when we think of the probable result of this new change by which the Buddhism of great Japan will rise and spread its wings under all heaven as the grand Buddhism of the whole world.
Buddhism, as it exists in Siam, teaches that all things are made up from the Dharma, a Sanscrit term meaning the "essence of nature." The Dharma presents the three following phenomena, which generally exist in every being: 1. The accomplishment of eternal evolution. 2. Sorrow and suffering, according to human ideas. 3. A separate power, uncontrollable by the desire of man, and not belonging to man.

The Dharma is formed of two essences, one known as matter, the other known as spirit. These essences exist for eternity; they are without beginning and without end; the one represents the world and the corporeal parts of man and the other the mind of man. The three phenomena combined are the factors for molding forms and creating sensations. The waves of the ocean are formed but of water, and the various shapes they take are dependent upon the degree of motion in the water; in similar manner the Dharma represents the universe, and varies according to the degree of evolution accomplished within it. Matter is called in the Pali "Rupa," and spirit "Nama." Everything in the universe is made up of Rupa and Nama, or matter and spirit, as already stated. The difference between all material things, as seen outwardly, depends upon the degree of evolution that is inherent to matter; and the difference between all spirits depends upon the degree of will, which is the evolution of spirit. These differences, however, are only apparent; in reality, all is one and the same essence, merely a modification of the one great eternal truth, Dharma.

Man, who is an aggregate of Dharma, is, however, unconscious of the fact, because his will either receives impressions and becomes modified by mere visible things, or because his spirit has become identified with appearances, such as man, animal, deva, or any other beings that are also but modified spirits and matter. Man becomes, therefore, conscious of separate existence. But all outward forms, man himself included, are made to live or to last for a short space of time only. They are soon to be destroyed and recreated again and again by an eternal evolution. He is first body and spirit, but, through igno-
rance of the fact that all is Dharma, and of that which is
good and evil, his spirit may become impressed with evil
temptation. Thus, for instance, he may desire certain
things with that force peculiar to a tiger, whose spirit is
modified by craving for lust and anger. In such a case
he will be continually adopting, directly or indirectly, in
his own life, the wills, and acts of that tiger and thereby
is himself that animal in spirit and soul. Yet outwardly
he appears to be a man, and is as yet unconscious of the
fact that his spirit has become endowed with the cruelties
of the tiger.

If this state continues until the body be dissolved or
changed into other matter, be dead, as we say, that same
spirit which has been endowed with the cravings of lust
and anger of a tiger, of exactly the same nature and feel-
ings as those that have appeared in the body of the man
before his death, may reappear now to find itself in the
body of a tiger, suitable to its nature. Thus, so long as
man is ignorant of that nature of Dharma and fails to
identify that nature, he continues to receive different im-
pressions from beings around him in this universe, there-
by sufferings, pains, sorrows, disappointments of all kinds,
death.

If, however, his spirit be impressed with the good qual-
ities that are found in a superior being, such as the deva,
for instance, by adopting in his own life the acts and wills
of that superior being, man becomes spiritually that supe-
rior being himself, both in nature and soul, even while in
his present form. When death puts an end to his phys-
ical body, a spirit of the very same nature and quality
may reappear in the new body of a deva to enjoy a life of
happiness, not to be compared to anything that is known
in this world.

However, to all beings alike, whether superior or in-
ferior to ourselves, death is a suffering. It is, therefore,
undesirable to be born into any being that is a modification
of Dharma, to be sooner or later, again and again, dis-
solved by the eternal phenomenon of evolution. The
only means by which we are able to free ourselves from
sufferings and death is therefore to possess a perfect
knowledge of Dharma, and to realize by will and acts
that nature only obtainable by adhering to the precepts
given by Lord Buddha in the Four Noble Truths. The
consciousness of self-being is a delusion, so that, until we are convinced that we ourselves and whatever belongs to ourselves is a mere nothingness, until we have lost the idea or impression that we are men, until that idea be completely annihilated and we have become united to Dharma, we are unable to reach spiritually the state of Nirvana, and that is only attained when the bodies dissolve both spiritually and physically. So that one should cease all petty longing for personal happiness and remember that one life is as hollow as the other, that all is transient and unreal.

The true Buddhist does not mar the purity of his self-denial by lusting after a positive happiness which he himself shall enjoy here or hereafter. Ignorance of Dharma leads to sin, which leads to sorrow; and under these conditions of existence each new birth leaves man ignorant and finite still. What is to be hoped for is the absolute repose of Nirvana, the extinction of our being, nothingness. Allow me to give an illustration: A piece of rope is thrown in a dark road; a silly man passing by cannot make out what it is. In his natural ignorance the rope appears to be a horrible snake, and immediately creates in him alarm, fright and suffering. Soon light dwells upon him; he now realizes that what he took to be a snake is but a piece of rope; his alarm and fright are suddenly at an end; they are annihilated as it were; the man now becomes happy and free from the suffering he has just experienced through his own folly.

It is precisely the same with ourselves, our lives, our deaths, our alarms, our cries, our lamentations, our disappointments, and all other sufferings. They are created by our own ignorance of eternity, of the knowledge of Dharma to do away with and annihilate all of them.

I shall now refer to the Four Noble Truths as taught by our Merciful and Omniscient Lord Buddha; they point out the path that leads to Nirvana or to the desirable extinction of self.

The first Noble Truth is suffering; it arises from birth, old age, illness, sorrow, death, separation, and from what is loved, association with what is hateful, and in short, the very idea of self in spirit and matters that constitute Dharma.

The second Noble Truth is the cause of suffering which
results from ignorance, creating lust for objects of perishable nature. If the lust be for sensual objects it is called, in Pali, Kama Tanha. If it be for supersensual objects, belonging to the mind but still possessing a form in the mind, it is called Bhava Tanha. If the lust be pure for supersensual objects that belong to the mind but are devoid of all form whatever, it is called Wibhava Tanha.

The third Noble Truth is the extinction of sufferings, which is brought about by the cessation of the three kinds of lust, together with their accompanying evils, which all result directly from ignorance.

The fourth Noble Truth is the means of paths that lead to the cessation of lusts and other evils. This Noble Truth is divided into the following eight paths: Right understanding; right resolutions; right speech; right acts; right way of earning a livelihood; right efforts; right meditation; right state of mind. A few words of explanation on these paths may not be found out of place.

By right understanding is meant proper comprehension, especially in regard to what we call sufferings. We should strive to learn the cause of our sufferings and the manner to alleviate and even to suppress them. We are not to forget that we are in this world to suffer; that wherever there is pleasure there is pain, and that, after all, pain and pleasure only exist according to human ideas.

By right resolutions is meant that it is our imperative duty to act kindly to our fellow-creatures. We are to bear no malice against anybody and never to seek revenge. We are to understand that in reality we exist in flesh and blood only for a short time, and that happiness and sufferings are transient or idealistic, and therefore we should try to control our desires and cravings, and endeavor to be good and kind toward our fellow-creatures.

By right speech is meant that we are always to speak the truth, never to incite one's anger toward others, but always to speak of things useful and never use harsh words destined to hurt the feelings of others.

By right acts is meant that we should never harm our fellow-creatures, neither steal, take life or commit adultery. Temperance and celibacy are also enjoined.

By right way of earning a livelihood is meant that we are always to be honest and never to use wrongful or guilty means to attain an end.
By right efforts is meant that we are to persevere in our endeavors to do good and to mend our conduct should we ever have strayed from the path of virtue.

By right meditation is meant that we should always look upon life as being temporary, consider our existence as a source of suffering, and therefore endeavor always to calm our minds that may be excited by the sense of pleasure or pain.

By right state of mind is meant that we should be firm in our belief and be strictly indifferent both to the sense of feeling of pleasure and pain.

It would be out of place here to enter into further details on the Four Noble Truths; it would require too much time. I will, therefore, merely summarize their meanings and say that sorrow and sufferings are mainly due to ignorance, which creates in our minds lust, anger, and other evils. The extermination of all sorrow and suffering and of all happiness is attained by the eradication of ignorance and its evil consequences, and by replacing it with cultivation, knowledge, contentment, and love.

Now comes the question, what is good and what is evil? Every act, speech, or thought derived from falsehood, or that which is injurious to others is evil. Every act, speech, or thought derived from truth and that which is not injurious to others is good. Buddhism teaches that lust prompts avarice; anger creates animosity; ignorance produces false ideas. These are called evils because they cause pain. On the other hand, contentment prompts charity; love creates kindness; knowledge produces progressive ideas. These are called good because they give pleasure.

The teachings of Buddhism on morals are numerous, and are divided into three groups of advantages: The advantage to be obtained in the present life, the advantage to be obtained in the future life, and the advantage to be obtained in all eternity. For each of these advantages there are recommended numerous paths to be followed by those who aspire to any one of them. I will only quote a few examples:

To those who aspire to advantages in the present life Buddhism recommends diligence, economy, expenditure suitable to one's income, and association with the good.

To those who aspire to the advantages of the future life
are recommended charity, kindness, knowledge of right and wrong.

To those who wish to enjoy the everlasting advantages in all eternity are recommended purity of conduct, of mind, and of knowledge.

Allow me now to say a few words on the duties of man towards his wife and family as preached by the Lord Buddha himself to the lay disciples in different discourses, or Suttas, as they are called in Pali. They belong to the group of advantages of present life.

A good man is characterized by seven qualities. He should not be loaded with faults, he should be free from laziness, he should not boast of his knowledge, he should be truthful, benevolent, content, and should aspire to all that is useful.

A husband should honor his wife, never insult her, never displease her, make her mistress of the house, and provide for her. On her part, a wife ought to be cheerful toward him when he works, entertain his friends, and care for his dependents, to never do anything he does not wish, to take good care of the wealth he has accumulated, not to be idle, but always cheerful when at work herself.

Parents in old age expect their children to take care of them, to do all their work and business, to maintain the household, and, after death, to do honor to their remains by being charitable. Parents help their children by preventing them from doing sinful acts, by guiding them in the path of virtue, by educating them, by providing them with husbands and wives suitable to them, by leaving them legacies.

When poverty, accident, or misfortune befalls man, the Buddhist is taught to bear it with patience, and if these are brought on by himself it is his duty to discover their causes and try, if possible, to remedy them. If the causes, however, are not to be found here in this life, he must account for them by the wrongs done in his former existence.

Temperance is enjoined upon all Buddhists for the reason that the habit of using intoxicating things tends to lower the mind to the level of that of an idiot, a madman, or an evil spirit.

These are some of the doctrines and moralities taught by Buddhism, which I hope will give you an idea of the
scope of the Lord Buddha's teachings. In closing this brief paper I earnestly wish you all, my brother religionists, the enjoyment of long life, happiness and prosperity.
CHAPTER X.

The Brahmo-Somaj.

I.—SPIRITUAL IDEAS OF THE BRAHMO-SOMAJ, BY B. B. NARGARKAR, OF BOMBAY.

DURING the last few days various faiths have been pressing their claims upon your attention. And it must be a great puzzle and perplexity for you to accept any of these or all of these. But, during all these discussions and debates, I would earnestly ask you all to keep in mind one prominent fact—that the essence of all these faiths is one and the same. The truth that lies at the root of them all is unchanged and unchanging. But it requires an impartial and dispassionate consideration to understand and appreciate this truth. One of the poets of our country has said:

"When scriptures differ, and faiths disagree, a man should see truth reflected in his own spirit."

This truth cannot be observed unless we are prepared to forget the accident of our nationality. We are all too apt to be carried away for or against a system of religion by our false patriotism, insular, nationality and scholarly egotism. This state of the heart is detrimental to spiritual culture and spiritual development. Self-annihilation and self-effacement are the only means of realizing the verities of the spiritual world. The mind of man is like a lake, and just as the clear and crystal image of the evening moon cannot be faithfully reflected on the surface of the lake so long as the waters are disturbed by storms and waves, so in the same way, spiritual truths cannot be imaged in the heart of man so long as his mind is disturbed by the storms of false pride and partial prejudice.

I stand before you as an humble member of the Brahmo-Somaj, and if the followers of other religions will com-
mend to your attention their own respective creeds, my humble attempt will be to place before you the liberal and cosmopolitan principles of my beloved church.

The fundamental, spiritual ideal of the Brahmo-Somaj is belief in the existence of one true God. Now, the expression, belief in the existence of God, is nothing new to you. In a way, you all believe in God, but to us of the Brahmo-Somaj that belief is a stern reality; it is not a logical idea; it is nothing arrived at after an intellectual process. It must be our aim to feel God, to realize God in our daily spiritual communion with Him. We must be able, as it were, to feel His touch—to feel as if we were shaking hands with Him. This deep, vivid, real, and lasting perception of the Supreme Being is the first and foremost ideal of the theistic faith.

You, in the western countries, are too apt to forget this ideal. The ceaseless demand on your time and energy, the constant worry and hurry of your business activity and the artificial conditions of your western civilization are all calculated to make you forgetful of the personal presence of God. You are too apt to be satisfied with a mere belief—perhaps at the best, a notional belief in God. The eastern does not live on such a belief, and such a belief can never form the life of a life-giving faith. It is said that the way to an Englishman's heart is through his stomach; that is, if you wish to reach his heart you must do so through the medium of that wonderful organ called the stomach. The stomach, therefore, is the life of an Englishman, and all his life rests in his stomach.

Wherein does the heart of a Hindu lie? It lies in his sight. He is not satisfied unless and until he has seen God. The highest dream of his spiritual life is God-vision—the seeing and feeling in every place and at every time the presence of a Supreme Being. He does not live by bread, but by sight.

The second spiritual ideal of the Brahmo-Somaj is the unity of truth. We believe that truth is born in time, but not in a place. No nation, no people, or no community has any exclusive monopoly of God's truth. It is a misnomer to speak of truth as Christian truth, Hindu truth, or Mohammedan truth.

Truth is the body of God. In His own providence He sends it through the instrumentality of a nation or a peo-
ple, but that is no reason why that nation or that people should pride themselves for having been the medium of that truth. Thus, we must always be ready to receive the gospel truth from whatever country and from whatever people it may come to us. We all believe in the principle of free trade or unrestricted exchange of goods. And we eagerly hope and long for the golden day when people of every nation and of every clime will proclaim the principle of free trade in spiritual matters as ardently and as zealously as they are doing in secular affairs or in industrial matters.

It appears to me that it is the duty of us all to put together the grand and glorious truths believed in and taught by different nations of the world. This synthesis of truth is a necessary result of the recognition of the principle of the unity of truth. Owing to this character of the Brahmo-Somaj the church of Indian theism has often been called an eclectic church; yes, the religion of the Brahmo-Somaj is the religion of eclecticism—of putting together the spiritual truths of the entire humanity, and of earnestly striving after assimilating them with our spiritual being. The religion of the Brahmo-Somaj is inclusive and not exclusive.

The third spiritual ideal of the Brahmo-Somaj is the harmony of prophets. We believe that the prophets of the world—spiritual teachers such as Vyas and Buddha, Moses and Mohammed, Jesus and Zoroaster, all form a homogeneous whole. Each has to teach mankind his own message. Every prophet was sent from above with a distinct message, and it is the duty of us who live in these advanced times to put these messages together and thereby harmonize and unify the distinctive teachings of the prophets of the world. It would not do to accept the one and reject all the others, or to accept some and reject even a single one. The general truths taught by these different prophets are nearly the same in their essence; but in the midst of all these universal truths that they taught, each has a distinctive truth to teach, and it should be our earnest purpose to find out and understand this particular truth. To me Vyas teaches how to understand and apprehend the attributes of divinity. The Jewish prophets of the Old Testament teach the idea of the sovereignty of God; they speak of God as a King, a Monarch, a sovereign
who rules over the affairs of mankind as nearly and as closely as an ordinary human king. Mohammed, on the other hand, most emphatically teaches the idea of the unity of God. He rebelled against the Trinitarian doctrine imported into the religion of Christ through Greek and Roman influences. The monotheism of Mohammed is hard and unyielding, aggressive and almost savage. I have no sympathy with the errors or erroneous teachings of Mohammedanism, or of any religion for that matter. In spite of all such errors Mohammed's ideal of the unity of God stands supreme and unchallenged in his teachings.

Buddha, the great teacher of morals and ethics, teaches in most sublime strains the doctrine of Nirvana or self-denial and self-effacement. This principle of extreme self-abnegation means nothing more than the subjugation and conquest of our carnal self. For you know that man is a composite being. In him he has the angelic and the animal; and the spiritual training of our life means no more than subjugation of the animal and the setting free of the angelic.

So, also, Christ Jesus of Nazareth taught a sublime truth when he inculcated the noble idea of the fatherhood of God. He taught many other truths, but the fatherhood of God stands supreme above them all. The brotherhood of man is a mere corollary, or a conclusion, deduced from the idea of the fatherhood of God. Jesus taught this truth in the most emphatic language, and therefore that is the special message that He has brought to fallen humanity. In this way by means of an honest and earnest study of the lives and teachings of different prophets of the world, we can find out the central truth of each faith. Having done this it should be our highest aim to harmonize all these and to build up our spiritual nature on them.

The religious history of the present century has most clearly shown the need and necessity of the recognition of some universal truths in religion. For the last several years there has been a ceaseless yearning, a deep longing after such a universal religion. The present parliament of religions, which we have been, for the last few days, celebrating with so much edification and ennoblement, is the clearest indication of this universal longing, and whatever the prophets of despondency or the champions
of orthodoxy may say or feel, every individual, who has the least spark of spirituality alive in him, must feel that this spiritual fellowship that we have enjoyed for the last several days within the precincts of this noble hall cannot but be productive of much that leads toward the establishment of universal peace and good-will among men and nations of the world.

To us of the Brahmo-Somaj this happy consummation, however partial and imperfect it may be for the time being, is nothing short of a sure foretaste of the realization of the principle of the harmony of prophets. In politics and in national government it is now an established fact that, in future, countries and continents on the surface of the earth will be governed, not by mighty monarchies or aristocratic autocracies, but by the system of universal federation. The history of political progress in your own country stands in noble evidence of my statement; and I am one of those who strongly believe that, at some future time, every country will be governed by itself as an independent unit, though in some respects may be dependent on some brother power or sister kingdom. What is true in politics will also be true in religion; and nations will recognize and realize the truths taught by the universal family of the sainted prophets of the world.

In the fourth place we believe that the religion of the Brahmo-Somaj is a dispensation of this age; it is a message of unity and harmony; of universal amity and unification, proclaimed from above. We do not believe in the revelation of books and men, of histories and historical records. We believe in the infallible revelation of the Spirit—in the message that comes to man, but the touch of human spirit with the Supreme Spirit. And can we even for a moment ever imagine that the Spirit of God has ceased to work in our midst? No, we cannot. Even to-day God communicates His will to mankind as truly and as really as He did in the days of Christ or Moses, Mohammed or Buddha.

The dispensations of the world are not isolated units of truth but, viewed as a whole, and followed out from the earliest to the latest in their historical sequence, they form a continuous chain, and each dispensation is only a link in this chain. It is our bounden duty to read the message of each dispensation in the light that comes
from above, and not according to the dead letter that might have been recorded in the past. The interpretation of letters and words, of books and chapters, is a drag behind on the workings of the Spirit. Truly hath it been said that the letter killeth. Therefore, brethren, let us seek the guidance of the Spirit, and interpret the message of the Supreme Spirit by the help of his Holy Spirit.

Thus the Brahmo-Somaj seeks to Hinduize Hinduism, Mohammedanize Mohammedanism, and Christianize Christianity. And, whatever the champions of old Christian orthodoxy may say to the contrary, mere doctrine, mere dogma can never give life to any country or community. We are ready and most willing to receive the truths of the religion of Christ as truly as the truths of the religions of other prophets, but we shall receive these from the life and teachings of Christ himself, and not through the medium of any church or the so-called missionary of Christ. If Christian missionaries have in them the meekness and humility, and the earnestness of purpose that Christ lived in His own life, and so pathetically exemplified in His glorious death on the cross, let our missionary friends show it in their lives.

We are wearied of hearing the dogmas of Christendom reiterated, from Sunday to Sunday, from hundreds of pulpits in India, and evangelists and revivalists of the type of Dr. Pentecost, who go to our country to sing to the same tune, only add to the chaos and confusion presented to the natives of India by the dry and cold lives of hundreds and thousands of his Christian brethren. They come to India on a brief sojourn, pass through the country like birds of passage, moving at a whirlwind speed, surrounded by Christian fanatics and dogmatists, and to us it is no matter of wonder that they do not see any good, or, having seen it, do not recognize it, in any of the ancient or modern religious systems of India. Mere rhetoric is no reason, nor is abuse an argument, unless it be the argument of a want of common sense. And we are not disposed to quarrel with any people if they are inclined to indulge in these two instruments generally used by those who have no truth on their side. For these our only feeling is a feeling of pity—unqualified, unmodified, earnest pity, and we are ready to ask God to forgive them, for they know not what they say.
The first ideal of the Brahma-Somaj is the ideal of the motherhood of God. I do not possess the powers, nor have I the time to dwell at length on this most sublime ideal of the church of Indian Theism. The world has heard of God as the Almighty Creator of the universe as the omnipotent Sovereign that rules the entire creation, as the Protector, the Saviour and the Judge of the human race; as the Supreme Being vivifying and enlivening the whole of the sentient and insentient nature.

We humbly believe that the world has yet to understand and realize, as it never has in the past, the tender and loving relationship that exists between mankind and their supreme, universal, divine mother. Oh, what a world of thought and feeling is centered in that one monosyllabic word Ma, which in my language is indicative of the English word Mother. Words cannot describe, hearts cannot conceive of the tender and self-sacrificing love of a human mother. Of all human relations, the relation of mother to her children is the most sacred and elevating relation. And yet our frail and fickle human mother is nothing in comparison with the divine mother of the entire humanity, who is the primal source of all love, of all mercy, and all purity.

Let us, therefore, realize that God is our mother, the mother of mankind, irrespective of the country or the clime in which men and women may be born. The deeper the realization of the motherhood of God, the greater will be the strength and intensity of our ideas of the brotherhood of man and the sisterhood of woman. Once we see and feel that God is our mother, all the intricate problems of theology, all the puzzling quibbles of church government, all the quarrels and wranglings of the so-called religious world will be solved and settled. We of the Brahma-Somaj family hold that a vivid realization of the motherhood of God is the only solution of the intricate problems and differences in the religious world.

May the universal Mother grant us all her blessings to understand and appreciate her sweet relationship to the vast family of mankind. Let us approach her footstool in the spirit of her humble and obedient children.
Mr. President, Representatives of Nations and Religions:—I told you the other day that India is the mother of religion; the land of evolution. I am going this morning to give you an example, or demonstrate the truth of what I said. The Brahma-Somaj of India which I have the honor to represent is that example. Our society is a new society; our religion is a new religion, but it comes from far, far antiquity, from the very roots of our national life, hundreds of centuries ago.

Sixty-three years ago the whole land of India—the whole country of Bengal—was full of a mighty clamor. The great jarring noise of a heterogeneous polytheism rent the stillness of the sky. The cry of widows; nay, far more lamentable, the cry of those miserable women who had to be burned on the funeral pyre of their dead husbands, desecrated the holiness of God's earth.

We had the Buddhist goddess of the country, the mother of the people, ten-handed, holding in each hand the weapons for the defense of her children. We had the white goddess of learning, playing on her Vena, a stringed instrument of music, the strings of wisdom, because, my friends, all wisdom is musical, where there is a discord there is no deep wisdom. The goddess of good fortune, holding in her arms, not the horn, but the basket of plenty, blessing the nations of India, was there, and the god with the head of an elephant, and the god who rides on a peacock—martial men are always fashionable, you know,—and the 33,000,000 of gods and goddesses besides. I have my theory about the mythology of Hinduism, but this is not the time to take it up.

Amid the din and clash of this polytheism and so-called evil, amid all the darkness of the times, there arose a man, a Brahman, pure bred and pure born, whose name was Raja Ram Dohan Roy. In his boyhood he had studied the Arabic and Persian; he had studied Sanscrit, and his own mother was a Bengalee. Before he was out of his teens he made a journey to Thibet and learned the wisdom of the Lamas.

Before he became a man he wrote a book proving the falsehood of all polytheism and the truth of the existence
of the living God. This brought upon his head persecution, nay, even such serious displeasure of his own parents that he had to leave his home for awhile and live the life of a wanderer. In 1830 this man founded a society known as the Brahmo-Somaj; Brahma, as you know, means God. Brahmo means the worshiper of God and Somaj means society; therefore Brahmo-Somaj means the society of the worshipers of the one living God. While, on the one hand, he established the Brahmo-Somaj, on the other hand he co-operated with the British government to abolish the barbarous custom of suttee, or the burning of widows with their dead husbands. In 1832 he traveled to England, the very first Hindu who ever went to Europe, and in 1833 he died, and his sacred bones are interred in Brisco, the place where every Hindu pilgrim goes to pay his tribute of honor and reverence.

This monotheism, the one true living God—this society in the name of this great God—what were the underlying principles upon which it was established? The principles were those of the old Hindu scriptures. The Brahmo-Somaj founded this monotheism upon the inspiration of the Vedas and the Upanishads. When Raja Ram Dohan Roy died his followers for awhile found it nearly impossible to maintain the infant association. But the Spirit of God was there. The movement sprang up in the fullness of time. The seed of eternal truth was sown in it; how could it die? Hence, in the course of time, other men sprang up to preserve it and contribute toward its growth. Did I say the Spirit of God was there? Did I say the seed of eternal truth was there? There! Where?

All societies, all churches, all religious movement have their foundation, not without, but within the depths of the human soul. Where the basis of a church is outside the floods shall rise, the rain shall beat, and the storm shall blow, and, like a heap of sand, it will melt into the sea. Where the basis is within the heart, within the soul, the storm shall rise, and the rain shall beat, and the flood shall come, but like a rock it neither wavers nor falls. So that movement of the Brahmo-Somaj shall never fall. Think for yourselves, my brothers and sisters, upon what foundation your house is laid.

In the course of time, as the movement grew, the members began to doubt whether the Hindu scriptures were
really infallible. In their souls, in the depth of their intelligence, they thought they heard a voice which here and there, at first in feeble accents, contradicted the deliveries of the Vedas and the Upanishads. What shall be our theological principles? Upon what principles shall our religion stand? The small accents in which the question first was asked became louder and louder and were more and more echoed in the rising religious society, until it became the most practical of all problems—upon what book shall true religion stand?

Briefly, they found that it was impossible that the Hindu scriptures should be the only records of true religion. They found that the Spirit was the great source of confirmation, the voice of God was the great judge, the soul of the indweller was the revealer of truth, and, although there were truths in the Hindu scriptures, they could not recognize them as the only infallible standard of spiritual reality. So twenty-one years after the foundation of the Brahma-Somaj the doctrine of the infallibility of the Hindu scriptures was given up.

Then a further question came. The Hindu scriptures only not infallible! Are there not other scriptures also? Did I not tell you the other day that on the imperial throne of India Christianity now sat with the Gospel of Peace in one hand and the scepter of civilization in the other? The Bible had penetrated into India: its pages were unfolded, its truths were read and taught. The Bible is the book which mankind shall not ignore. Recognizing, therefore, on the one hand, the great inspiration of the Hindu scriptures, we could not but, on the other hand, recognize the inspiration and the authority of the Bible. And in 1861 we published a book in which extracts from all scriptures were given as the book which was to be read in the course of our devotions.

Our monotheism, therefore, stands upon all scriptures. That is our theological principle, and that principle did not emanate from the depths of our own consciousness, as the donkey was delivered out of the depths of the German consciousness: it came out as the natural result of the indwelling of God's Spirit within our fellow-believers. No, it was not the Christian missionary that drew our attention to the Bible: it was not the Mohammedan priests who showed us the excellent passages in the Koran; it was no
Zoroastrian who preached to us the greatness of his Zend-Avesta; but there was in our hearts the God of infinite reality, the source of inspiration of all the books, of the Bible, of the Koran, of the Zend-Avesta, who drew our attention to His excellences as revealed in the record of holy experience everywhere. By His leading and by His light it was that we recognized these facts, and upon the rock of everlasting and eternal reality our theological basis was laid.

What is theology without morality? What is the inspiration of this book or the authority of that prophet without personal holiness—the cleanliness of this God-made temple and the cleanliness of the deeper temple within. Soon after we had got through our theology the question stared us in the face that we were not good men, pure-minded, holy men, and that there were innumerable evils around us, in our houses, in our national usages, in the organization of our society. The Brahmo-Somaj therefore next laid its hand upon the reformation of society. In 1851 the first intermarriage was celebrated. Intermarriage in India means the marriage of persons belonging to different castes. Caste is a sort of Chinese wall that surrounds every household and every little community, and beyond the limits of which no audacious man or woman shall stray. In the Brahmo-Somaj we asked, "Shall this Chinese wall disgrace the freedom of God's children forever?" Break it down; down with it, and away!

Next, my honored leader and friend, Keshub Chunder Sen, so arranged that marriage between different castes should take place. The Brahmans were offended. Wise-acres shook their heads; even leaders of the Brahmo-Somaj shrugged up their shoulders and put their hands into their pockets. "These young firebrands," they said, "are going to set fire to the whole of society." But intermarriage took place, and widow marriage took place.

Do you know what the widows of India are? A little girl of ten or twelve years happens to lose her husband before she knows his features very well, and from that tender age to her dying day she shall go through penances and austerities and miseries and loneliness and disgrace which you tremble to hear of. I do not approve of or understand the conduct of a woman who marries a first time, and then a second time, and then a third time, and a fourth
time—who marries as many times as there are seasons in the year. I do not understand the conduct of such men and women. But I do think that when a little child of eleven loses what men call her husband and who has never been a wife for a single day of her life, to put her to the wretchedness of a life-long widowhood and inflict upon her miseries which would disgrace a criminal, is a piece of inhumanity which cannot too soon be done away with. Hence intermarriages and widow marriages. Our hands were thus laid upon the problem of social and domestic improvement, and the result of that was that very soon a rupture took place in the Brahmo-Somaj. We young men had to go—we, with all our social reform—and shift for ourselves as we best might. When these social reforms were partially completed, there came another question.

We had married the widow; we had prevented the burning of widows; what about her personal purity, the sanctification of our own consciences, the regeneration of our own souls? What about our acceptance before the awful tribunal of the God of infinite justice? Social reform and the doing of public good is itself only legitimate when it develops into the all-embracing principle of personal purity and the holiness of the soul.

My friends, I am often afraid, I confess, when I contemplate the condition of European and American society, when your activities are so manifold, your work is so extensive that you are drowned in it, and you have little time to consider the great questions of regeneration, of personal sanctification, of trial and judgment, and of acceptance before God. That is the question of all questions. A right theological basis may lead to social reform, but a right line of public activity and the doing of good is bound to lead to the salvation of the doer’s soul and the regeneration of public men.

After the end of the work of our social reform we were therefore led into this great subject. How shall this unregenerate nature be regenerated; this defiled temple, what waters shall wash it into a new and pure condition? All these motives and desires and evil impulses, the animal inspirations, what will put an end to them all, and make man what he was, the immaculate child of God, as Christ was, as all regenerated men were? Theological principle first, moral principle next, and in the third place the spiritual of the Brahmo-Somaj.
Devotions, repentance, prayer, praise, faith; throwing ourselves entirely and absolutely upon the Spirit of God and upon His saving love. Moral aspirations do not mean holiness; a desire of being good does not mean to be good. The bullock, that carries on his back hundredweights of sugar, does not taste a grain of sweetness because of its unbearable load. And all our aspirations, and all our fine wishes, and all our fine dreams, and fine sermons either hearing or speaking them—going to sleep over them, or listening to them intently—these will never make a life perfect. Devotion only, prayer, direct perception of God's spirit, communion with Him, absolute self-abasement before His majesty; devotional fervor, devotional excitement, spiritual absorption, living and moving in God—that is the secret of personal holiness.

And in the third stage of our career, therefore, spiritual excitement, long devotions, intense fervor, contemplation, endless self-abasement, not merely before God but before man, became the rule of our lives. God is unseen; it does not harm anybody or make him appear less respectable if he says to God: "I am a sinner; forgive me." But to make your confessions before man, to abase yourselves before your brothers and sisters, to take the dust off the feet of holy men, to feel that you are a miserable, wretched object in God's holy congregation—that requires a little self-humiliation, a little moral courage. Our devotional life, therefore, is twofold, bearing reverence and trust for God and reverence and trust for man, and in our infant and apostolical church we have, therefore, often immersed ourselves into spiritual practices which would seem absurd to you if I were to relate them in your hearing.

The last principle I have to take up is the progressiveness of the Brahmo-Somaj. Theology is good; moral resolutions are good; devotional fervor is good. The problem is, how shall we go on ever and ever in an onward way, in the upper path of progress and approach toward Divine perfection? God is infinite; what limit is there in His goodness or His wisdom or His righteousness? All the scriptures sing His glory; all the prophets in the Heaven declare His majesty; all the martyrs have reddened the world with their blood in order that His Holiness might be known. God is the one infinite good; and, after we had made our three attempts of theological,
moral, and spiritual principle, the question came that
God is the one Eternal and Infinite, the Inspirer of all
human kind. The part of our progress then lay toward
allying ourselves, toward affiliating ourselves with the
faith and the righteousness and wisdom of all religions
and all mankind.

Christianity declares the glory of God; Hinduism
speaks about His infinite and eternal excellence; Moham-
medanism, with fire and sword, proves the almightiness
of His will; Buddhism says how joyful and peaceful He
is. He is the God of all religions, of all denominations, of
all lands of all scriptures, and our progress lies in harmoniz-
ing these various systems, these various prophecies and de-
velopments into one great system. Hence the new system
of religion in the Brahmo-Somaj is called the New
Dispensation. The Christian speaks in terms of admira-
tion of Christianity; so does the Hebrew of Judaism; so
does the Mohammedan of the Koran; so does the Zoroas-
trian of the Zend-Avesta. The Christian admires his
principle of spiritual culture; the Hindu does the same; the
Mohammedan does the same.

But the Brahmo-Somaj accepts and harmonizes all these
precepts, systems, principles, teachings, and disciplines,
and makes them into one system, and that is his religion.
For a whole decade, my friend, Keshub Chunder Sen, my-
self and other apostles of the Brahmo-Somaj have traveled
from village to village, from province to province, from
continent to continent, declaring this new dispensation
and the harmony of all religious prophecies and systems
unto the glory of the one true, living God. But we are a
subject race; we are uneducated; we are incapable; we
have not the resources of money to get men to listen to
our message. In the fullness of time you have called
this august parliament of religions, and the message that
we could not propagate you have taken into your hands
to propagate. We have made that the gospel of our very
lives, the ideal of our very being.

I do not come to the sessions of this parliament as a
mere student, not as one who has to justify his own
system. I come as a disciple, as a follower, as a brother.
May your labors be blessed with prosperity, and not only
shall your Christianity and your America be exalted, but
the Brahmo-Somaj will feel most exalted; and this poor
man who has come such a long distance to crave your sympathy and your kindness shall feel himself amply rewarded.

May the spread of the New Dispensation rest with you and make you our brothers and sisters. Representatives of all religions, may all your religions merge into the Fatherhood of God and in the brotherhood of man, that Christ's prophecy may be fulfilled, the world's hope may be fulfilled, and mankind may become one kingdom with God, our Father.
CHAPTER XI.

THE UNIVERSALISTS.

THE RELIGIOUS INTENT—REV. E. L. REXFORD, D. D., OF BOSTON.

VENERABLE BROTHERS:—By the leading of that beneficent Providence which has always attended the fortunes of men, we are brought to this most significant hour in the history of religious fellowship, if, indeed, it be not the most significant hour in the history of the religious development of the world. What event in the earlier or the later centuries has ever transcended or even closely approached in its import the meeting of this assembly? What day, in all the fragmentary annals of good-will, ever witnessed a fraternity so manifold, or a congress whose constituency was so essentially cosmopolitan? This is a larger Pentecost, in which a greater variety of people than of old are telling in their various language, custom, and achievement of the wonderful works and ways of God. The Emperor Akbar, in overreaching the special limits of his chosen sect that he might pay a fitting tribute to the spirit of religion in its several forms, displayed a noble catholicity of spirit, but, unsupported by the popular sympathies of his age, his generosity was largely personal and resulted in no representative movement.

We have had our national and international Evangelical alliances among Christians, and likewise our national and international Young Men’s Christian Associations, with assemblies filling the largest halls of Europe and America, but these fellowships have embraced only a slight diversity of opinions and practices in one division of the religious world, while larger numbers of even fellow-Christians have been excluded. The portals of the Divine Kingdom have been held but slightly ajar by such untrained Christian hands, while it has been left to the mightier spirit of this day to throw those gates wide open, and to
bid every sincere worshiper in all the world, of whatever name or form, "Welcome in the great and all-inclusive name of God, the common Father of all souls."

This is a day and an occasion sacred to the sincere spirit in man, and it is devoutly to be hoped that, out of its generosity and its justice, a new and self-vindicating definition of true and false religion, of true and false worship, may appear. I would that we might all confess that a sincere worship anywhere and everywhere in the world is a true worship, while an insincere worship anywhere and everywhere is a false worship before God and man. The unwritten but dominant creed of this hour I assume to be, that whatever worshiper in all the world bends before The Best he knows, and walks true to the purest light that shines for him, has access to the highest blessings of Heaven; while the false-hearted and insincere man, whatever his creed or form may be, has equal access, if not to the flames, then at least to the dust and ashes and darkness of hell.

I doubt if, at any period very long anterior to this, such an assembly could have been convened. Those great aggregations of the world's interest at Paris and London and Philadelphia had no such feature. Men sought to have the world's activity as completely represented in those expositions as possible, but no man had the courage or the inclination to suggest a scheme so daring as that of a congress of religions. This achievement was left to the closing years of a wonderful century wherein a mightier spirit seems swaying the lives of men to higher issues, at a time when the very gods seem crowning all the doctrines of the past with the imperial dogma of the solidarity of the race. The time-spirit has largely conquered, though we cannot close our ears entirely to the sullen cry of a baffled and retreating anger, charged with the accusation that the whole import of this congress is that of infidelity to the only divine and infallible religion. Every man is the true believer, himself being the judge, while nobody is the true believer if somebody else is permitted to decide. I am not willing to stand within the limits of my sect or party and from thence judge of the world. I prefer rather to stand in the world as a part of it, and from thence judge of my party or sect, and even of that great religious division of the world's faith and life in which my lot has fallen.
There is no separableness in the providence of that Infinite Being who is over all and through and in us all.

The primary fact or condition which justifies this congress in the minds of all reverent and rational men is that, among all sincere worshipers of all ages and lands, the religious intent has always been the same. Briefly, but broadly stated, that intent has been to establish more advantageous relations between the worshiper and the being or beings worshiped. The reverse of this is practically unthinkable. To substitute any other motive would be impossible. This one fact lies at the foundation of every religious structure in the world. Here is the basis of our fellowship. Claude Lorraine once said that the most important thing for a landscape painter to know is where to sit down in order to command a full and fair view of every determining feature in the landscape. Such a rule must be essential in art, but it is not less imperative in the treatment of that spectacle which religion presents to us in its wide fields, and this observation-point of the identity of the religious intent of all the world commands permanent features of every religion in the history of mankind.

Some men stand aloof and scorn and scoff the thought that there is any possible relation between their religion and that of widely diverse types, but this anchor will hold amid all the tempests of religious wrath that may rage. And after these storms of vituperation shall have spent their fury, and editors shall have written leading articles and archbishops and sultans shall have predicted dire calamities, it will be found that the religious world, as well as the scientific and the commercial, is in the relentless grasp of a Divine purpose that will not let the people separate in the deep places of their lives.

Men in the lesser stages of development have been alienated in their religion and by their religion, as if they had been thrust upon this earth from worlds created by hostile gods forever at war with each other, and whose children should legitimately fight in the names of their parent deities. If the history of religion in this world could have commenced with the monotheistic conception, the bitter chapters of alienation would have been omitted. But history could not begin on that high level in a world where humanity was destined to work out its
own salvation, not only with fear and with trembling, but with strife and sorrow and vast misapprehension, from an almost helpless ignorance to the freedom and grace of self-poised and masterful souls.

The Infinite Wisdom of this universe seems to have decreed that man shall have a great part in the noble task of making himself. A human being, fashioned and completed by a foreign power, could never be what man has already become by his failures and his successes in the struggle to win the best results of character. A diadem made of the celestial jewels by the combined skill of all the angels in heaven could not compare with that crown which the human being himself shall create by his own heroic and persistent determination to wrest victory from defeat, success from failure—the determination to pluck the truth out of its mysterious disguises, and at last to "think God's thoughts after Him."

It has been a difficult problem for the interpreters of man to solve—this fact of frailty and imperfection in the hands of a perfect Deity. Man was created perfect by the perfect God, but he fell from that high, original estate and thus became the poor creature he is.

The distance between the first blind and helpless groping after God, with its characteristic griefs, failures, and failings, and the intelligent comprehension of God and man and religion and duty and the fellowship of to-day is almost amazing, and yet, in all the tragic though ever brightening way, there is no point where the line of succession breaks off.

God's working is by development, and we have only to look into the magic White City to see that man's work follows the same law and method. Not a single excellence is there that has not had its imperfection that it might be even as perfect as it is. Not a science exists today in all its beautiful adaptations that was not an offensive vulgarity at an earlier day. And religion—shall we say of it that here is a fact in human life that reverses in its movement and method all the human and Divine ways with everything else? If there be one pre-eminent fact in the history of religion that fact is the growth of religion. There is no religion in the world, if it be a living religion, that is to-day what it was one, two, or ten centuries ago. The Christian religion is not to-day what it
was five centuries ago, in the thought of the people, and what the religion or anything else is in the actual thought of the people that the thing practically is.

And if this great exposition is wanting in one of the most significant exhibits conceivable, it is a hall that should contain a historic illustration of religion. Max Muller would be one of the few men who could arrange the order of such a hall. And who could visit it without feeling a great uplift of faith and love and joy that we have been what we have and have become what we are? I expect that this suggestion of an evolutionary unity of religion may disturb some classes of men, but you shall see no man in all the retreating centuries performing his devotions with whatever tragic or forbidding accompaniment without saying and being compelled to say: "That man might have been myself, or I might have been as he, and should have been had I lived in his country and been educated as he was." It is quite too superficial for us to suppose that this great Spirit bestowed His blessings on the score of the geography and the centuries.

Personal infallibility is not yet attained by any one, inasmuch as personal fortunes are related to the Infinite, and that sense of a lingering weakness which must be felt by all men must ally them with the world-wide necessity of a rugged and persistent sympathy. The world has been wounded by fragments of truth, whereas no man can ever be wounded by an entire truth. A detached truth fallen even from heaven would be voiceless, but relate it to the economy of God's purposes and immediately it becomes vocal. It bears in its joyous or its tremulous tones the varying fortunes of every soul that God has made, and it tells the story of the Divine Spirit working in and for all. And if the various and multiplied systems of theology had been written while the theologians were looking in the faces of their human brothers, many a judgment and confusion would have been greatly modified. If one hand had written while the other clasped a human hand the verdict would have been changed. The Word made flesh, or the Divine Spirit set forth in human form and fashion, gleaming out from human faces becomes very tender and very considerate, while the mere theories of men lay no check upon those severities of judgment which have shattered this human world and rent it asunder in the name of religion.
Back to the primal unity where man appears as a child of God before he is a Christian or Jew, Brahman or Buddhist, Mohammedan or Parsee, Confucian, Taoist or aught beside—back to this must we go if we will be loyal to our kind, and loyal to that imperishable religion that is born of human souls in contact with the spirit. Back to this, and thence we must follow the struggle of the infinite child upward along his perilous ascent through the societies, weary centuries to the ineffable light and glory that await him, led by the patient hand of God.

I am perfectly well aware that this idea of religious unity, and at the base religious identity, must fight its way through the great fields of religious traditions if it will gain recognition—fields preoccupied and bristling with inveterate hostility. It must meet the warlike array of “special providences,” and “divine elections,” and “sacred books,” and “revelations,” and “inspirations,” and “the chosen people,” and “sacraments,” and “infallibilities,” and institutionalisms of nameless and numberless kinds, but it is not timid, and it has resources of great endurance. Who will say that any man ever sincerely chose any religion for any other than a good purpose? It is incredible. And before the spectacle of an immortal soul seeking for and communing with its God, all hostilities must pause. No missile must be discharged. All the angers and furies must await on that mood and fact of worship, for an immortal soul talking with God is greater than a king. And while we wait in this divine silence let us read the profound and befitting word which Heaven has vouchsafed to the people of the Orient, and which has been preserved to us through the ages in one of the “Sacred books of the East.” The great deity said to the inquiring Arduna concerning the many forms of worship: “Whichever form of deity any worshiper desires to worship with faith, to that form I render his faith steady. Possessed of that faith he seeks to propitiate the deity in that form, and he obtains from it those beneficial things which he desires, though they are really given by me” (Bhagavad Gita, chap. vii.).

If we could duly regard the charitable philosophy of such a word the hostilities would never be resumed. No ruthless hand shall justly destroy any form of deity, while yet it arrests the reverent mind and the heart of man.
There is only one being in the world who may legitimately destroy an idol, and that being is the one who has worshiped it. He alone can tell when it has ceased to be of service. And assuredly the great Spirit who works through all forms and who makes all things His ministers can make the rudest image a medium through which He will approach His child.

There is no plea of “revelation” or “providence” or “the sacred book,” that may not be interpreted in perfect accord with this greater plea of the religious unity of mankind. Nothing is a revelation till its meaning is discovered. God’s revelations are made to the world by man’s discovery of God’s meaning to the world. Revelation by discovery is the eternal law. The “sacred books” of the world, instead of being a revelation from God, are the records of a revelation or the record of the human understanding of what God has done. Not a truth of life in any or all the holy books was ever written till it had been experienced. Not all the meaning of any great soul in life has ever been set down in words. The divine “Word” was made flesh; it was not made a book. And all the holy books of the world must fall short of that holiest experience of the soul in communion with God:

Max Muller says that what the world needs is a “bookless religion.” It is precisely this bookless religion that the world already has, but does not realize it as it should. There is, I repeat, an experience in human souls that lies deeper than the conviction of any book—a religious sense, a holy ecstasy that no book can create or describe. The book does not create the religion—the religion creates the book. We should have religion left if all the books should perish. The eternal emphasis must be placed upon that living Spirit that lies back of all Bibles, back of all institutions, and is the eternal reality forever discoverable, but never completely discovered. There is not a piece of mechanism in all this Columbian Exposition that does not owe its defectiveness to a nearer approach to the idea which God concealed in the mechanical laws of the universe. The revelation came through somebody’s discovery of it, and the same law holds good from the dust beneath our feet to the star-dust of all the heavens, from the trembling of a forest leaf to the trembling ecstasies of the immortal soul.
The "special providence" that pleaded by those who are unwilling to take their places in the common ranks of men are wholly admissible if it be meant that the specialties are created from the human side. The "divine election" is on the human side, and to-day it largely means the right of any man to elect himself to the highest offices in the kingdom of God. This is a noble doctrine of election; but, to place the electing mind on the divine side, and to say that the common Father elects some and rejects others, forgets some and remembers others, in the sense of finality, is to proclaim a Fatherhood little needed on this earth. Because I am a Christian and my brother is a Buddhist is not construed by me as a proof that God loves me better than he does him. I am not willing to be so victimized by love. He is no more cursed by such divine forgetfulness than I am by such capricious remembrance. Let the specialties and let love be one and our faith remains in their eternal benignity.

And the great religious teachers and founders of the world—have they not secured their immortal places in the love and generation of mankind by teaching the people how to find and use this large beneficence of Heaven? They have not created; they have discovered what existed before. Some have revealed more, others less, but all have revealed some truth of God by helping the world to see. They have asked nothing for themselves as finalities. They have lived and taught and suffered and died and risen again. That they might bring us to themselves? No, but that they might bring earth to God. "God's consciousness," to borrow a noble word from Calcutta, has been the goal of them all. It is still before all nations. There in the distance—is it so great?—is the mountain of the Lord, rising before us into the serene and the cloudless heavens.

Let all the kingdoms and nations and religions of the world vie with each other in the rapidity of the divine ascent. Let them cast off the burdens and break the chains which retard their progress. Our fellowship will be closer as we approach the radiant summits and there, on the heights, we shall be one in love and one in light for God the infinite life is there, "of whom and through whom and to whom are all things, and to whom be the glory forever."
CHAPTER XII.

THREE THE PRESBYTERIANS.

TRUTHFULNESS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, BY REV. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D., OF NEW YORK.

The first speaker of the morning was Dr. Charles A. Briggs, of New York, who was introduced by Dr. Barrows as "one whose learning, whose courage, whose faithfulness to his convictions have given him a high place in the Church universal." Dr. Briggs was received with loud applause. He spoke substantially as follows:

The time allotted for a paper like this is so short that I can only treat the subject very cursorily and with many gaps, which every one of you will probably notice. All the great historic religions have sacred books which are regarded as the inspired word of God. Prominent among those sacred books are the Holy Scriptures of the Christian Church. The history of the Christian Church shows that it is the intrinsic excellence of these Holy Scriptures which has given them the control of so large a portion of our whole race. With a few exceptions the Christian religion was not extended by force of arms, or by the arts of statesmanship, but by the holy lives and faithful teaching of self-sacrificing men and women, who had firm faith in the truthfulness of the Holy Scriptures and were able to convince men in all parts of the world that they are faithful guides to God and salvation.

We may now say confidently to all men: "All the sacred books of the world are now accessible to you; study them; compare them; recognize all that is good and noble and true in them all, and tabulate results, and you will be convinced that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are true, holy, and divine." When we have gone searchingly through all the books of other religions, we will find that they are as torches of various
sizes and brilliance, lighting up the darkness of the night, but the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are like the sun shining in the heavens and lighting up the whole world.

We are living in a scientific age, which demands that every traditional statement shall be tested. Science explores the earth in its height and breadth in search of truth; it explores the heavens in order to solve the mysteries of the universe; it investigates all the monuments of history, whether of stone or of metal, and that man must be lacking in intelligence, or in observation, at least, who imagines that the sacred books of the Christian religion or the institutions of the Christian Church shall escape the criticism of this age. It will not do to oppose science with religion or criticism with faith.

Criticism makes it evident that the faith which shrinks from criticism is a faith so weak and uncertain that it excites suspicion as to its life and reality. Science goes on, confident that every form of religion which resists this criticism will ere long crumble into dust. All departments of human investigation sooner or later come in contact with the Christian Scriptures; all find something that accords with them or conflicts with them, and the question forces itself upon us, can we maintain the truthfulness of the Holy Scriptures in the face of modern science? We are obliged to admit that there are scientific errors in the Bible, errors of astronomy, geology, zoology, botany and anthropology. In all these respects there is no evidence that the authors of the Scriptures had any other knowledge than that possessed by their contemporaries. Their statements are such as indicate ordinary observation of the phenomena of life. They had not that insight, that grasp of conception and power of expression in these matters such as they exhibited when writing concerning matters of religion.

If it was not the intent of God to give to the ancient world the scientific knowledge of our nineteenth century, why should any one suppose that the Divine Spirit influenced them in relation to any such matters as science? Why should they be kept from misstatements, misconceptions, and errors in such respects? The Divine Spirit wished to use them as religious teachers, and so long as they made no mistakes in that respect they were trust-
worthy and reliable, even if they erred in such matters as come in contact with modern science. There are historical mistakes in the Bible, mistakes of chronology and geography, discrepancies and inconsistencies which cannot be removed by any proper method of interpretation. There are such errors as we are apt to find in modern history. There is no evidence that the writers of the Scriptures received any of their history by revelation from God. There is no evidence that the Divine Spirit corrected these narratives.

The purpose of the sacred writers was to give us the history of God's redemptive workings. This made it necessary that there should be no essential errors in the redemptive facts and agencies, but did not make it necessary that there should be no mistakes in places, dates, and persons, so long as these did not change the redemptive lessons or redemptive facts. None of the mistakes which have been discovered disturb the religious lessons of the Biblical history, and those lessons are the only ones whose truthfulness we are concerned to defend. Higher criticism recognizes faults of grammar, of rhetoric and logic in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, but errors in these formal things do not mar the truthfulness of the religious instruction itself. Higher criticism shows that most of the books were composed by unknown authors: that they passed through the hands of a considerable number of unknown editors. In this process of editing, arranging, subtraction, and reconstruction, extending through so many centuries, what evidence have we that these unknown editors were kept from error in all their work?

They were guided by the Divine Spirit in their comprehension and expression of the Divine instruction, but, judging also from their work, it seems most probable that they were not guided by the Divine Spirit in grammar, rhetoric, logic, expression, arrangement of material, or general editorial work. They were left to those errors which even the most faithful and scrupulous of writers will sometimes make. The science which approaches the Bible from without, and the science which studies it from within agrees as to the essential facts of the case. Now, can the truthfulness of Scripture be maintained by those who recognize these errors? There is no reason why the
substantial truthfulness of the Bible shall not be consistent with circumstantial errors. God did not speak Himself in the Bible except a few words recorded here and there; He spoke in much greater portions of the Old Testament through the voices and pens of the human authors of the Scriptures. Did the human minds and pens always deliver the inerrant word?

Even if all writers possessed of the Holy Spirit were merely passive in the hands of God, the question is, can the human voice and pen express truth of the infinite God! How can an imperfect word, an imperfect sentence, express the Divine truth? It is evident that the writers of the Bible were not, as a rule, in an ecstatic state. The Holy Spirit suggested to them the Divine truths they were to teach. They received them by intuition, and framed them in imagination and fancy. Then, if the Divine truth passed through the conception and imagination of the human mind, did the human mind receive it fully without any fault or shadow of error; did the human mind add anything to it or color it; was it delivered in its entirety exactly as it was received? How can we be sure of this when we see the same doctrine in such a variety of forms, all partial and all inadequate?

All that we can claim is inspiration and accuracy for that which suggests the religious lessons to be imparted. God is true. He is the truth. He cannot lie; He cannot mislead or deceive His creatures. But the question arises, when the Infinite God speaks to finite man must He speak words which are not error? This depends not only upon God's speaking, but on man's hearing, and also of the means of communication between God and man. It is necessary to show the capacity of man to receive the word before we can be sure that he transmitted it correctly. The inspiration of the Holy Scriptures does not carry with it inerrancy in every particular; it was sufficient if the Divine truth was given with such clearness as to guide men aright in religious life.

The errors of Holy Scripture are not errors of falsehood or deceit, but of ignorance, inadvertence, partial and inadequate knowledge, and of incapacity to express the whole truth of God which belonged to man as man. Just as light is seen not in its pure and clouded state, but in the beautiful colors of the spectrum, so it is that the truth
of God, its revelation and communication to man, met with such obstacles in human nature. Men are capable of receiving it only in its diverse operations, and diverse manners as it comes to them through the diverse temperaments and points of view of the Biblical writers. The religion of the Old Testament is a religion which includes some things hard to reconcile in an inerrant revelation. The sacrifice of Jephtha's daughter, the Divine command to Abraham to offer up his son as a burnt offering, and other incidents, seem unsuited to Divine revelation. The New Testament taught that sacrifices must be of broken, contrite hearts and humble and cheerful spirits. What pleasure could God take in smoking altars? How could the true God prescribe such puerilities?

We can only say that God was training Israel to the meaning of the higher sacrifices. The offering up of children and domestic animals was part of a preparatory discipline. But it was provisional and temporal discipline. It was the form necessary then to clothe the Divine Law of sacrifice in the early stages of revelation. They were the object lessons by which the children of the ancient world could be trained to understand the inerrable law of sacrifice for man. St. Paul calls them the weak and beggarly rudiments, the shadow of the things to come.

We cannot defend morals in the Old Testament at all points. Nowhere in the Old Testament was polygamy or slavery condemned. The time had not come in the history of the world when they could be condemned. Is God to be held responsible for these twin relics of barbarism, because He did not condemn, but, on the contrary, recognized them and restrained them in the early stages of his revelation? The patriarchs are not truthful. Their age seems to have had little comprehension of the principles of truth, yet Abraham was faithful to God, and so faithful under temptation and trial that he became the father of the faithful, and, from that point of view, the friend of God. David was a sinner, a very wicked sinner, but he was a very penitent sinner, and showed such a devout attachment to the worship of God that his sins, though many, were all forgiven him, and his life as a whole exhibits such generosity, courage, human affection, and such heroism and patience under suffering and such self-restraint under magnificent prosperity, such nobility
and grandeur of character altogether that we must admire him and love him as one of the best of men, and we are not surprised that the heart of the infinite God went out to him. Many of the stories of revenge in the Old Testament stand out in glaring contrast to the picture of Jesus Christ praying for his enemies, and it is the story of Christ that lifts us into a different ethical air from any of the Old Testament.

We cannot regard these things in the Old Testament as inerrable, in the light of the moral character of Christ and the moral character of God as He reveals it. And yet we may well understand that the Old Testament times were not ripe for the higher revelation of His will, such as would guide His people in the right direction, with as steady and rapid a pace as they were capable of making. Jesus Christ teaches the true principle. You may judge the ethics of the Old Testament when He repealed the Mosaic laws of divorce. He said: "Moses, for your hardness of heart, suffers you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it hath not been so." In other words, Mosaic law of divorce was not in accord with the original institution of marriage, or with the mind and will of the holy God.

God revealed himself partially to the people of the Old Testament in a way sufficient for their purposes of preparatory discipline, which revelation was to disappear forever when it had accomplished its purpose. The laws of the Old Testament have all been cast down by the Christian Church, with the single exception of ten laws; and, with reference to the fourth of these Jesus Christ says: "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." The doctrine of the creation is set forth in a great variety of beautiful poetical representations, which give in the aggregate a grand conception of the creation, a fuller conception than the ordinary doctrine drawn from an interpretation of the first and second chapters of Genesis. I grant he was conceived as the father of the nations and of the kings. But as our Father, made known to us through Jesus Christ, he was not known to the Old Testament dispensation. The profound depth of sympathy of God and Jesus Christ were not yet manifested.

The doctrine of the Holy Trinity was not yet revealed. But there is a difference in God's revelation in these
other successive layers of the Old Testament writing which is like the march of an invincible army. It is true there are times when there are expressions of the jealousy of God, and a cruel disregard of human sufferings, all of which betrayed the inadequacy of ancient Israel to understand their God. The errancy of their conceptions. We all know that the true God, whom we all love and worship, does not agree with these ancient conceptions. The truthfulness of the teachings of the doctrine of God is not destroyed by occasional inaccuracies among the teachings.

The doctrine of man of the Old Testament is a noble doctrine. Unity of brotherhood of the race in origin and destiny is established in the Old Testament as nowhere else. The origin and development of sin finds a response in the experience of mankind. The ideal of righteousness, and the original plan of God for man, His ultimate destiny for man is held up as a banner over the heads of the people. Surely these are inspirations—they are faithful, they are divine. But there are doubtless expressions of faulty psychology and occasional exaggerations of mere external forms in ceremonial worship; but these do not mar but rather serve to enhance our estimate of their value for all of that in the Scriptures which binds our race to all that is good in the history of the past, created and given by holy God for the welfare of humanity.

The scheme of redemption is so vast, so comprehensive, so far-reaching, that the Christian Church has even thus far failed to fully comprehend it. All evil is to be banished. There is to come in a reign of universal peace. There is to be a new heaven and a new earth and a new Jerusalem, from which the wicked will be excluded. Such ideals of redemption are Divine ideals which the human race has not yet attained, and which we can only partially and inadequately comprehend. If, in the course of training for these ideals of redemption for God’s people, they have made mistakes, it is quite sure that forgiveness of sins was appropriated without any explanation of its grounds.

The sacrifices of the New were unknown in the Old Testament. It is the mercy of God which is the forgiveness of sins. There is a lack of appreciation in the Old
Testament, of the richness of faith. It was Jesus Christ who first gave faith its unique place in the order of Salvation. The doctrine of holy love; the doctrine of the future life, and of the resurrection from the dead. Thus, in every department of doctrine the Old Testament has only advanced through the centuries. The several periods of Biblical literature, of unfolding of the doctrines, prepared the way for a full revelation in the New Testament. That revelation looked only at the end, the highest ideals, that what would be accomplished in the last century of human time; that would be a revelation for all men, but it would be of no use to any other century but the last.

But man must be prepared for the present as well as for the future. Man must have something for every century of human history, a revelation for the barbarian as well as for the Greek, the Gentile as well as the Jew, the dark-minded African as well as the open-minded European, the South Sea Islander as well as the Asiatic, the child as well as the man. It is just in this respect that the Holy Scriptures in the New Testament are so permanent and have in them religious instructions, for the world. They were designed for the training of Israel in every stage of their development, and so they will train all minds in every stage of their development.

It does no harm to the advanced student to look back upon the uneducated years of his youthful days. It does not harm the Christian to see the many imperfections, crudities and errors of the more elementary instructions of the Old Testament. Nor does it destroy his faith of the truthfulness of the divine Word because it has passed through human hands. The infallible Will has all the time been at work using the imperfect medium, training them to their utmost capacity, to get man to raise them, to advance them in the true religion. The great books are always pointing forward and upward. They are always extending in all directions. They are now, as they always have been, true and faithful guides to God and all the highest. They are now, as they always have been, trustworthy and reliable in their religious instruction. They are now, as they always have been, altogether truthful in their testimony to the heart and experience of mankind.
CHAPTER XIII.

THE BAPTISTS.

THE BAPTISTS IN HISTORY, BY REVEREND GEORGE C. LORIMER
OF BOSTON.

Greatness is not to be determined by bulk or by numbers, but rather by aim, ambition, and achievement. The Persian Empire was larger than Athens, and the walls of Cathay marked a vaster territorial domain than the dykes of Holland. But judged by what they have wrought, and by what they have contributed of art, letters, and liberty to the progress of society, the smaller states excel in value their mammoth and colossal neighbors.

The ark of bulrushes was a tiny thing and quite insignificant by the side of the pyramids, but the living babe, Moses, sheltered by its fragile walls, was a grander blessing to humanity than all the dead Pharaohs in their massive and magnificent mausoleums. A manger in the modest town of Bethlehem was but an inconsiderable dot in comparison with the magnitude of the Pantheon in imperial and haughty Rome, and yet that stable bed surpasses in spiritual splendor all the intempled deities of High Olympus. The Santa Maria and the Mayflower, though as midgets when associated in thought with the Great Eastern, yet mean more and stand for more in the history of mankind than an entire fleet of modern vessels, however gorgeous and gigantic.

A diamond of even meager dimensions is worth more than a common mountain, for it inspheres and irradiates light; and an inch of canvas by Meissonier is costlier far than an acre by an inferior hand; and who is there that does not esteem a thinking soul of more transcendent import than an entire universe of unconscious matter?

It is not, therefore, likely that the merit and meaning, or the place and power of a religious body in the world, can be adequately determined by its size and girth. During these memorable gatherings, several denominations have been heard whose deserved renown cannot be accounted for by numbers. And certainly the Baptists
cannot advance a claim to recognition in this parliament grounded in the immensity of their fraternity. Their hosts are neither huge nor overwhelming.

At the most, their regular enrolled army, the wide world over, is only something more than 4,000,000 strong, with a possible 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 of sympathetic followers. If, then, they have not justified their existence by things attempted and attained, and if what they represent is not intrinsically precious to the race, they have no sufficient reason for being here to-day, nor, indeed, for being anywhere. They must, therefore, be judged, if judged at all, by the richness and fertility of their possessions, and not by the extent of their borders.

That the Baptists are among the oldest of the non-liturgical and non-prelatical branches of Christ's Church, and more than likely are in reality the oldest, is generally conceded and grows more certain with the progress of scholarly investigation. It is, however, to be admitted that their origin is obscure. Mosheim says "it is buried in the depths of antiquity;" and unquestionably it antedates the appearance of Huss and of Luther.

The beginning of some of the post-reformation denominations are easily determined, and are marked by national upheavals and crises; but this is not the case with the Baptists, and seems to indicate that they belong to the pre-reformation period and are identical with the anti-ecclesiastical thought, feeling, and aspiration which steadily flowed through the Middle Ages as the Gulf-stream penetrates and courses through the Atlantic.

The Baptists from the beginning and through all the centuries have stood for individuality in the religious life; for the enlargement and emancipation of the individual, for the rights and responsibilities of the individual, and for the autonomy and authority of the individual. Rev. Thomas Armitage has well said, in the *North American Review*, that their "Primary idea is not to build up an ecclesiastical system, but to create high and manly Christian character. In other words, it is to create in each individual soul and life a legitimate independency of all men in matters of faith and practice Godward." To them there are two great factors in religion, the Creator and the creature; the former comprehending all that is supernatural, the latter including all that is natural; the first
being absolutely sovereign and supreme over the second; but the second in its individuality being supreme over self as far as every other fellow-creature is concerned.

They believe that Christianity, like the Sabbath, was made for man, not man for Christianity; made not, of course, for him to ignore, pervert or destroy, but for him to respect, preserve, and honor; and not made to efface his personality, enslave his reason, circumscribe his intelligence, and subvert his conscience, but for the development of all the faculties and resources of his being, and for the deliverance of his soul from spiritual slavery of every kind.

The Baptists believe that man's supreme allegiance, so far as earthly powers are concerned, is not to the Church, but to himself, to his own reason and conscience, to his own dignity and destiny. As all societies, whether secular or spiritual, are but aggregations of beings like himself, how can the aggregates taken together be more important or more sacred than the units of which they are composed?

The Baptists admit that there is a place for churches in the Christian economy; but they insist that they are not for the suppression of the individual, but for his unfolding and perfection. Organized and visible churches are means to an end; they are not themselves the end. They are temporal, but man is eternal; hence they shall at last decay and disappear, whether gorgeous ecclesiastical monarchies or modest democracies—but man is immortal.

How delusive, then, yea, how poor and paltry the scheme to build up a majestic structure with its vast possessions, with its lordly ambitions, with its lust of world-wide power, when, in the fullness of time, it shall crumble and perish from the earth! And, in comparison, how divine the movement that makes the welfare of the particular soul its direct end and aim, and that treats as trivial the homage of state and the favor of princes, if it can only succeed in clothing the individual with personal salvation and crowning him with all the glories of regnant manhood.

This is the Baptist idea, and he is persuaded that it is the idea of the New Testament. God was incarnate, not in humanity at large, but exclusively in the man, Jesus, to teach that in coming to dwell in His children by the Holy Ghost, He does not abide in them as a whole with-
out taking up His abode in each separate child. "Ye are the temples of the Holy Ghost," was affirmed of every Christian as well as of a numerous communion. And it is written that "Christ is the head of every man" as well as being "the head of His body, the Church." So likewise, "every man must render an account of himself to God," and, to emphasize more fully the place of individuality in religion, it is written that Jesus "tasted death for every creature."

It was belief in these Scripture representations that led the Anabaptists to teach, in the sixteenth century, that every Christian has in himself a divine guide whom he must follow at any cost; even as Hans Denck, described by Keller as their apostle, declared: "This I know in myself certainly to be the truth; therefore, I will if God will, listen to what it shall say to me; him that would take it from me, I will not permit." This faith in the "inner light" has survived the swift flight of nearly four hundred years, and is cherished to-day, not only among the Baptists, but among others who have no direct connection with them. I do not say that this doctrine has not been modified, refined of crudities, and freed from excesses in its transmission from the past, but I do maintain that, in all of its essential meaning, it has been transmitted to the present. And what is more, this conception, once the almost exclusive possession of lowly, humble men, has found something like recognition in the transcendentalism of Emerson, and in the poetry of Robert Browning. In Paracelsus the poet writes:

``There is an inmost center in us all,
Where truth abides in fulness; and around,
Wall upon wall, the gross flesh hems it in.
This perfect, clear perception, which is truth;
A baffling and perverting carnal mesh
Blinds it, and makes all error: and, 'to know',
Rather consists in opening out a way
Whence the imprisoned splendor may escape,
Than in effecting entry for a light
Supposed to be without.''

But a greater than Browning has said:

``Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He will not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak; and He will show you things to come.'"
I would not be understood as intimating that the poet's thought runs parallel with that of the Master, or that philosophy and religion are at one in their interpretation of that indwelling mystery which allies man to God. But they both at least agree in this, that He is the center of the divinest thing in the world, call it truth or even by a higher name. And surely it is beautiful, touchingly beautiful, to see these Anabaptists of four centuries gone, many of whom were unlettered and unrefined, ascribing to human nature a dignity which the richest culture and profoundest thought of these latter times has recognized and glorified, while others, socially higher than themselves, were busy building cathedral and basilica; beautiful forevermore their faith in the divine possibilities of manhood.

Pursued continually by the thought of Christ. "Behold, a greater than the temple is here," and never having heard of the weary east and of the despairing Buddha, who, according to Arnold, regarded "life as woe," finally to be engulfed in the Infinite, as "the dewdrop sinks into the shining sea." These sturdy men were more than satisfied to sacrifice and suffer for the sake of the "greater"—for man—that the individual, instead of becoming unconscious in God, might become fully conscious of the perfection of God in the individual.

This is very apparent in their loyalty to the Holy Scriptures as the supreme authority in personal faith and moral conduct. They are people of one book, one that is "quite sufficiently called," as Heine has it, "The Book." Nature, they concede, has manifold disclosures of the Infinite, and they are far from indifferent to its teachings, whether embodied in science or in the unvarying and harmonious operation of its laws. They recognize reason also as related to belief and practice; not, however, as in itself, an original revelation, but as the subject and interpreter of all revelations, whether they proceed from without or are due to the illuminating ministrations of the Comforter within.

But for all the important purposes of religious thought and life, the Bible is their ultimate guide, as, in addition to its own messages, it furnishes a criterion by which the message from other sources may be judged. The Baptists have never formally acknowledged the binding ob-
ligation of creeds. Their confessions, from that of 1527 to the one of the most recent date, that called of New Hampshire, including Smyth's, 1611, and the London confession, 1646, were not promulgated to secure uniformity of belief, nor are standards to which subscription is imperative; but rather as defenses and apologies forced from them by the abuse and calumnies of enemies, or as succinct and convenient expositions of their opinions.

These symbols all have their value as religious literature, but they are not necessarily final statements of truth, nor are they endowed with any coercive power. No documents of this kind are permitted by the Baptists to rival in authority the sacred writings, nor to fix by arbitrary rule what they are designed to communicate to each soul. The Bible is divine thought given to every man, and every man ought to give human thought to the Bible, and ecclesiastical bodies do their entire duty when they bring these two thoughts into immediate communion and commerce with each other.

From this representation it can easily be seen how large a part individuality plays in our simple ecclesiastical system. Infants are not baptized, because that ordinance would mislead them as to their standing before God, would tend to diminish their sense of personal responsibility and would finally establish an unconverted church in a corrupt world. If the kingdom of Christ is really not radically different from the kingdom of Satan, and is only visibly separate and distinct by a few ceremonies, professions, and the solemn invocation of holy names, of what particular use is it to society, and how can it ever hope to subdue its rival? To guard against this deplorable confusion, this deadly fellowship between light and darkness, the Baptists have adhered to their Bible that requires a heart difference between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not, with the appropriate outward expression of the change.

Here, then, we have the ground, both in Scripture and reason, for the baptism of believers only, and a baptism that sinners reverence for the divine Will in form and purpose as immersion manifestly does. But conscious individuality is necessary to all this, and is emphasized by it. Before a human being has come to realize self-hood with all that it implies, he cannot act of his own
volition in these high matters; but when he is competent to do so there will be developed capabilities for further duties. These will find their sphere of action in the church; for its government being such as I have described, it opens a field for the exercise of every personal talent, attainment, and grace.

That the significance of the Baptists in history lies mainly in the direction I have indicated is demonstrated beyond a doubt by their persistent advocacy of soul freedom and by hearty and practical sympathy with almost every movement on behalf of civil liberty. The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States was inspired by them, and in no other country can such a provision be found. It reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This tender solicitude for the emancipation and enthronement of conscience is a noble tribute to the moral grandeur of the individual. It implies that the preservation of a man's own integrity is worth more than the unbroken integrity of an ecclesiastical system. His own inner harmony, that which springs from sincerity in his religious life, is of more importance than uniformity of belief and ritual throughout Christendom. Were there as many churches as there are men, if they were all honest and faithful, it would be better for the world than for there to be only one church if, to the members thereof, multitudes had to forswear their convictions and crucify their sense of duty.

One man centered in truth and breathing truth will achieve more for society than a thousand held together by conventionalism and by a creed which has become incredible to intelligence. I am not pleading for divisions. Far from it. I would do everything in my power to abate differences and unify Christianity. But this seeming to be, this fiction of oneness, which gentle enthusiasts are deluded by, is humiliating in the extreme. It assumes what is not a fact, or it implies that professedly upright men have deliberately stultified themselves by pretending to what is not true.

The real issue is this: Is it permissible or justifiable to subordinate the individual, his conscious self-respect, and his sincerity, to the interests of an organization, even a
church? Some teachers insinuate, if they do not affirm, that it is. I insist that it is not. For this sacrifice on his part means moral reins to himself, and disqualifies him to be associated on any terms with honorable people.

The Baptists of former times evidently perceived the disastrous effect of enforced formalism. They were not opposed to communities of Christians, but they realized that their efficiency depended on the voluntary nature of the fellowship. In proportion, as they became mere aggregations of human particles, having little in common, and held together by external pressure, they necessarily impaired their own power and wrecked the society to whose well-being their compulsory membership was deemed indispensable.

Independence is inseparable from the highest type of individuality, and the individuality of the highest type is necessary to vital and vigorous organization. Here, then, we have the explanation of the long struggle for religious liberty. Apart from the Divine Word, to whose teachings the entire movement is primarily due, it must be ascribed to that recognition of each man's personal dignity and worth as a creature made in the image of God, which has been so distinguishing a note of Baptist history.

The practical profitableness of the root principle out of which the historical significance of the Baptists has grown, very frequently has been challenged, and is even now admitted in some circles only with evident reluctance. Unquestionably it has been abused, and, like other precious things, may be made a source of incalculable mischief.

But it is not, as some of its adversaries assert, unmitigated selfishness, or lawless insubordination, or narrow-minded egotism. Individuality does not consist in living for self, but in living one's self freely for others; not in the avoidance of obligation and suffering, but in the performance of duty, however painful, from the high sense of responsible stewardship, and not from the cringing servility inspired by superstition or slavery. It is the doing voluntarily what may be done through compulsion, only it changes entirely the character of the doing.

Out of the agony and anguish of life it makes ennobling self-sacrifices; out of the solidarity and interdependence
of life it fashions holy and endearing brotherhoods, and
out of the misfortunes and temptations of life frames
heroic ministries of philanthropy and piety. While it is
opposed to mechanical and coercive socialism, as it has
been to feudal ecclesiasticism, it is in no wise inimical to
fraternity of spirit or to any form of mutual helpfulness
that does not tend to obliterate manhood in attempting
to succor the man.

We may, I believe without hesitancy, appeal to our own
denomination for proofs of its expediency and excellency.
These are furnished in the contributions made by its
leaders and churches toward the evolution of modern
society, with its liberty and progress, its inventions and
discoveries, its reforms and charities. Much has already
been suggested on this point, and yet something more
remains to be added.

The Baptists have been conspicuous for their devotion
to education, and to-day they have more money invested
in property and endowments for educational interests
than any other religious body in the land. They have
consecrated in America to the cause of human enlighten-
ment over $32,000,000, and have in the main given it
unhampered by sectarian conditions. Manifestly, in this
instance, individualism in religion has wrought no ill to
the community but only good.

The Baptists have been equally prominent in founding
modern missions to the heathen, and are everywhere ac-
nowledged as the heroic leaders in an enterprise which
means the salvation and unification of races in Christ,
and without which this parliament of religions would
never have been dreamt of, much less so wonderfully
realized.

But, in addition, in the domain of letters, they have
given to the world a Bunyan and a Milton, a Foster and
a William R. Williams; to the domain of heroism a long
line, including Arnold of Brescia, a Havelock, a Carey,
and Judson; to that of theology a Gill, a Haldane, and
many others; and to that of philanthropy a John Har-
vard, who was a member of Samuel Stennett’s congrega-
tion in London, and an Abraham Lincoln, who, though
not himself a Baptist, was born of Baptist parents, and
attributed all that he was to his Baptist mother.

Nor should we forget the influence they have exerted
on the devotional life of the people at large. They have taught us to sing "Blest be the Tie that Binds," "Did Christ O'er Sinners Weep?" "Majestic Sweetness Sits Enthroned Upon the Saviour's Brow," "How Firm a Foundation Ye Saints of the Lord," "Mid Scenes of Confusion and Creature Complaints," "They are Gathering Homeward from Every Land," "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name," "Saviour, Thy Dying Love," "I Need Thee Every Hour," "Lo, the Day of God is Breaking," "My Country,'Tis of Thee," and they have given us many other hymns by which faith has been strengthened, sorrow comforted, duty glorified, patriotism stimulated, and our Lord Jesus Christ rendered more precious and endearing to the souls of men.

They who have thus sung; they who have thus thought; yea, they who have thus wrought—for holy ideas are kindred to holy deeds—are in themselves the best witnesses to the wholesome influence of a doctrine that seeks to make out of every human creature a man, out of every man a saint, and out of every saint a special and individual confessor for Christ.
CHAPTER XIV.

UNITARIANS.

SPIRITUAL FORCES IN HUMAN PROGRESS, BY REV. EDWARD E. HALE OF BOSTON.

We speak and think in this matter of the celebration of the discovery of our country as if everybody else had always spoken and thought as we do. Now, this is by no means so. Only a century ago, when Columbus' discovery was three hundred years old, the whole world of science, the whole world of literature, the whole world of history, was very doubtful whether we had done any good to the world at all. In fact the general weight of opinion was that America was a nuisance and had done a great deal more harm than good to civilized men. And, if you think of it, they had some reason for this impression. America had launched the European nations in all their wars. England was just then disgraced by the loss of her colonies. France was in debt and disgraced by the loss of Canada. The discovery of gold and silver in America had, strange to say, impoverished Spain and Portugal—the gentlemen at Washington can tell you why and how—and the whole commercial arrangements of the world were thrown out of joint, because this untoward discovery of America had been made. There were diseases which, it was universally said, had been introduced from America, and there had been no additions to the arts or the sciences; no additions to those things which seem to make life worth living, which they were willing to deem as received from America. The Literary Society at Lyons offered a great prize to be awarded, in 1792, for an essay on "The Advantages and Disadvantages of the Discovery of America." When the time came for the prize to be awarded the society was so impecunious, and France was so much engaged in other matters of more importance to
France and her poor king, that the prize was never given.

But the papers exist which were written for that prize. Among them is the very curious paper of the Abbé de Janty. The abbé, after going from the north pole to the south, from Patagonia to Greenland, comes out with the view that America has never been of any use to the world so far; and, if it is to be of any use, it will be because of the moral virtues of three million people in the United States. It has proved that the abbé was perfectly right. All that the world owes to America, it owes to the spiritual forces which have been at work in the United States for the last one hundred years.

I do not think you will expect me, in the brief time at my disposal, to state exhaustively what these spiritual forces are. I had rather allude in more detail to one alone and let the others speak for themselves at the lips of other speakers here. I do not believe that Americans of to-day sufficiently appreciate the strength which was given to this country when every man in it went about his own business and was told that he must "paddle his own canoe," that he must "play the game alone," that he must get the best, and that he must not trust to anybody about him to work out these miracles and mysteries. And the statement of these duties, these necessities to each man and to every man in the Declaration of Independence, gave an amount of power to the United States of America, which the United States of America does not enough realize to-day. It is power given to America that the European writers never could conceive of and, with one or two exceptions, do not conceive of to this hour.

When you send a man off into the desert and tell him he is to build his own cottage and break up his own farm, make his own road, and that he is not to depend for these things on any priest or bishop or on any prefect or mayor or council, that he is not to write home to any central board for an order for proceeding, but that he is to work out his own salvation and that he himself, by the great law of promotion, is to ascend to the summit to add incalculably to your national power, it is a thing which the earlier travelers in this country never could understand. It drove them frantic with rage.

They would come over here, this French gentleman,
that English adventurer, that Scotchman working out his fortune—they would come over here, with that habit of condescension which I must observe is remarkable in all Europeans to this day when they travel in America; and, with that habit of condescension, they were invariably disgusted with the language in which the American pioneer spoke of the future of his country. One of these travelers traveled along on his horse through the mud for thirty miles over a wretched road, which was not a road, over a corduroy, which was not corduroy, and at length he received a welcome in a dirty little log cabin by a man who was hospitable, but he would not stand nonsense. And this pioneer told him that in that dirty home of his were growing up children who were going to live in a palace on that very spot. He told him that that roadway which he had been following was going to be the finest roadway in the world. He told him that this country around him, with just a few redskins in the neighborhood, and occasionally the howl of a wolf in the fields at night, was going to be the most magnificent city ever read of in history. And the traveler never could bear this; he could never stand it.

What did it mean? It meant that the pioneer had been sent by the nation, as one of the children of the nation, and that he knew he had the nation behind him; he knew he had a country which would stand by him. This country had said to him, “Do what you will, so you do not interfere with the rights of others.” This country said to him in the great words of the Declaration of Independence that every man is born free, and every man is born with equal rights. It is true that the country, as it sent out the pioneer did not give him a ticket, did not give him a pin with which to scratch his way in the wilderness. The country said to him in that magnificent proverbial phrase, “Root, hog, or die,” you are to live out your own life, but you shall be free to live out your own life; you are to work out your own salvation, but working out your salvation you are to will and do according to God’s good pleasure.

The country thus gave to him the inestimable privilege of freedom. What does a country gain which gives to its citizens this inestimable privilege? Why, if that country needs a million pioneers it sounds its whistle and
a million pioneers rise at its order. If, in the course of history, that country needs that every son of hers shall rise in her defense, every son of hers rises in her defense. A government of the people, for the people, by the people, gives the country strength such as no nation ever had before. The pioneer looks forward to such strength as this in that magnificent expression of patriotism which seemed so brutal to the Scotch or English or French adventurer. It is true that all the time there were vulnerable points in this armor of American citizenship. It was all very fine to say, "All men are born free and equal" if, when you said so, none of them happened to be born slaves. It was all very fine to sing

"The star-spangled banner, long may it wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave,"

if you did not remember that the rhyme sounded just as well when you sang

"O'er the land of the free and the home of the slave,"

and was just as true. There is something really pathetic in the tract book of historical speeches of, say, the first thirty years of the century. There is a sort of wish and attempt to keep this matter of slavery out of sight, you know. Why, it is as if we had a fine boy come up here to make his exhibition speech and he should forget his words, and you should all pretend to observe that he had not forgotten his words. So, in the first thirty years of this century, we would say our country was the land of the free and the home of the brave, and we would not remember that there were some black people there; we would keep them out of sight if we could.

But this country is ruled by ideas; it is not ruled by frivolities or excuses. And in the middle of all that keeping out of the way the things we did not wish to have seen, there was this man and that woman who steadily said, without much rhetoric or eloquence, perhaps, "Human slavery is wrong." And they kept saying it; would not be silenced. "Human slavery is wrong"—that is the only answer they would give to arguments on the other side to conventional statements of historical deduc-
tion. You know what came from that answer. You know that the great idealism of the beginning worked its way along till, in the blood of your own sons, in the sacrifices of your own home, it should be proved that all men are born free, that all men have equal rights, and to prove these great spiritual truths, smoke and dust and pleasure, gold and silver—these are all forgotten and all as nothing, and the things that are remembered and prized are the spiritual truths which have given this country its strength and its power.

It is this something which, on the other side of the water, is not understood. They are forever telling that, when the wealth of our prairies is exhausted, we shall have to begin where they began; and now they begin to tell us that it is the accident of gold and silver, of lead and copper, that makes our country what it is. No, all these things were here before. The virgin prairies were here, plenty of nuggets of gold were here. It was not till you created men and women who deserved the name of children of God, it was not until you sent every one of them out, sure that he was a child of God and working under God's law, that your gold and silver were worth anything more than dust in the balance.

One is tempted to say in passing, that it was the people, not the theologians, so-called—that it was the people who proved to be the great theologians in this affair. The fall of Augustinism, the utter ruin of the theory of the Middle Ages, that men are children of the devil, born of sin—all this dates from the decision of the people of America that they would live by universal suffrage. Universal suffrage came in, one hardly knows how, there was so little said about it. It worked its way in. The voice of the people is the voice of God, the people said, and of course you could not strip the Connecticut valley of its farmers, and tell every man from fifty to sixty years of age that he had got to shoulder his musket and go out against Burgoyne, and then tell him when he came back home: "You cannot vote, you are too wicked to vote; you are the son of the devil and should not be allowed to vote." You had to give them universal suffrage. If this Connecticut valley farmer is good enough to die for you, he is good enough to vote for you. This custom of universal suffrage was in advance of all the theologians, and although they
kept bits of paper with statements of Augustinism on them to the effect that the people were the children of the devil, they gave them a suffrage as sons of God.

Augustinism died with the fact of universal suffrage— it had died long before. I speak with perfect confidence in this matter, because I know there was not a pulpit in the country that brought forth on that Sunday this old doctrine, which is a doctrine to be preserved in a museum, but is not to be paraded at the present day. The doctrine for us was the great truth that was announced in the beginning, that was written in the gospels, that we are all kings and priests and sons of God, and that all of us are able in our political constitution to write down the laws of our eternal life.

And I am tempted in passing to speak of that old fashioned sneer about the "almighty dollar"—how every book of travel used to say that we had no idealism in America, that we were all given so to making money, to mines and timber and crops, that we would never know what ideas were, and that for spiritual truths we must go back to Germany and England. "Nobody ever reads American books," they said; "nobody ever looks at an American statue," and thus they really thought that the writing of a great book was the greatest of things, or the carving of a great statue was the greatest of triumphs; not seeing that to create a nation of happy homes is greater than any such triumph, not seeing that to make good men and good women whose history may be worth recording by the pen or by the chisel, is an achievement vastly beyond what any artist ever wrought with a chisel or any man of letters ever wrote with his pen. It is in the midst of such sneers about our lack of idealism that one observes with a certain interest the American origin of the man whom everybody would admit was the first great idealist of the English-speaking tongue to-day.

The man who speaks the word, which some miner in his humble cabin read last night when he took down from his bookshelf Emerson’s Essays; the man who wrote the poem which some poor artist read in Paris last night, to his comfort; the man whose works were read last Sunday as the Scriptures are read in some rude log-house in the mountain is Ralph Waldo Emerson—he of the country which is said to know nothing of ideals. His philos-
ophy was not German in its origin. He did not study the English masters in style. He is not troubled by the traditions of the classics of the Greeks and the Romans. Our friends in Oxford, as they put back the Plato which they have been reading for a little refreshment in their idealism, resort to the Yankee Plato of this clime, Ralph Waldo Emerson.

I have chosen in the few minutes in which I have this greatest privilege in my life to speak thus briefly of what has passed since the year 1800 rather than to attempt a great speech on the great subject assigned to me by your committee, "the spiritual forces of the world." That, it seems to me, is the greatest subject possible. I thought I would not like to have you think me wholly a fool, so I selected one or two of these little illustrations instead of attempting a subject of such great magnitude. The lessons which America has learned. If she will only learn them well and remember them, are lessons which may well carry her through this twentieth century which is before us. We have built up all our strength, all our success on the triumph of ideas and those ideas for the twentieth century are very simple.

God is nearer to man than he ever was before, and man knows that and knows that because men are God's children, they are nearer to each other than they ever were before. And so life is one higher plane than it was. Men do not bother so much about the smoke and dust of earth. They live in higher altitudes because they are children of God, living for their brothers and sisters in the world, a life with God for man in Heaven. That is the whole of it. At the end of the nineteenth century we can state all our creeds as briefly as this. It is the statement of the Pope's encyclical, as he writes another of his noble letters. It is the statement on which is based the action of some poor come-outer, who is so afraid of images that he won't use words in his prayers.

Life with God for man in heaven—that is the religion on which the light of the twentieth century is to be formed. The twentieth century, for instance, is going to establish peace among all the nations of the world. Instead of these permanent arbitration boards, such as we have now occasionally, we are going to have a permanent tribunal, always in session, to discuss and settle the griev-
ances of the nations of the world. The establishment of this permanent tribunal is one of the illustrations of life with God, with men in a present heaven. Education is to be universal. That does not mean that every boy and girl in the United States is to be taught how to read very badly and how to write very badly. We are not going to be satisfied with any such thing as that. It means that every man and woman in the United States shall be able to study wisely and well all the works of God, and shall work side by side with those who go the farthest and study the deepest. Universal education will be best for every one—that is what is coming. That is life with God for man in Heaven.

And the twentieth century is going to care for everybody's health; going to see that the conditions of health are such that the child born in the midst of the most crowded parts of the most crowded cities have the same exquisite delicacy of care as the babe born to some President of the United States in the White House. We shall take that care of the health of every man, as our religion is founded on life with God for man in heaven.

As for social rights, the statement is very simple. It has been made already. The twentieth century will give to every man according to his necessities. It will receive from every man according to his opportunity. And that will come from the religious life of that century, a life with God for man in heaven. As for purity, the twentieth century will keep the body pure—men as chaste as women. Nobody drunk, nobody stifled by this or that poison, given with this or that pretense, with everybody free to be the engine of the almighty soul.

All this is to say that the twentieth century is to build up its civilization on ideas, not on things that perish: build them on spiritual truths which endure and are the same forever; build them on faith, on hope, on love, which are the only elements of eternal life. The twentieth century is to build a civilization which is to last forever, because it is a civilization of an idea.
CHAPTER XV.

THE CONGREGATIONALISTS.

RELIGION, ESSENTIALLY CHARACTERISTIC OF HUMANITY.
MAN SEEKING GOD, GOD SEEKING MAN, BY REV. LYMAN
ABBOTT, OF BROOKLYN.

To adequately elucidate the meaning of this phrase, which has been given me as my title, and to attempt to demonstrate the truth which it expresses would require a wealth of scholarship which I do not possess, and a length of time which it is impossible shall be accorded to any one topic on such an occasion as this. I shall not occupy your time in any words of introduction or peroration, nor shall I attempt to demonstrate the truth of the proposition of which I have been asked to speak. I shall simply endeavor, in a series of statements, to elucidate and interpret, and, in some small measure, apply it.

Religion, then—and you will pardon me if I speak in dogmatic phraseology; I am giving you my convictions, and it will be egotistic, as well as needless, for me to interpolate continually “this is what I think”—religion is essential to humanity. It is not a something or a somewhat external to man. It is an essential life of man. It is not a something apart from him which has been imposed upon him by priest or hierarchies here or anywhere. It is not a fungus growth that does not belong to his nature. The power, the baneful power of superstition, lies in the very fact that man is religious and that his religious nature, inherent in him, has been too often played upon by evil or ignorant men for base or selfish purposes. But this does not counteract the truth that religion itself is an essential integral part of his own inherent nature. Religion is not a something or a somewhat which has been conferred upon him by any cultus, by any hierarchy.
Religion is not the mother of all religions, not the child. The White City at yonder end of Chicago is not the parent of architecture; architecture is the parent of the White City. And the temples and the priests and the rituals that cover this round globe of ours have not made religion, they have been born of the religion that is inherent in the soul. Religion is not the exceptional gift of exceptional geniuses. It is not what men have sometimes thought poetry or art or music to be, a thing that belongs to a favored few great men. It is the universal characteristic of humanity. It belongs to man as man. Religion is not a somewhat that has been conferred upon him by any supernatural act of irresistible grace, either upon an elect few or an elect many. Still less is it a somewhat that has been conferred upon a few, so that the many, strive never so hard to conform their lives to the light of nature, unless aided by some supernatural or extraordinary acts of grace, can never attain to it. Religion belongs to man and is inherent in man.

If I may be allowed to use the terminology of our own theology, it is not conferred upon man in redemption, it is conferred upon man in creation. It was not first brought into existence at Mount Sinai, it was not first brought into existence at Bethlehem. Christ came not to create religion, but to develop the religion that was already in the human soul. In the beginning God breathed the breath of life into man, and into every man, and all men have something of that Divine breath in them. They may stifle it, they may refuse to obey that to which it calls them, but still it is in them. They are children of God, whether they know it or know it not. And to their God they are drawn by a power like that which draws the earth to the sun.

Religion, that is, the power of perceiving the Infinite and the Eternal, is a characteristic of man, as man. Man is a wonderful machine. This body of his is, I suppose, the most marvelous mechanism in the world. Man is an animal, linked to the animal race by his instincts, his appetites, his passions, his social nature. He has all that the animal possesses, only in a higher and larger degree; but he is more than a machine, he is more than an
animal. He is linked to more than the earth from which he was formed; he is more than the animal from which he was produced; he is linked to the Divine and the eternal. He has in him a faith, a hope, and love—a faith, which, if it does not always see the Infinite, at all events always tries to see the Infinite, groping after Him, if haply he may find Him—a hope, which, if it be sometimes elusive, nevertheless beckons him on to higher and higher achievements in character and in condition—a love, which, beginning in the cradle, binding him to his mother, widens in ever broadening circles, as life enlarges, including the children of the home, the villagers, the tribe, the nation, at last reaching out and taking in the whole human race, and in all of this learning that there is a still larger life in which we live and move and have our being, toward which we tend, and by which we are fed and are inspired.

Max Muller has defined religion—I quote from memory, but I believe I quote with substantial accuracy—as a perception of such a manifestation of the Infinite as produces an effect upon the moral character and conduct of man. It is not merely the moral character and conduct. That is ethics. It is not merely a perception of the Infinite. That is theology. It is such a perception of the Infinite as produces an influence on the moral character and conduct of man. That is religion.

My proposition, then, is this, that in every man there is an inherent capacity, so to perceive the Infinite, and to every man on this round globe of ours, God has so manifested himself in nature and in inward experience, as that, taking that manifestation on the one hand and a power of perception on the other, the moral character and the conduct of man, if he follows the light that he receives, will be steadily improved and enlarged and enriched in his upward progress to the Infinite, and the Eternal. Man is conscious of himself and he is conscious of the world within himself. He is conscious of a perception that brings him in touch with the outer world. He is conscious of reason by which he sees the relation of things. He is conscious of emotions, feelings of hope, of fear, of love. He is conscious of will, of resolve, of purpose. Sometimes painfully conscious of resolves that have been broken. Sometimes gladly conscious of re-
solves that have been kept. And in all of this life he is conscious of these things; that he is a perceiving, thinking, feeling, willing creature.

He is also conscious of the world outside of himself. A world of form, of color, of material, of phenomena. They are borne in upon him by his perceiving faculties. And he is also conscious of a relation between himself, this thinking, willing creature that he is, and this outward world that impinges upon him. He is conscious that the fragrance of the rose gives him pleasure, and the fragrance of the bone-boiling establishment does not give him pleasure. He is conscious that fire warms him, and he is conscious that fire burns and stings him. He is conscious of hunger; he is conscious of the satisfaction that comes through the feeding of himself when hungry. He is brought into perpetual contact with this outward world, so he becomes conscious of three things.

First, himself; second, the not-self; third, the relation between himself and this not-self. And this relationship is forced upon him by every movement of his life. It begins with the cradle and does not end until the grave. Life is perpetually an impinging upon him. He himself is coerced whether he will or whether he will not, to ascertain what is the relationship, the true, the right, the just, the accurate relationship between this thinking, feeling creature that he calls self and this outward and material and phenomenal world in the midst of which he lives.

In the pursuit of this inquiry he begins by attributing to all the phenomena that impinges upon him the continuous life that is within him. He thinks that all things are themselves persons. He very soon learns from his grouping together of this outward phenomena differently. He groups them in classes, he produces them in provinces, he becomes polytheistic. He goes but a very little way through life before he learns there is a larger unity of life than at first he thought. He learns that all phenomena of life are bound together in some one common bond. He learns that behind all the phenomena of nature there is a cause, that behind the apparent there is the real, behind the shadow there is the substance, behind the transitory there is the eternal. The old teachers of the old religion, the old teachers of the Japanese religion,
they, as well as the old teachers of the Hebrew religion, did see that truth which Herbert Spencer has put in axiomatic form in these later days: "Midst all mysteries by which we are surrounded, nothing is more certain than that we are in the presence of an infinite and eternal Energy from which all things proceed."

Now he begins to study this Energy, for the success of his life, the well-being of his life here, even if there were no hereafter, depends on his understanding what are his relations, not only to the related phenomena of life, but to the infinite and eternal Energy from which all these phenomena spring. And in the study of this energy he very soon discovers that it is an intellectual energy. All the phenomena of life have behind them thought relations. The world has not happened; life is not a chapter of mere accidents; the universe is not a heap of disjecta membra; there is a unity which makes life what it is. It is summed up in the very word by which we endeavor to describe all things, "Universe," all forces combined in one.

The relation of these phenomena one to the other he seeks to learn. He talks of laws and forces. Science is not merely the gathering of phenomena here and there, science is the discovery of the relations which exist between phenomena, and which have existed through eternity. The scientist does not create those relations; he discovers them. He does not make the laws; he finds them. Science is a thought of man trying to find the divine reality that is behind all this transitoriness. Science is the thinking of the thoughts of God after Him. He perceives art, the relations of beauty in form, in color, in music. He endeavors to discover what are those relations of beauty in form, in art, in color. He does not create them; he discovers them. They existed before he came upon the stage, and they will continue to exist if, by some cataclysm, all humanity should be swept off the stage. And in this search for beauty he finds there, too, that he has perceived the Infinite. Bach knocks at one door and out there issues one form of music, Mozart another, Mendelssohn another, Beethoven another, Wagner another; each one interprets something of the beauty that lies wrapt up in the possibility of sound, and still the march goes on, still the doors swing open, still the notes
come tripping out, still the music grows and grows and grows, and will grow while eternity goes on, for in music we are searching for the Infinite and Eternal whether we know it or know it not.

He perceives, however, not only the outward world of things. He perceives an outward world of sentient beings like himself. He sees about him his fellow-men, that they also perceive, that they also reason, that they also hope and fear and love and hate, that they also resolve and break their resolves and keep their resolutions. He sees that he is but one of the great company marching along the same highway out of the great unknown in the past toward the same great unknown goal in the future; and he finds, he discerns, that there is a unit in this humanity. First, he sees it in the family, then in the tribes, then in the nations, and last of all in the whole race. If there were no unit in the human race, there could be no history. History is not the mere narration of things that have happened; history is the evolution of the progress of a united race, coming from the egg into the full-fledged bird of the future. There could be no political economy if there were no unit in the human race, no science, no religion, no nothing. We are not a mere set of disintegrated separate pieces of sand in one great heap which we are building up to be blown asunder. All humanity is united together by unmistakable ties—united with a power that far transcends the local temple, the temple of tribes or nations or creeds or circumstances. And we thus discern that, as there is back of all the material phenomena an ethical culture, so there is back of all moral phenomena moral culture.

History, political economy, sociology, the whole course of the development of the human race is a witness that there is not only an infinite and eternal Energy from which all things proceed, but an infinite and eternal moral energy from which all human life proceeds, and in which all human life in its last analysis has its unifying element. Vital man is compelled to study what this bond of union is. He must know what are the right relationships between himself and his fellow-men. If he fails, all sorts of distresses and calamities come upon him.

He must find out what are the right relationships between employer and employed, what are the right rela-
tionships between governor and governed, what are the right relationships between parent and children. Again he does not make them, but finds out what they are. Let Congress, with a power of thirty millions of people behind it, enact slavery in the American Constitution; let the thirty millions say, "We will make a law that the blacks shall be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, and the white men shall be served by them," and the law that Congress makes, with thirty millions of people behind it, infringes against the divine, eternal and infinite law of human liberty, and it goes down with one great clash and is buried forever.

So man is compelled, by the very nature of his social and civil organization, to seek for an infinite and eternal behind humanity, an infinite and eternal behind the material and behind the aesthetic. Unconsciously he has been seeking for the divine, but he awaits the consciousness. He knows that there is a divine somewhat, an eternal somewhat, an infinite somewhat, an ideal somewhat, if you like, behind all material and behind all spiritual phenomena, and his emotions are stirred toward that somewhat, stirred to awe, stirred to fear, stirred to reverence, stirred to curiosity, but stirred. So with temple and with worship, and with ritual and with priest, he endeavors consciously to learn who and what this somewhat is who draws him in his moral resolutions to his fellow-man, who speaks the inward voice of righteousness in the conscience of the individual.

Thus we get out of religion religions—religions that vary with one another, according as curiosity or fear or hope or the ethical element or the personal reverence predominates. Religious curiosity wants to know about the infinite and eternal, and it gives us creeds and theologies; the religion of fear gives us the sacrificial system, with its atonements and propitiations; the religion of hope expects some reward or recompense from the great infinite, and expresses itself in services and gifts, with the expectation of rewards here or in some Elysium hereafter. Then there is the religion which, although it can never learn the nature of the lawgiver, still goes on trying to understand the nature of his laws: and, finally, the religion which more or less clearly sees behind all this that there is one who is the ideal of humanity, the infinite and
Eternal Ruler of humanity, and therefore reveres and worships, and last of all learns to love.

If, in this very brief summary, I have carried you with me, you will see that the object of man's search is not merely religion: he is seeking to know the infinite and the eternal, not merely the priests and the hierarchies, not merely the men and women, with their services, and their rituals, and their prayer-books, but the whole current and tendency of human life is a search for the infinite and the divine. All science, all art, all sociology, all business, all government, as well as all worship, is in the last analysis an endeavor to comprehend the meaning of the great words: honesty, justice, truth, pity, mercy, love. In vain does the atheist or the agnostic try to stop our search to know the infinite and eternal; in vain does he tell us it is a useless quest. Still we press on and must press on. The incentive is in ourselves, and nothing can blot it out of us and still leave us men and women.

God made us out of himself and God calls us back to himself. It would be easier to kill the appetite of man, and let us feed by merely shoveling in carbon as into a furnace; it would be easier to blot ambition out of man and to consign him to endless and nerveless content; easier to blot love out of man and banish him to live the life of a eunuch in the wilderness than to blot out of the soul of man those desires and aspirations which knit him to the infinite and the eternal, give him love for his fellow-men and reverence for God. In vain does the philosopher of the barnyard say to the egg, "You are made of egg; you always were an egg; you always will be an egg; don't try to be anything but an egg." The chicken pecks and pecks until he breaks the shell and comes out to the sunlight of the world.

We welcome here to-day, in this most cosmopolitan city of the most cosmopolitan race on the globe, the representatives of all the various forms of religious life from east to west and north to south. We are glad to welcome them. We are glad to believe that they, as we, have been seeking to know something more and better of the divine from which we issue, of the divine to which we are returning. We are glad to hear the message they have to bring to us. We are glad to know what they have to tell us, but what we are gladdest of all about is
that we can tell them what we have found in our search, and that we have found the Christ.

I do not stand here as the exponent, the apologist, or the defender of Christianity. In it there have been the blemishes and the mars of human handiwork. It has been too intellectual, too much a religion of creeds. It has been too fearful, too much a religion of sacrifices. It has been too selfishly hopeful; there has been too much a desire of reward here or hereafter. It has been too little a religion of unselfish service and unselfish reverence. No! It is not Christianity that we want to tell our brethren across the sea about; it is the Christ.

What is it that this universal hunger of the human race seeks? Is it not these things—a better understanding of our moral relations, one to another, a better understanding of what we are and what we mean to be, that we may fashion ourselves according to the idea of the ideal being in our nature, a better appreciation of the Infinite One who is behind all phenomena, material and spiritual? Is it not more health and added strength and clearer light in our upward tendency to our everlasting Father's arms and home? Are not these the things that most we need in the world? We have found the Christ and loved Him and revered Him and accepted Him, for nowhere else, in no other prophet, have we found the moral relations of men better represented than in the Golden Rule, "Do unto others that which you would have others do unto you." We do not think that He furnishes the only ideal the world has ever had. We recognize the voice of God in all prophets and in all time. But we do think we have found in this Christ, in His patience, in His courage, in His heroism, in His self-sacrifice, in His unbounded mercy and love an ideal that transcends all other ideals written by the pen of poet, painted by the brush of artist, or graved into the life of human history.

We do not think that God has spoken only in Palestine and to the few in that narrow province. We do not think He has been vocal in Christendom and dumb everywhere else. No! We believe that He is a speaking God in all times and in all ages. But we believe no other revelation transcends and none other equals that which He has made to man in the one transcendent human life that was lived eighteen centuries ago in Palestine. And we think we find in Christ one thing that we have not been able to
find in any other of the manifestations of the religious life of the world. All religions are the result of man's seeking after God. If what I have portrayed to you this morning so imperfectly has any truth in it, the whole human race seeks to know its eternal and divine Father. The message of the Incarnation—that is the glad tidings we have to give to Africa, to Asia, to China, to the isles of the sea.

The everlasting Father is also seeking the children who are seeking Him. He is not an unknown, hiding Himself behind a veil impenetrable. He is not a Being dwelling in the eternal silence; He is a speaking, revealing, incarnate God. He is not an absolute Justice, sitting on the throne of the universe and bringing before Him imperfect, sinful man and judging him with the scales of unerring justice. He is a Father coming into human life and coming into one transcendental human life, coming into all human life for all time. Perhaps we have sometimes misrepresented our own faith respecting this Christ. Perhaps, in our metaphysical definitions, we have sometimes been too anxious to be accurate and too little anxious to be true. He himself has said it—He is a door. We do not stand merely to look at the door for the beauty of the carving upon it. We push the door open and go in. Through that door God enters into human life; through that door humanity enters into the Divine life; Man seeking after God, the incarnate God seeking after man; the end in that great future after life's troubled dream shall be o'er, and we shall awake satisfied because we awake in His likeness.
CHAPTER XVI.

ZOROASTER.

BELIEF AND CEREMONIES OF FOLLOWERS OF ZOROASTER,
BY JINANJI JAMSHODJI MODI PARSEE.

The greatest good that a Parliament of Religions, like the present, can do is to establish what Professor Max Muller calls "that great golden dawn of truth 'that there is a religion behind all religions.'" The learned professor very rightly says that "Happy is the man who knows that truth in these days of materialism and atheism." If this parliament of religions does nothing else but spread the knowledge of this golden truth, and thus make a large number of men happy, it will immortalize its name. The object of my paper is to take a little part in the noble efforts of this great gathering, to spread the knowledge of that golden truth from a Parsee point of view. The Parsees of India are the followers of Zoroastrianism, of the religion of Zoroaster, a religion which was for centuries both the state religion and the national religion of ancient Persia. As Professor Max Muller says:

There were periods in the history of the world when the worship of Ormuzd threatened to rise triumphant on the ruins of the temples of all other gods. If the battles of Marathon and Salamis had been lost and Greece had succumbed to Persia, the state religion of the empire of Cyrus, which was the worship of Ormuzd, might have become the religion of the whole civilized world. Persia had absorbed the Assyrian and Babylonian Empires; Jews were either in Persian captivity or under Persian sway at home; the sacred monuments of Egypt had been mutilated by the hands of Persian soldiers. The edicts of the king—the king of kings—were sent to India, to Greece, to Scythia and to Egypt, and if "by the grace of Ahura Mazda" Darius had crushed the liberty of Greece, the purer faith of Zoroaster might easily have superseded the Olympian fables.

With the overthrow of the Persian monarchy under its last Sassanian King, Yasdagart, at the battle of
Nehavand in A. D. 642, the religion received a check at the hands of the Arabs, who, with sword in one hand and Koran in the other, made the religion of Islam both the state religion and national religion of the country. But many of those who adhered to the faith of their fathers quitted their ancient fatherland for the hospitable shores of India. The modern Parsees of India are the descendants of those early settlers. As a former Governor of Bombay said, "Their position is unique—a handful of persons among the teeming millions of India, and yet who not only have preserved their ancient race with the utmost purity, but also their religion absolutely unimpaired by contact with others."

In the words of Rt. Rev. Dr. Meurin, the learned Bishop (Vicar Apostolic) of Bombay, in 1885, the Parsees are "a people who have chosen to relinquish their venerable ancestors' homesteads rather than abandon their ancient religion, the founder of which lived no less than 3,000 years ago—a people who for a thousand years have formed in the midst of the great Hindu people, not unlike an island in the sea, a quite separate and distinct nation, peculiar and remarkable as for its race, so for its religious and social life and customs." Professor Max Muller says of the religion of the Parsees:

Though every religion is of real and vital interest in its earliest state only, yet its later development, too, with all its misunderstandings, faults and corruptions, offers many an instructive lesson to the thoughtful student of history. Here is a religion, one of the most ancient of the world, once the state religion of the most powerful empire, driven away from its native soil and deprived of political influence, without even the prestige of a powerful or enlightened priesthood, and yet professed by a handful of exiles—men of wealth, intelligence, and moral worth in western India—with unhesitating fervor such as is seldom to be found in larger religious communities. It is well worth the earnest endeavor of the philosopher and the divine to discover, if possible, the spell by which this apparently effete religion continues to command the attachment of the enlightened Parsees of India and makes them turn a deaf ear to the allurements of the Brahmanic worship and the earnest appeals of Christian missionaries.

Zoroastrianism or Parseeism—by whatever name the system may be called—is a monotheistic form of religion. It believes in the existence of one God, whom it knows under the names of Mazda, Ahura and Ahura-Mazda, the last form being one that is most commonly met with in the
latter writings of the Avesta. The first and the greatest truth that dawns upon the mind of a Zoroastrian is that the great and the infinite universe, of which he is an infinitesimally small part, is the work of a powerful hand—the result of a master mind. The first and the greatest conception of that master mind, Ahura-Mazda, is that, as the name implies, he is the Omniscient Lord, and as such he is the ruler of both the material and immaterial world, the corporeal and the incorporeal world, the visible and the invisible world. The regular movements of the sun and the stars, the periodical waxing and waning of the moon, the regular way in which the sun and the clouds are sustained, the regular flow of waters and the gradual growth of vegetation, the rapid movements of the winds and the regular succession of light and darkness, of day and night, with their accompaniments of sleep and wakefulness, all these grand and striking phenomena of nature point to and bear ample evidence of the existence of an almighty power who is not only the creator, but the preserver of this great universe, who has not only launched that universe into existence with a premeditated plan of completeness, but who, with the controlling hand of a father, preserves by certain fixed laws harmony and order here, there and everywhere.

As Ahura-Mazda is the ruler of the Physical World, so He is the ruler of the Spiritual World. His distinguished attributes are good mind, righteousness, desirable control, piety, perfection and immortality. He is the Beneficent Spirit from whom emanate all good and all piety. He looks into the hearts of men and sees how much of the good and of the piety that have emanated from him has made its home there, and thus rewards the virtuous and punishes the vicious. Of course, one sees at times, in the plane of this world, moral disorders and want of harmony, but then the present state is only a part, and that a very small part, of His scheme of moral government. As the ruler of the world, Ahura-Mazda hears the prayers of the ruled. He grants the prayers of those who are pious in thoughts, pious in words, and pious in deeds. "He not only rewards the good, but punishes the wicked. All that is created, good or evil, fortune or misfortune, is his work."

We have seen that Ahura-Mazda, or God, is, according
to Parsee scriptures, the causer of all causes. He is the creator as well as the destroyer, the increaser as well as the decreaser. He gives birth to different creatures and it is he who brings about their end. How is it, then, that he brings about these two contrary results? In the words of Dr. Haug:

Having arrived at the grand idea of the unity and indivisibility of the Supreme Being, he (Zoroaster) undertook to solve the great problem which has engaged the attention of so many wise men of antiquity and even of modern times, viz., How are the imperfections discoverable in the world, the various kinds of evils, wickedness and baseness, compatible with the goodness, holiness and justice of God? This great thinker of remote antiquity solved this difficult question philosophically by the supposition of two primeval causes which though different were united and produced the world of material things as well as that of the spirit.

These two primeval causes or principles are called in the Avesta the two "Mainyus." This word comes from the ancient Aryan root "man," to "think." It may be properly rendered into English by the word "spirit," meaning "that which can only be conceived by the mind but not felt by the senses." Of these two spirits or primeval causes or principles one is creative and the other destructive. These two spirits work under the Almighty day and night. They create and destroy, and this they have done ever since the world was created. According to Zoroaster's philosophy our world is the work of these two hostile principles. Spenta-mainyush, the good principle, and Angra-mainyush, the evil principle, both serving under one God. In the words of that learned Orientalist, Professor Darmestetter, "all that is good in the world comes from the former; all that is bad in it comes from the latter. The history of the world is the history of their conflict; how Angra-mainyu invaded the world of Ahura-Mazda and marred it, and how he shall be expelled from it at last. Man is active in the conflict, his duty in it being laid before him in the law revealed by Ahura-Mazda to Zarathushtra. When the appointed time is come * * * Angra-mainyu and hell will be destroyed, men will rise from the dead and everlasting happiness will reign over the world."

These philosophical notions have led some learned men to misunderstand Zoroastrian theology. Some authors entertain an opinion that Zoroaster preached dualism
But this is a serious misconception. In the Parsee scriptures the names of God are Mazda, Ahura and Ahura-Mazda, the last word being a compound of the first two. The first two words are common in the earliest writings of the Gāthā and the third in the later scriptures. In later times the word Ahura-Mazda, instead of being restricted like Mazda, the name of God began to be used in a wider sense and was applied to Spenta-mainyush, the Creative or the Good principle. This being the case, wherever the word Ahura-Mazda was used in opposition to that of Angra-mainyush, later authors took it as the name of God, and not as the name of the Creative principle, which it really was. Thus the very fact of Ahura-Mazda’s name being employed in opposition to that of the Angra-mainyush or Ahriman, led to the notion that Zoroastrian scriptures preached dualism.

Not only is the charge of dualism as leveled against Zoroastrianism, and as ordinarily understood, groundless, but there is a close resemblance between the ideas of the Devil among the Christians and those of the Ahriman among the Zoroastrians. Dr. Haug says the same thing in the following words:

The Zoroastrian idea of the Devil and the infernal kingdom coincides entirely with the Christian doctrine. The Devil is a murderer and father of lies according to both the Bible and the Zend-Avesta.

Thus we see that, according to Zoroaster’s philosophy, there are two primeval principles that produce our material world. Consequently, though the Almighty is the creator of all, a part of the creation is said to be created by the Good Principle and a part by the Evil Principle. Thus, for example, the heavenly bodies, the earth, water, fire, horses, dogs and such other objects are the creation of the Good Principle, and serpents, ants, locusts, etc., are the creation of the Evil Principle. In short, those things that conduct to the greatest good of the greatest number of mankind fall under the category of the creations of the Good Principle, and those that lead to the contrary result, under that of the creations of the Evil Principle. This being the case, it is incumbent upon men to do actions that would support the cause of the Good Principle and destroy that of the Evil One. Therefore, the cultivation of the soil, the rearing of domestic animals, etc., on the
one hand and the destruction of wild animals and other noxious creatures on the other are considered meritorious actions by the Parsees.

As there are two primeval principles under Ahura-Mazda that produce our material world, so there are two principles inherent in the nature of man which encourage him to do good or tempt him to do evil. One asks him to support the cause of the Good Principle, the other to support that of the Evil Principle. The first is known by the name of Vohumana or Behemana, i. e., "good mind." The prefix "vohu" or "beh" is the same word as that of which our English "better" is the comparative. Mana is the same as the word "maniyu" and means mind or spirit. The second is known by the name of Akamana, i. e., bad mind. The prefix "aka" means "bad" and is the same as our English word "ache" in "headache."

Now the fifth chapter of the Vendidad gives, as it were, a short definition of what is morality or piety. There, first of all, the writer says: "Purity is the best thing for man after birth." This you may say is the motto of the Zoroastrian religion. Therefore M. Harlez very properly says that, according to Zoroastrian scriptures, the "notion of the word virtue sums itself up in that of the 'Asha.'" This word is the same as the Sanscrit "rita," which word corresponds to our English "right." It means therefore righteousness, piety or purity. Then the writer proceeds to give a short definition of piety. It says that "the preservation of good thoughts, good words and good deeds is piety." In these pithy words is summed up, so to say, the whole of the moral philosophy of the Zoroastrian scriptures. It says that, if you want to lead a pious and moral life and thus to show a clean bill of spiritual health to the angel, Meher Daver, who watches the gates of Heaven at the Chinvat Bridge, practice these three: Think of nothing but the truth, speak nothing but the truth, and do nothing but what is proper. In short, what Zoroastrian moral philosophy teaches is this, that your good thoughts, good deeds, and good words, alone will be your intercessors. Nothing more will be wanted. They alone will serve you as a safe pilot to the harbor of heaven, as a safe guide to the gates of Paradise. The late Dr. Haug rightly observed that "the moral philosophy of Zoroaster was moving in the triad of 'thought, word and deed.'"
These three words form, as it were, the pivot upon which the moral structure of Zoroastrianism turns. It is the ground-work upon which the whole edifice of Zoroastrian morality rests.

The following dialogue in the Pehelvi Padnameh of Buzurge-Meher shows in a succinct form what weight is attached to these three pithy words in the moral code of the Zoroastrians.

Question—Who is the most fortunate man in the world?
Answer—He who is the most innocent.

Question—Who is the most innocent man in the world?
Answer—He who walks in the path of God and shuns that of the devil.

Question—Which is the path of God, and which that of the devil?
Answer—Virtue is the path of God, and vice that of the devil.

Question—What constitutes virtue, and what vice?
Answer—(Humata, hukhta, and hvarshta) good thoughts, good words, and good deeds constitute virtue, and (dushmanata, duzukhta and duzvarshhta) evil thoughts, evil words, and evil deeds constitute vice.

Question—What constitute (humata, hukhta and hvarshta) good thoughts, good words and good deeds, and (dushmanata, duzukhta and duzvarshhta) evil thoughts, evil words, and evil deeds?
Answer—Honesty, charity, and truthfulness constitute the former, and dishonesty, want of charity, and falsehood constitute the latter.

From this dialogue it will be seen that a man who acquires (humata, hukhta, and hvarshta) good thoughts, good words, and good deeds, and thereby practices honesty, charity, and truthfulness, is considered to walk in the path of God, and therefore to be the most innocent and fortunate man.

Herodotus also refers to the third cardinal virtue of truthfulness, mentioned above. He says that to speak the truth was one of the three things taught to a Zoroastrian of his time from his very childhood.

Zoroastrianism believes in the immortality of the soul. The Avesta writings of Hadokht Nushk and the nineteenth chapter of the Vendidad and of the Pehelvi books of Minokherad and Viraf-nameh treat of the fate of the soul after death. Its notions about heaven and hell correspond to some extent to the Christian notions about them. A plant called the Homa-i-saphid, or white Homa, a name corresponding to the Indian Soma of the Hindus, is held to be the emblem of the immortality of the soul. According to Dr. Windischmann and Professor Max Muller this
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plant reminds us of the "Tree of Life" in the garden of Eden. As in the Christian Scriptures the way to the Tree of Life is strictly guarded by the Cherubim, so in the Zoroastrian scriptures the Homa-i-saphid, or the plant which is the emblem of immortality, is guarded by innumerable Fravashis—that is, guardian spirits. The number of these guardian spirits as given in various books is 99,999.

Again, Zoroastrianism believes in heaven and hell. Heaven is called Vahishta-ahu in the Avesta books. It literally means the "best life." This word is afterward contracted, with a slight change, into the Persian word "Behesht," which is the superlative form of "Veh," meaning "good," and corresponds exactly with our English word "best." Hell is known by the name of "Achishta-ahu." Heaven is represented as a place of radiance, splendor, and glory, and hell as that of gloom, darkness, and stench. Between heaven and this world there is supposed to be a bridge named "Chinvat." This word—from the Aryan root "chi," meaning to pick up, to collect—means the place where a man's soul has to present a collective account of the actions done in the past life.

According to the Parsee scriptures, for three days after a man's death his soul remains within the limits of the world under the guidance of the angel Srosh. If the deceased be a pious man or a man who led a virtuous life his soul utters the words "Ushta-almai yahmai; ushta-kahmai-chit," i.e., "Well is he by whom that which is his benefit becomes the benefit of any one else." If he be a wicked man or one who led an evil life, his soul utters these plaintive words: "Kam nemoizam? Kuthra nemo ayeni?" i.e., "To which land shall I turn? Whither shall I go?"

On the dawn of the third night the departed souls appear at the "Chinvat Bridge." This bridge is guarded by the angel Meher Daver, i.e., Mether the judge. He presides there as a judge, assisted by the angels Rashne and Astad, the former representing justice and the latter truth. At this bridge, and before this angel Meher, the soul of every man has to give an account of its doings in the past life. Meher Daver, the judge, weighs a man's actions by a scale-pan. If a man's good actions outweigh
his evil ones, even by a small particle, he is allowed to pass from the bridge to the other end to heaven. If his evil actions outweigh his good ones, even by a small weight, he is not allowed to pass over the bridge, but is hurled down into the deep abyss of hell. If his meritorious and evil deeds counterbalance each other, he is sent to a place known as "hamast-gehan," corresponding to the Christian "purgatory" and the Mahommedan "aeraf." His meritorious deeds done in the past life would prevent him from going to hell, and his evil actions would not let him go to heaven.

Again Zoroastrian books say that the meritoriousness of good deeds and the sin of evil ones increase with the growth of time. As capital increases with interest, so good and bad actions done by a man in his life increase, as it were, with interest in their effects. Thus a meritorious deed done in young age is more effective than that very deed done in advanced age. A man must begin practicing virtue from his very young age. As in the case of good deeds and their meritoriousness, so in the case of evil actions and their sins. The burden of the sin of an evil action increases, as it were, with interest. A young man has a long time to repent of his evil deeds, and to do good deeds that could counteract the effect of his evil deeds. If he does not take advantage of these opportunities the burden of those evil deeds increases with time.

The Parsee places of worship are known as fire-temples. The very name fire-temple would strike a non-Zoroastrian as an unusual form of worship. The Parsees do not worship fire as God. They merely regard fire as an emblem of refulgence, glory, and light as the most perfect symbol of God, and as the best and noblest representative of His divinity. "In the eyes of a Parsee his (fire's) brightness, activity, purity, and incorruptibility bear the most perfect resemblance to the nature and perfection of the Deity." A Parsee looks upon fire "as the most perfect symbol of the Deity on account of its purity, brightness, activity, subtility, purity and incorruptibility."

Again, one must remember that it is the several symbolic ceremonies that add to the reverence entertained by a Parsee for the fire burning in his fire-temples. A new element of purity is added to the fire burning in the
fire-temples of the Parsees by the religious ceremonies accompanied with prayers that are performed over it, before it is installed in its place on a vase on an exalted stand in a chamber set apart. The sacred fire burning there is not the ordinary fire burning in our hearths. It has undergone several ceremonies, and it is these ceremonies, full of meaning, that render the fire more sacred in the eyes of a Parsee. We will briefly recount the process here.

In establishing a fire-temple fires from various places of manufacture are brought and kept in different vases. Great efforts are also made to obtain fire caused by lightning. Over one of these fires a perforated metallic flat tray with a handle attached is held. On this tray are placed small chips and dust of fragrant sandalwood. These chips and dust are ignited by the heat of the fire below, care being taken that the perforated tray does not touch the fire. Thus a new fire is created out of the first fire. Then from this new fire another is again produced, and so on, until the process is repeated nine times. The fire thus prepared after the ninth process is considered pure. The fires brought from other places of manufacture are treated in a similar manner. These purified fires are all collected together upon a large vase, which is then put in its proper place in a separate chamber.

Now what does a fire so prepared signify to a Parsee? He thinks to himself: "When this fire on this vase before me, though pure in itself, though the noblest of the creations of God, and though the best symbol of the Divinity, had to undergo certain processes of purification, had to draw out, as it were, its essence—nay, its quintessence—of purity to enable itself to be worthy of occupying this exalted position, how much more necessary, more essential and more important it is for me—a poor mortal who is liable to commit sins and crimes, and who comes into contact with hundreds of evils, both physical and mental—to undergo the process of purity and piety by making my thoughts, words, and actions pass, as it were, through a sieve of piety and purity, virtue and morality, and to separate by that means my good thoughts, good words, and good actions from bad thoughts, bad words, and bad actions, so that I may, in my turn, be enabled to acquire an exalted position, in the next world."
Again, the fires put together as above are collected from the houses of men of different grades in society. This reminds a Parsee that, as all these fires from the houses of men of different grades have all, by the process of purification, equally acquired the exalted place in the vase, so before God all men—no matter to what grades of society they belong—are equal, provided they pass through the process of purification, i.e., provided they preserve purity of thoughts, purity of words, and purity of deeds.

Again, when a Parsee goes before the sacred fire, which is kept all day and night burning in the fire-temple, the officiating priest presents before him the ashes of a part of the consumed fire. The Parsee applies it to his forehead just as a Christian applies the consecrated water in his church and thinks to himself: "Dust to dust. The fire, all brilliant, shining and resplendent, has spread the fragrance of the sweet-smelling sandal and frankincense round about, but is at last reduced to dust. So it is destined for me. After all I am to be reduced to dust and have to depart from this transient life. Let me do my best to spread, like this fire, before my death, the fragrance of charity and good deeds and lead the light of righteousness and knowledge before others."

In short, the sacred fire burning in a fire-temple serves as a perpetual monitor to a Parsee standing before it to preserve piety, purity, humility, and brotherhood.

As we said above, evidence from nature is the surest evidence that leads a Parsee to the belief in the existence of the Deity. From Nature he is led to Nature's God. From this point of view, then, he is not restricted to any particular place for the recital of his prayers. For a visitor to Bombay, which is the headquarters of the Parsees, it is therefore not unusual to see a number of Parsees saying their prayers, morning and evening, in the open space, turning their faces to the rising or the setting sun, before the glowing moon or the foaming sea. Turning to these grand objects, the best and sublimest of His creations, they address their prayers to the Almighty.

All Parsee prayers begin with an assurance to do acts that would please the Almighty God. The assurance is followed by an expression of regret for past evil thoughts, words, or deeds if any. Man is liable to err, and so, if during the interval any errors of commission or omission
are committed, a Parsee in the beginning of his prayers repents for those errors. He says:

"O Omniscient Lord! I repent of all my sins. I repent of all evil thoughts that I might have entertained in my mind, of all the evil words that I might have spoken, of all the evil actions that I might have committed. O Omniscient Lord! I repent of all the faults that might have originated with me, whether they refer to thoughts, words, or deeds, whether they appertain to my body or soul, whether they be in connection with the material world or spiritual."

To educate their children is a spiritual duty of Zoroastrian parents. Education is necessary, not only for the material good of children and the parents, but also for their spiritual good. According to the Parsee books, the parents participate in the meritoriousness of the good acts performed by their children as the result of the good education imparted to them. On the other hand, if the parents neglect the education of their children, and if, as the result of this neglect, they do wrongful acts or evil deeds, the parents have a spiritual responsibility for such acts. In proportion to the malignity or evilness of these acts the parents are responsible to God for their neglect of the education of their children. It is, as it were, a spiritual self-interest that must prompt a Parsee to look to the good education of his children at an early age. Thus, from a religious point of view, education is a great question with the Parsees.

The proper age recommended by religious Parsee books for ordinary education is seven. Before that age, children should have home education with their parents, especially with the mother. At the age of seven, after a little religious education, a Parsee child is invested with Sudreh and Kusti, i.e., the sacred shirt and thread. This ceremony of investiture corresponds to the confirmation ceremony of the Christians. A Parsee may put on the dress of any nationality he likes, but under that dress he must always wear the sacred shirt and thread. These are the symbols of his being a Zoroastrian. These symbols are full of meaning, and act as perpetual monitors, advising the wearer to lead a life of purity—of physical and spiritual purity. A Parsee is enjoined to remove and put on again immediately, the sacred thread several times during the day, saying a very short prayer during the process. He has
to do so early in the morning on rising from bed, before meals and after ablutions. The putting on of the symbolic thread and the accompanying short prayer remind him to be in a state of repentance for misdeeds if any, and to preserve good thoughts, good words, and good deeds, the triad in which the moral philosophy of Zoroaster moved.

It is after this investiture with the sacred shirt and thread that the general education of a child generally begins. The Parsee books speak of the necessity of educating all children, whether male or female. Thus female education claims as much attention among the Parsees as male education. Physical education is as much spoken of in the Zoroastrian books as mental and moral education. The health of the body is considered as the first requisite for the health of the soul. That the physical education of the ancient Persians, the ancestors of the modern Parsees, was a subject of admiration among the ancient Greeks and Romans is too well known. In all the blessings invoked upon one in the religious prayers, the strength of body occupies the first and the most prominent place. Analyzing the Bombay Census of 1881, Dr. Weir, the Health Officer, said:

"Examining education according to faith or class, we find that education is most extended among the Parsee people; female education is more diffused among the Parsee population than any other class. **Contrasting these results with education at an early age among Parsees, we find 12.2 per cent. Parsee male and 8.84 per cent. female children, under six years of age, under instruction; between six and fifteen the number of Parsee male and female children under instruction is much larger than in any other class. Over fifteen years of age the smallest proportion of illiterate, either male or female, is found in the Parsee population."

The religious books of the Parsees say that the education of Zoroastrian youths should teach them perfect discipline, obedience to their teachers, obedience to their parents, obedience to their elders in society, and obedience to the constitutional forms of government should be one of the practical results of their education. So a Zoroastrian child is asked to be affectionate toward and submissive to his teachers. A Parsee mother prays for a son that could take an intelligent part in the deliberations of the councils of his community and government; so a regard for the regular forms of government was necessary.
Of all the practical questions the one most affected by
the religious precepts of Zoroastrianism is that of the
observation of sanitary rules and principles. Several
chapters of the Vendidad form, as it were, the sanitary
code of the Parsees. Most of the injunctions will stand
the test of sanitary science for ages together. Of the
different Asiatic communities inhabiting Bombay the
Parsees have the lowest death-rate. One can safely say
that that is, to a great extent, due to the Zoroastrian ideas
of sanitation, segregation, purification, and cleanliness. A
Parsee is enjoined not to drink from the same cup or glass
from which another man has drunk, lest he catch, by
contagion, the disease from which the other may be suffer-
ing. He is, under no circumstances, to touch the body of
person a short time after death, lest he spread the disease,
if contagious, of the deceased. If he accidentally or una-
voidably does, he has to purify himself by a certain process
of washing before he mixes with others in society. A
passing fly, or even a blowing wind, is supposed to spread
disease by contagion. So he is enjoined to perform ablutions
several times during the day, as before saying his
prayers, before meals, and after answering the calls of
nature. If his hand comes into contact with the saliva
of his own mouth or with that of somebody else, he has
to wash it. He has to keep himself aloof from corpse-
bearers, lest he spread any disease through them. If
accidentally he comes into contact with these people, he has
to bathe himself before mixing in society. A breach of
these and various other sanitary rules is, as it were, help-
ing the cause of the Evil Principle.

Again, Zoroastrianism asks its disciples to keep the
earth pure, to keep the air pure, and to keep the water
pure. It considers the sun as the greatest purifier. In
places where the rays of the sun do not enter, fire over
which fragrant wood is burnt, is the next purifier. It is
a great sin to pollute water by decomposing matter. Not
only is the commission of a fault of this kind a sin, but
also the omission, when one sees such a pollution, of tak-
ing proper means to remove it. A Zoroastrian, when he
happens to see, while passing in his way, a running stream
of drinking water polluted by some decomposing matter,
such as a corpse, is enjoined to wait and try his best to
go into the stream and to remove the putrefying matter,
least its continuation may spoil the water and affect the health of the people using it. An omission to do this act is a sin from a Zoroastrian point of view. At the bottom of a Parsee's custom of disposing of the dead, and at the bottom of all the strict religious ceremonies enjoined therewith lies the one main principle, viz., that, preserving all possible respect for the dead, the body, after its separation from the immortal soul, should be disposed of in a way the least harmful and the least injurious to the living. The homely proverb of "cleanliness is godliness" is nowhere more recommended than in the Parsee religious books, which teach that the cleanliness of the body will lead to and help the cleanliness of mind.

We now come to the question of wealth, poverty and labor. As Herodotus said, a Parsee, before praying for himself, prays for his sovereign and for his community, for he is himself included in the community. His religious precepts teach him to drown his individuality in the common interests of his community. He is to consider himself as a part and parcel of the whole community. The good of the whole will be the good—and that a solid good—of the parts. In the twelfth chapter of the Yasna, which contains, as it were, Zoroastrian articles of faith, a Zoroastrian promises to preserve a perfect brotherhood. He promises, even at the risk of his life, to protect the life and the property of all the members of his community, and to help in the cause that would bring about their prosperity and welfare. It is with these good feelings of brotherhood and charity that the Parsee community has endowed large funds for benevolent and charitable purposes. If the rich Parsees of the future generations were to follow in the footsteps of their ancestors of the past and present generations in the matter of giving liberal donations for the good of the deserving poor of their community, one can say that there would be very little cause for the socialists to complain from a poor man's point of view. It is these notions of charity and brotherhood that have urged them to start public funds for the general good of the whole community. Men of all grades in society contribute to these funds on various occasions. The rich contribute on occasions both of joy and grief. On grand occasions like those of weddings in their families, they contribute large sums in charity to commemorate those
events. Again, on the death of their dear ones, the rich and the poor all pay various sums, according to their means, in charity. These sums are announced on the occasion of the Oothumna, or the ceremony on the third day after death. The rich pay large sums on these occasions to commemorate the names of their dear ones. In the Vendidad three kinds of charitable deeds are especially mentioned as meritorious: To help the poor; to help a man to marry and thus to enable him to lead a virtuous and honorable life, and to give education to those who are in search of it. If one were to look to the long list of Parsee charities, headed by that of that prince of Parsee charity, the first Parsee baronet, he will find these three kinds of charity especially attended to. The religious training of a Parsee does not restrict his ideas of brotherhood and charity to his own community alone. He extends his charity to non-Zoroastrians as well.

The qualifications of a good husband, from a Zoroastrian point of view, are that he must be (1) young and handsome; (2) strong, brave and healthy; (3) diligent and industrious, so as to maintain his wife and children; (4) truthful, as would prove true to herself; and true to all others with whom he would come in contact, and wise and educated. A wise, intelligent and educated husband is compared to a fertile piece of land which gives a plentiful crop, whatever kind of seeds are sown in it. The qualifications of a good wife are that she be wise and educated, modest and courteous, obedient and chaste. Obedience to her husband is the first duty of a Zoroastrian wife. It is a great virtue, deserving all praise and reward. Disobedience is a great sin, punishable after death.

According to the Sad-dar, a wife that expressed a desire to her husband three times a day—in the morning, afternoon and evening—to be one with him in thoughts, words and deeds, i. e., to sympathize with him in all his noble aspirations, pursuits and desires, performed as meritorious an act as that of saying her prayers three times a day. She must wish to be of the same view with him in all his noble pursuits and ask him every day, “What are your thoughts, so that I may be one with you in those thoughts? What are your words, so that I may be one with you in your speech? What are your deeds, so that I may be one with you in deeds?” A Zoroastrian wife so
affectionate and obedient to her husband was held in great respect, not only by the husband and the household, but in society as well. As Dr. West says, though a Zoroastrian wife was asked to be very obedient to her husband, she held a more respectable position in society than that enjoined by any other Oriental religion. As Sir John Malcolm says, the ordinance of Zoroaster secured for Zoroastrian women an equal rank with the male creation. The progress of the ancient Persians in civilization was partly due to this cause. “The great respect in which the female sex was held was, no doubt, the principal cause of the progress they had made in civilization. These were at once the cause of generous enterprise and its reward.” The advance of the modern Parsis, the descendants of the ancient Persians, in the path of civilization is greatly due to this cause. As Dr. Haug says, the religious books of the Parsis hold women on a level with men. “They are always mentioned as a necessary part of the religious community. They have the same religious rites as men: the spirits of deceased women are invoked as well as those of men.” Parsee books attach as much importance to female education as to male education.

Marriage is an institution which is greatly encouraged by the spirit of the Parsee religion. It is especially recommended in the Parsee scriptures on the ground that a married life is more likely to be happy than an unmarried one; that a married person is more likely to be able to withstand physical and mental afflictions than an unmarried person, and that a married man is more likely to lead a religious and virtuous life than an unmarried one. The following verse in the Gāthā conveys this meaning:

I say (these) words to you marrying brides and to you bridegrooms. Impress them in your mind! May you two enjoy the life of good mind by following the laws of religion. Let each one of you clothe the other with righteousness because then assuredly there will be a happy life for you.

An unmarried person is represented to feel as unhappy as a fertile piece of ground that is carelessly allowed to lie uncultivated by its owner (Vend. iii. 24). The fertile piece, when cultivated, not only adds to the beauty of the spot, but lends nourishment and food to many others round about. So a married couple not only add to their
own beauty, grace and happiness, but by their righteousness and good conduct are in a position to spread the blessings of help and happiness among their neighbors. Marriage being thus considered a good institution, and being recommended, by the religious scriptures, it is considered a very meritorious act for a Parsee to help his co-religionists to lead a married life (Vend. iv. 44). Several rich Parsees have, with this charitable view, founded endowment funds, from which young deserving brides are given small sums on the occasion of their marriage for the preliminary expenses of starting in married life.

Fifteen is the minimum marriageable age spoken of by the Parsee books. The parents have a voice of sanction or approval in the selection of wives and husbands. Mutual friends of parents or marrying parties may bring about a good selection. Marriages with non-Zoroastrians are not recommended, as they are likely to bring about quarrels and dissensions owing to a difference of manners, customs and habits.

We said above that the Parsee religion has made its disciples tolerant about the faiths and beliefs of others. It has as well made them sociable with the other sister communities of the country. They mix freely with members of other faiths and take a part in the rejoicings of their holidays. They also sympathize with them in their griefs and afflictions and in case of sudden calamities, such as fire, floods, etc., they subscribe liberally to alleviate their misery. From a consideration of all kinds of moral and charitable notions inculcated in the Zoroastrian scriptures, Francis Power Cobbe, in his “Studies, New and Old, of Ethical and Social Subjects,” says of the founder of the religion:

Should we in a future world be permitted to hold high converse with the great departed, it may chance that in the Bactrian sage who lived and taught almost before the dawn of history, we may find the spiritual patriarch, to whose lessons we have owed such a portion of our intellectual inheritance that we might hardly conceive what human belief would be now had Zoroaster never existed.
CHAPTER XVII.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

GREEK CHURCH CHARACTERISTICS, BY REV. P. PHIAMBOLIS, OF THE GREEK CHURCH, CHICAGO.

Most Honorable President Charles C. Bonney, Most Reverend John Henry Barrows and Very Honorable Ladies and Gentlemen:—At first I wish to beg your pardon if I make any mistakes, not being well versed in the English language. In coming here as a delegate to the religious congress I did not come to discuss Christianity and the Christian truths, nor the existence of a God, because I think I would attack your Christian conscience. All the Christian delegates of this parliament have spoken enough of Christianity and the existence of a God, and I think a repetition of it would be vain labor.

I did not come to teach you to become Christians, because you are Christians, perhaps, with a small exception of non-Christian hearers. I did not come to teach you to believe in one God, Father God, God without beginning and end, God eternal, immaterial, personal, living God, omnipotent Saint, just, almighty, provider, God of Mercy, God of Love, God creator of every being, creator of Heaven and Earth, invisible, incomprehensible, intellectual, God having mind, and where there is a mind there is a word, and where there is a word there is a spirit, and consequently in a God of three persons there is the mind of the Father, the Word of the Son and the Spirit of the Holy Ghost.

I say I do not come to preach such a God, because you and every Christian believe. I do not come to discuss that the God of love and mercy sent his Son to earth, who took flesh from the blood of a holy virgin and became man—became man equal to us, but without sin; perfect God and perfect man mysteriously united in one person.

I do not come to teach you a new gospel, because our
gospel is always new. You know very well that its truths are unchangeable and eternal, the rudder of the action of every Christian, the guide for salvation. But I come into your presence as a representative of the truths of the Orthodox Church and to greet you with our love.

Let us see where is the truth and the righteousness in the philosophical systems? They have been proved unable to find the truth and satisfy the requests of the human hearts, and the results of those philosophical systems were a ridiculous polytheism, and humanity had been educated in desperation to find the truth, when a man of Judea preached, saying: "I am the Truth, I am the Light of the world, I will send to the world the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of the Truth, and He will say every truth." Now let us examine. Has that man said the truth? Two thousand years passed almost from that epoch, and all the nations who came in connection with His preaching say "yes," but let us continue to examine where this truth remained pure and clear and unmixed with some errors.

I read the Scriptures and I see that our Jesus Christ sent His Holy Ghost, the Spirit of the Truth, to all the disciples without exception. The Apostles were the first Christian Church with the Spirit of the Truth. But the Apostles sometimes disputed among themselves upon religious questions. They decided it, however, by leaving it to the apostles and elders of the Church. Has the Orthodox Church kept this example of the Apostles; namely, the discussion and the union after the decision? Let us look at the history of the Church. The Jews of Judea, according to the prophets, were waiting for a Messiah. When in the fullness of time a boy was born in Bethlehem, and when he was old enough to preach the kingdom of Heaven and that He was the Son of God, He met great opposition until He was crucified. After His resurrection His disciples continued the work of their teacher, and the subject of their teaching was the person of Jesus Christ, the crucified. St. Paul, an eminent and learned Jew, at first a persecutor of Christianity, finally became the chosen vessel of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ was to the Jews a scandal and to the Greek a foolishness. The apostles began at first their preaching among their compatriots, the Jews, but their followers were few. Then
they, and especially St. Paul, applied to the nations, and especially to the Greeks of Asia Minor; afterwards to the Thessalonians and Philippians, of Macedonia, to Athenians, Corinthians and, at last, to Romans, or to the Jews and Greeks of Rome.

Some Greek Christian churches had been established and for that reason the evangelists wrote their gospel in the Greek language, as other disciples did their epistles. I said above that Christianity met a great opposition. It was to fight against all the religions of that epoch: against the prejudices, the philosophical systems; it was to fight against tyranny, against all the world, and to conquer. The emperors of Rome armed themselves against it, and the weapon cut off tender and feeble creatures. But Christianity became the religion of the Roman states. Meanwhile the opposition continued under other shapes of false Christian philosophy, that is, the heresies, and it began to enter the enclosure of the Church under the shape of Truth and agitated the peace of the Church. Clouds of heresies troubled the ceremony of the Church, which cut them off by the weapon of the true doctrine, by the weapon of the Holy Ghost according to the example of the apostles, and they guarded the Christian doctrine far from any error. All these synods agreed about the Christian and evangelical truths and composed the Christian creed as it is to-day except the filioqua, which entered in the Church without the ecumenical decision at the ninth century. And the opinion of the whole Church was one, and they had true love of Jesus Christ and the truth of the Holy Ghost. In that time have been seen most eminent theologians, Christian philosophers and writers of the Christian doctrine, and the most of them took part in these synods.

Unfortunately the human interest, the human proud and politic, unknown to the United Church, entered at the ninth century the sacred inclosure of the Church, and a great schism and division followed between the east and the west. This division resulted in retarding Christianity and the progress of Mohammedanism, whose motto is "Kill the Infidels," because every one who is not a Mohammedan, according to the Koran of the Prophet, is an infidel, is a dog.

It is not my desire to speak about Turkish tyranny, but
I will say a few words concerning the Christian kings of Europe. The people of the Orient suffered and still suffer; Christian virgins are dishonored by the followers of the moral Prophet, and the life of a Christian is not considered as precious as that of a dog. But the kings of Europe, the Christian kings, thinking only of themselves and their interests, see from afar this barbarous state of affairs, but without sympathy, and for that reason I stated that politics had entered the Church.

Regarding the Orthodox Church, we are true to the examples of the apostles; we follow the same road in religious questions and after discussion do not accept new dogma without the agreement of the whole ecumenical Church; neither do we adopt any dogma other than that of the one united and undivided Church whose doctrine has been followed until to-day. The Orthodox Apostolic Catholic Church contains many different nations and every one of them uses its own language in the mass and litany, and governs its Church independently, but all these nations have the same faith. The patriarchs, metropolites, archbishops and bishops are all equal. There is no difference in their rank; freedom, fraternity and ceremony range between them. This is, in short, the Church which I represent. The Church which does not request the authority over other churches or mix itself in politics—the Church of the apostles who had the Spirit of truth. And can we say that the truth, far from any error, is not found in such a church?

In finishing this short exhibition of my Church, I raise my eyes on high and pray:

O, Thou Holy Ghost, the Spirit of the Truth, King of Kings, Thou who illuminated the Holy Apostles, Thou who illuminated Thy saints apostolic, Thy united and undivided Church and synods; O Thou Holy Ghost who illuminates every man coming into the world; Thou who illuminated Columbus the hero to give the whole continent to humanity; Thou who illuminated this glorious people of America to fight against slavery and for freedom and they conquered; Thou who illuminated the eminent Presidents of this Religious Congress from which an immense light will be spread over all the world, that great benevolences for the Gospel and humanity are expected; O Thou Holy Ghost, hear my humble prayer and grant us that all men of the earth may become one flock under one Shepherd, and that our Jesus Christ the only head of the Church.
CHAPTER XVIII.

THE SYNTHETIC RELIGION.

SYNTHETIC RELIGION, BY KINZA KINGEM, HIRAI OF JAPAN.

The primitive age of humanity was like the hypothetical epoch of nebula. No particular star of wisdom illuminated the mental universe of dim, cloudy expansion, and no special beam of love kept warm the shivering heart. But right in the heavens, above those spots where the hazy human mind's indissoluble mist crystallized into a condensed form, the brilliant suns of religion appeared shining with resplendent luster. One sparkles still over the blue vault in the Persian forest, while the two brightest flashing from the sky of India and, throwing their glittering light over the Oriental wilderness, tinge with crimson hue the white face of the snow on the purple Himalayas. One or more isolated luminaries glance toward the western seas from among the clouds hovering over the fan-shaped Fujinoyama pendant from the empyrean of sunland. Several in the celestial expanse of the flowery kingdom and in the horizons of the Arabian desert, with many others here and there, vie with one another in their splendor in the vast cosmic sphere. One—"the star of the east"—flashing first with unwonted splendor over the Mount of Olives, gradually traveled toward the European firmament and on to the skies of the new world of America.

In historical ages each one of these suns, by its rapidity of revolution, or by chaotic concussion, crumbled into small fragments of sects, many of which since have discharged their heat and lost their effulgence on account of their diminutive size, and thus have produced many constellations of religion with their dependent stars, satellites and asteroids, as we see in the present age. In such times of violent shocks innumerable souls perish by the
sparks and flashes caused by the incandescent heat of impetuous excitement.

The age of concussion, however, has already passed, and all faiths are now desiring to face one another in order to blend their special rays; but unfortunately there are some obstacles against this ideal hope of friendship. The Occident and the Orient are attired in their own apparel and are speaking in their own tongues, which differ entirely from each other, and, in so far as the costumes of them are not stripped off and their languages are not translated, they will ever remain as strangers. There is still another impediment which is not of an external and physical nature but is of the most delicate quality deeply set at the bottom of each mind—the true heart of different religions, and until this central point comes to be well comprehended, one will persistently repel the other and not the slightest halo can be interchanged. Unless this essential nature is distinctly revealed and each comes to a better understanding of the other, there will never be the time of a grand union of the world’s religions.

Look over the mighty universe sprinkled over with luminous bodies. Some emit a dazzling luster and revolve from one point to another with the greatest momentum, while others shine so far away and so insignificantly that their quivering lights are scarcely visible. But, if by any means they could be approached, probably some fixed stars would be found among them. Heretofore we have had scholars who have investigated and compared the different religions, yet very few have discerned the true kernel or fixed star, but most of them have only discovered the outside discolored envelope of these teachings, just like the astronomers, who, through a telescope, have described the black spots on the face of the sun and certain unusual phases of the planets, but who never could prove their real substances, or, sometimes, a fragmentary piece of Scripture supplies the topic of criticism or discussion, like a small meteoric stone which is carefully analyzed and considered to be the essential part of the moon, the composition of which can hardly be determined by a single meteorite. Having the honor to be here with this great congress of religions, I consider it my duty to endeavor to discuss some few important points which are
apparently contradictory in different beliefs, so that they can be synthesized and fraternized.

The first question is: How can religions be synthesized? There are no two things exactly alike, and as long as we dwell upon dissimilarity nothing can be generalized. A certain attribute equally possessed by different things must be found in order to arrange them in one group under its head. The innumerable different living beings are thus classified into the animal kingdom, or the larger class of organism, and also all organic or inorganic bodies are brought under a still wider category of material substance. This very "apprehension of the one in many" is the only method by the application of which all beliefs of whatever source or phase they may be, are to be reconciled. In other words, as I hinted before, if the central truth common to all religions be disclosed, we can accomplish our aim.

What common traits are there contained in the various religions? To answer this question let me examine for a little while the nature of religion and set down its definition for your consideration. It is an idle conception to think that prayer and worship, with their more or less formal ceremonies, are the important characteristics of religion, for they are the mere outside paraphernalia and not the true substance which they envelop. According to my notion, religion has two forms in three stages. viz.: In the first or embryonic stage it is non-ceremonious; in the second or middle stage it is ceremonious, and in the last stage it is non-ceremonious again. That of the second stage is easily recognized as religion from its being ceremonious, but at the first and last stages no visible mark of it is observed, and hence by some the existence of religion is totally denied in these two periods. But I regard the minds of the rudest barbarians and the lower animals, who are generally said to have no religion, as belonging to the first stage, and those of a certain class of civilized people, who are considered unbelievers of religion, or who call themselves non-religionists, to the third stage. These two resemble each other on the outside, for both have the non-ceremonious feature, but the first is not yet clearly defined while the last is fully developed. The above statement will be found to be correct if the following definition of religion be admitted as correct.
Religion is a priori belief in an unknown entity, and no human being or lower animal can evade or resist this belief. Some one may argue that he does not believe anything unknown but relies upon knowledge and intellect. But what is knowledge other than the result known by intellect? To know by intellect means nothing else than to know by reasoning, which is the process of deriving conclusions from the two premises. But by what means are they known, and why are they relied upon as the unmistakable basis of the argument? They must be the results of the previous deductions or instructions which also were drawn from their own premises.

Thus, if we trace back in the same way and try to reach the true source of these premises, in every step of our task we confront more incomprehensible assumptions, and the farther we proceed the more we are enshrouded by the mystic cloud. Perhaps rather turning from the very verge of the present question, we will attempt to explain it by plunging into psychological queries, and will say that the foremost premises were imparted to us by the mental processes of pure logical activity. Still we are far from the point of understanding, for the ultimate impulse which caused the mental processes awaits in the background to be satisfactorily defined. Then we will bound into physical, chemical, physiological, and next into dynamic, and finally into atomic theories, which have the most distant relations with the original question; but entering into a deeper and wider and more generalized region, we are left entirely vague, acquiring not a single clew by which to escape entanglement. We can grasp nothing during infinite duration in this realm where any logical structure is shattered to pieces.

Shall we then reject these premises because they are inexplicable? No. We cannot syllogize without them. We cannot think, will and act without them. We must retain and rely upon them. We are forced to believe them as true without reasoning. If it is not by reasoning then what compels us to believe them as true? We do not know why and what for it is entirely beyond our reason. It is not the place where we say "we know," but we say only we believe something which we do not know. This is what I call a priori belief in an unknown entity.
This abstract definition does not cover all those faiths which are ordinarily understood as religions, for each of them has the central object or entity, be it the reason or truth expounded in Buddhism and other so-called atheistic doctrines, or be it the one God taught in Christianity or the material image or even the animal of idol and animal worship, none of which is conceivable, at least to its believers.

Let us examine the nature of the above mentioned entities. First. What is the reason or truth? It is cause and effect. What is cause and effect? If we go on to strive to reach the comprehension of them we shall enter into exactly the same condition of desperate uncertainty as when we attempt to know in vain the premises of our argument, and we must be satisfied to conclude that truth is an entity utterly incomprehensible. Some will argue that truth is a creation of God, but unfortunately, this proposition is self-inconsistent on its face, for it is true that God must have ever existed before he created anything. Who created this truth before the creations and what is the difference between this first truth and the second truth created by God? And again, to create truth is itself a truth. Therefore if there was no truth before, how could any truth be created without using a truth which must have been existent?

It may be admitted that there was no truth before its creation by God. Still, there is another contradiction, for no existence of truth or non-truth is already a truth, and who created this negative truth before the creation? It may be protested that as God is an absolute, finite, unlimited, unconditional and omnipotent power, he can create by the method which is entirely beyond our human intellect; but these attributes are incompatible with one another and nullify the very existence of God.

First. Creation implies relatively in comparison with non-creation and if God is creator, he loses the attribute of absolute which must not be relative. Also He is relative with the things created, or in other words, He is the relative cause in regard to the effect. Next, though the universe is unlimitedly wide and infinitely vast, yet the suns, moons and stars are conditionally created with certain form, heat, light, etc.; human beings are conditioned into a limited space of body with their finite power of in-
tellect, the limited length of nose, the relatively located eyes, ears and limbs: the lower animals are under still more limited mental capacity, with certain conditioned physical power and construction, destined to live in a conditional habitat, and all inorganic substances are still more finite, relatively limited and conditioned than the organic beings.

If we observe the other phenomena around us we shall see that the moon transforms its phase into many conditions within limited times; the sun gives its heat and light to us in different degrees according to the different conditions; the rain falls within finite locality and the sea rolls in great storms and sleeps in pacific calmness under certain conditions; the earthquake and volcanic eruptions occur under certain conditions in a limited place, by which and many other agencies operated from time immemorial, the present condition of the earth was conditioned as seen in the strata of the geological ages. If we are convinced that the creative mind must be conditioned, because if no condition is considered nothing can be designed, and also that the created universe is thus in the finite complexity of limited condition, we cannot think otherwise than that God is also limited, finite and conditional and cannot be infinite, absolute and omnipotent.

Here is another contradiction, not on the part of God, but on our side. If our human mind is unlimited and omnipotent, the question is at once settled, but so long as no one can deny that we are limited in our intelligence, we cannot prove the divine infiniteness. For, to ascertain the dimensions of a certain object we need a standard measure, and the number of times of its adjustment determines the extent. In the same way, to value the unlimited intellect of God with our limited standard, we must continue to compute to the end, of the unlimited; but as there is no end to the unlimited, we could not stop at any point, for when we cease in the middle we have not yet ascertained the unlimitedness. It is ridiculous when a person says a piece of lumber, say of 100 feet, is unlimited, stopping his measurement in the point of ten or twelve feet distance from the end. Therefore the unlimitedness of God is a contradictory conclusion, for our limited intellect does not go so far and stops at a certain
place and beyond that point we are not yet certain whether limited or unlimited.

Finally, as God is understood to have the above attributes, then the existence of such a God is itself an irreconcilable conception. Thus no one can prove logically the existence and attributes of God and every effort toward satisfactory evidence turns a stumbling-block. Here the definition of religion, which was set down before, well adjusts this question—*a priori* belief of an unknown entity.

Let us go a step farther and decide whether the belief in the gods of pantheism or idol worship will be in another predicament. If God has a personal or animal form, or is a material idol, this notion does not prevent the faith in him being compromised with the two preceding beliefs—truth and God—for he is presumed to have a wonderful power unknown to the believers. Thus the features of the above three faiths are very dissimilar on their exterior, yet, internally, all of their followers believe in the unknown entity. And if no one can verify its substantial nature by any testimonial evidence, where is the difference among them, each of which being invariably unknown? Here will be established a perfect union between atheism and theism, for I cannot consider from the previous argument that truth was created by God, or God is a different thing from truth, and can see but one entity—truth—the connecting link of cause and effect, the essence of phenomena.

If this is the same thing with God, the terms atheism and theism mean the same thing, or both are misnomers at the same time, for both believe in one unknown entity, a fountain from which our complex and mental phenomena and their consequent physical actions flow out, a base upon which the fabrics of science and philosophy are erected. This is not only the foundation of the intellect of human beings, but also of the lower animals, because though their mental faculties cannot be compared with ours, so far as they have even rudimentary mind, they must have this unconscious belief. Much more the human infants and wildest savages are not to be excepted from this natural conviction. In the last three cases they do not realize the existence of an unknown entity and a belief in it, but they cannot live without these, as a newly born child does not recognize the existence of its parents.
If the above inference is correct, we can conclude that whether a man is a religionist or a so-called non-religionist, whether he is a theist or atheist, whether a monotheist or pantheist, whether a scientist, philosopher, spiritualist, or materialist, a statesman or a lawyer, whether infant or adult, whether barbarian or beast, all beings of the human and animal kingdom have, consciously or unconsciously, a priori belief of an unknown One. That is, they are all believers of religion. And also we can conclude that all the religions in the world have one and the same center and are synthesized into one synthesized religion, or, if I may use the term, "entitism," which has been the inherent spirit of Japan, and is called satori or hotoke in Japanese. The apparent contradictions among them are only the different descriptions of the same thing, seen from different situations and different views, to be observed in the way to the termination.

The relation of Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Shintoism and all the other religions of the world and their believers is like that of many lines of different railroads and their passengers. Each starts from a different point and direction, passing through different country scenes, but the final destiny is the one and the same world's fair, which will also be differently viewed by the mental situation of the visitors. Do not dispute about the distinctions of the different lines of railroad. The world's fair is not in the trains and cars, but it is in Chicago, right before you. You are in the fair. Stop your debate about the difference of religion. Kill Gautama—he is only a conductor of the train; burn his scripture—truth is not in it, but right before you. You are in truth. Do not mind Christ—he is only a brakeman. Tear up the Bible—God is not in it, but right before you. You are in God.

This synthesis of all faiths is no more a vain hope. If it were ever so thought, it is now known that this apparent dream was not Utopian, but a mirage refracted from a remote reality. Could I but have for a few moments the clairvoyant vision of the seer and peer into the deep and subtle minds of the great men and women who are here assembled, I should discover one aim and one object common to them all—the desire in love to help and teach the others, but I should also find a mental conception and
hope in regard to this parliament as different in each mind as the faces of these members vary from one another.

It is the dream of the Christian representatives that in assembling together these great men from China, from India, from Europe, from South America, from Japan and the islands of the sea, they will, for the first time, behold with understanding the bloody cross of Christ, and will enroll under the banner of the humble Nazarene, and the Christian representative is right, but there is something more.

It was the dream of the Buddhist that the clear and pure enlightenment of Gautama might be explained and comprehended by the student of the west, and the Buddhist representative is right; but there is something more.

It was the dream of the representative from the land of the star and crescent, and all those Moslems who pray to Allah with their faces toward Mecca, that some recognition should be held out to them as a powerful and aggressive faith which has earned its right of place among the accepted religions of the world, and the representative of Mohammed is right; but there is something more.

The clean Parsee, purified by fire, standing almost alone to-day under the untarnished flag of Zoroaster, still hopes and dreams of a revival of his faith by the influence of this parliament of religions, and he is right; but there is something more.

Members of this great auxiliary assembly, there is a surprise awaiting you. The lamb and the lion shall lie down together. Looking more intently, some of us behold a strange thing—the paradox, the anomaly—the Christian a Buddhist and the Buddhist a Christian; the Moslem a Parsee and the Parsee a Moslem. The grand, far-reaching result to grow out of this parliament is not what you conceive, but, as I said before, a surprise awaits you. Out of it shall come a pure being—unfettered, naked, white, with eyes like Christ and dignity like Buddha, bearing the rewards of Zoroaster and the flaming sword of Moslem. To her the Jew bows his head, the Christian kneels, the Brahman prays; before her the habiliments of sects and creeds fall off, for she is pure and naked—she is the one truth resurrected from the mingled heart and interchanged mind of the world's great parliament of religions.
CHAPTER XIX.

Religion and Wealth.

RELIGION AND WEALTH, BY REV. WASHINGTON GLADDEN,
D. D.

Religion and wealth are two great interests of human life. Are they hostile or friendly? Are they mutually exclusive or can they dwell together in unity? In a perfect social state what would be their relations?

What is religion? Essentially it is the devout recognition of a supreme power. It is belief in a creator, a sovereign, a father of men, with some sense of dependence upon him and obligation to him. The religious life is the life according to God, the life whose keynote is harmony with the divine nature and conformity to the divine will. What will the man who is living this kind of a life think about wealth? How will his religion affect his thoughts about wealth? If all men were in this highest sense of the word religious, should we have wealth among us?

To answer this question intelligently we must first define wealth. The economists have had much dispute over the word, but for our purposes we may safely define wealth as consisting in exchangeable goods. All products, commodities, rights which men desire and which in this commercial age can be exchanged for money, we may include under this term. But the question before us has in view the abundance, the profusion of exchangeable goods now existing in all civilized nations. There is vastly more in the hands of the men of Europe and America to-day than suffices to supply their immediate physical necessities. Vast stores of food, of fuel, of clothing and ornament, of luxuries of all sorts, millions of costly homes, filled with all manner of comforts and adornments, enormous aggregations of machinery for the production and transportation of exchangeable goods—
these are a few of the signs of that abundance toward which our thought is now directed.

Our question is whether, if all men lived accordingly to God, in perfect harmony with his thought, in perfect conformity with his will, the world would contain such an abundance of exchangeable goods as that which we now contemplate?

This is a question which the devout have long debated. Through long periods and over wide eras the prevalent conception of religion has involved the renunciation of riches. The life of the pious Brahman culminates in mendicancy; he reaches perfection only when he rid himself of all the goods of this world.

Buddhism does not demand of all devotees the ascetic life, but its eminent saints adopt this life, and poverty is regarded as the indispensable condition of the highest sanctity. The sacred order founded by Gautama was an order of mendicants. Three garments of cotton cloth, made from cast-off rags, are the monk's whole wardrobe, and the only additional possessions allowed him are a girdle for the loins, an almsbowl, a razor, a needle and a water strainer. The monastic rule has had wide vogue, however, in Christian communions, and great numbers of saintly men have adopted the rule of poverty. Many of the early Christian fathers use very strong language in denouncing the possession of wealth as essentially irre- ligious.

The corner-stone of monasticism is the sanctity of poverty. It is not too much to say that for ages the ideal of saintliness involved the renunciation of wealth. Nor is this notion confined to the monastic ages or the monastic communities. There are many good Protestants, even in these days, who feel that there is an essential incompatibility between the possession of wealth and the attainment of a high degree of spirituality.

Doubtless the ascetic doctrine respecting wealth finds support in certain texts in the New Testament. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God." "Whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath he cannot be my disciple."

It will not be difficult for the student to find other words of Jesus relating to the possession and use of the good
things of this world in which the subject is placed in a different light. The fact that several rich men are mentioned as friends of Jesus must also be taken into consideration. The ascetic doctrine with regard to wealth cannot, I think, be clearly drawn from the New Testament. Nevertheless this doctrine has greatly influenced the thought, not the life, of the Christian Church.

This feeling has been strengthened also by the many abuses of wealth. How grave these abuses have always been I need not try to tell; it is the most threadbare of truisms. Love of money, in Paul’s words, has been a root of all kinds of evil. The desire of wealth is the parent of pride and extortion and cruelty and oppression; it is the minister of treason and corruption and bribery in the commonwealth; it is the purveyor of lust and debauchery; it is the instigator of countless crimes.

It is in these abuses of wealth, doubtless, that devout men have found the chief reason for their skepticism concerning it and their renunciation of it. It is often difficult for ardent and strenuous souls to distinguish between use and abuse. What is the truth in this case? Do the authorities rightly interpret the will of God? Is their manner of life the perfect life? Would God be better pleased with men if they had no possessions beyond the supply of the actual needs of the hour?

The earth’s riches are simply the development of the earth’s resources. It is plain that these material resources of the earth readily submit themselves to this process of development under the hand of man. Is it not equally plain that these processes of development have followed, for the most part, natural laws; that these grains and fruits and roots and living creatures have simply been aided by man in fulfilling the law of their own life?

In order that men may reach intellectual and spiritual perfection there must be opportunity for study, for meditation, for communion with Nature. There must be time and facilities for travel, that the products and thoughts of all climes may be studied and compared; that human experience may be enlarged and human sympathies broadened and deepened. It is no more possible that humanity should attain its ideal perfection in poverty than that maize should flourish in Greenland.
If, then, the material wealth of the world consists simply in the development of powers with which Nature has been stocked by the Creator, and if this development is the necessary condition of the perfection of man, who is made in the image of God, it is certain that in the production of wealth, in the multiplication of exchangeable utilities, man is a co-worker with God.

So much has religion to say concerning the production of wealth. I am sure that the verdict of the religious consciousness on this part of the question must be clear and unaltering.

But there is another important inquiry. That wealth should exist is plainly in accordance with the will of God, but in whose hands? Religion justifies the production of wealth; what has religion to say about its distribution? The religious man must seek to be a co-worker with God, not only in the production, but also in the distribution of wealth. Can we discover God's plan for this distribution?

It is pretty clear that the world has not as yet discovered God's plan. The existing distribution is far from being ideal. While tens of thousands are rioting in superfluity, hundreds of thousands are suffering for the lack of the necessaries of life; some are even starving. That the suffering is often due to indolence and improvidence and vice—a natural penalty which ought not to be set aside—may be freely admitted, but, when that is all taken account of, there is a great deal of penury left which it is hard to justify in view of the opulence everywhere visible.

What is the rule by which the wealth of the world is now distributed? Fundamentally, I think, it is the rule of the strongest. The rule has been greatly modified in the progress of civilization; a great many kinds of violence are now prohibited; in many ways the weak are protected by law against the encroachments of the strong; human rapacity is confined within certain metes and bounds; nevertheless, the wealth of the world is still, in the main, the prize of strength and skill. Our laws furnish the rules of the game, but the game is essentially as Rob Roy describes it. To every one according to his power is the underlying principle of the present system of distribution. It is evident, that under such a system,
in spite of legal restraints, the strong will trample upon the weak. We cannot believe that such a system can be in accordance with the will of a Father to whom the poor and needy are the especial objects of care.

A striking illustration of the fact that this is the fundamental principle of the existing industrial order is seen in the recent occupation of the Cherokee lands. Our government had a little property to distribute. And on what principle was the distribution made? Was the land divided among the neediest, or the worthiest, or the most learned, or the most patriotic? No; it was offered to the strongest. Only those of the toughest muscle and greatest powers of endurance had any chance in the mêlée. The government stood by to prevent the competitors, so far as possible, from killing or maiming one another in the scramble; it tried to enforce the rules of the game; but the game was essentially a contest of strength.

What other rule of distribution can religion suggest? Let us quote a few comprehensive words from Dr. Newman Smyth: “Three socialistic principles have been proposed; to every one alike; to every one according to his needs; to every one according to his work. But would either be a sufficient ethical distribution? What under perfect economic conditions would be an ideal distribution of goods? The first principle of distribution, to all alike, would itself occasion an unequal distribution, because all have not equal needs, or the same capacity for reception and ability to use what is received; heaven can do no communism; every cup will be filled, but there may be differences in the sizes of the cups. The second principle may be charitable but it is not just, as needs are no standard either of service rendered or true desert. The third may be just, but it is not merciful. In a perfect distribution of good, justice, mercy and regard for possible use may be combined.”

These words bring clearly before us the problem of distribution. I think that we can see that none of these methods, taken by itself, would furnish a rule in perfect harmony with divine justice and benignity. The communistic rule is clearly unjust and impracticable. Thus to give to all an equal portion would be wasteful in the extreme, for some could by no possibility use their portion; much of it would be squandered and lost. Some could use productively and beneficently ten times or even
The Divine wisdom must follow somewhat closely the rule of the man in the parable who distributed his goods among his servants, giving "to every man according to his several ability." But ability here is not ability to take, but ability to use beneficently and productively, which is a very different matter.

The ability of men productively and beneficently to use wealth is by no means equal: often those who have most power in getting it show little wisdom in using it. One man could handle with benefit to himself and fellows $100,000 a year; another could not handle $1,000 a year without doing both to himself and his fellows great injury. If the function of wealth under the Divine order is the development of manhood, then it is plain that an equal distribution of it would be altogether inadmissible; for under such a distribution some would obtain far less than they could use with benefit and others far more.

The socialistic maxims: "To each according to his needs" and "To each according to his worth," are evidently ambiguous. What needs? The needs of the body or of the spirit? And how can we assure ourselves that by any distribution which we could effect real needs would be supplied? Any distribution according to supposed needs would be constantly perverted. It is impossible for us to ascertain and measure the real needs of men.

"To each according to his works" is equally uncertain. What works? Works of greed or works of love? Works whose aim is sordid or works whose aim is social? According to the divine plan the function of wealth, as we have seen, is the perfection of character and the promotion of social welfare. The Divine plan must, therefore, be that wealth shall be so distributed as to secure the greatest results. And religion, which seeks to discern and follow the divine plan, must teach that the wealth of the world will be rightly distributed, only when every man shall have as much as he can wisely use to make himself a better man, and the community in which he lives a better community—so much and no more.

It is obvious that the divine plan is yet far from realization. Other and far less ideal methods of distribution are recognized by our laws, and it would be folly greatly to change the laws until radical changes have taken place in human nature.
CHAPTER XX.

THE MOHAMMEDANS.

THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL CONDITION, BY MOHAMMED ALEXANDER WEBB.

One of the greatest mistakes the follower of any religion can make is to form and express a positive opinion of the moral effects of another religious system from the general conduct of those who profess to follow it, and, at the same time, to ignore the faults and weaknesses of those who are within the fold of his own faith. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that among the masses of believers religious prejudice is so strong as to prevent the exercise of a calm and just discrimination in the examination of an opposing creed.

It would be neither just nor truthful to assert that every man who lives in an American city, town or village is a Christian and represents in his acts and words the natural effects of Christian teachings. Nor is it fair to judge the Islamic system in a similar manner, and yet I regret to say that it is quite generally done in Europe and in America. There are in Asia to-day many thousands of people who call themselves Mussulmans and yet who have a no more truthful conception of the character and teachings of Mohammed than they have of the habits of the man in the moon. If one or a dozen of these should commit an act of brutal intolerance or fanaticism would it be just to say that it was due to the inevitable tendencies of their religion?

There are several reasons why Islam and the character of its followers are so little understood in Europe and America, and one of these is that when a man adopts, or says he adopts, Islam, he becomes known as a Mussulman and his nationality becomes merged in his religion. As soon as a Hindu embraces Islam his character disappears.
If a Mohammedan, Turk, Egyptian, Syrian or African commits a crime the newspaper reports do not tell us that it was committed by a Turk, an Egyptian, a Syrian or an African, but by a Mohammedan. If an Irishman, an Italian, a Spaniard or a German commits a crime in the United States we do not say that it was committed by a Catholic, a Methodist or a Baptist, nor even a Christian; we designate the man by his nationality. There are thousands of men in the prisons of our country whose religious belief, if they have any, is rarely or never referred to. We do not refer to them as Christians simply because their parents attended a Christian church, or they themselves had a church membership at some time in the remote past. But, just as soon as a native of the east is arrested for a crime or misdemeanor, he is registered as a representative of the religion his parents followed or which he has adopted.

We should only judge of the inherent tendencies of a religious system by observing carefully and without prejudice its general effects upon the character and habits of those who are intelligent enough to understand its basic principles, and who publicly profess to teach or follow it. If we find that their lives are clean and pure and full of love and charity, we may fairly say that their religion is good. If we find them given to hypocrisy, dishonesty, uncharitableness and intolerance, we may safely infer that there is something wrong with the system they profess.

In forming our estimate of a religion we should also calmly analyze its fundamental and consider the racial and climatic influences that surround its followers as well as their national habits and customs.

I take it that we all desire to know the truth and that we are willing to have our attention called to the fact if we make a mistake in our estimate of our neighbor's religion. That was the sentiment that possessed me ten years ago, when I began the study of the Oriental religions, and I hope that it largely influences the minds of all who hear me to-day.

Another of the most potent reasons for the unfavorable opinion of Islam and its professed followers which prevails in America and Europe to-day, is the disposition of the people of the West to judge the people of the East
by our Western standard of civilization. We of the West believe that our wonderful progress in the arts and sciences, and the perfection of those means by which our physical comfort and pleasure are secured, gives us just cause to feel superior to those who do not bask in the sunshine of our nineteenth century civilization. In a general way, and with some few exceptions, perhaps, we consider our social system admirable, and when we find that many Mohammedans, Buddhists, Hindus, and other Eastern people do not join with us in this opinion, we console ourselves with the belief that it is because they are heathen and incapable of recognizing and appreciating a good thing when they see it. It would, undoubtedly, surprise some of my hearers to know what many of the more intelligent Mussulmans and Hindus of India think of this civilization of ours of which we are so proud.

There is a class of Mussulmans and Hindus and Buddhists in the East, with whom the Western missionaries rarely come in contact, and when they do there is no discussion of religious doctrines because these "heathen" have learned by experience that it is worse than a waste of time to argue over such matters. But generally they are men of profound learning, who speak English as fluently as they do the Oriental tongues, and who are well versed in all the known systems of religion and philosophy. It will probably surprise many people here to know that nearly all the more intelligent and highly educated Mussulmans of India are quite as well informed as to the history and doctrines of the other religious systems as they are concerning their own.

We Mussulmans firmly believe that the teachings of Moses, Abraham, Jesus and Mohammed were substantially the same; that the followers of each truly inspired Prophet have always corrupted and added, more or less, to the system he taught, and have drifted into materialistic forms and ceremonies; that the true spirit has often been sacrificed to what may, perhaps, be called the weak conceptions of fallible humanity.

In order to realize the influence of Islam upon social conditions, and to comprehend and appreciate the teachings of Mohammed, his whole life and apparent motives must be inspected and analyzed carefully and without
prejudice. In view of the very unsatisfactory and contradictory nature of much that has been written in English concerning him, we must learn to read between the lines of so-called history. When we have done this we will find that the ethics he taught are identical with those of every other prominent religious system. That is to say, he presented the very highest standard of morality, established a system of worship calculated to produce the best results among all classes of his followers, and made aspiration to God the paramount purpose of life.

Like every other truly inspired teacher, he showed that there were two aspects or divisions of the spiritual knowledge he had acquired—one for the masses who were so thoroughly occupied with the affairs of this world that they had only a very small portion of their time to devote to religion, and the other for those who were capable of comprehending the higher spiritual truths and realized that it was better to lay up treasures for the life to come than to enjoy the pleasures of this world. But his purpose, clearly, was to secure the most perfect moral results by methods applicable to all kinds and conditions of humanity.

In analyzing the hades or sayings of the Prophet, aside from the Koran, we should always bear in mind the social conditions prevalent among the Arabs at the time he taught, as well as the general character of the people. Presuming that Mohammed was truly inspired by the supreme spirit, it is quite reasonable to suppose that he used quite different methods of bringing the truth to the attention of the Arabs 1,200 years ago than he would follow before an audience of intelligent, educated people, such as sits before me in this nineteenth century.

Before proceeding further I desire to explain that, in order to show clearly the influence of Islam upon social conditions, it will be necessary to make some comparisons between the habits and customs in Mussulman communities and in the cities and towns of Europe and America where Christianity is the prevailing religion. In doing this I have no intention to reflect upon the latter nor give offense to any of its followers. My purpose is to show, as lucidly and distinctly as possible, a side of the Islamic faith which is quite familiar to my fellow countrymen and which is the life of the Moslem social fabric.
There are a number of objections to Islam raised by western people which I would like to reply to fully, but the very limited time allotted to me prevents my doing so. I can only enter a general denial, and trust to time and the earnest, honest efforts of some of those who hear me to prove the truth of what I say. Nearly, if not quite all, the objections I refer to have their birth and growth in ignorance of the vital principles of Islam.

The chief objection and the first one generally made is polygamy. It is quite generally believed that polygamy and the Purdah, or exclusion of females, is a part of the Islamic system. This is not true. There is only one verse in the Koran which can possibly be distorted into an excuse for polygamy and that is, practically, a prohibition of it. Only the other day I read a communication in a church newspaper, written by a well-known clergyman who said that the Koran required the Sultan of Turkey to take a new wife every year. There is no such requirement in the Koran and what surprised me most was that such an intelligent, well-educated man as the writer should make that statement. I am charitable enough to admit that he made it through ignorance. I never met but two Mussulmans in my life who had more than one wife. There is nothing in the sayings of the Prophet nor in the Koran warranting or permitting the Purdah. During the life of the prophet and the early caliphates, the Arabian women went abroad freely, and, what is more, were honored, respected and fully protected in the exercise of their right and privileges.

Islam has been called "The religion of the sword" and there are thousands of good people in America and Europe who really believe that Mohammed went into battle with the sword in one hand and the Koran in the other. This is rather a singular charge for Christian writers to make; but they do make it and very inconsistently and unjustly too.

The truth is that the Prophet never encouraged nor consented to the propagation of Islam by force and the Koran plainly forbids it. It says:

Let there be no forcing in religion; the right way has been made clearly distinguishable from the wrong one. If the Lord had pleased, all who are on the earth would have believed together; and wilt thou force men to be believers?
And in the second Sura, 258th verse, it says:

Let there be no compulsion in religion. Now is the right way made distinct from error; whoever, therefore, denieth Yaghoot (literally error) and believeth in God hath taken hold on a strong handle that hath no flaw. And God is He who heareth, knoweth.

Our Prophet himself was as thoroughly non-aggressive and peace-loving as the typical Shaker, and, while he realized that a policy of perfect non-resistance would speedily have resulted in the murder of himself and every Mussulman in Arabia, he urged his followers to avoid, as far as possible, violent collisions with the unbelievers and not to fight unless it was necessary in order to protect their lives. It can be shown, too, that he never in his life participated in a battle, and never had a sword in his hand for the purpose of killing or maiming a human being.

It has been charged that slavery is a part of the Islamic system in the face of the fact that Mohammed discouraged it, and the Koran forbids it, making the liberation of a slave one of the most meritorious acts a person can perform. But, in weighing the evidence bearing upon this subject, we should never lose sight of the social and political conditions prevalent in Arabia at the time the Prophet lived and the Koran was compiled.

It has also been said that Mohammed and the Koran denied a soul to woman and ranked her with the animals. The Koran places her on a perfect and complete equality with man and the Prophet's teachings often place her in a position superior to the males in some respects. Let me read you one passage from the Koran bearing upon the subject. It is the thirty-fifth verse of the thirty-third Sura:

Truly the men who resign themselves to God (Moslems)
And the women who resign themselves,
And the believing men,
And the believing women,
And the devout men,
And the devout women,
And the men of truth,
And the women of truth,
And the patient men,
And the patient women,
And the humble men,
And the humble women,
And the men who give alms,
And the women who give alms,
And the men who fast,
And the women who fast,
And the chaste men,
And the chaste women,
And the men and women who oft remember God,
For them hath God prepared forgiveness and a rich recompense.

Could anything have been written to emphasize more forcibly the perfect equality of the sexes before God? The property rights which American women have enjoyed for only a few years have been enjoyed by Mohammedan women for 1,200 years; and to-day there is no class of women in the world whose rights are so completely protected as those of the Mussulman communities.

And now, having endeavored to dispel some of the false ideas concerning Islam, which have been current in this country, let me show you briefly what it really is and what its natural effects are upon social conditions. Stated in the briefest manner possible, the Islamic system requires belief in the unity of God and in the inspiration of Mohammed. Its pillars of practice are physical and mental cleanliness, prayer, fasting, fraternity, alms-giving and pilgrimage. There is nothing in it that tends to immorality, social degradation nor fanaticism. On the contrary, it leads on to all that is purest and noblest in the human character; and any professed Mussulman who is unclean in his person or habits, or is cruel, untruthful, dishonest, irreverent or fanatical fails utterly to grasp the meaning of the religion he professes.

But there is something more in the system than the mere teaching of morality and personal purity. It is thoroughly practical, and the results, which are plainly apparent among the more intelligent Moslems, show how well the prophet understood human nature. It will not produce the kind of civilization that we Americans seem to admire so much, but it will make a man sober, honest and truthful, and will make him love his God with all his heart and all his mind, and his neighbor as himself.

Every Mussulman who has not become demoralized by contact with British civilization prays five times a day, not whenever he happens to feel like it, but at fixed periods. His prayer is not a servile, cringing petition for some material benefit, but a hymn of praise to the one in-
comprehensible, unknowable God, the omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent Ruler of the universe. He does not believe that by argument and entreaty he can sway the judgment and change the plans of God, but, with all the force of his soul, he tries to soar upward in spirit to where he can gain strength, to be pure and good and holy and worthy of the happiness of the future life. His purpose is to rise above the selfish pleasures of earth and strengthen his spirit wings for a lofty flight when he is at last released from the body.

Before every prayer he is required to wash his face, nostrils, mouth, hands and feet, and he does it. During youth he acquires the habit of washing himself five times a day, and this habit clings to him through life and keeps him physically clean. He comes in touch with his religion five times a day in a manner which produces results proportionate to the intelligence and spiritual development of the man. His religion is not a thing apart from his daily life, to be put on once a week and thrown aside when it threatens to interfere with his business or pleasure. It is a fixed and inseparable part of his existence and exerts a direct and potent influence on his every thought and act. Is it to be wondered at that his idea of civilization differs from that of the West? That it is less active and progressive, less grand and imposing and dazzling and noisy?

I will confess that when I went to live among the intelligent Mussulmans I was astonished beyond measure at the social conditions I encountered. I had acquired the idea that prevails generally in this country and Europe, and was prepared to find the professed followers of Islam selfish, treacherous, untruthful, intolerant, sensual, and fanatical. I was very agreeably disappointed. I saw the practical results of Islam manifested in honesty, truthfulness, sobriety, tolerance, gentleness, and a degree of true brotherly love that was a surprise to me. The evils that we Americans complain of in our social system—drunkenness, prostitution, marital infidelity, and cold selfishness—were almost entirely absent.

It is a significant fact that the Mussulmans who drink whisky and gamble are those who wear European clothing and imitate the appearance and habits of the Englishmen. I have never seen a drunken Mussulman nor one
who carried the odor of whisky or beer about with him. But I have heard that some of those who have become Anglicized and have broken away from the Moslem dress and customs actually do drink beer and whisky and smoke cigarettes.

I have been in mosques where from 500 to 3,000 Muslims were gathered to pray, and, at the conclusion of the prayer, I was hemmed in by a hundred of them who were eager to shake my hand and call me their brother. But I never detected those disagreeable odors which suggest the need of extended facilities for bathing. I have repeatedly called this fact to mind while riding on the elevated railways in New York and in two or three public assemblages in London.

Prostitution and marital infidelity, with scandalous newspaper reports of divorce proceedings, are quite impossible in a Muslim community where European influences have no foothold. A woman toiling over a wash-tub to support a drunken husband and several children, and a poor widow with her little ones turned into the streets for non-payment of rent are episodes that never occur where Islamic laws and customs prevail. Woman takes her place as man's honored and respected companion and helpmate, and is the mistress of her home whenever she is disposed to occupy that position. Her rights are accorded to her freely.

It is true that she does not attend public balls and receptions, wearing a dress that some people might consider immodest, and waste her health and jeopardize her marital happiness in the enervating dance—nor does her husband do so. She does not go to the theater, the circus, the races, nor other public gatherings in search of amusement, but finds her pleasure and recreation at home in the pure atmosphere of her husband's and children's love, and the peaceful, refining occupations of domestic life. Both she and her husband, as well as their children, are taught and believe that it is better to retire at nine, just after the prayer of the day, and arise before daybreak and say the morning prayer just as the first rays of the sun are gilding the eastern horizon.

Another feature of the Islamic social life that has impressed me is the utter absence of practical joking, or what is popularly known as "guying." There is little or
no sarcasm, bitter irony, cruel wit among the Mussulmans calculated to cause their fellows chagrin, shame, or annoyance, wounding the heart and breaking that bond of loving fraternity which should subsist between men. The almost universal disposition seems to be to cultivate unselfishness and patience, and to place as little value as possible upon the things of this world.

In the household of the true Mussulman there is no vain show, no labored attempt to follow servilely the fashions, including furniture and ornaments, in vogue in London and Paris. Plainness and frugality are apparent everywhere, the idea being that it is far better to cultivate the spiritual side of our nature than to waste our time and money trying to keep up appearances that we hope will cause our neighbors to think that we have more money than we really have, and are more aesthetic in our tastes than we really are.

"But," some one may say, "what about the story that a Mussulman believes that he will go directly to Paradise if he dies while trying to kill a Christian?"

This is one of the numerous falsehoods invented by enemies of the truth to injure as peaceful and non-aggressive a class of people as the world has ever seen. A traveler who has visited nearly all the Mohammedan countries said to me last week: "I would rather be alone in the dark woods and miles away from a town with one hundred Mussulmans than to walk half a dozen blocks in the slums of an English or American city after dark."

He also told me that while he was on a steamer at Constantinople, he gave a Turkish boatman a lira, or about five dollars, to buy him some fruit and cigarettes. The English passengers laughed at his credulity and assured him that he would never see his lira again. But just as the anchor was being raised the boatman returned bringing with him the fruit and cigarettes and the exact change.

In April last a lady at the Desbrosses Street ferry in New York, gave her cloak to a young man to hold while she purchased her ticket. She has not seen it since.

A Mussulman, if he is hungry and has no lodging place may walk into the house of a brother Mussulman and be sure of a cordial, hospitable welcome. He will be given a seat at the frugal meal and a place where he can spread
his sleeping mat. One of the best of Islamic social cus-
toms is hospitality. Many Mussulmans are glad to have 
the opportunity to give a home and food to a poor brother, 
believing that God has thus favored them with the means 
of making themselves more worthy to inherit paradise. 

The greeting: "Assalam Aleikum" (Peace be with 
thee), and the response: "Aleikum Salaam" (With thee 
be peace), have a true fraternal sound in them, calculated 
to arouse the love and respect of any one who hears them. 
In the slums of our American cities this summer there 
were hundreds of hungry, homeless people, while hun-
dreds of houses in the fashionable streets were closed and 
empty and their owners were living luxuriously at sum-
mer resorts. Such a state of affairs would be impossible 
in a purely Mussulman community.

I have seen it asserted that, under the Islamic system, 
a high state of civilization is impossible. Stanley Lane-
Poole writes as follows:

For nearly eight centuries under her Mohammedan 
rulers Spain set to all Europe a shining example of a 
civilized and enlightened state. Her fertile provinces 
rendered doubly prolific by the industry and engineering 
skill of her conquerors bore fruit in an hundred-fold. 
Cities innumerable sprang up in the rich valleys of the 
Guadalquivir, and Guadiana, whose names, and names only, 
still commemorate the vanquished glories of their past. 
Art, literature and science prospered as they then pros-
pered nowhere else in Europe. Students flocked from 
France and Germany and England to drink from the 
fountains of learning which flowed only in the cities of 
the Moors. The surgeons and doctors of Andalusia 
were in the van of science; women were encouraged to 
devote themselves to serious study and a lady doctor was 
not unknown among the people of Cordova. Mathemat-
ics, astronomy and botany, philosophy and jurisprudence 
were to be mastered in Spain and in Spain alone. The 
practical work of the field, the scientific methods of 
irrigation, the arts of fortification and ship-building, the 
highest and most elaborate products of the loom, the 
graver and the hammer, the potter's wheel and the 
mason's trowel were brought to perfection by Spanish 
lords. In the practice of war, no less than in the arts of 
peace, they long stood supreme. Whatsoever makes a
kingdom great and prosperous; whatsoever tends to refinement and civilization, was found in Moslem Spain.

And what has become of this grand civilization, traces of which we still see in some of the Spanish cities, and the splendid architecture of the Mogul emperors of India? It is to be seen here in Chicago, and in wherever there is a manifestation of materialistic progress and enlightenment.

So long as the pure teachings of the Prophet were followed, the Moslem development was pure and healthy and much more stable and admirable than the gaudy materialism that finally developed and brought with it utter ruin. True civilization—a civilization based upon purity, virtue and fraternal love—is the kind of civilization that exists to-day among the better classes of Mussulmans and brings with it a degree of contentment and happiness unknown amid the tumult of the western social system.

The devout Mussulman, one who has arrived at an intelligent comprehension of the true teachings of the Prophet, lives in his religion and makes it the paramount principle of his existence. It is with him in all his goings and comings during the day, and he is never so completely occupied with his business or worldly affairs that he cannot turn his back upon them when the stated hour of prayer arrives and present his soul to God. His love, his sorrows, his hopes, his fears are all immersed in it—it is his last thought when he lies down to sleep at night and the first to enter his mind at dawn, when the voice of the Muezzin sings out loudly and clearly from the minaret of the mosque, waking the soft echoes of the morn with its thrilling, solemn majestic monotones, "Come to prayer; prayer is better than sleep."
CHAPTER XXI.

SHINTOISM.

RT. REV. RENCHI SHIBATA, SHINTO BISHOP—(READ BY DR. BARROWS).

I feel very happy to be able to attend this Congress of Religions as a member of the Advisory Council and to hear the high reasonings and profound opinions of the gentlemen who come from various countries of the world. As for me it will be my proper task to explain the character of Shintoism, and especially of my Jikko sect.

The word Shinto or Kami-no-michi, comes from the two words “Shin” or “Kami,” each of which means Deity, and “to” or “michi” (way), and designates the way transmitted to us from our divine ancestors and in which every Japanese is bound to walk. Having its foundation in our old history, conforming to our geographical positions and the disposition of our people, this way, as old as Japan itself, came down to us with its original form and will last forever, inseparable from the Eternal Imperial House and the Japanese nationality.

According to our ancient scriptures there were a generation of Kami or Deities in the beginning, who created the heavens and the earth, together with all things, including human beings, and became the ancestors of the Japanese.

Jimmu-tenno, the grandson of Ninigi-no-mikoto, was the first of the human emperors. Having brought the whole land under one rule he performed great services to the divine ancestors, cherished his subjects, and thus discharged his great filial duty, as did all the emperors after him. So also all the subjects were deep in their respect and adoration toward the divine ancestors and the emperors, their descendants. Though in the course of time various doctrines and creeds were introduced into the country, Confucianism in the reign of the fifteenth emperor, Ojin, Buddhism in the reign of the twenty-ninth
emperor, Kimmei, and Christianity in modern times, the emperors and the subjects never neglected the great duty of Shinto. The present forms of ceremony are come down to us from time immemorial in our history. Of the three divine treasures transmitted from the divine ancestors, the divine gem is still held sacred in the imperial palace, the divine mirror in the Great Temple of Iso, and the divine sword in the Temple of Atsuta in the Province of Owari. To this day his majesty the emperor performs himself the ceremony of worship to the divine ancestors, and all the subjects perform the same to the deities of temples, which are called, according to the local extent of the festivity, the national, the provincial, the local, and the birth-place temple. When the festival day of temples, especially of the birth-place, etc., comes, all people who, living in the place, are considered specially protected by the deity of the temple, have a holiday and unite in performing the ancient ritual of worship and praying for the perpetuity of the imperial line and for profound peace over the land and families. The deities dedicated to the temple are divine imperial ancestors, illustrious loyalists, benefactors to the place, etc. Indeed, the Shinto is a beautiful cultus peculiar to our native land, and is considered the foundation of the perpetuity of the imperial house, the loyalty of the subjects, and the stability of the Japanese State. Thus far I have given a short description of Shinto, which is the way in which every Japanese, no matter to what creed—even Buddhism, Christianity, etc.—he belongs, must walk. Let me explain briefly the nature and origin of a religious force of Shinto, i.e., of the Jikko sect, whose tenets I profess to believe.

The Jikko (practical) sect, as the name indicates, does not lay so much stress upon mere show and speculation as upon the realization of its teachings. Its doctrines are plain and simple, and teach man to do man’s proper work. Being a new sect, it is free from the old dogmas and prejudices, and is regarded as a reformed sect. The scriptures on which the principal teachings of the sect are founded are Furukotobumi, Yamatobumi, and many others. They teach us that before heaven and earth came into existence there was one absolute deity called Ameno-mina-kanushi-no-kami. He has great virtue, and
power to create and reign over all things; He includes everything within Himself, and He will last forever without end. In the beginning the One Deity, self-originated, took the embodiments of two Deities; one with the male nature, and the other female. The male Deity is called Takai-mu-sibi-no-kami, and the female Kami-musubi-no-kami. These two Deities are nothing but forms of the one Substance, and unite again in the Absolute Deity. These three are called the "Three Deities of Creation." They caused a generation of Deities to appear, who, in their turn, gave birth to the islands of the Japanese Archipelago, the sun and moon, the mountains and streams, the divine ancestors, etc., etc. So their virtue and power are esteemed wondrous and boundless.

According to the teachings of our sect we ought to reverence the famous mountain Fuji, assuming it to be the sacred abode of the Divine Lord, and as the brain of the whole globe. And, as every child of the Heavenly Deity came into the world with a soul separated from the one original soul of Deity, he ought to be just as the Deity ordered (in sacred Japanese "kanngara") and make Fuji the example and emblem of his thought and action. For instance, he must be plain and simple as the form of the mountain, make his body and mind pure as the serenity of the same, etc. We would respect the present world, with all its practical works, more than the future world; pray for the long life of the emperor and the peace of the country; and, by leading a life of temperance and diligence, co-operating with one another in doing public good, we should be responsible for the blessings of the country.

The founder of this sect is Hasegawa Kakugyo, who was born in Nagasaki, of the Hizen Province, in 1541. In the eighteenth year of his age, Hasegawa, full of grief at the gloomy state of things over the country, set out on a pilgrimage to various sanctuaries of famous mountains and lakes, Shintoistic and Buddhistic temples. While he was offering fervent prayers on sacred Fuji, sometimes its summit and sometimes within its cave, he received inspiration through the miraculous power of the mountain; and becoming convinced that this place is the holy abode of Ameno-mina-kanu-shi-no-kima, he founded a new sect and propagated the creed all over the empire.
After his death in the cave, in his one hundred and sixth year, the light of the doctrines was handed down by a series of teachers. The tenth of them was my father, Shibata Hanamori, born at Ogi, of the Hizen Province, in 1809. He was also in the eighteenth year of his age when he adopted the doctrine of this sect. Amid the revolutionary war of Meiji, which followed immediately, he exerted all his power to propagate his faith by writing religious works and preaching about the provinces.

Now I have given a short sketch of the doctrines of our religion and of its history. In the next place, let me express the humble views that I have had for some years on religion.

As our doctrines teach us, all animate and inanimate things were born from One Heavenly Deity, and every one of them has its particular mission; so we ought to love them all and also to respect the various forms of religion in the world. They are all based, I believe, on the fundamental truth of religion. The difference between them is only in the outward form, influenced by variety of history, the disposition of the people and the physical conditions of the places where they originated.

Lastly, there is one more thought which I wish to offer here. While it is the will of Deity, and the aim of all religionists, that all His beloved children on the earth should enjoy peace and comfort in one accord, many countries look still with envy and hatred toward one another, and appear to seek for opportunities of making war under the slightest pretext, with no other aim than of wringing out ransoms or robbing a nation of its lands. Thus, regardless of the abhorrence of the Heavenly Deity, they only inflict pain and calamity on innocent people. Now and here my earnest wish is this, that the time should come soon when all nations on the earth will join their armies and navies with one accord, guarding the world as a whole, and thus prevent preposterous wars with each other. They should also establish a supreme court, in order to decide the case when a difference arises between them. In that state no nation will receive unjust treatment from another, and every nation and every individual will be able to maintain their own right and enjoy the blessings of Providence.

There will thus ensue, at last, the universal peace and
tranquillity, which seem to be the final object of the benevolent Deity.

For many years such has been my wish and hope. In order to facilitate and realize this in the future, I earnestly plead that every religionist of the world may try to edify the nearest people to devotion, to root out enmity between nations and to promote our common object.
CHAPTER XXII.

THE CONFUCIANS.

CONFUCIANISM.—BY KUNG HSIEH HO, OF SHANGHAI (TRANSLATED BY REV. TIMOTHY HYRICHARD, ENGLISH BAPTIST MISSION, CHINA).

The most important thing in the superior man's learning is to fear disobeying Heaven's will. Therefore in our Confucian religion the most important thing is to follow the will of Heaven. The book of Yin King says, "In the changes of the world there is a great Supreme which produces two principles, and these two principles are Yin and Yang. By Supreme is meant the spring of all activity. Our sages regard Yin and Yang and the five elements as acting and reacting on each other without ceasing, and this doctrine is all important, like as the hinge of a door.

The incessant production of all things depends on this as the tree does on the root. Even all human affairs and all good are also dependent on it; therefore it is called the Supreme just as we speak of the extreme points of the earth as the north and south poles.

By Great Supreme is meant that there is nothing above it. But heaven is without sound or smell, therefore the ancients spoke of the infinite and the Great Supreme. The Great Supreme producing Yin and Yang is law-producing forces. When Yang and Yin unite they produce water, fire, wood, metal, earth. When these five forces operate in harmony the four seasons come to pass. The essence of the infinite, of Yin and Yang, and of the five elements, combine, and the heavenly become male, and the earthly become female. When these powers act on each other all things are produced and reproduced and developed without end.

As to man, he is the best and most intelligent of all.
This is what is meant in the book of Chung Yong when it says that what Heaven has given is the spiritual nature. This nature is law. All men are thus born and have this law. Therefore it is Mencius says that all children love the parents and when grown up all respect their elder brethren. If men only followed the natural bent of this nature, then all would go the right way; hence, the Chung Yung says, "To follow nature is the right way."

The choicest product of Ying Yang and the five elements in the world is man, the rest are refuse products. The choicest among the choice ones are the sages and worthies, and the refuse among them are the foolish and the bad. And as man's body comes from the Yin and man's soul from the Yang he cannot be perfect. This is what the Lung philosophers called the material nature. Although all men have at birth a nature for goodness, still, if there is nothing to fix it, then desires arise and passions rule, and men are not far from being like beasts; hence Confucius says: "Men's nature is originally alike, but in practice men become very different." The sages, knowing this, sought to fix the nature with the principles of moderation, uprightness, benevolence and righteousness. Heaven appointed rulers and teachers, who, in turn, established worship and music to improve men's disposition and set up governments and penalties in order to check men's wickedness. The best among the people are taken into schools where they study wisdom, virtue, benevolence and righteousness, so that they may know beforehand how to conduct themselves as rulers or ruled.

And in case after many generations, there should be degeneration and difficulty in finding the truth, the principles of heaven and earth, of men and of all things have been recorded in the Book of Odes for the use of after generations. The Chung Yung calls the practice of wisdom religion. Our religion well knows heaven's will, it looks on all under heaven as one family, great rulers as elder branches in their parents' clan, great ministers as chief officers of this clan, and people at large as brothers of the same parents; and it holds that all things should be enjoyed in common, because it regards heaven and earth as the parents of all alike. And the commandment of the Confucian is "Fear greatly lest you offend against heaven."
But what Confucians lay great stress on is human affairs. What are these? These are the five relations and the five constants. What are the five relations? They are those of sovereign and minister, father and son, elder and younger brother, husband and wife, and that between friend and friend. Now, the ruler is the Son of Heaven, to be honored above all others, therefore in serving him there has to be loyalty. The parents' goodness to their children is boundless, therefore the parents should be served filially. Brothers are branches from the same root, therefore mutual respect is important. The marriage relation is the origin of all human relations, therefore mutual gentleness is important. As to friends, though as if strangers to our homes, it is important to be very affectionate.

When one desires to make progress in the practice of virtue as ruler or minister, as parent or child, as elder or younger brother, or as husband and wife, if any one wishes to be perfect in any relation, how can it be done without a friend to exhort one to good and check one in evil? Therefore, one should seek to increase his friends. Among the five relations there are also the three hands. The ruler is the hand of the minister, the father is that of the son, and the husband is that of the wife. And the book of the Ta Hsioh says, "From the Emperor down to the common people the fundamental thing for all to do is to cultivate virtue." If this fundamental foundation is not laid, then there cannot be order in the world. Therefore, great responsibility lies on the leaders. This is what Confucius means when he says: "When a ruler is upright he is obeyed without commands."

Now, to cause the doctrine of the five relations to be carried out everywhere by all under heaven, the ruler must be intelligent and the minister good, then the government will be just; the father must be loving and the son filial, the elder brother friendly, the younger brother respectful, the husband kind and the wife obedient, then the home will be right; in our relation with our friends there must be confidence, then customs will be reformed and order will not be difficult for the whole world, simply because the rulers lay the foundation for it in virtue.

What are the five constants? Benevolence, righteousness, worship, wisdom, faithfulness. Benevolence is love,
righteousness is fitness, worship is principle, wisdom is thorough knowledge, faithfulness is what one can depend on. He who is able to restore the original good nature and to hold fast to it is called a worthy. He who has got hold of the spiritual nature and is at peace and rest, is called a sage. He who sends forth unseen and infinite influences throughout all things is called divine. The influence of the five constants is very great, and all living things are subject to them.

Mencius says: "He who has no pity is not a man; he who has no sense of shame for wrong is not a man; he who has no yielding disposition is not a man, and he who has not the sense of right and wrong is not a man. The sense of pity is the beginning of benevolence, the sense of shame for wrong is the beginning of righteousness, a yielding disposition is the beginning of religion, the sense of right and wrong is the beginning of wisdom. Faithfulness is not spoken of, as it is what makes the other four real; like the earth element among the five elements, without it the other four manifestly cannot be placed.

The Chung Yung says, "Sincerity or reality is the beginning and the end of things. There is no such thing as supreme sincerity without action. This is the use of faithfulness."

As to benevolence, it also includes righteousness, religion and wisdom; therefore the sages consider that the most important thing is to get benevolence. The idea of benevolence is gentleness and liberal mindedness, that of righteousness is clear duty, that of religion is showing forth, that of wisdom is to gather silently. When there is gentleness, clear duty, showing forth and silent gathering constantly going on, then everything naturally falls to its proper place, just like the four seasons; e. g., the spring influences are gentle and liberal and are life-giving ones; in summer life-giving things grow, in autumn these show themselves in harvest, and in winter they are stored up. If there were no spring the other three seasons would have nothing; so it is said the benevolent man is the life. Extend and develop this benevolence and all under heaven may be benefited thereby. This is how to observe human relation.

As to the doctrine of future life, Confucianism speaks of it most minutely. Cheng Tsze says the spirits are the
forces or servants of heaven and earth and signs of creative power. Chu Fu Tsze says: “Speaking of two powers, the demons are the intelligent ones of Yin, the gods are the intelligent ones of Yang; speaking of one power, the supreme and originating is called God, the reverse and the returning is demon.”

Confucius, replying to Tsai Wo, says, “When flesh and bones die below the dust the material Yin becomes dust, but the immaterial rises above the grave in great light, has odor and is very pitiable. This is the immaterial essence.” The Chung Yung, quoting Confucius, says: “The power of the spirits is very grave! You look and cannot see them, you listen and cannot hear them, but they are embodied in all things without missing any, causing all men to reverence them and be purified, and be well adorned in order to sacrifice unto them.” All things are alive, as if the gods were right above our heads or on our right hand or on the left. Yih King makes much of divining to get decisions from the gods, knowing that the gods are the forces of heaven and earth in operation. Although unseen, still they influence; if difficult to prove, yet easily known. The great sages and great worthies, the loyal ministers, the righteous scholars, filial sons, the pure women of the world having received the purest influences of the divinest forces of heaven and earth, when on earth were heroes, when dead are the gods. Their influences continue for many generations to affect the world for good, therefore many venerate and sacrifice unto them.

As to evil men, they arise from the evil forces of nature; when dead they also influence for evil, and we must get holy influences to destroy evil ones.

As to rewards and punishments the ancient sages also spoke of them. The great Yu, b. c. 2255, said: “Follow what is right and you will be fortunate; do not follow it and you will be unfortunate; the results are only shadows and echoes of our acts.” Tang, b. c. 1766, says: “Heaven’s way is to bless the good and bring calamity on the evil.” His minister, Yi Yin, said: “It is only God who is perfectly just; good actions are blessed with a hundred favors; evil actions are cursed with a hundred evils.” Confucius, speaking of the Book of Changes (Yih King) said: “Those who multiply good deeds will have
joys to overflowing; those who multiply evil deeds will have calamities running over.”

But this is very different from Taoism, which says that there are angels from heaven examining into men's good and evil deeds, and from Buddhism, which says that there is a purgatory or hell according to one's deeds. Rewards and punishments arise from our different actions just as water flows to the ocean and as fire seizes what is dry; without expecting certain consequences they come inevitably. When these consequences do not appear they are like cold in summer or heat in winter, or like both happening the same day, but this we say is unnatural. Therefore it is said, sincerity is the way of heaven. If we say that the gods serve heaven exactly as mandarins do on earth, bringing quick retribution on every little thing, this is really to make them appear very slow. At present men say, “Thunder killed the bad man.” But it is not so, either. The Han philosopher, Tung Chung Shu (second century b. c.), says: “Vapors, when they clash above, make rain; when they clash below, make fog; wind is nature's breathing. Thunder is the sound of clouds clashing against each other. Lightning is light emitted by their collision. Thus we see that when a man is killed it is by the collision of these clouds.”

As to becoming genii and transmigration of souls, these are still more beside the mark. If we became like genii, then we would live on without dying; how could the world hold so many? If we transmigrate, then so many would transmigrate from the human life and ghosts would be numerous. Besides, when the lamp goes out and is lit again it is not the former flame that is lit. When the cloud has a rainbow it rains, but it is not the same rainbow as when the rainbow appeared before. From this we know also that these doctrines of transmigration should not be believed in. So much on the virtue of the unseen and hereafter.

As to the great aim and broad basis of Confucianism, we say it searches into things, it extends knowledge, it has a sincere aim, i.e., to have a right heart, a virtuous life, so as to regulate the home, to govern the nation and to give peace to all under heaven. The book of great learning, Ja Hsigh, has already clearly spoken of these. The foundation is laid in illustrating virtue; for our relig-
ion in discussing government regards virtue as the foundation and wealth as the superstructure. Mencius says: "When the rulers and ministers are only seeking gain the nation is in danger." He also says: "There is no benevolent man who neglects his parents; there is no righteous man who helps himself before his ruler." From this it is apparent what is most important.

Not that we do not speak of gain; the Great Learning says: "There is a right way to get gain. Let the producers be many and the consumers few. Let there be activity in production and economy in the expenditure. Then the wealth will always be sufficient. But it is important that the high and low should share it alike."

As to how to govern the country and give peace to all under heaven the nine paths are most important. The nine paths are: Cultivate a good character, honor the good, love your parents, respect great offices, carry out the wishes of the ruler and ministers, regard the common people as your children, invite all kinds of skillful workmen, be kind to strangers, have consideration for all the feudal chiefs. These are the great principles.

Their origin and history may also be stated. Far up in mythical ancient times, before literature was known, Fu Hsi arose and drew the eight diagrams in order to understand the superhuman powers and the nature of all things. At the time of Tang Yao (n. c. 2356) they were able to illustrate noble virtue. Nine generations lived together in one home in love and peace and the people were firm and intelligent. Yao handed down to Shun a saying, "Sincerely hold fast to the 'mean.'" Shun transmitted it to Yu and said: "The mind of man is restless, prone to err; its affinity for the right way is small. Be discriminating, be undivided that you may sincerely hold fast to the 'mean.'" Yu transmitted this to Tang of the Siang dynasty (n. c. 1766). Tang transmitted it to Kings Wen and Wu of the Chow dynasty (n. c. 1122). These transmitted it to Duke Kung. And these were all able to observe this rule of the heart by which they held fast to the "mean."

The Chow dynasty later degenerated, then there arose Confucius, who transmitted the doctrines of Yao and Shun as if they had been his ancestors, elegantly displayed the doctrines of Wen and Wu, edited the odes and the history, reformed religion, made notes on the Book of
Changes, wrote the annals of spring and autumn, and spoke of governing the nation, saying: "Treat matters seriously and be faithful, be temperate and love men, employ men according to proper times, and in teaching your pupils you must do so with love." He said to Yen Tsze: "Self-sacrifice and truth is benevolence. If you can for one whole day entirely sacrifice self and be true, then all under heaven will become benevolent." Speaking of being able to put away selfishness and attaining to the truth of heaven, everything is possible to such a heart.

Alas! He was not able to get his virtues put into practice, but his disciples recorded his words and deeds and wrote the Confucian Analects. His disciple, Jeng Tsze, composed the Great Learning. His proud son, Tsze Sze, composed the doctrine of the mean (Chung Yung). When the contending states were quarreling, Mencius, with a loving heart that could not endure wrong, arose to save the times. The rulers or the time would not use him; so he composed a book in seven chapters. After this, although the ages changed this, religion flourished. In the Han dynasty, Tung Chung Shu (twentieth century B.C.); in the Sui dynasty, Wang Tung (A.D. 588-617); in the Tang dynasty, Hung Yo (A.D. 768-824), each made some part of this doctrine better known. In the Sung dynasty (960-1260), these were the disciples of the philosophers Cheng, Chow and Chang, searching into the spiritual nature of man, and Chu Fu-Tsze collected their works, and this religion shone with great brightness. Our present dynasty, respecting scholarship and considering truth important, placed the philosopher Cho in Confucian temples to be reverenced and sacrificed to. Confucianists all follow Chu Fu-Tsze's comments. From ancient times till now those who followed the doctrines of Confucius were able to govern the country; whenever these were not followed there was disorder.

On looking at it down the ages, there is also clear evidence of results in governing the country and its superiority to other religions. There is a prosperity of Tang Yis, of the dynasties Iisia Siang and Chow (B.C. 2356, B.C. 255), when virtue and good government flourished. It is needless to enlarge upon them. At the time of the contending states there arose theorists, and all under heaven became disorder. The Tsin dynasty (of Tsin
She-Hwang fame) burned the books and buried the Confucianists and did many other heartless things, and also went to seek the art of becoming immortal (Taoism), and the empire was soon lost.

Then the Han dynasty arose (B.C. 206—A.D. 220). Although it leaned toward Taoism, the people, after having suffered so long from the cruelties of the Tsìn, were easily governed. Although the religious rites of the Shu Sun-tung do not command our confidence, the elucidation of the ancient classics and books we owe mostly to the Confucianists of the Han period. Although the Emperor, the Emperor Wu, of the western (early) Han dynasty, was fond of genii (Taoism), he knew how to select worthy ministers. Although the Emperor Ming, of the eastern (later) Han dynasty, introduced Buddhism, he was able to respect the Confucian doctrines. Since so many followed Confucianism, good mandarins were very abundant under the eastern and western Han dynasties and the dynasty lasted very long.

Passing on to the epoch of the Three Kingdoms and the Tsìn dynasty (A.D. 221-419) the people then leaned towards Taoism and neglected the country. Afterwards the north and south quarreled, and Emperor Laing Wu reigned the longest, but lost all by believing in Buddhism and going into the monastery at Tsìn Tai, where he died of starvation at Tai Ching. When Yuen Ti came to the throne (A.D. 552) the soldiers of Wei arrived while the teaching of Taoism was still going on and the country was ruined. It is not worth while to speak of the Sui dynasty. The first emperor of the Tang dynasty (618-907) greatly sought out famous Confucianists and increased the demand for scholars, so that the country was ruled almost equal to Cheng and Kang of ancient times. Although there was the affair of Empress Woo and Lu Shan the dynasty flourished long. Its fall was because the Emperor Huen Tsung was fond of Taoism and Buddhism, and was put to death by taking wrong medicine. The Emperor Mu Tsung also believed in Taoism, but got ill by eating immortality pills. After this the Emperor Wu Tsung was fond of Taoism and reigned only a short time. The Emperor Tsung followed Buddhism and the dynasty fell into a precarious condition.

Passing by the five dynasties (907-960) on to the first
emperor of the Sung dynasty (960–1360) who, cherishing the people and having good government, step by step prospered—when Jen Tsung ruled he reverenced heaven and cared for the people; he reformed the punishment and lightened the taxes, and was assisted by such scholars as Han Ki, Fan Chung Yen, Foo Pih, Ou Yang Sui, Wen Yen Poh and Chas Pien. They established the government at the mountain Pas Sang, and raised the people to the state of peace which is still in every home. Such government may be called benevolent.

Afterwards there arose the troubles of Kin, when the good ministers were destroyed by cliques, and the Sang dynasty moved to the south of China.

When the Mongol dynasty (A.D. 1260–1368) arose, it believed in and employed Confucian methods, and all under heaven was in order. In the time of Jen Chung the names of the philosophers, Chow and Cheng (of the Sung dynasty), were placed in the Confucian temples to be sacrificed to. They carried out the system of examinations and sent commissioners to travel throughout the land to inquire into the sufferings of the people.

The emperor served the empress dowager with filial piety, and treated all his relations with honor, and he may be called one of our noble rulers, but the death of Shunti was owing to his passion for pleasure. He practiced the methods of western priests (Buddhists) to regulate the health, and had no heart for matters of state.

When the first emperor of the Ming dynasty (A.D. 1368–1644) arose and reformed the religion and ritual of the empire, he called it the great, peaceful dynasty. The pity was that he selected Buddhist priests to attend on the princes of the empire, and the priest Tao Yen corrupted the Pekin prince, and a rebellious spirit sprung up, which was a great mistake. Then Yen Tsung, too, employed Yen Sung, who only occupied himself in worship. Hi Tsung employed Ni Ngan, who defamed the loyal and the good, and the dynasty failed. These are the evidences of the value of Confucianism in every age.

But in our present dynasty worship and religion have been wisely regulated, and the government is in fine order; noble ministers and able officers have followed in succession down all these centuries.

That is what has caused Confucianism to be transmitted
from the oldest times till now, and wherein it constitutes its superiority to other religions is that it does not encourage mysteries and strange things or marvels. It is impartial and upright. It is a doctrine of great impartiality and strict uprightness, which one may body forth in one's person, and carry out with vigor in one's life; therefore, we say, when the sun and moon comes forth (as in Confucianism), then the light of candles can be dispensed with.
CHAPTER XXIII.

The World's Religious Debt To Asia.

The first gift conferred by Asia on the religious world is insight into Nature. The Oriental discovers, contemplates, and communes with the Spirit of God, who, in his view, fills all creation. Nature is not a mere stimulus to mild poetry; Nature is God's abode. He did not create it and then leave it to itself, but He lives in every particle of its great structure. Nature is not for man's bodily benefit, but for his spiritual emancipation also. It is not enough to say the heavens are God's handiwork, but the heaven is His throne, the earth is His footstool. Our Nanak said: "Behold, the sun and moon are His altar-lights, and the sky is the sacred vessel of sacrifice to Him." In the vast temple of nature, Asia beholds the Supreme Spirit reigning, and worships Him through the great objects His hand has made. Nay, more, the Oriental beholds in Nature the image of God. "I offer my salutations unto the bountiful Lord," says Yogavasista, who is the inner soul of all things, reveals Himself in heaven, in earth, in the firmament, in my own heart, and in all around me."

To the Asiatic the Immanent Spirit embodies himself in Nature's beauty and sweetness, to be immersed in which is to be nursed in God Himself. We receive from every object we see a suggestion of something unseen, something higher, inner, something divine and immortal. "Whatever is on earth," the Persian poet Sadi says, "is the resemblance and shadow of something that is in the spheres; again, that light is the shadow of something more resplendent, and so up to the Light of lights." When no audible speech was heard what meant the royal psalmist by saying, The Heavens declare the glory of God,
day uttereth speech unto day, and night sheweth knowledge unto night.” It was the law of the Lord, His statutes, His precepts that filled David’s heart, and he heard the celestial music of his contemplation re-echoed in all the universe. “When,” says the Bhagavadgita, “Arjuna, the faithful warrior, looked up to the Divine Form, he saw there the glory of the mountains, the sweep of the rivers, the bloom of the flowers, and the animated beauty of mankind.” This does not mean that Nature and God are one, but Nature is the primary form and image of God’s Spirit.

The book of creation is in God’s handwriting—it is His language; nature is His revelation. The roar of the hurricane is a feeble echo of His eternal voice. The thunders of the sea breaking in fury over the immovable rocks are the faint utterances of His might. The midnight firmament, with its mighty arches of light, shows His vast bosom bending over the repose of the good and the bad alike.

The forces of nature strike the Asiatic not as blind or fantastic, but as the manifestations of a personal will. The life of Nature is the life of God. Our own personality, which originates so many activities, unfolds a person who originates and preserves the universal power of all things. In Asia, therefore, nature is not a mere design, or mere law, or uniformity, but the arena of God’s personal activity.

But personal activity means Providence, when the Spirit fills all things, is imaged in all things, is revealed by all things, and as a person presides over all activities, the whole world is full of His Providence. It is for this reason that Vedic sages beheld in every force and phenomenon of nature an inworking light of the Divinity. There was God in the sun, God in the Himalayas, God in the all-investing sky, God in the expanse of the round blue sea, but all these Gods merged into one supreme Brahma, the meaning of which word is “God is great, and makes everything great.” Thus the senses and the soul form a vast organ on which the contemplation of nature plays her august harmony, and through which insight makes her supernatural yet most natural revelations.

How, then, can we tire of our mountains and rivers, or the sacred solitude of the forests? Mount Sinai is neither
cold nor dumb; but there is no Moses to hear the commandments, or bare his feet to the burning bush. The roses of Sharon are still in bloom, the nightingale's song still fills the midnight silence, but there is no Hafez to realize that the Great Beloved dwells in the garden and welcomes His faithful devotees. The fountain Zemzem flows on by the side of Mecca, but the Prophet is forever gone, and the pilgrim hordes spread infection and uncleanness. Nature is spiritual still, but man has become material, and Asia calls upon the world to once more enthrone God in His creation. Reconciled with Nature, at one with the creation, inspired by the soul of beauty in all things. Asia is at one with God.

The second lesson which Asia teaches is introspection. This means beholding the Spirit of God within your own heart; it is spirituality. Nature inspires the Old Testament, Job, David, Jiaia, the Rig Vedas, the Avesta, the Spirit makes the New Testament, the Upanishads, the religion of Sadi-Rowland Roum. Is there any light of beauty or intelligence, or harmony, in outward things which has not its original seat in the mind of the observer? From observation to introspection the step is easy and natural. On the framework of your own soul the warp and woof of all the worlds are woven, the universe of light and order is to be seen within. There is no glory without which the soul does not put there from within itself. This marvelous creation is sometimes described as an objective dream, a medium of communion between the human and the Divine, the self-manifestation of the spirit who appeals through our senses to the kindred spirit within.

Neither in Scripture nor in Nature, nor in church nor in prophet, is the Spirit of God realized in His fullness, but in man's soul, and there alone, is the purpose of God fully revealed. He who has found Him there has found the secret of the Sonship of man.

Believe me the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem worship the Father. But the hour cometh and now is when the true worshiper shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such worship. God is a spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.
Until, therefore, we behold God as the spirit in the only spirit realm we have access to, namely, our own souls, how is true worship possible? The Taitirya Upanishad says: "When the devotee is established within the unseen, formless, unspeakable Spirit of God in Himself, only then is he perfectly fearless." This sense of the supreme fact of the Spirit's dwelling glows into attitudes of blessedness which intensifies every other faculty of the soul. All mental powers turn themselves into channels through which the abundance of Divine manifestation pours within. The sentiments, the imagination, the powers of intelligence, the resolutions of the will, are all kindled into that spirit of prophetic fire which glows in the inspiration of the Orient.

And thus Asiatic philosophy, whether Hindu, or Gnostic, or Sufi, is the philosophy of the Spirit, the philosophy of the Supreme Substance, not of phenomena only. All Asiatic poetry breathes the aroma of the sacred mansions, glows with the light of the dawning heavens. The deepest music is spiritual music, the noblest architecture is raised by the hand of faith. When the Spirit of God indwells the spirit of man, literature, science, the arts, nay, all ideals and all achievements find their national source, the whole world is spiritualized into a vision of the Eternal.

Has the spiritual nature an end to its possibilities? The Oriental mind does not really deny the being of the outward world, but, seeing God within its own being, the outer becomes only a phase of the inner spirit. It is not logic nor observation, nor even the Scripture, that reveals God to the rapt Oriental mind; it is through his own instincts that he has the deepest view of the unity and perfection of the Godhead. No dialectic subtlety or analytic skill is unknown in the East, but there the philosopher is the seer also. Asia has the seeing of God within her spirit, and what is seen cannot be disproved by what is said. The progress of true religion is not in the conversion of the so-called heathen, but in the conception, the inspiration and realization of the ideal of the man of spirit.

The Supreme Spirit manifests Himself in the soul as reason, as love, as righteousness, as joy. The product of reason is wisdom, and true wisdom is universal. "In the
beginning was the word, and the word was with God and
the word was God.” What is true in Asia is true in
Europe, what is true before Christ is true after Christ,
because Christ is the spirit of truth. Whoever conceives
the unmixed truth in science or in faith, in art or in
literature, conceives the imperishable and the eternal.

In the high realms of that undying Wisdom the Hebrew,
the Hindu, the Mongolian, the Christian are ever at one,
for that Wisdom is no part of themselves, but the self-
revelation of God. The Hindu books have not plagiarized
the Bible, Christianity has not plundered Buddhism, but
Universal Wisdom is like unto itself everywhere. Simi-
larly Love, when it is unselfish and incarnal, has its coun-
terpart in all lands and all times. The deepest poetry
whether in Dante, Shakespeare or Kalidaas is universal.
The Love of God repeats itself century after century in
the pious of every race; the Love of Man makes all man-
kind its kindred. True holiness is the Universal ideal,
however much personal prejudices or passions stand in
the way of the light. Hence Asia, seeking the Universal
God in her soul, has discovered God to all the world.

This process of seeking and finding God within is an
intense spiritual culture known by various names in vari-
ous countries; in India we call it Yoga. The self-con-
centrated devotee finds an immersion in the depths of the
indwelling Deity. God’s reason becomes man’s reason,
God’s love becomes man’s love. God and man become
one. Introspection finds the universal soul—the over-
soul of your Emerson—beating in all humanity and a
human and Divine are thus reconciled.

Asia has taught the world to worship. Asia is the
land of impulse. Religion there has meant always senti-
ment, joyousness, exaltation, excitement in the love of
God and man. All this impulse the Asiatic throws into
his worship. With us Orientals worship is not a mere
duty; it is an instinct, a longing, a passion. There is a
force that draws every drop of dew into the sea, a spark
into the conflagration, a planet to the sun. They feel in
the east a similar force of impulse draws them into the
depths of God. That is worship. “As the hart panteth
for the brook of living water so my soul panteth for God.”
Routines and rituals are indeed known in the east; they
are to keep the undevout in the practice of religion. But
for the spiritual the impulse toward God is irresistible. The love of God is a growing passion, a wine that inebriates, a madness of the spirit.

The holy festival in the east, whether it is song or ceremony, or praise or prayer, is an intense excitement. This longing for the companionship of the spirit is half human, half divine. It is man calling after God and God seeking after man. No devotional act is complete which is not an act of advance on the part of God and man; no prayer is true which does not bring with it a blessed consciousness of acceptance. But worship is then worthy of heaven when it is uttered in tearful and fervid love. When the devotee feels conscious that he is accepted, an ecstasy of trust fills him, the rapture of his love overpowers him. He cries, he laughs, he sings, he dances, he falls into a trance. Such phenomena are not confined to one religion or one country. The Hebrew Miriam danced and the congregation played upon clamorous instruments of music. Mohammed fell into fits of unconsciousness. Hafez was reputed as a madman. The Vaishnavas of India dance and violently sing in their devotional excitement. The vagrant, Puran, thus describes the condition of the devout worshiper:

He sings the names of the dearest One, his heart is melted with holy love, he laughs loudly, or he cries or ceaselessly prays, and at last, overcome by common impulses, dances like a man beside himself.

This kind of excitement cannot be agreeable or suitable to all men, but it shows the extreme to which devotional impulses run in Asia.

The uttered worship of the east none can limit. Can any one number the songs of praise, the invocations, the entreaties which rise night and day like a ceaseless noise of many waters to the throne of Heaven. The universe itself is to the Oriental like a vast devotee which uttereth ceaselessly the words of adoration, and we, each one of us, feebly respond to these utterances; blessed is he who responds from his deepest heart. But at last speech becomes inadequate and devotion lapses into silence. Our worship is then profoundest when we find no language adequate to express our love and trust. The east, therefore, cultivates the habit of devotional silence. But silence also becomes too oppressive, and takes shape in the
offerings and acts of worship. Flowers, incenses, sacrificial fires, sacramental food, symbolic postures, bathings, fastings, and vigils are oftentimes more eloquent than words. There is no spirit without form. Ceremonies without spirit are indeed dangerous, but, when words fail before God, symbols become indispensable.

All true worship is twofold in its direction, it is Godward and it is manward. The honor and love of God are sure to lead to the honor and love of man. In Asia we almost worship our spiritual guides; we almost idolize the objects we love. The man of God stands next to God. We do not understand spiritual democracy; we look out for towering personalities, nay, even in loving our equals, we are fired by a divine enthusiasm. Opposite moods are reconciled in the character of the spiritual man. Tenderness and sternness, rebuke and forgiveness mingle into a strange dignity. Meekness, penitence, gentleness, forgiveness, affectionateness, lofty indignation, weeping, compassion are attitudes of the love of man. The devotee is not only kind to man, but kind and compassionate also to all living things. The beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, the sweet humanities of Buddha, thus become realities of the true instinct of worship.

Adoration fails, the flower fades, the fire quenches, the incense becomes dust, but when the spirit abides in the rapture of joy and love within the depths of God, it forgets the world's distractions, and when similarly the love of man becomes to it a passion, it becomes one with mankind. Oneness with God and man therefore in perfect love is the ideal of eastern worship.

What lesson do the hermitages, the monasteries, the cave temples, the disciplines, and austerities of the religious east teach the world? Renunciation. The Asiatic apostle will ever remain an ascetic, a celibate, a homeless Akinchama, a Fakir. Orientals—we are all the descendants of John the Baptist. Any one who has taken pains at spiritual culture must admit that the great enemy to a devout concentration of mind is the force of bodily and worldly desire. Communion with God is impossible so long as the flesh and its lusts are not subdued. Hence renunciation has always been recognized as a law of spiritual progress in Asia. It is not mere temperance, but positive asceticism; not mere self-restraint, but self-
mortification; not mere self-sacrifice, but self-extinction; not mere morality, but absolute holiness. The passion for holiness conquers the passion for self-indulgence and leads to much voluntary suffering. Poverty, homelessness, simplicity have characterized the east. The Brahmins do not charge a fee for teaching sacred knowledge, the missionaries of the Brahmo-Somaj never take a salary.

The foxes had holes, the birds had nests, but the Son of Man had not where to lay His head. To the gates of Kapilvastu, where he was to be Lord and King, Buddha went as a wandering mendicant with his alms bowl in his hand, begging from house to house. The sight was too painful for the feelings of the aged king, his father, so that he entreated the illustrious mendicant would go to beg elsewhere and not bring shame to the royal house he had forsaken. Buddha calmly replied: "You, O King, are faithful to your ancestors who were kings, but I am equally faithful to my ancestors who were all mendicants." Mohammed lived in a cave and found enough nourishment in a few dates. The fakir in Moslem countries and the Sadhu in India are regarded with universal awe. Those orders of Christians, who, like the Roman Catholics, have adopted this principle of renunciation, have made the greatest impression upon Asiatic communities. It is a sign of the times that even Protestant orders are reverting to the monastic principle of Asia. This has its danger, but it is still more dangerous to allow carnality and worldliness to mix in a spiritual life. Jesus presided at the marriage feast, Sakya Muni shocked his early disciples by eating hearty meals; Mohammed married wives; Nanak, the founder of the Sikhs, kept a shop; St. Paul stood upon his political rights as a Roman citizen, not because of worldly-mindedness, but in the faithful discharge of their holy duties. Their hearts were austere and unselfish as ever.

Once upon a time, so goes the Indian legend, the saintly ascetic, Sukdeva visited the palace of the royal devotee, the Raja Janak. The man of austerity was struck at the wealth and magnificence of his host. The throne on which he sat, his wives, his attendants, his robes, his chariots, disgusted Sukdeva. The Raja Janak, by insight, knew the thoughts of his simple-minded guest. To disabuse him, Janak suddenly set on fire his palace by the power of
There was a fearful uproar, everybody hurrying to save what was most precious to himself. Even Sukdeva rushed to snatch away from the fire a narrow strip of rag, worn round his loins, his only belonging, which he had hung up to dry. Only Raja Janak sat calmly, smiling, free from care. The fire was as soon put out as it had been set up, and the royal devotee, addressing the ascetic saint, said:

"Thou, O Sukdeva, lost thy peace when thy rag was threatened, but I could look calmly on while all my palace with its wealth was burning to ashes. Renunciation is not to abstain from much and be over-fond of the little, but to retain our peace at the loss of everything we have, be it little or great."

Self-conquest or renunciation is but one part of the culture of the will into spirituality. The other is obedience, self-consecration, merging one’s self into the supreme self of God and the sublime service of humanity. Self-discipline is only a means to the higher end of reconciliation and oneness with the will of God. The grain of wheat falls and dies in the earth, that it may produce a hundred-fold, and he who spends his life for God, keeps it unto immortality. Death has been, and always will be the price of the attainment of God; and the service of man, death of all service and finality. Who can say, who did say, "Not my will, but Thine be done?" He who struggled with the last cup of agony, and who looked up to serve God and man while the murderer was at the gate. Call it renunciation, call it stoicism, call it death, the fact is there that he who dies to himself can only find rest in God or reconciliation with man. This great law of self-effacement, poverty, suffering, death, is symbolized in the mystic cross so dear to you and dear to me. Christians, shall you ever repudiate Calvary? Oneness of will and character is the sublimest and most difficult unity with God. And that lesson of unity Asia has repeatedly taught the world.

Thus by insight into the immanence of God's spirit in nature, thus by introspection into the fullness of the Divine presence in the heart, thus by rapturous and loving worship, and thus by renunciation and self-surrender Asia has learned and taught wisdom, practiced and preached con-
temple, laid down the rules of worship and glorified
the righteousness of God.

But how can I, within a brief half-hour, describe the
mystic spirituality of a great continent, from which all
religions, all prophets, all founders, all devotions, and all
laws of righteous life have come? I have uttered only
one word and leave the rest to your spiritual discernment.
I know Asia has to learn a great deal from the west. I
know that even such qualities of the Asiatic as I have
described require to be assimilated in a new dispensation
of God, the future religion of mankind. But Europe has
gone out to the east and the new religion has dawned in
the Bramo-Somaj.

In the west you observe, watch, act, and speculate. In
the east we contemplate, commune, and suffer ourselves
to be carried away by the spirit of the universe. In the
west you wrest from Nature her secrets, you conquer her,
she makes you wealthy and prosperous, you look upon
her as your slave, and sometimes fail to realize her sacred-
ness. In the east Nature is our Eternal sanctuary, the
soul is our everlasting temple, and the sacredness of God’s
creation is only next to the sacredness of God himself. In
the west, you love equality, you respect man, you seek
justice. In the east, love is the fulfillment of the law; we
have hero-worship—we behold God. In the west you
establish the moral law, you insist upon propriety of con-
duct, you are governed by public opinion. In the east we
aspire, perhaps vainly aspire, after absolute self-conquest
and the holiness which makes God its model. In the west
you work incessantly, and your work is your worship. In
the east we meditate and worship for long hours, and
worship is our work. Perhaps one day, after this par-
liament has achieved its success, the western and eastern
man shall combine to support each other’s strength and
supply each other’s deficiencies. And then that blessed
synthesis of human nature shall be established which all
prophets have foretold, and all the devout souls have
sighed for.

Some years ago, when I saw Professor Tyndall after his
great Belfast address he spoke to me thus: “The symp-
thies of such men as you are the crumbs of comfort left
me in my unpopularity. Because I will not accept religi-
on in the hands of those who have it not, they revile
me. I complain not. True religion once came from the east, and from the east it shall come again."

This, perhaps, was too great a compliment, at least I regarded it as such. But, looking back into the past, it cannot be denied that the world's religious debt to Asia is very great. In the east we are a subject race; we are talked of with contumely; the Asiatic is looked upon as the incarnation of every meanness and untruth. Perhaps we partly deserve it. Perhaps in being allowed to associate with you, free and noble children of the west, we shall learn what we have failed to learn hitherto. Yet in the midst of the sadness, the loneliness, the prostration of the present, it has been some consolation to think that we still retain some of our spiritual ground; to reflect on the prophecy of Ezekiel: "Behold, the glory of the Lord cometh from the way of the east."
CHAPTER XXIV.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH, BY PROFESSOR MINAZ SCHERAZ.

The first monarch who bowed the knee before the cross of Golgotha was an Armenian king. Thaddeus founded the first Christian church, and intrusted its direction to Atteus, whom he consecrated bishop; thence is the cradle of the Armenian Church; which became the first national church in the history of Christendom. It was the same apostle who handed down the gospel precepts enshrined in the Armenian religious books, and especially in the Ganonakirk (book of the canons). Besides Thaddeus, the apostle Bartholomew went and preached in Armenia, which was visited likewise by the apostle Xumas. The Armenian Church has thus a perfect right to regard itself as apostolic, primitive and independent, and as the most ancient of the historic churches.

The number of Christians was so great that in the reign of Adrian more than 10,000 were crucified on Mount Ararat. The final conversion of Armenia took place in 302, ten years before Constantine the Great beheld the shining cross. St. Gregory the Illuminator preached the Christian faith for sixty-six days at Vaghardiabad, the capital of Tridates, who embraced it with his household and helped the saint to found Etchmiadzin, seat of the supreme patriarchate of the Armenian church, to extirpate idolatry and to convert the inhabitants. After the Nicene Council commenced that long series of bloody wars which the kings of Persia waged against Armenia in order to substitute the law of Zoroaster for the faith of Christ. The Persians had hardly retired from the canton of Daron when the Arabs made their appearance. Electrified by their victories in the other parts of western Asia, they ravaged Armenia with fire and sword for
almost a century, after which the Catholic John the Philosopher obtained from the Caliph Omar a short respite for his flocks.

After him, the Arabs, the Persians, the Tartars, the Egyptians, the Turcomans, Turks and the other followers of Islamism recommenced, with incredible cruelty, their work of destruction in Armenia and Cilicia, where the fourth and last Armenian dynasty held sway. It was during this dynasty that the crusades took place.

The Armenians, filled with enthusiasm at seeing Christians who came from the extremity of Europe to fight the enemies of the cross, from the first moment made common cause with them. Many Europeans have written the history of the crusades, but who has ever asked what became of the Christians of Asia who fraternized with the crusaders? Left alone in the presence of Saracens, who overran Europe after two centuries of Homeric struggles, the Armenians endured their formidable onset, and after a heroic resistance Cilicia, the victim of Christian solidarity, was deluged in the blood of her children. It was thus that the last bulwark of Christianity in Asia succumbed.

The persecutions directed against the Armenian church have served to strengthen the character of the faithful who have survived them. At Constantinople I have seen many Christians from Poland and Hungary embrace Islamism without difficulty in order to obtain employment in the Turkish army or administration; but very few Armenians succumb to this temptation, and if an Armenian turns Mohammedan he raises the murmur of the whole community against him, who never pardon this apostacy.

The Christian religion has rendered inestimable services in its turn—has organized charity and spread instruction. It has maintained the Armenian nationality. The spirit of charity which forms the very basis of the Christian religion has penetrated the heart of the people. Innumerable houses of piety and benevolence have been erected in all parts of the country. The revolution brought about by Christianity in the ideas of the Armenian people has pushed them forward in the way of instruction. The Armenians formed their own alphabet, and from the Greek text of the Septuagint and Syriac version called Peshito they translated the Bible. They
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have produced, in the silence of a number of flourishing cloisters, an immense literature.

Christianity, when it became a national church, maintained the Armenian nationality. Without it the Armenians would have been absorbed in Zoroastrianism, and at a later period in Islamism, for in that nest of religions which goes by the name of the East, religion makes nationality, and the peoples are nothing but religious communities. That is why the Armenians, especially after the loss of their political independence, look askance at every attempt to detach the faithful from their church. Surrounded at the present day by orthodoxy, Catholicism and Protestantism, each of which aims at bringing this martyred church into its course, they believe it is their duty to maintain the statu quo, because they would not be able to satisfy the three churches all at once, and because their church is the last refuge of their nationality. They possess a national church just as they possess a national language and literature, with a national alphabet, a national era, and a national history, a national music and a national architecture, and they do not wish to sacrifice them to the national characteristics of the more numerous nations.

Blessed be the Church which should undertake to propagate among the Christians of Armenia not such and such a form of Christianity, but an instruction and an education which render a people capable of reconciling respect for the past with the exigencies of the modern spirit. From this point of view the American college at Constantinople renders greater services than those who waste their time in inculcating puritan simplicity in the brilliant imagination of an Eastern people.

The Armenian Church belongs to the Eastern Church, and its rites do not differ much from those of the Greek church, but it is completely autonomous and is ruled by its deacons, priests, and bishops, whose ecclesiastical vestments recall those of the Greeks and Latins. It admits the seven sacraments, only administers extreme unction to the ecclesiastics, does not recognize either expiatory or indulgences, and celebrates the communion with unleavened bread and wine without water. It holds Easter at the date assigned by Christians before the Nicene council, and the nativity and epiphany on the sixth of January.
It prescribes fastings on Wednesday and Friday, and has a period of fasting and an order of saints which are peculiar to it. It believes that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father.

Toleration is one of the glories of the Armenian Church. Its adherents have given manifold proofs of it to the Christians of all denominations, and if you happen to visit Etchmiadzin, you will see the tomb of Sir John Mac- Donald, who was British envoy in Persia, quite close to the entrance of the cathedral, among the tombs of the greatest patriarchs of modern Armenia. The church founded by the Illuminator prays daily "for all holy and orthodox bishops," and "for the peace of the whole world and the stability of the Holy Church" and beseeches the mercy of God "by the prayers and intercessions of those who invoke the name of the Lord of sanctity, in any country, from the rising to the setting sun."

Another glory of the Armenian Church is its democratic spirit. No obstacle is put in the way of its adherents to read and study the Bible. In the mass it practices the ceremony of cordial salutation, which the faithful render to one another with the holy kiss. Its deacons and priests, who are married, live on the voluntary offerings of their flocks, and it is the high clergy only, who are bound to celibacy, who receive a very moderate stipend. No annual payment is required, as in certain civilized countries, to have a pew in the church; every Christian is received gratuitously, and rich and poor alike bow the head side by side before the Eternal. The clergy, from the humblest deacon to the supreme patriarch, are elected by the free will of the ecclesiastics and the laity. In the very midst of the consecration of a candidate, the bishop stops to ask the congregation if he is worthy of receiving orders. If one single individual calls out that he is not worthy of them, the consecration is suspended, and if this individual proves his assertion to the bishop, the candidate is immediately discarded. It may well be said that the Armenian clergy are the servants and not the masters of the Church.

Such is the Armenian Church, venerable by reason of its antiquity, proud of its orthodoxy and glorious in the purple mantle of its martyrdom. Every stone of its sanctuary is cemented with the tears and the blood of its
persecuted children. It is for this reason that the seat of the Illuminator is so firmly established, and with so much vigor raises aloft its five domes—symbols of the five Armenian patriarchates of Etchmiadzin, Sis, Aghtamar, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. Sentinel of civilization and advance guard of Christianity, the Armenian Church has bravely done its duty on the confines of the eastern world. It has survived the attacks of Zoroastrianism and of Islamism, as it has survived the attacks of Christians who did not understand liberty of conscience, and in the midst of the painful crisis which it is going through at the present time, it sends a fraternal salutation to all the pious souls who are gathered together at this truly ecumenical council, and it blesses the first steps of the parliament of religions in the path of universal tolerance and charity, and the noble efforts of the great American people to spread the marvelous rainbow of human brotherhood over the deluge of long-standing hatreds.
CHAPTER XXV.

THE WORLD’S SACRED BOOKS.

THE NEED OF A WIDER CONCEPTION OF REVELATION, OR
LESSONS FROM THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE WORLD, BY
PROFESSOR J. ESTLIN CARPENTER OF OXFORD.

The congress which I have the honor to address in this paper is a unique assemblage. It could not have met before the nineteenth century, and no country in the world possesses the needful boldness of conception and organizing energy save the United States of America. History does indeed record other endeavors to bring the religions of the world into line. The Christian fathers of the fourth century credited Demetrius Phalereus, the large-minded librarian of Ptolemy Philadelphus, about 250 B.C., with the attempt to procure the sacred books not only of the Jews, but also of the Ethiopians, Indians, Persians, Elamites, Babylonians, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Romans, Phenicians, Syrians, and Greeks. The great Emperor Akber (the contemporary of Queen Elizabeth), invited to his court Jews, Christians, Mohammedans, Brahmans, and Zoroastrians. He listened to their discussions, he weighed their arguments, until (says one of the native historians) there grew, gradually as the outline on a stone, the conviction in his heart that there were sensible men in all religions. Different, indeed, is this from the curt condemnation by the English Lexicographer, Samuel Johnson, who said a hundred years ago: “There are two objects of curiosity, the Christian world and the Mohammedan world, all the rest may be considered barbarous.” This Congress meets, I trust, in the spirit of that wise old man who wrote: “One is born a Pagan, another a Jew, a third a Mussulman. The true philosopher sees in each a fellow seeking after God.” With this conviction of the sympathy of religions I offer some remarks founded on the study of the world’s sacred books.
I will not stop to define a sacred book, or distinguish it from those which, like the "Imitatio Christi," "Theologia Germanica," or "Pilgrim's Progress," have deeply influenced Christian thought or feeling. It is enough to observe that the significance of great collections of religious literature cannot be overestimated. As soon as a faith produces a scripture, i.e., a book invested with legal or other authority, no matter on how lowly a scale, it at once acquires an element of permanence. Such permanence has both advantages and dangers. First of all, it provides the great sustenance for religious affection; it protects a young and growing religion from too rapid change through contact with foreign influences; it settles a base for future internal development; it secures a certain stability; it fixes a standard of belief; consolidates the moral type.

It has been sometimes argued that if the gospels had never been written, the Christian Church which existed for a generation ere they were composed, would still have transmitted its orders and administered its sacraments, and lived on by its great tradition. But where would have been the image of Jesus enshrined in these brief records? How could it have sunk into the heart of nations and served as the impulse and the goal of endeavor, unexhausted in Christendom after eighteen centuries? The diversity of the religions of Greece, their tendency to pass into one another, the ease with which new cults obtained a footing in Rome, the decline of any vital faith during the last days of the republic, supply abundant illustrations of the religious weakness of a nation without scriptures. On the other hand the dangers are obvious. The letter takes the place of the spirit, the transitory is confused with the permanent, the occasional is made universal, the local and temporal is erected into the everlasting and absolute.

The sacred book is indispensable for the missionary religion. Even Judaism, imperfect as was its development in this direction, discovered this as the Greek version of the Seventy made its way along the Mediterranean. Take the Koran from Islam and where would have been its conquering power? Read the records of the heroic labors of the Buddhist missionaries and of the devoted toil of the Chinese pilgrims to India in search of copies of the
holy books; you may be at a loss to understand the enthusiasm with which they gave their lives to the reproduction of the teachings of the great master; you will see how clear and immediate was the perception that the diffusion of the new religion depended on the translation of its scriptures.

And now, one after another, our age has witnessed the resurrection of ancient literatures. Philology has put the key of language into our hands. Shrine after shrine in the world's great temple has been entered; the songs of praise, the commands of law, the litanies of penitence, have been fetched from the tombs of the Nile or the mounds of Mesopotamia, or the sanctuaries of the Ganges. The Bible of humanity has been recorded. What will it teach us? I desire to suggest to this congress that it brings home the need of a conception of revelation unconfined to any particular religion, but capable of application in diverse modes to all. Suffer me to illustrate this very briefly under three heads: 1. Ideas of Ethics. 2. Ideas of Inspiration. 3. Ideas of Incarnation.

The sacred books of the world are necessarily varied in character and contents. Yet no group of scriptures fails to recognize in the long run the supreme importance of conduct. Here is that which in the control of action, speech, and thought is of the highest significance for life. This consciousness sometimes lights up even the most arid wastes of sacrificial detail.

All nations do not pass through the same stages of moral evolution within the same periods or mark them by the same crises. The development of one is slower, of another more swift. One people seems to remain stationary for millenniums, another advances with each century. But in so far as they have both consciously reached the same moral relations and attained the same insight, the ethical truth which they have gained has the same validity. Enter an Egyptian tomb of the century of Moses' birth and you will find that the soul as it came before the judges in the other world was summoned to declare its innocence in such words as these: "I am not a doer of what is wrong, I am not a robber, I am not a murderer, I am not a liar, I am not unchaste, I am not the causer of others' tears." Is the standard of duty here implied less noble than that of the decalogue? Are we
to depress the one as human and exalt the other as Divine? More than five hundred years before Christ the Chinese sage, Lao-Tsze, bade his disciples, "Recompense injury with kindness," and at the same great era, faithful in noble utterance, Gautama the Buddha said, "Let man overcome anger by liberality and the liar by truth." Is this less a revelation of a higher ideal than the injunction of Jesus, "Resist not evil, but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also?" The fact surely is that we cannot draw any partition line through the phenomena of the moral life and affirm that on one side lie the generalizations of earthly reason, and, on the other, the declarations of heavenly truth. The utterances in which the heart of man has embodied its glimpses of the higher vision are not all of equal merit, but they must be explained in the same way. The moralists of the Flowery Land, even before Confucius, were not slow to perceive this, though they could not apply it over so wide a range as that now open to us. Heaven in giving birth to the multitudes of the people, to every faculty and relationship affixed its law. The people possess this normal virtue.

In the ancient records gathered up in the Shu King the Duke of Chow related how Hea would not follow the leading of Shang Ti—supreme ruler of God. "In the daily business of life and the most common actions," wrote the commentator, "we feel, as it were, an influence exerted on the intelligence, the emotions and the heart. Even the most stupid are not without their gleams of light." This is the leading idea of Ti, and there is no place where it is not felt. Modern ethical theory, in the forms which it has assumed at the hands of Butler, Kent and Martineau, recognizes this element. Its relation to the whole philosophy of religion will no doubt be discussed by other speakers at this congress.

Suffer me in brief to state my conviction that the authority of conscience only receives its full explanation when it is admitted that that difference which we designate in forms of "higher" is not of our own making. It issues forth from our own nature because it has been first implanted within it. It is a speech to our souls of a loftier voice, growing clearer and more articulate as thought grows wider and feeling more pure. It is in fact
the witness of God within us; it is the self-manifestation of His righteousness, so that in the common terms of universal moral experience lies the first and broadest element or Revelation. But may we not apply the same tests, the worth of belief, the genuineness of feeling, to more special cases? If the Divine life shows itself forth in the development of conscience, may it not be traced also in the slow rise of a nation's thought of God, or in the swifter response of nobler minds to the appeal of heaven? The fact is that man is so conscious of his weakness that, in his earlier days, all higher knowledge, the gifts of language and letters, the discovery of the crafts, the inventions of civilization, poetry and song, art, law, philosophy, bear about them the stamp of the superhuman. "From thee," sang Pindar (nearest of Greeks to Hebrew prophecy) "cometh all high excellence to mortals." Such love is in fact the teaching of the Unseen, the manifestation of the infinite in our mortal ken. If this conception of Providential guidance be true in the broad sphere of human intelligence, does it cease to be true in the realm of religious thought? Read one of the Egyptian hymns laid in the believer's coffin ere Moses was born:

"Praise to Amen-Ra, the good God beloved, the Ancient of Heavens, the oldest of the earth, Lord of Eternity, Maker Everlasting. He is the causer of pleasure and light, maker of grass for the cattle and of fruitful trees for man, causing the fish to live in the river and the birds to fill the air, lying awake when all men sleep to seek out the good of His creatures. We worship Thy Spirit who alone hast made us; we, whom Thou hast made, thank Thee that Thou hast given us birth; we give Thee praises for Thy mercy to us."

Is this less inspired than a Hebrew psalm? Study that antique record of all the Zarathustra in the Gathas, which all scholars receive as the oldest part of the Zend-Avesta. Does it not rest on a religious experience similar in kind to that of Isaiah?

Theologies may be many, but religion is but one. It was after this that the Vedic seers were groping when they looked at the varied worship around them and cried: "They call him India, Mitra, Varuna, Agni; sages name variously him who is but one; or again, "the sages in their hymns give many forms to him who is but one." It was this essential fact with which the early Christians
were confronted as they saw that the Greek poets and philosophers had reached truths about the being of God not at all unlike those of Moses and the prophets. Their solution was worthy of freedom and universality of the spirit of Jesus. They were for recognizing and welcoming truth wherever they found it, and they referred it without hesitation to the ultimate source of wisdom and knowledge, the Logos, at once the minor thought and the uttered word of God. The martyr Justin affirmed that the Logos had worked through Socrates, as it had been present in Jesus; nay, with a wider outlook he spoke of the seed of the Logos implanted in every race of man. In virtue of this fellowship, therefore, all truth was revelation and akin to Christ Himself. "Whatsoever things were said among all men, are the property of us Christians." The Alexandrian teachers shared the same conception. The divine Intelligence pervaded human life and history and showed itself in all that was best in beauty, goodness, truth. The way of truth was like a mighty river ever flowing, and, as it passed, it was ever receiving fresh streams on this side and that. Nay, so clear in Clement's view was the work of Greek philosophy that he not only regarded it like law and gospel as a gift of God, it was an actual covenant as much as that of Sinai, possessed of its own justifying power, or following the great generalization of St. Paul. The law was a tutor to bring the Jews to Christ. Clement added that philosophy wrought the same heaven-appointed service for the Greeks. May we not use the same great conception over other fields of the history of religion? "In all ages," affirmed the author of the wisdom of Solomon, "wisdom entering into holy souls maketh them friends of God and prophets." So we may claim in its widest application the saying of Mohammed: "Every nation has a creator of the heavens—to which they turn in prayer—it is God who turneth them toward it. Hasten, then, emulously after good wheresoever ye be. God will one day bring you all together."

We shall no longer, then, speak, like a distinguished Oxford professor, of the three chief false religions—Brahmanism, Buddhism, Islam. In so far as the soul discerns God, the reverence, adoration, trust, which constitutes the moral and spiritual elements of its faith, are in fact
identical through every variety of creed. They may be more or less clearly articulate, less or more crude and confused, or pure and elevated, but they are in substance the same.

"In the adoration and benedictions of righteous men," said the poet of the Masnavi-i-Manavi, "the praises are mingled into one stream; all the vessels are emptied into one ewer; because He that is praised is in fact only one. In this respect all religions are only one religion." Can the same thought be carried one step farther? If inspiration be a world-wide process unconfined by specific limits of one people, or one book, may the same be said of the idea of Incarnation? The conception of incarnation has many forms, and in different theologies serves various ends. But they all possess one feature in common. Among the functions of the manifestation of the Divine Man is instruction; His life is in some sense or other a mode of revelation. Study the various legends belonging to Central America of which the beautiful story of the Mexican Quetzalcoatl may be taken as a type—the virgin born who inaugurates a reign of peace, who establishes arts, institutes beneficent laws, abolishes all human and animal sacrifices and suppresses war—they all revolve around the idea of disclosing among men a higher life of wisdom and righteousness and love, which is in truth an unveiling of heaven. Or consider a much more highly developed type, that of the Buddhas in Theistic Buddhism, as the manifestation of the self-existent, everlasting God. Not once only did he leave His heavenly home to become incarnate in His mother's womb.

"Repeatedly am I born in the land of the living. And what reason should I have to manifest myself? When men have become unwise, unbelieving, ignorant, careless, then I, who know the course of the world, declare "I am so-and-so," and consider how I can incline them to enlightenment, how they can become partakers of the Buddha nature."

To become partakers of the Divine nature is the goal also of the Christian believer. But may it not be stated as already implicitly a present fact? When St. Paul quoted the words of Aratus on Mars Hill, "For we also are His offspring," did he not recognize the sonship of man to God as a universal truth? Was not this the meaning
of Jesus when He bade His followers pray, "Our Father who art in Heaven"? Once more Greek wisdom may supply us with a form for our thought. The Logos of God which became flesh and dwelt in Christ, wrought, so Justin tells us, in Socrates as well. Was its purpose or effect limited to those two? Is there not a sense in which it appears in all men? If there is a true Light which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world, will not every man as he lives by the Light himself also show forth God? The word of God is not of single application. It is boundless, unlimited. For each man as he enters into being, there is an idea in the Divine Mind—may we not say in our poor human fashion?—Of what God means him to be; that dwells in every soul, and realizing itself not in conduct only, but in each several highest form of human endeavor. It is the fountain of all lofty thought, it utters itself through the creatures of beauty in poetry and art, it prompts the investigation of science, it guides the inquiries of philosophy. There are so many kinds of voices in the world, and no kind is without signification. So many voices! So many words! Each soul a fresh word with a new destiny conceived for it by God, to be something which none that has preceded has ever been before; to show forth some purpose of the Divine Being just then and there which none else could make known.

Thus conceived the history of religion gathers up into itself the history of human thought and life. It becomes the story of God's continual revelation to our race. However much we may mar or frustrate it, in this revelation each one of us may have part. Its forms may change from age to age; its institutions may rise and fall; its rights and usages may grow and decline. These are the temporary, the local, the accidental; they are not the essence which abides. To realize the sympathy of religions is the first step toward grasping this great thought. May this Congress, with its noble representation of so many faiths, hasten the day of mutual understanding when God, by whatever name we hallow Him, shall be all in all.
CHAPTER XXVI.

THE JAINS.

THE ETHICS AND HISTORY OF THE JAINS, BY VIRCHAND A. GHANDI, OF BOMBAY.

Mr. President and Gentlemen:—I wish that the duty of addressing you on the history and tenets of the Jain faith world had fallen on an abler person than myself. The inclemency of the climate and the distant voyage which one has to undertake before he can come here have prevented abler Jains than myself from attending this grand assembly and presenting their religious convictions to you in person. You will, therefore, look upon me as simply the mouthpiece of Muni Almarimji, the learned high priest of the Jain community in India, who has devoted his whole life to the study of that ancient faith. I am truly sorry that Muni Almarimji is not among us to take charge of the duty of addressing you.

Without further preface I shall at once go to the subject of the day. It will be convenient to divide this paper into two parts: First, "The Philosophy and Ethics of the Jains;" second, "The History of the Jains."

1. Jainism has two ways of looking at things—one called Dravyarthekaraya and the other Paryayartheka Noya. I shall illustrate them. The production of a law is the production of something not previously existing, if we think of it from the latter point of view, i.e., as a Paryaya, or modification; while it is not the production of something not previously existing if we look at it from the former point of view, i.e., as a Dravya or substance. According to the Dravyarthekaraya view the universe is without beginning and end, but according to the Paryayartheka view we have creation and destruction at every moment.

The Jain canon may be divided into two parts:
First, Shrute Dharma, i.e., philosophy; and second, Chatra Dharma, i.e., ethics.

The Shrute Dharma inquires into the nature of nine principles, six substances, six kinds of living beings and four states of existence—Jiva (sentient beings), Ajiva (non-sentient things), Punya (merit), Papa (demerit). Of the nine principles, the first is Pua (soul). According to the Jain view, soul is that element which knows, thinks and feels. It is in fact the Divine element in the living being. The Jain thinks that the phenomena of knowledge, feeling, thinking, and willing are conditioned on something, and that that something must be as real as anything can be. This “soul” is in a certain sense different from knowledge, and in another sense identical with it. So far as one’s knowledge is concerned the soul is identical with it, but so far as some one else’s knowledge is concerned it is different from it. The true nature of soul is right knowledge, right faith, and right conduct. The soul, so long as it is subject to transmigration, is undergoing evolution and involution.

The second principle is non-soul. It is not simply what we understand by matter, but it is more than that. Matter is a term contrary to soul. But non-soul is its contradictory. Whatever is not soul is non-soul.

The rest of the nine principles are but the different states produced by the combination and separation of soul and non-soul. The third principle is Punya (merit). That, on account of which a being is happy, is Punya. The fourth principle is Papa (demerit), that on account of which a being suffers from misery. The fifth is Ashrana, the state which brings in merit and demerit. The seventh is Nirjara, destruction of actions. The eighth is Bardha, with bondage of soul, with Karwa, actions. The ninth is Moksha, total and permanent freedom of soul from all Karwas.

Substance is divided into the sentient, or conscious, matter, stability, space, and time. Six kinds of living beings are divided into six classes, earth-body beings, water-body beings, fire-body beings, wind-body beings, vegetables, and all of them having one organ of sense, that of touch. These are again divided into four classes of beings having two organs of sense, those of touch and of taste, such as tapeworms, leeches, etc.; beings having
three organs of sense, those of taste, touch and smell, such as ants, lice, etc.; beings having four organs of sense, those of touch, taste, smell and sight, such as bees, scorpions, etc.; beings having five organs of sense, those of touch, taste, smell, sight, and hearing. There are human beings, animals, birds, men, and gods. All these living beings have four, five, or six of the following capacities: Capacity of taking food, capacity of constructing body, capacity of constructing organs, capacity of respiration, capacity of speaking, and the capacity of thinking. Beings having one organ of sense, that is, of touch, have the first four capacities. Beings having two, three and four organs of sense, have the first five capacities, while those having five organs have all the six capacities.

The Jain canonical book treats very elaborately of the minute divisions of the living beings, and their prophets have long before the discovery of the microscope been able to tell how many organs of sense the minutest animalcule has. I would refer those who are desirous of studying Jain biology, zoology, botany, anatomy, and physiology to the many books published by our society.

I shall now refer to the four states of existence. They are naraka, tiryarch, manushyra and deva. Naraka is the lowest state of existence, that of being a denizen of hell; tiryarch is the next, that of having an earth body, water-body, fire-body, wind-body, vegetable, of having two, three, or four organs, animal and birds. The third is manushyra, of being a man, and the fourth is deva, that of being a denizen of the celestial world. The highest state of existence is the Jain Moksha, the apotheosis in the sense that the mortal being by the destruction of all Karwan attains the highest spiritualism, and the soul being severed from all connection with matter regains its purest state and becomes divine.

Having briefly stated the principal articles of Jain belief, I come to the grand questions, the answers to which are the objects of all religious inquiry and the substance of all creeds.

1. What is the origin of the universe?

This involves the question of God. Gautama, the Buddha, forbids inquiry into the beginning of things. In the Brahmanical literature bearing on the constitution of cosmos, frequent reference is made to the days and nights
of Brahma, the periods of Mannantara and the periods of Peroloya. But the Jains, leaving all symbolical expression aside, distinctly reaffirm the view previously promulgated? by the previous hierophants, that matter and soul are eternal and cannot be created. You can affirm existence of a thing from one point of view, deny it from another, and affirm both existence and non-existence with reference to it at different times. If you should think of affirming both existence and non-existence at the same time, from the same point of view, you must say that the thing cannot be spoken of similarly, under certain circumstances the affirmation of existence is not possible; of non-existence and also of both.

What is meant by these seven modes is that a thing should not be considered as existing everywhere at all times, in all ways, and in the form of everything. It may exist in one place and not in another at one time. It is not meant by these modes that there is no certainty, or that we have to deal with probabilities only as some scholars have taught. Even the great Bedantist Shoukarachaya has possibly erred when he says that the Jains are agnostics. All that is implied is that every assertion which is true, is true only under certain conditions of substance, space, time; etc.

This is the great merit of the Jain philosophy, that, while other philosophies make absolute assertions, the Jain looks at things from all standpoints, and adapts itself like a mighty ocean in which the sectarian rivers merge themselves. What is God, then? God, in the sense of an extracosmic personal Creator, has no place in the Jain philosophy. It distinctly denies such Creator as illogical and irrelevant in the general scheme of the universe. But it lays down that there is a subtle essence underlying all substances, conscious as well as unconscious, which becomes an eternal cause of all modifications, and is termed God. But then, the advocate of theism, holding that even primordial matter had its first cause—the God—argues that “everything that we know had a cause. How, then, can it be but that the elements had a cause to which they are indebted for their existence?” That great philosopher John Stuart Mill, replies:

“The fact of experience, however, when correctly expressed, turns out to be, not that everything which we know derives its
existence from the cause, but only every event or change. There is in nature a permanent element and also a changeable; the changes are always the effects of previous changes; the permanent existences, so far as we know, are not effects at all. It is true we are accustomed to say, not only of events but of objects, that they are produced by causes, as water by the union of hydrogen and oxygen. But by this we only mean that when they begin to exist, their beginning is the effect of a cause. But their beginning to exist is not an object, it is an event. If it be objected that the cause of a thing’s beginning to exist may be said with propriety to be the cause of the thing itself, I shall not quarrel with the expression. But that which in an object begins to exist is that in it that belongs to the changeable element in nature, the outward form and the properties depending upon mechanical or chemical combinations of its component parts. There is in every object another and a permanent element, viz.: the specific elementary substance or substances of which it consists and their inherent properties. These are not known to us as beginning to exist; within the range of human knowledge they have no beginning, consequently no cause; though they themselves are causes or non-causes of everything that takes place. Experience, therefore, affords no evidences; not even analogies, to justify our extending to the apparently immutable a generalization grounded only on our observation of the changeable.

As a fact of experience, then, causation cannot legitimately be extended to the material universe itself, but only to its changeable phenomena; of these, indeed, causes may be affirmed without any exception. But what causes? The cause of every change is a prior change, and such it cannot but be, for if there were no new antecedent there would not be a new consequent. If the state of facts which brings the phenomenon into existence had existed always, or for an indefinite duration, the effect also would have existed always, or been produced an indefinite time ago. It is thus a necessary part of the fact of causation, within the sphere of our experience, that the causes, as well as the effects, had a beginning in time and were themselves caused. It would seem, therefore, that our experience, instead of furnishing an argument for the first cause, is repugnant to it, and that the very essential of causation as it exists within the limits of our knowledge is incompatible with a first cause.

This doctrine of the transmigration of soul, or the reincarnation, is another grand idea of the Jain philosophy. Once the whole civilized world embraced this doctrine. Many philosophers have upheld it. Scientists
like Flammarion, Figuier and Brewster have advocated it. Theologians like Müller, Dorner and Edward Beecher have maintained it. The Bible and sacred literature of the east are full of it, and it is to-day accepted by the majority of the world's inhabitants.

People are talking of design in nature. But what does the idea of design lead to? Design means contrivance, adaptation of means to an end. But the necessity of contrivance, the need of employing means, is a consequence of the limitation of power. Who would have recourse to means if to attain his end his mere word was sufficient?

But how shall we reconcile God's infinite benevolence and justice with His infinite power, when we look around and see that some of His creatures are born happy and others miserable? Why is He so partial? Where is the moral responsibility of a person having no incentive to lead a virtuous life? The problem of injustice and misery which broods over our world can only be explained by the doctrine of reincarnation and Karma, to which I am presently coming.

That the soul is immortal is doubted by very few. It is an old declaration that whatever begins in time must end in time. You cannot say that soul is eternal on one side of its earthly period without being so in the other. If the soul sprang into existence specially for this life, why should it continue afterward? The ordinary idea of creation at birth involves the correlative of annihilation at death. Moreover, it does not stand to reason that from an infinite history, the soul enters this world for its first and all physical existence, and then merges into an endless spiritual eternity. The more reasonable deduction is that it has passed through many lives and will have to pass through many more before it reaches its ultimate goal. But it is objected that we have no memory of past lives. Can any one recall his childhood? Has any one a memory of that wonderful epoch—infancy?

The companion doctrine of transmigration is the doctrine of Karma. The Sanscrit of the word Karma means action. "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again," and, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" are but the corollaries of that
most intricate law of Karmon. It solves the problem of the inequality and apparent injustice of the world.

The Karmon in the Jain philosophy is divided into eight classes: Those which act as an impediment to the knowledge of truth; those which act as an impediment to the right insight of various sorts; those which give one pleasure or pain, and those which produce bewilderment. The other four are again divided into other classes, so minutely, that a student of Jain Karmon philosophy can trace any effect to a particular Karma. No other Indian philosophy reads so beautifully and so clearly the doctrine of Karmas. Persons who, by right faith, right knowledge, and right conduct destroy all Karmon and thus fully develop the nature of their soul, reach the highest perfection, become divine and are called Jinias. Those Jinias who in every age, preach the law and establish the order, are called Tirtharkaros.

I now come to the Jain ethics. Different philosophers have given different bases for the guidance of comfort. The Jain ethics direct conduct to be so adapted as to insure the fullest development of the soul—the highest happiness, that is the goal of human conduct, which is the ultimate end of human action. Jainism teaches to look upon all living beings as upon himself. What, then, is the mode of attaining the highest happiness? The sacred books of the Brahmins prescribe Upasona (devotion and Karma). The Vedanta indicates the path of knowledge as the means to the highest. But Jainism goes a step farther and says that the highest happiness is to be obtained by knowledge and religious observances. The five Maharatas for Jain ascetics are:

Not to kill, i.e. to protect all life.
Not to lie.
Not to take that which is not given.
To abstain from sexual intercourse.
To renounce all interest in worldly things, especially to call nothing one's own.
CHAPTER XXVII.

The Historic Christ.

THE HISTORIC CHRIST, BY RIGHT REV. T. W. DUDLEY, BISHOP OF KENTUCKY.

Beyond a controversy in or about the year 750 of the building of the City of Rome, a man named Jesus was born in the province of Judea. Equally beyond a controversy this man was crucified before Pontius Pilate, a Roman Governor at Jerusalem, in or about the year of the city, 783.

Of this man Jesus millions of men believe that, according to His own sure word of promise, He came back from the grave on the third day after His crucifixion; that, forty days thereafter in the presence of chosen witnesses, He visibly ascended into the heavens; that there He liveth to make perpetual intercession with the one God, His own Father, for us men whom He did redeem; that in the fullness of time He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead; and that of His Kingdom there shall be no end. They believe that, of His bitter suffering, prophecy had spoken continual promise for thousands of years, and that in His life and death was realization perfect and complete of all that had thus been foretold; that, therefore, He is the Christ; the Anointed of God. Further that, in the fulfillment of His own prophetic declarations His church, which is His body, should be animated by His spirit. Because He was lifted up upon the accursed tree He has drawn unto Himself the hearts of all men who have looked upon Him; because He has drawn near and does draw near to the men who believe in Him; because He has not left men comfortless, but has and does come unto them and comfort them; therefore they believe in Him, the historic Christ—even this God, who at sundry times and in diverse manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the proph-
ets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son.

Let us begin our consideration of the claims of this historic Personage with the briefest enumeration of the results of the preaching of Him, and of the consequent discipleship of the nations, without any present reference to or mention of His nature. Be he fallible man or infallible God, be he but an extraordinary natural development of humanity or the miraculous incarnation of Deity, in either case I affirm that the teaching of the moral precepts enunciated by Jesus of Nazareth, the uplifting before men's eyes and hearts of the portraiture of His character, the proclamations of His image of hope to the world, the gathering into organized communities of them that have received that image, that have been won, by that ideal beauty and that would learn those precepts and be conformed to that image, this agency has had emphatic results in the education and development of mankind more than all others of which we can take cognizance. Remember the words of the historian of rationalism and of morals:

"It has been reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character, which, through all the changes of eighteen centuries has filled the hearts of men with an impassioned love and has shown itself capable of acting on all ages and nations, temperaments and conditions; has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the highest incentive to its practice, and has exerted so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of these short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the dispensatories of philosophy and than all the exhortations of moralists."

Who will deny that the teachings of Jesus as to the very conception of God have been a supreme energy in the uplifting and liberation of mankind. The Roman people had ceased to believe; the spiritual quality had gone out of them. The noble conception of beloved God, which had been the inspiration of the ancient Hebrew people, had been overlaid with the subtleties of rabbinistic speculations, until it remained as but a memory of a dead faith, guarded by a great tomb of protective argument, rather than a living, energizing power.

Yes, mankind is sacred, for it is the choice of the Omnipotent Father. And see in a glance what has followed
and what must follow. All humanity is sacred, but to the masters of the world no such conception has come. The law which controlled the great empire contained no protection for the life of a child from the capricious fury of those who would destroy it. "The extermination of children," says Gibbon, "was the prevailing and stubborn vice of antiquity," and was as common in the Hellenic states as even on the Tiber, but "Whoso shall receive one such little child in My name, receiveth Me."

In the world to which came the message of the historic Christ the institution of slavery was universal. At long intervals we hear the protest of some philosopher or poet against the unnatural bondage of man to man, but the system was deep-rooted in human society everywhere.

Often the slaves were of one blood with their masters, captives in war or paupers, self-sold to gain their bread, and the palaces of the luxurious Romans of the empire were adorned with poets, musicians, actors, authors, artists of every kind, all alike slaves for life, and at the very mercy of their masters, whose tenderest mercy was cruel. To them came the message of the historic Christ, not to enjoin the effort to escape by violence or craft; no, but to tell of the Fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man which cannot but abolish slavery. There is no open, declared hostility, but forces are set to work by whose silent action every bond must be broken. The Christ has said, in revealing the principles of the crucial purposes at the end of the world: "I was an hungered and ye gave Me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave Me drink; I was a stranger and ye took Me in; naked and ye clothed Me; I was sick and ye visited Me; I was in prison and ye came unto Me. Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me."

Humanity is one, for all are the children of the one Father; all joined to this man Jesus, to himself in mysterious union; all must minister of the abundance unto the needy of the health, and happiness to the sickness and sorrow of the followers. It must be so.

Again, the influence upon individuals has of necessity extended to enfold the nations which the individuals make up. And the nations are hearing and have been hearing the message of the human Christ. Arbitration has asserted its right to determine international differences
instead of the ancient arbiter, the sword. It is because there comes sounding down the ages His word. "I say unto ye that ye resist not evil," and the echo which follows is the voice of this great expounder, "Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good." What marvelous advances since the historic Christ began His teaching.

The march is onward, the flag floats in advance, the trumpet note that sounded at Jerusalem still sounds, "Repent ye and be converted."

Beyond all controversy, by the testimony of the Roman custodians of the period, written fifty days after the asserted resurrection of Jesus, the little company of followers had been reassembled and reorganized.

I would not be understood to fail to recognize and give thanks for the faith and the labors, the zeal and the devotion of Christians of every name who, under the influence of the one Spirit, have presented this gospel and borne their witness. They are all members of the Catholic Church of Christ.

There is more evidence for the resurrection of Jesus than any other event in human history. The historic Christ, the redemption of humanity, the supreme energy of man's elevation and development, the highest manhood is the incarnate God equal unto the Father, and therefore their mighty works do show themselves in Him, Jesus of Nazareth, the Friend of publicans and sinners, homeless and penniless, hungry and thirsty, cold and suffering, scourged and spit upon, crucified. Jesus, the historic Christ, whom we worship, yes, worship as God, all blessed forever, became heaven and earth and full of the majesty of their glory. The glorious company of the Apostles praise Thee, the martyrs praise Thee, that Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ!
CHAPTER XXVIII.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE NEGRO.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE NEGRO, BY BISHOP B. W. ARNETT, OF
THE AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

We have gathered from the east, from the west, from the north, from the south, this day to celebrate the triumph of human freedom on the American continent. For there is not one slave within all of our borders. There is no master. From Huron’s lordly flood to where the venturesome Magellan passed from sea to sea in the south, every man is free, owning no master save his own free will on earth and his God in Heaven.

The greatest of all things created, visible or invisible, that we know of, is man. He is the greatest mystery of creation. The world was made for him. The ultimate design of God cannot be fully comprehended until we see the dust standing erect in the form of man, with body, soul, and spirit; a compound of matter and mind, material, and immaterial, and a mortal and an immortal being; the master of the realm of thought.

I congratulate the representatives of all nations of the earth who have assembled in this hall this day—a day around which clusters so much history, so much hope, and so much liberty. We have met for the first time since the children of Noah were scattered on the Plains of Shinar. The Parliament at Shinar plotted treason against the Divine command and Providence; inaugurated a rebellion against Heaven; their tongues were confused and they were banished until this day; in fact, this is the adjourned meeting, from Shinar to Chicago. They met to show their disloyalty to God; we have met to discuss the subjects which are ultimately connected with our present happiness and the future prosperity of our race and country.

The evolution in the religious thought of the world has
enabled us to assemble in one place and of one accord to compare notes, to examine the truth, in order that our faith might be strengthened and our hopes brightened and our love increased toward the fundamental truths of each of our religions. We are to make a report of the battles fought, of the victories won, in search after truth. Also to report the discoveries made in the investigation of the material world and in the realms of mind and thought and to give the latest conclusions of philosophy about the relations of God, man, and the world. In fact, we are to see whether the fundamental truth of philosophy is not the same as the fundamental truth of theology, which is God. It has been said that philosophy searches, but religion reveals God. Our duty will be to show that revealed religion is superior to natural religion in giving us a true knowledge, the new and true conception of God; His nature, His attributes, communicable, and uncommunicable; His relation to the physical, moral, and mental world, as the Creator, Preserver and Governor.

But there are two revelations of God: the one written and the other unwritten. The unwritten revelation of God is Nature, from whose forms of matter and systems of operating forces flash the suggestions of infinite power, goodness and wisdom. The Bible is the written revelation of God, and is open to the gaze of man and subject to interpretation. It contains truths which are subject to explanation. The theologian is the interpreter, not alone of the Bible, but of Nature and Providence. He is to interrogate Nature and to give her answers according to the rules of reason and science. He is to interrogate the truths as found in Revelation and explain them in the light of the Church of God.

The negro is older than Christianity, as old as man, for he is one of the legitimate sons of his father and grandfather. In some way or other he has been connected with the history of every age and every work, so that no history of the past is complete without some reference to the negro or his home, Africa, whose soil has been abundantly fruitful in some of the best and many of the worst of human productions.

The negro’s home, Africa, was the home of Dido, of Hannibal; the scene of Scipio’s triumphs and Jugurtha’s
crimes; it also has been the home of scholars, of philosophers, of theologians, of statesmen, and of soldiers. It was the cradle of art and of science. In the first days of Christianity it contributed more than its proportion of the early agents of the propagators of the new religion. Luke, the beloved physician, was from Cyrene, an African by birth, if not by blood. Lucius, of Cyrene, was one of the first teachers of Christianity and was from Africa. Simon, the father of Rufus and Alexander, was a Cyrenian. It was this black man, a native of an African city, who became the cross-bearer of the Son of God on his way to Calvary.

Africa having contributed either by birth or blood to the establishment of the religion of Christ upon earth, certainly her sons and daughters ought to be permitted to enjoy the blessings purchased with so much sorrow, suffering and tears. Among the early teachers of Antioch was one Simon, who was called Niger. Thus we have at least one evangelist and four of the early teachers of Christianity who were Africans.

We do fervently pray and earnestly hope that the meeting held this day will start a wave of influences that will change some of the Christians of this land and the brotherhood of man, and from this time forward they will accord to us that which we receive in every land except this "land of the free and home of the brave."

All we ask is the right of an American citizen; the right to life, liberty, and happiness, and there be given us the right and privileges that belong to every citizen of a Christian commonwealth. It is not pity we ask for, but justice, it is not help, but a fair chance; we ask not to be carried, but to be given an opportunity to walk, run, or stand alone in our own strength or to fall in our own weakness; we are not begging for bread, but for an opportunity to earn bread for our wives and children; treat us not as wards of a nation nor as objects of pity, but treat us as American citizens, as Christian men and women; do not chain your doors and bar your windows and deny us a place in society, but give us the place that our intelligence, our virtue, our industry, and our courage entitle us to. "But admit none but the worthy and well qualified."

We do not shun judgment, but we ask to be judged
justly and without prejudice; hear both sides of our case before you render a verdict, and then render it according to the testimony given. Judge us not by the color of our skin, nor the texture of our hair, but judge us by our intelligence and character. When you weigh us, weigh our virtues against our vices; our intelligence against our ignorance; our industry against our idleness; our accumulations against our poverty; our courage against our cowardice; our strength against our weakness.

When you look for a sample of the Christian negro, do not go to the depot of some southern town, or the Hell's Half Acre of some city, or to the poorhouse, or jail or penitentiary. You won't find the model negro there; he has moved from such places thirty years ago. It is possible to find some of his children still lingering about the old homestead, but the Christian and model negro is living in the city of industry and thrift, and in the cottage of comfort and ease, which he has dedicated to religion, morality, and education, and morning and evening the passer-by may hear music from the piano or organ of "Home, Sweet Home," the dearest spot on earth.

We speak not thus in anger, but in words of truth and soberness. We know what has been done in the name of Christianity, in the name of religion, in the name of God. We were stolen from our native land in the name of religion, chained as captives and brought to this continent in the name of the liberty of the gospel; they bound our limbs with fetters in the name of the Nazarene in order to save our souls; they sold us to teach the principles of religion; they sealed the Bible to increase our faith in God; pious prayers were offered for those who chained our fathers, who stole our mothers, who sold our brothers for paltry gold, all in the name of Christianity, to save our poor souls. When the price of flesh went down the interest in our souls became small; when the slave-trade was abolished by the strong hand of true Christianity, then false Christianity had no interest in our souls at all. Christianity has always had some strong friends for the negro in the south and in the north; men who stood by him under all circumstances.
CHAPTER XXIX.

THE SWEDENBORGIANS.

SWEDENBORG AND THE HARMONY OF RELIGIONS, BY REV. L. P. MERCER OF CHICAGO.

Before the closing of this grand historic assembly, with its witness to the worth of every form of faith by which men worship God and seek communion with Him, one word more needs be spoken, one more testimony defined, one more hope recorded.

Every voice has witnessed to the recognition of a new age. An age of inquiry, expectation, and experiment has dawned. New inventions are stirring men's hearts, new ideals inspire their arts, new physical achievements beckon them on to one marvelous mastery after another of the universe. And now we see that the new freedom of "willing and thinking" has entered the realm of religion, and the faiths of the world are summoned to declare and compare not only the formulas of the past, but the movements of the present and the forecasts of the future.

One religious teacher, who explicitly heralded the new age, before yet men had dreamed of its possibility, and referred its causes to great movements in the centers of influx in the spiritual world, and described it as incidental to great purposes in the providence of God, needs to be named from this platform—one who ranks with prophets and seers rather than with inquirers and speculators; a revelator rather than a preacher and interpreter; one whose exalted personal character and transcendent learning are eclipsed in the fruits of his mission as a herald of a new dispensation in religion, as the revealer of heavenly arcana, and "restorer of the foundations of many generations;" who, ignored by his own generation, and assaulted by its successor, is honored and respected in the present, and awaits the thoughtful study which the expansion and
culmination of the truth and the organic course of events will bring with to-morrow; "the permeating and formative influence" of whose teachings in the religious belief and life of to-day, in Christendom, is commonly admitted; who subscribed with his name on the last of his Latin quartos—Emanuel Swedenborg, "servant of the Lord Jesus Christ."

That Swedenborg was the son of a Swedish bishop, a scholar, a practical engineer, a man of science, a philosopher and a seer, who lived between 1683 and 1772, is generally known. That the first fifty years of his remarkable life, devoted to the pursuit of natural learning and independent investigations in science and philosophy, illustrate the type of man in which one age believes is generally conceded. Learned, standing far ahead of his generation; exact, trained in mathematical accuracy and schooled to observation; practical, seeing at once some useful application of every new discovery; a man of affairs, able to take care of his own and bear his part in the nation's councils; aspiring, ignoring no useful application, but content with no achievement short of a final philosophy of causes; inductive, taking nothing for granted, but facts of experiment, and seeking to ascend therefrom to a generalization which shall explain them—this is the sort of man which in our own day we consider sound and useful. Such was the man who, at the age of fifty-six, in the full maturity of his powers, declares that "he was called to a holy office by the Lord." "Who most graciously manifested Himself to me in person, and opened my sight to a view of the spiritual world and granted me the privilege of conversing with spirits and angels." "From that day forth," he says, "I gave up all worldly learning and labored only in spiritual things according to what the Lord commanded me to write."

He tells us that, while in the body, yet in a state of seership, and thus able to note the course of events in both worlds, and locate the stupendous transactions in the spiritual world in earthly time, he witnessed a last judgment in the world of spirits in 1757, fulfilling in every respect the predictions in the Gospel and in the Apocalypse; that he beheld the Lord open in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself, revealing in their eternal sense the Divine meaning, the whole course
and purpose of His providence, organizing a new heaven
of angels out of every nation and kindred and tongue, and
coördinating it with the ancient and most ancient heavens,
for the inauguration of a new dispensation of religion, and
of the church universal; and that this new dispensation,
begun in the spiritual world, is carried down and inaugu-
rated among men by the revelation of the spiritual sense
and Divine meaning of the Sacred Scriptures, in and by
means of which He makes His promised second advent,
which is spiritual and universal, to gather up and com-
plete all past and partial revelations, to consummate and
crown the dispensations and churches which have been
upon the earth.

The Christian world is incredulous of such an event,
and for the most part heedless of its announcement. But
that does not much signify, except as it makes one with
the whole course of history, as to the reception of Divine
announcements. What prophet was ever welcomed until
the event had proved his message? The question is not
whether it meets the expectation of men; not whether it
is what human prudence would forecast, but whether it
reveals and meets the needs and necessities of the nations
of the earth. "My thoughts are not your thoughts,"
saith the Lord, "neither are your ways My ways." The
great movements of divine Providence are never what
men anticipate, but they always provide what men need.
And the appeal to the "Parliament of Religions" in be-
half of the revelation announced from heaven is in its
ability to prove its divinity by outreaching abundantly
all human forecast whatsoever. Does it throw its light
over the past, and into the present, and project its promise
into the future? Does it illuminate and unify history,
elucidate the conflicting movements of to-day, and explain
the hopes and yearnings of the heart in every age and
clime?

There is not time at this hour for exposition and illus-
tration, only to indicate the catholicity of Swedenborg's
teachings in its spirit, scope, and purpose. There is one
God and one Church. As God is one, the human race, in
the complex movements of its growth and history, is be-
fore him as one greatest man. It has had its ages in their
order corresponding to infancy, childhood, youth, and man-
hood in the individual. As the one God is the Father of
all, He has witnessed Himself in every age according to its state and necessities. The Divine case has not been confined to one line of human descent, nor the revelation of God’s will to one set of miraculously given Scriptures.

The great religions of the world have their origin in that same word or mind of God, which wrote itself through Hebrew lawgiver and prophet and became incarnate in Jesus Christ, He, as “the word which was in the beginning of God and was God,” was the light of every age in the spiritual development of mankind, preserving and carrying over the life of each into the several streams of tradition in the religions of men concerning and embodying all in the Hebrew Scriptures, fulfilling that in His own person, and now opening His divine mind in all that Scripture, the religions of the world are to be restored to unity, purified and perfected in Him.

Nor in this world Swedenborgian, the liberal sentiment of good-will and the enthusiasm of hope, but the discovery of divine fact and the rational insight of spiritual understanding. He has shown that the Sacred Scriptures are written according to the correspondence of national with spiritual things, and that they contain an internal spiritual sense treating of the providence of God in the dispensations of the church and of the regeneration and spiritual life of the soul. Before Abraham there was the church of Noah, and before the word of Moses there was an ancient word, written in allegory and correspondences, which the ancients understood and loved, but in process of time turned into magic and idolatry. The ancient church scattered into Egypt and Asia, carried fragments of that ancient word and preserved something of its representatives and allegories, in scriptures and mythologies, from which have come the truths and fables of the Oriental religions, modified according to nations and peoples and revived from time to time in the teachings of leaders and prophets.

From the same ancient word Moses derived, under Divine direction, the early chapters of Genesis, and to this in the order of Providence was added the law and the prophets. The history of the incarnation and the prophecy of a final judgment of God, all so written as to contain an integral spiritual sense, corresponding with the latter, but distinct from it as the soul corresponds with the body,
and is distinct and transcends it. It is the opening of this internal sense in all the Holy Scriptures and not any addition to their final letter which constitutes the new and needed revelation of our day. The sciences of correspondences is the key which unlocks the Scriptures and discloses their internal contents. The same key opens the scriptures of the Orient and traces them back to their source in primitive revelation.

If it shows that their myths and representatives have been misunderstood, misrepresented, and misapplied it shows, also, that the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures have been likewise perverted and falsified. It is that very fact, which necessitates the revelation of their internal meaning, in which resides their divine inspiration and the life of rational understanding for the separation of truth from error. The same rational life and science of interpretation separates the great primitive truths from the corrupting speculations and traditions in all the ancient religions and furnishes the key to unlock the myths and symbols in ancient scriptures and worship.

If Swedenborg reveals errors and superstitions in the religions out of Christendom, so does he also show that the current Christian faith and worship is largely the invention of men and falsifying of the Christian's Bible. If he promises and shows true faith and life to the Christian from the Scriptures, so does he also to the Gentiles in leading them back to primitive revelation and showing them the meaning of their own aspirations for the Light of life. If he sets the Hebrew and Christian word above all other sacred Scripture, it is because it brings, as now opened in its scriptural depths, the Divine sanction to all the rest and gathers their strains into its sublime symphony of revelation.

So much as the indication what Swedenborg does for Catholic enlightenment in spiritual wisdom. As for salvation, he teaches that God has provided with every nation a witness of Himself and means of eternal life. He is present by His spirit with all. He gives the good of His love, which is life, internally and impartially to all. All know that there is a God, and that He is to be loved and obeyed; that there is a life after death, and that there are evils which are to be shunned as sins against God. So far as any one so believes and so lives from a principle
of religion, he receives eternal life in his soul, and after
death instruction and perfection according to the sincerity
of his life.

No teaching could be more catholic than this, showing
that, "whomsoever in any nation feareth God and worketh
righteousness is accepted of Him." If he sets forth Jesus
Christ as the only wise God, in whom in the fullness of
the Godhead, it is Christ glorified and realizing to the
mind the infinite and eternal Lover, and Thinker, and Doer,
a real and personal God, our Father and Saviour. If he
summons all prophets and teachers to bring their honor
and glory unto Him, it is not as to a conquering rival, but
as to their inspiring life, whose word they have spoken
and whose work they have wrought out. If he brings all
good spirits in the other life to the acknowledgment of
the glorified Christ, as the only God, it is because they
have in heart an essential faith, believe in Him and live
for Him, in living according to precepts of their religion.
He calls himself a Christian who lives as a Christian; and
he lives as a Christian who looks to the one God and does
what He teaches, as he is able to know it. If he denies
reincarnation, so also does he deny sleep in the grave and
the resurrection of the material body.

If he teaches the necessity of regeneration and union
with God, so also does he show that the subjugation and
quiescence of self is the true "Nirvana" opening conscious-
ness to the Divine life, and conferring the peace of har-
mony with God.

If he teaches that man needs the Spirit of God for the
subjugation of self, he teaches that the spirit is freely
 imparted to whosoever will look to the law and shun
selfishness as sin. If he teaches, thus, that faith is nec-
essary to salvation, he teaches that faith alone is not
sufficient, but faith which worketh by love.

If he believes that salvation is of favor, or immediate
mercy, and affirms that it is vital and the effect of right-
eousness he also teaches that the Divine righteousness
is imparted vitally to him that seeks it first and above
all; and if he denies that several probations on earth
are necessary to the working out of the issues of right-
eousness, it is because man enters a spiritual world,
after death, in a spiritual body and personality, and in an
environment in which his ruling love is developed, his
ignorence enlightened, his imperfections removed, his good beginnings perfected, until he is ready to be incorporated in the grand Man of Heaven, to receive and functionate his measure of the divine life and participate in the divine joy. And so I might go on.

My purpose is accomplished if I have won your respect and interest in the teachings of this great apostle, who, claiming to be called of the Lord to open the Scriptures, presents a harmony of truths that would gather into its embrace all that is of value in every religion and open out into a career of illimitable spiritual progress.

The most unimpassioned of men, perhaps because he so well understood that his mission was not his own, but the concern of him who builds through the ages. Swedenborg wrote and published. The result is a liberty that calmly awaits the truth-seekers. If the religions of the world become disciples there, it will not be proselytism that will take them there, but the organic course of events in that Providence which works on, silent but mighty, like the forces that poise planets and gravitate among the stars.

Present history shows the effect of unsuspected causes. This parliament of religions is itself a testimony to unseen spiritual causes, and should at least incline to belief in Swedenborg's testimony, that a way is open, both in the spiritual world and on earth, for a universal church in the faith of one visible God in whom is the invisible, imparting eternal life and enlightenment to all from every nation who believe in him and work righteousness.
CHAPTER XXX.

Comparative Theology.

THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY, BY PROFESSOR
C. P. TIELE OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY—(READ BY REV. FRANK
M. BRISTOL).

What is to be understood by comparative theology? I
find that English-writing authors use the appellation pro-
miscuously with comparative religion, but if we wish
words to convey a sound meaning, we should, at least,
beware of using these terms as convertible ones. The-
ology is not the same as religion; and, to me, comparative
theology signifies nothing but a comparative study of re-
ligious dogmas; comparative religion nothing but a com-
parative study of various religions in all their branches.
I suppose, however, I am not expected to make this dis-
tinction, but comparative theology is to be understood to
mean what is now generally called the science of religion,
the word "Science" not being taken in the limited sense it
commonly has in English, but in the general signification
of the Dutch Wetenschap (H. G. Wissenschaft), which it
has assumed more and more even in the Roman languages.
So the history and the study of this science would have
to form the subject of my paper, a subject vast enough to
devote to it one or more volumes. It is still in its in-
fancy. Although in former centuries its advent was her-
alded by a few forerunners, as Selden (Dedus Syrus), de
Brosses (Le culte des deux fetiches), the tasteful Herder
and others, as a science it reaches back not much farther
than to the middle of the nineteenth century. "Duxius,
Origine de Tous les Cultes" which appeared in the open-
ing years of the century, is a gigantic pamphlet, not an
impartial historical research. Nor can Creuren's and
Baur's Symbolik and Mythologie lay claim to the latter
appellation, but are dominated by long refuted theory.
Meiner's "Allquemeine Kritische Geschichte der Relig-
ionen” (1806–7), only just came up to the low standard which at that time historical scholars were expected to reach. Much higher stood Benjamin Constant, in whose work, “La Religion Considerée dant sa Source, ses Forme et ses Developments” (1824), written with French lucidity, for the first time a distinction was made between the essence and the forms of religion, to which the writer also applied the theory of development.

From that time the science of religion began to assume a more sharply defined character, and comparative studies on an ever-growing scale were entered upon, and this was done no longer chiefly with by-desires, either by the enemies of Christianity, in order to combat it, and to point out that it differed little or nothing from all the superstitions one was now getting acquainted with, or by the apologists, in order to defend it against these attacks, and to prove its higher excellence when compared with all other religions. The impulse came from two sides. On one side it was due to philosophy. Philosophy had for centuries past been speculating on religion, but only about the beginning of our century it had become aware of the fact that the great religious problems cannot be solved without the aid of history—that, in order to define the nature and the origin of religion, one must first of all know its development. Already before Benjamin Constant this was felt by others, of whom we will only mention Hegel and Schelling. It may even be said that the right method for the philosophical inquiry into religion was defined by Schelling, at least from a theoretical point of view, more accurately than by any one else; though we should add that he, more than any one else, fell short in the applying of it. Hegel even endeavored to give a classification, which, it is proved, hits the right nail on the head here and there, but, as a whole, distinctly proves that he lacked a clear conception of the real historical development of religion. Nor could this be otherwise. Even if the one had not been confined within the narrow bounds of an a-prioristic system of the historical data which were at his disposal, even if the other had not been led astray by his unbridled fancy, both wanted the means to trace religion in the course of its developments. Most of the religions of antiquity, especially those of the east, were at that time known but
superficially, and the critical research into the newer forms of religion had as yet hardly been entered upon.

One instance out of many. Hegel characterized the so-called Syriac religions as "die Religion des Schinnersens" (religion of suffering). In doing this he of course thought of the myth and the worship of Thammur-Adonis. He did not know that these are by no means of Aryanaic origin. But were borrowed by the people of western Asia from their eastern neighbors, and are, in fact, a survival of an older, highly sensual naturism. Even at the time he might have known that Adonis was far from being an ethical ideal, that his worship was far from being the glorification of a voluntarily suffering deity. In short, it was known that only the comparative method could conduce to the desired end, but the means of comparing, though not wholly wanting, were inadequate.

Meanwhile material was being supplied from another quarter. Philological and historical science, cultivated after strict methods, archaeology, anthropology, ethnology, no longer a prey to superficial theorists and fashionable dilettanti only, but also subjected to the laws of the critical research, began to yield a rich harvest. I need but hint at the many important discoveries of the last hundred years, the number of which is continually increasing. You know them full well, and you also know that they are not confined to a single province nor to a single period. They reach back as far as the remotest antiquity and show us, in those ages, long gone by, a civilization postulating a long-previous development, but also draw our attention to many conceptions, manners, and customs among several backward or degenerate tribes of our own time, giving evidence of the greatest rudeness and barbarousness. They thus enable us to study religion as it appears among all sorts of people and in the most diversified degrees of development. They have at least supplied the sources to draw from, among which are the original records of religion concerning which people formerly had to be content with very scanty, very recent, and very untrustworthy information. You will not expect me to give you an enumeration of them. Let me mention only Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria, India and Persia, and of their sacred books, the "Book of the Dead," the so-called "Chaldean Genesis," the "Cabylonia," the "Penitential
Psalms” and mythological texts, the “Veda” and the “Avesta.” These form but a small part of the acquired treasures, but though we had nothing else it would be much.

I know quite well that at first, even after having deciphered the writing of the first two named, and having learned in some degree to understand the languages of all, people seemed not to be fully aware of what was to be done with these treasures, and that the translations hurriedly put together failed to lead to an adequate perception of the contents. I know also that even now, after we have learned how to apply to the study of these records the universally admitted, sound philological principles, much of what we believe to be known has been rejected as being valueless, and that the questions and problems which have to be solved have not decreased in number, but are daily increasing. I cannot deny that scholars of high repute and indisputable authority are much divided in opinion concerning the explanation of those texts, and that it is not easy to make a choice out of so many conflicting opinions. How much does Brugsch differ in his representation of the Egyptian mythology from Edward Meyer and Ermann. How great a division among the Assyriologists between the Accadists, or Sumnerists and the anti-Summerists or anti-Accadists! How much differs the explanation of the Veda by Roth, Muller and Grassman, from that of Ludwig, and how different is Barth’s explanation from Bergaime’s and Regnaud’s! How violent was the controversy between Speigel and Haupt about the explanation of the most ancient pieces in the Avesta, and now in this year of grace, while the younger generation, Bartholomae and Geldner on the one hand, Geiger, Wilhelm, Hubschmann, Mills on the other hand, are following different roads, there has come a scholar and a man of genius, who is, however, particularly fond of paradoxes—James Darmestetter—to overthrow all that was considered up to his time as being all but stable, nay, even to undermine the foundations, which were believed safe enough to be built upon.

But all this cannot do away with the fact that we are following the right path, that much has already been obtained and much light has been shed on what was dark. Of not a few of these new-fangled theories may be said
they are at least useful in compelling us once more to put to a severe test the results obtained. So we see that the modern science of religion, comparative theology, has sprung from these two sources: the want of a firmer empirical base of operations, felt by the philosophy of religion, and the great discoveries on the domain of history, archaeology and anthropology.

These discoveries have revealed a great number of forms of religion and religious phenomena which until now were known imperfectly or not at all; and it stands to reason that these have been compared with these already known and that inferences have been drawn from this comparison. Can any one be said to be the founder of the young science? Many have conferred this title upon the famous Oxford professor, F. Max Muller; others, among them his great American opponent, the no less famous professor of Yale college, W. Dwight Whitney, have denied it to him. We may leave this decision to posterity. I, for one, may rather be said to side with Whitney than with Muller. Though I have frequently contended the latter’s speculations and theories, I would not close my eyes to the great credit he has gained by what he has done for the science of religion, nor would I gainsay the fact that he has given a mighty impulse to the study of it, especially in England and in France.

But a new branch of study can hardly be said to be founded. Like others, this was called into being by a generally felt want, in different countries at the same time and as a matter of course. The number of those applying themselves to it has been gradually increasing, and for years it has been gaining chairs at universities, first in Holland, afterward also in France and elsewhere, now also in America. It has already a rich literature, even periodicals of its own. Though at one time the brilliant talents of some writers threatened to bring it into fashion and to cause it to fall a prey to dilettanti—a state of things that is to be considered most fatal to any science, but especially to one that is still in its infancy—this danger has fortunately been warded off, and it is once more pursuing the noiseless tenor of its way, profiting by the fell criticism of those who hate it.

I shall not attempt to write its history. The time for it has not yet come. The rise of this new science, the
comparative research of new religions, is as yet too little a feature of the past to be surveyed from an impartial standpoint. Moreover, the writer of this paper himself has been one of the laborers in this field for more than thirty years past, and so he is, to some extent, a party to the conflict of opinions. His views would be apt to be too subjective, and could be justified only by an exhaustive criticism which would be misplaced here, and the writing of which would require a longer time of preparation than has now been allowed to him. A dry enumeration of the names of the principal writers and the titles of their works would be of little use, and would prove very little attractive to you. Therefore, let me add some words on the study of Comparative Theology.

The first, the predominating question is: Is this study possible? In other words, what man, however talented and learned he may be, is able to command this immense field of inquiry, and what lifetime is long enough for the acquiring of an expansive knowledge of all religion? It is not even within the bounds of possibility that a man should master all languages, to study in the vernacular the religious records of all nations, not only recognized sacred writings, but also those of dissenting sects and the songs and sages of uncivilized people. So one will have to put up with the translations, and everybody knows that meaning of the original is but poorly rendered even by the best translations. One will have to take upon trust what may be called second-hand information, without being able to test it, especially where the religions of the so-called primitive peoples are concerned. All these objections have been made by me for having the pleasure of setting them aside; they have frequently been raised against the new study and have already dissuaded many from devoting themselves to it. Nor can it be denied that they contain at least some truth. But if, on account of these objections, the comparative study of religions were to be esteemed impossible, the same judgment would have to be pronounced upon many other sciences.

I am not competent to pass an opinion concerning the physical and biological sciences. I am alluding only to anthropology and ethnology, history, the history of civilization, archaeology, comparative philology, comparative literature, ethics, philosophy. Is the independent study
of all these sciences to be relinquished because no one can be required to be versed in each of their details equally well, to have acquired an exhaustive knowledge, got at the mainspring of every people, every language, every literature, every civilization, every group of records, every period, every system? There is nobody who will think of insisting upon this. Every science, even the most comprehensive one, every theory must rest on an empirical basis, must start from an “unbiased ascertaining of facts,” but it does not follow that the tracing, the collecting, the sorting, and the elaborating of these facts and the building up of a whole out of these materials must needs be consigned to the same hands. The flimsily constructed speculative system, pasteboard buildings all of them, we have done away with for good and all.

But a science is not a system, not a well-arranged storehouse of things that are known, but an aggregate of researches all tending to the same purpose, though independent yet mutually connected, and each in particular connected with similar researches in other domains, which serve thus as auxiliary sciences. Now, the science of religion has no other purpose than to lead to the knowledge of religion in its nature and in its origin. And this knowledge is not be acquired, at least if it is to be a sound, not a would-be knowledge—but by an unprejudiced historical-psychological research. What should be done first of all is to trace religion in the course of its development, that is to say in its life, to inquire what every family of religions, as for instance the Aryan and Semitic, what every particular religion, what the great religious persons have contributed to this development, to what laws and conditions this development is subjected, and in what it really consists? Next the religious phenomena, ideas and dogmas, feelings and inclinations, forms of worship and religious acts are to be examined, to know from what wants of the soul they have sprung, and of what aspirations they are the expression. But these researches, without which one cannot penetrate into the nature of religion nor form a conception of its origin, cannot bear lasting fruit, unless the comparative study of religious individualities lie at the root of them. Only to a few it has been given to institute this most comprehensive inquiry, to follow to the end this long way. He who ventures upon it cannot
think of examining closely all the particulars himself; he has to avail himself of what the students of special branches have brought to light and have corroborated with sound evidence.

It is not required of every student of the science of religion that he should be an architect; yet, though his study may be confined within the narrow bounds of a small section, if he does not lose sight of the chief purpose, and if he applies the right method, he too will contribute not unworthily to the great common work.

So a search after the solution of the abstruse fundamental questions had better be left to those few who add a great wealth of knowledge to philosophical talents. What should be considered most needful with a view to the present standpoint of comparative theology is this: Learning how to put the right use to the new sources that have been opened up; studying thoroughly and penetrating into the sense of records that on many points still leave us in the dark; subjecting to a close examination particular religions and important periods about which we possess but scanty information; searching for the religious meaning of myths; tracing prominent deities in their rise and development, and forms of worship through all the important changes of meaning they have undergone; after this the things thus found have to be compared with those already known.

Two things must be required of the student of the science of religion. He must be thoroughly acquainted with the present state of the research—he must know what has already been got, but also what questions are still unanswered; he must have walked, though it be quick in time, about the whole domain of his science; in short, he must possess a general knowledge of religions and religious phenomena. But he should not be satisfied with this. He should then select a field of his own, larger or smaller, according to his capacities and the time at his disposal; a field where he is quite at home, where he himself probes to the bottom of everything, of which he knows all that is to be known about it, and the science of which he then must try to give a fresh impulse to. Both requirements he has to fulfill. Meeting only one of them will lead either to the superficial dilettantism which has already been alluded to, or the trifling of those Philistines
of science, who like nothing better than occupying our attention longest of all with such things as lie beyond the bounds of what is worth knowing. But the last-named danger does not need to be especially cautioned against, at least in America. I must not conclude without expressing my joy at the great interest in this new branch of science, which of late years has been revealing itself in the new world.
CHAPTER XXXI.

Farewell.

"Peace on earth and good will toward men!"

With these sublime words, pronounced by nearly five thousand voices, the wonderful parliament of religions dissolved. It was a noble and inspiring scene, that which marked the dispersing of the creeds in the great gray Palace of Art on the shores of Lake Michigan. Never since the confusion of tongues at Babel have so many religions, so many creeds, stood side by side, hand in hand, and almost heart to heart, as in that great amphitheater. Never since written history began has varied mankind been so bound about with golden chains of love.

The exercises began with "Lift Up Your Heads, Oh Ye Gates," by the Apollo Club, under the leadership of Professor Tomlins. Then, at the request of Mr. Bonney, the assembly arose and silently invoked the Divine blessing. Cardinal Newman's hymn, "Lead, Kindly Light," was sung by the chorus.

"The demands of the occasion," said Mr. Bonney, "require the utmost possible economy of our time. We shall endeavor to present during the evening a large number of brief speeches rather than a few long ones. Dr. Barrows will now present some of the distinguished guests whom we have entertained during the past three weeks and who have taken such an active part in the world's parliament of religions."

"You are to hear to-night," said Dr. Barrows, stepping to the reading desk, "more than twenty brief speeches and, of course, all words of introduction must be few. The first speaker whom I have the honor to introduce is Dr. Alfred W. Momerie, of London, whom we all knew as a brilliant man, and whom we all have discovered is a very lovable man, and he has come to love the White City, Chicago, and the parliament of religions. When he goes
back to his native land and stands on London Bridge again, and thinks of our world’s fair he will no doubt say: ‘Though lost to sight, to Momerie dear.’

ADDRESS OF REV. ALFRED WILLIAMS MOMERIE, D. D., CHURCH OF ENGLAND, LONDON.

Before we part I wish to say three things. First of all I want to tender my warmest congratulations to Dr. Barrows. I do not believe there is another man living who could have carried this congress through and made it such a gigantic success. It needed a head, a heart, an energy, a common sense and a pluck such as I have never known to be united before in a single individual.

During my stay in Chicago it has been my singular good fortune to be received as a guest by the kindest of hosts and the most charming of hostesses, and among the many pleasures of their brilliant and delightful tables one of the greatest has been that I have sat day by day by Dr. Barrows, and day by day I have learned to admire and love him more. In the successes that lie before him in the future I shall always take the keenest interest; but he has already achieved something that will eclipse all. As chairman of this first parliament of religions, he has won immortal glory which nothing in the future can diminish, which, I fancy, nothing in the future can very much augment.

Secondly, I should like to offer my congratulations to the American people. This parliament of religions has been held in the new world. I confess I wish it had been held in the old world, in my own country, and that it had had its origin in my own Church. It is the greatest event so far in the history of the world, and it has been held on American soil. I congratulate the people of America. Their example will be followed in time to come in other countries and by other peoples, but there is one honor which will always be America’s—the honor of having led the way. And certainly I should like to offer my congratulations to you, the citizens of Chicago.

While our minds are full of the parliament, I cannot forget the fair. I have seen all the expositions of Europe dur-
ing the last ten or twelve years, and I am sure I do not exaggerate when I say that your exposition is greater than all the rest put together. But your parliament of religions is far greater than your exposition. There have been plenty of expositions before. Yours is the best, but it is a comparatively common thing. The parliament of religions is a new thing in the world. Most people, even those who regarded the idea with pleasure, thought that it was an impossibility. But it has been achieved. Here, in this Hall of Columbus, vast audiences have assembled day after day, the members of which came from all churches and from all sects and sometimes from no church at all. Here they sat side by side during long—I had almost said weary hours; the hours would have been weary but for their enthusiasm. Here they sat side by side during the long hours of the day listening to doctrines which they had been taught to regard with contempt, listening with respect, with sympathy, with an earnest desire to learn something which would improve their own doctrines.

And here on the platform have sat as brethren the representatives of churches and sects which, during bygone centuries, hated and cursed one another, and scarcely a word has fallen from any of us which could possibly give offense. If occasionally the old Adam did show itself, if occasionally something was said which had been better left unsaid, no harm was done. It only served to kindle into a flame of general and universal enthusiasm your brotherly love. It seemed an impossibility, but here in Chicago the impossible has been realized. You have shown that you do not believe in impossibilities. It could not have been realized but for you. It could not have been realized without your sympathy and your enthusiasm.

Citizens of Chicago, I congratulate you. If you show yourselves in other things as great as you have shown yourselves in regard to this parliament of religions, most assuredly the time will come when Chicago will be the first city in America, the first city in the world.
ADDRESS OF REV. P. C. MOZOOMDAR OF THE BRAHMO-SOMAJ.

Brethren of Different Faiths:—This parliament of religions, this concourse of spirits, is to break up before to-morrow's sun. What lessons have we learned from our incessant labors? Firstly, the charge of materialism, laid against the age in general, and against America in particular, is refuted forever. Could these myriads have spent their time, their energy, neglected their business, their pleasures, to be present with us if their spirit had not risen above their material needs or carnal desires? The spirit dominates still over matter and over mankind.

Secondly, the unity of purpose and feeling unmistakably shown in the harmonious proceedings of these seventeen days, teaches that men with opposite views, denominations with contradictory principles and histories, can form one congregation, one household, one body, for however short a time, when animated by one spirit. Who is or what is that spirit? It is the spirit of God Himself. This unity of man with man is the unity of man with God, and the unity of man with man in God is the kingdom of Heaven. When I came here by the invitation of you, Mr. President, I came with the hope of seeing the object of my life-long faith and labors, viz., the harmony of religions effected. The last public utterance of my leader, Keshub Chunder Sen, made in 1883, in his lecture, called "Asia's Message to Europe," was this:

"Here will meet the world's representatives, the foremost spirits, the most living hearts, the leading thinkers and devotees of each church, and offer united homage to the King of kings and the Lord of lords. This central union church is no Utopian fancy, but a veritable reality, whose beginning we see already among the nations of the earth. Already the right wing of each church is pressing forward, and the advanced liberals are drawing near each other under the central banner of the new dispensation.

"Believe me, the time is coming when the more liberal of the Catholic and Protestant branches of Christ's Church will advance and meet upon a common platform and form a broad Christian community, in which all shall be identified, in spite of all diversities and differences in non-essential matters of faith. Soshall the Baptists and Methodists, Trinitarian and Unitarian, the Ritualists and the Evangelical, all unite in a broad and universal church organization, loving, honoring, serving the common body while
retaining the peculiarities of each sect. Only the broad of each sect shall, for the present, come forward, and others shall follow in time.

"The base remains where it is; the vast masses at the foot of each church will yet remain, perhaps for centuries, where they now are. But, as you look to the lofty heights above, you will see all the bolder spirits and broad souls of each church pressing forward, onward, heavenward. Come, then, my friends, ye broad-hearted of all the churches, advance and shake hands with each other and promote that spiritual fellowship, that kingdom of heaven which Christ predicted."

These words were said in 1883, and in 1893 every letter of the prophecy has been fulfilled. The kingdom of heaven is, to my mind, a vast concentric circle, with various circumferences of doctrines, authorities, and organizations from outer to inner, from inner to inner still until heaven and earth become one. The outermost circle is belief in God and the love of man. In the tolerance, kindliness, good-will, patience, and wisdom which have distinguished the work of this parliament that outermost circle of the kingdom of heaven has been described. We have influenced vast numbers of men and women of all opinions, and the influence will spread and spread. So many human unities drawn within the magnetic circle of spiritual sympathy cannot but influence and widen the various denominations to which they belong. In the course of time those inner circles must widen also, till the love of man and the love of God are perfected in one church, one God, one salvation.

I conclude with acknowledging the singular cordiality and appreciation extended to us Orientals. Where every one has done so well, we did not deserve special honor; but undeserved as the honor may be, it shows the greatness of your leaders and especially of your chairman, Dr. Barrows. Dr. Barrows, humanly speaking, has been the soul of this noble movement. The profoundest blessings of the present and future generations shall follow him.

And now, farewell. For once in history all religions have made their peace, all nations have called each other brothers, and their representatives have, for seventeen days, stood up, morning after morning, to pray Our Father, the Universal Father of all, in heaven. His will has been done so far, and in the great coming future may that blessed will be done further and further, forever and ever.
ADDRESS OF PRINCE SERGE WOLKONSKI, ST. PETERSBURG, RUSSIA.

I hardly realize that it is for the last time in my life I have the honor, the pleasure, the fortune to speak to you. On this occasion, I should like to tell you so many things that I am afraid that, if I give free course to my sentiments, I will feel the delicate but imperative touch of Mr. President's hand on my shoulder long before I reach the end of my speech. Therefore, I will say thanks to all of you ladies and gentlemen in the shortest possible words—thanks for your kind attention, for your kind applause, your kind laughter, for your hearty hand-shakes. You will believe how deeply I am obliged to you when I tell you that this was the first time in my life that I ever took an active part in a congress, and I wish any enterprise I may undertake later on might leave me such happy remembrances as this first experience.

Before bidding you farewell, I want to express a wish; may the good feelings you have shown me so many times, may they, through my unworthy personality, spread to the people of my country, whom you know so little and whom I love so much. If I ask you that, it is because I know the prejudices which prevail among the people of your country. A compatriot said the other day that Russians thought all Americans were angels, and that Americans thought all Russians were brutes. Now, once in awhile, these angels and these brutes come together and both are deceived in their expectations. We see that you are certainly not angels, and you see we are not quite as much brute as you thought we were.

Now, why this disappointment? Why this surprise? Why this astonishment? Because we won't remember that we are men and nothing else and nothing more. We cannot be anything more, for to be a man is the highest thing we can pretend to be on this earth. I do not know whether many have learned in the sessions of this parliament what respect of God is, but I know that no one will leave the congress without having learned what respect of man is. And should the parliament of religions of 1893 have no other result but this, it is enough to
make the names of Dr. Barrows and those who have helped him imperishable in the history of humanity.

Should this congress have no other result than to teach us to judge our fellow-man by his individual value, and not by the political opinions he may have of his country, I will express my gratitude to the congress, not only in the name of those your brothers who are my countrymen, but in the name of those our brothers whom we so often revile because the political traditions of their country refuse the recognition of home rule; in the name of those our fellow-men whose motherland stands on the neck of India; in the name of those our brothers whom we so often blame only because the governments of their countries send rapacious armies on the western, southern, and eastern coast of Africa; I will express my gratitude to the congress in the name of those my brothers whom we often judge so wrongly because of the cruel treatment their government inflicts upon the Chinese. I will congratulate the congress in the name of the whole world if those who have been here have learned that, as long as politics and politicians exist, there is no happiness possible on earth. I will congratulate the congress in the name of the whole humanity if those who have attended sessions have realized that it is a crime to be astonished when we see that another human being is a man like ourselves.

Now, Dr. Bonney, one word to you personally; All I have said in thanking these ladies and gentlemen, I beg you to accept for yourself; for all I owe to them is due to your kindness. I pray you to accept my personal gratitude and the assurance that whenever I may be of any use to you, although on the other side of the earth, St. Petersburg will be near enough to Chicago. No continents, no oceans, no distances will ever prevent me from reaching a friendly hand to President Bonney, nor to any of the distinguished gentlemen and ladies I am so happy to have met and known.

ADDRESS OF KINZA RINGE HIRAI, KYOTO, JAPAN.

We cannot but admire the tolerant forbearance and compassion of the people of the civilized west. You are the pioneers in human history. You have achieved an
assembly of the world's religions, and we believe your next step will be toward the ideal goal of this parliament, the realization of international justice. We ourselves desire to witness its fulfillment in our lifetime and to greet you again with our deepest admiration. By your kind hospitality we have forgotten that we are strangers, and we are very much attached to this city. To leave here makes us feel as if we were leaving our native country. To part with you makes us feel as if we were parting from our own sisters and brothers. When we think of our homeward journey we cannot help shedding tears. Farewell. The cold winter is coming, and we earnestly wish that you may be in good health. Farewell.

ADDRESS OF HON. HUNG QUANG YU, CHINESE LEGATION, WASHINGTON (READ BY DR. BARROWS).

It is unnecessary for me to touch upon the existing relations between the government of China and that of the United States. There is no doubt that the Chinese minister at Washington and the honorable secretary of state are well able to deal with every question rising between the two countries in a manner satisfactory and honorable to both. As I am a delegate to the religious congress, I cannot but feel that all religious people are my friends. I have a favor to ask of all the religious people of America, and that is that they will treat, hereafter, all my countrymen just as they have treated me. I shall be a hundred times more grateful to them for the kind treatment of my countrymen than of myself. I am sure that the Americans in China receive just such considerate treatment from the cultured people of China as I have received from you. The majority of my countrymen in this country are honest and law-abiding. Christ teaches us that it is not enough to love one's brethren only. I am sure that all religious people will not think this request too extravagant.

It is my sincere hope that no national differences will ever interrupt the friendly relations between the two governments, and that the two peoples will equally enjoy the protection and blessings of heaven. I intend to leave this country shortly. I shall take great pleasure in
reporting to my government the proceedings of this parliament upon my return. With this I desire to bid all my friends farewell.

ADDRESS OF RIGHT REV. BUCHA SHABITA, OF JAPAN—(READ BY DR. BARROWS).

I am here in the pulpit again to express my thanks for the kindness, hearty welcome, and applause I have been enjoying at your hands ever since I came here to Chicago. You have shown great sympathy with my humble opinion, and your newspaper men have talked of me in high terms. I am happy that I have had the honor of listening to so many famous scholars and preachers forwarding the same opinion of the necessity of universal brotherhood and humanity. I am deeply impressed with the peace, politeness, and education which characterize your audiences. But is it not too sad that such pleasures are always short-lived? I, who made acquaintance with you only yesterday, have to part with you to-day, though reluctantly. This parliament of religion is the most remarkable event in history, and it is the first honor in my life to have the privilege of appearing before you to pour out my humble idea, which was so well accepted by you all. You like me, but I think it is not the mortal Shabita that you like, but you like the immortal idea of universal brotherhood.

What I wish to do is to assist you in carrying out the plan of forming the universal brotherhood under the one roof of truth. You know unity is power. I, who can speak no language but Japanese, may help you in crowning that grand project with success. To come here I had many obstacles to overcome, many struggles to make. You must not think I represent all Shintoism. I only represent my own Shinto sect. But who dares to destroy universal fraternity? So long as the sun and moon continue to shine, all friends of truth must be willing to fight courageously for this great principle. I do not know that I shall ever see you again in this life, but our souls have been so pleasantly united here that I hope they may be again united in the life hereafter.

Now I pray that eight million deities protecting the
beautiful cherry tree country of Japan may protect you and your government forever, and with this, I bid you good-by.

ADDRESS OF H. DHARMAPALA, BUDDHIST, OF CEYLOM.

PEACE, BLESSINGS, AND SALUTATIONS—BRETHREN: This congress of religions has achieved a stupendous work in bringing before you the representatives of the religions and philosophies of the east. The committee on religious congresses has realized the Utopian idea of the poet and the visionary. By the wonderful genius of two men—Mr. Bonney and Dr. Barrows—the beacon light has been erected on the platform of the Chicago parliament of religions to guide the yearning souls after truth.

I, on behalf of the four hundred and seventy-five million of my co-religionists, followers of the gentle Lord, Buddha Gautama, tender my affectionate regards to you and to Dr. John Henry Barrows, a man of noble tolerance, of sweet disposition, whose equal I could hardly find. And you, my brothers and sisters, born in this land of freedom, you have learned from your brothers of the far east their presentation of the respective religious systems they follow. You have listened with commendable patience to the teachings of the all-merciful Buddha through his humble followers. During his earthly career of forty-five years, he labored in emancipating the human mind from religious prejudices, and teaching a doctrine which has made Asia mild. By the patient and laborious researches of the men of science you are given to enjoy the fruits of material civilization, but this civilization by itself finds no praise at the hands of the great naturalists of the day.

Learn to think without prejudice, love all beings for love's sake, express your convictions fearlessly, lead a life of purity and the sunlight of truth will illuminate you. If theology and dogma stand in your way in the search of truth, put them aside. Be earnest and work out your own salvation with diligence; and the fruits of holiness will be yours.
REV. GEORGE T. CANDLIN, D. D., OF CHINA.

It is with deepest joy that I take my part in the congratulations of this closing day. The parliament has more than justified my most sanguine expectations. As a missionary I anticipate that it will make a new era of missionary enterprise and missionary hope. If it does not it will not be your fault, and let those take the blame who make it otherwise. Very sure I am that at least one missionary, who counts himself the humblest member of this noble assembly, will carry through every day of work, through every hour of effort, on till the sun of life sets-on the completion of his task, the strengthening memory and uplifting inspiration of this pentecost.

By this parliament the City of Chicago has placed herself far away above all the cities of the earth. In this school you have learned what no other town or city in the world yet knows. The conventional idea of religion which obtains among Christians the world over is that Christianity is true, all other religions false; that Christianity is of God, while other religions are of the devil; or else, with a little spice of moderation, that Christianity is a revelation from Heaven, while other religions are manufactures of men. You know better, and with clear light and strong assurance can testify that there may be friendship instead of antagonism between religion and religion, that so surely as God is our common Father, our hearts alike have yearned for Him and our souls in devoutest moods have caught whispers of grace dropped from his throne.

Then this is Pentecost, and behind is the conversion of the world.

ADDRESS OF SUANI VIVE KANANDA, BUDDHIST, INDIA.

The world's parliament of religions has become an accomplished fact and the merciful Father has helped those who labored to bring it into existence and crowned with success their most unselfish labor.

My thanks to those noble souls whose large hearts and
love of truth first dreamed this wonderful dream and then realized it. My thanks to the shower of liberal sentiments that has overflowed this platform. My thanks to this enlightened audience for their uniform kindness to me and for their appreciation of every thought that tends to smooth the friction of religions. A few jarring notes were heard from time to time in this harmony. My special thanks to them, for they have, by their striking contrast, made the general harmony the sweeter.

Much has been said of the common ground of religious unity. I am not going just now to venture my own theory. But if any one here hopes that this unity would come by the triumph of any one of these religions and the destruction of the others, to him I say, "Brother, yours is an impossible hope." Do I wish that the Christian would become Hindu? God forbid. Do I wish that the Hindu or Buddhist would become Christian? God forbid.

The seed is put in the ground, and earth and air and water are placed around it. Does the seed become the earth, or the air, or the water? No. It becomes a plant, it develops after the law of its own growth, assimilates the air, the earth, and the water, converts them into plant substance and grows a plant.

Similar is the case with religion. The Christian is not to become a Hindu or a Buddhist, nor a Hindu or a Buddhist to become a Christian. But each must assimilate the others and yet preserve its individuality and grow according to its own law of growth.

If the parliament of religions has shown anything to the world it is this: It has proved to the world that holiness, purity, and charity are not the exclusive possessions of any church in the world, and that every system has produced men and women of the most exalted character.

In the face of this evidence, if anybody dreams of the exclusive survival of his own and the destruction of the others, I pity him from the bottom of my heart, and point out to him that upon the banner of every religion would soon be written, in spite of their resistance: "Help and not Fight," "Assimilation and not Destruction," "Harmony and Peace, and not Dissension."
ADDRESS OF VICHAND GHANDI OF BOMBAY.

Are we not all sorry that we are parting so soon? Do we not wish that this parliament would last seventeen times seventeen days? Have we not heard with pleasure and interest the speeches of the learned representatives on this platform? Do we not see that the sublime dream of the organizers of this unique parliament have been more than realized? If you will only permit a heathen to deliver his message of peace and love, I shall only ask you to look at the multifarious ideas presented to you in a liberal spirit, and not with superstition and bigotry, as the seven blind men did in the elephant story.

Once upon a time in a great city an elephant was brought with a circus. The people had never seen an elephant before. There were seven blind men in the city who longed to know what kind of an animal it was, so they went together to the place where the elephant was kept. One of them placed his hands on the ears, another on the legs, a third on the tail of the elephant, and so on. When they were asked by the people what kind of an animal the elephant was one of the blind men said: “Oh, to be sure, the elephant is like a big winnowing fan.” Another blind man said: “No, my dear sir, you are wrong. The elephant is more like a big, round post.” The third: “You are quite mistaken: it is like a tapering stick.” The rest of them gave also their different opinions. The proprietor of the circus stepped forward and said: “My friends, you are all mistaken. You have not examined the elephant from all sides. Had you done so you would not have taken one-sided views.”

Brothers and sisters, I entreat you to hear the moral of this story and learn to examine the various religious systems from all standpoints.

I now thank you from the bottom of my heart for the kindness with which you have received us and for the liberal spirit and patience with which you have heard us. And to you, Rev. Dr. Barrows and President Bonney, we owe the deepest gratitude for the hospitality which you have extended to us.
ADDRESS OF PRINCE MOMOLU MASAQUOI OF VETE TERRITORY, AFRICA.

Permit me to express my hearty thanks to the chairman of this congress for the honor conferred upon me personally by the privilege of representing Africa in this world's parliament of religions. There is an important relationship which Africa sustains to this particular gathering. Nearly 1,900 years ago, at the great dawn of Christian morning, we saw benighted Africa opening her doors to the Infant Saviour Jesus Christ, afterwards the founder of one of the greatest religions man ever embraced, and the teacher of the highest and noblest sentiments ever taught, whose teaching has resulted in the presence of this magnificent audience.

As I sat in this audience listening to the distinguished delegates and representatives in this assembly of learning, of philosophy, of systems of religions, represented by scholarship and devout hearts, I said to myself: "What shall the harvest be?"

The very atmosphere seems pregnant with an indefinable, inexpressible something—something too solemn for human utterance—something I dare not attempt to express. Previous to this gathering the greatest enmity existed among the world's religions. To-night—I dare not speak as one seeing visions or dreaming dreams—but this night it seems that the world's religions, instead of striking one against another, have come together in amicable deliberation and have created a lasting and congenial spirit among themselves. May the coming together of these wise men result in the full realization of the general parliament of God, the brotherhood of man, and the consecration of souls to the service of God.

REV. DR. GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN OF PHILADELPHIA.

Fathers of the contemplative east; sons of the executive west—behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. The New Jerusalem, the city of God, is descending, heaven and earth chanting the eternal hallelujah chorus.
ADDRESS OF RABBI EMIL G. HIRSCH OF CHICAGO.

The privilege of being with you on the morning when in glory under God's blessing, this parliament was opened was denied me. At the very hour when here the first words of consecration were spoken, I and all other rabbis were attending worship in our own little temples and could thus only in spirit be with you, who were come together in this much grander temple. But we all felt when the trumpet in our ritual announced the birth of a new religious year, that here blazoned forth at that very moment the clearer blast heralding for all humanity the dawn of a new era.

None could appreciate the deeper significance of this parliament more fully than we, the heirs of a past spanning the millennia, and the motive of whose achievements and fortitude was and is the confident hope of the ultimate break of the millennium. Millions of my co-religionists hoped that this convocation of this modern great synagogue would sound the death-knell of hatred and prejudice under which they have pined and are still suffering, and their hope has not been disappointed. Of old, Palestine's hills were every month aglow with firebrands announcing the rise of a new month.

So here was kindled the cheering fires telling the whole world that a new period of time had been consecrated. We Jews came hither to give and to receive. For what little we could bring we have been richly rewarded in the precious things we receive in turn.

According to an old rabbinical practice friends among us never part without first discussing some problem of religious life. Our whole parliament has been devoted to such discussion, and we take hence, in parting, with us the richest treasures of religious instruction ever laid before man. Thus the Old Talmudic promise will be verified in us that when even three come together to study God's law his Shechinah abides with them.

Then let me bid you God-speed in the old Jewish salutation of peace. When one is carried to his resting-place we Jews will bid him go in peace, but when one who is still in the land of the living turns from us to go to his
daily task we greet him with the phrase, "Go thou toward peace." Let me then speed you on your way toward peace. For the parliament is not the gateway to death. It is a new portal to a new life; for all of us a life of greater love for and greater trust in one another. Peace will not yet come, but is to come. It will come when the seed here planted shall sprout up to blossom and fruitage; when no longer we see through a blurred glass, but, like Moses of old, through a translucent mirror. May God, then, bless you, Brother Chairman, whose loyalty and zeal have led us safely through the night of doubt to this bright hour of a happy and glorious consummation.

**ADDRESS OF REV. FRANK BRISTOL, D. D.**

"Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will, for a' that,
That man to man, the warl' o'er,
Shall brithers be for a' that."

Infinite good and only good will come from this parliament. To all who have come from afar, we are profoundly and eternally indebted. Some of them represent civilization that was old when Romulus was founding Rome, whose philosophies and songs were ripe in wisdom and rich in rhythm before Homer sang his Iliads to the Greeks, and they have enlarged our ideas of our common humanity. They have brought to us fragrant flowers from the gardens of eastern faiths, rich gems from the old mines of great philosophies, and we are richer to-night from their contributions of thought and particularly from our contact with them in spirit.

Never was there such a bright and hopeful day for our common humanity along the lines of tolerance and universal brotherhood. And we shall find that by the words that these visitors have brought to us and by the influence they have exerted, they will be richly rewarded in the consciousness of having contributed to the mighty movement which holds in itself the promise of one faith, one Lord, one Father, one brotherhood. A distinguished writer has said it is always morn somewhere in the world. The time hastens when a greater thing will be said—'tis
always morn everywhere in the world. The darkness has passed, the day is at hand, and with it will come the greater humanity, the universal brotherhood.

The blessings of our God and our Father be with you, brethren from the east; the blessings of our Saviour, our Elder Brother, the Teacher of the brotherhood of man, be with you and your peoples forever.

ADDRESS OF REV. JENKIN LLOYD JONES, SECRETARY OF THE PARLIAMENT.

I had rather be a doorkeeper in the open house of the Lord than to dwell in the tents of bigotry. I am sufficiently happy in the knowledge that I have been enabled to be, to a certain extent, the feet of this great triumph. I stand before you to-night with my brain badly addled, with my voice a good deal demoralized, with my heel somewhat blistered, but with my heart warm and loving and happy.

I bid to you, the parting guests, the God-speed that comes out of a soul that is glad to recognize its kinship with all lands and with all religions; and when you go, you go not only leaving behind you in our hearts more hospitable thoughts for the faiths you represent, but also warm and loving ties that bind you into the union that will be our joy and our life forevermore.

But I will not stand between you and your further pleasures except to venture, in the presence of this vast and happy audience, a motion which I propose to repeat in the next hall, and, if both audiences approve, who dare say that the motion may not be realized? It has been often said, and I have been among those who have been saying it, that we have been witnessing here in these last seventeen days what will not be given men now living again to see; but, as these meetings have grown in power and accumulative spirit, I have felt my doubts give way, and already I see in vision the next parliament of religions more glorious and more hopeful than this. And I have sent my mind around the globe to find a fitting place for the next parliament. When I look upon these gentle brethren from Japan, I have imagined that away out there in the calms of the Pacific Ocean we may, in the city of
Tokio, meet again in some great parliament. But I am not satisfied to stop in that half-way land, and so I have thought we must go farther and meet in that great English dominion of India itself.

At first I thought that Bombay might be a good place, or Calcutta a better place, but I have concluded to move that the next parliament of religion be held on the sacred banks of the Ganges, in the ancient, new City of Benares, where we can visit these brethren at their noblest headquarters. And when we go there we will do as they have done, leaving our heavy baggage behind, going in light marching order, carrying only the working principles that are applicable in all lands.

Now, when shall that great parliament meet? It used to take a long time to get around the world, but I believe that we are ready here to-night to move that we shall usher in the twentieth century with a great parliament of religion in Benares, and we shall make John Henry Barrows president of it, too.

ADDRESS OF MRS. CHARLES HENROTIN—VICE-PRESIDENT WOMAN'S BRANCH WORLD'S CONGRESS AUXILIARY.

The place which woman has taken in the parliament of religions and in the denominational congresses is one of such great importance that it is entitled to your careful attention.

As day by day the parliament has presented the result of the preliminary work of two years, it may have appeared to you an easy thing to put into motion the forces of which this evening is the crowning achievement, but to bring about this result, hundreds of men and women have labored. There are sixteen committees of women in the various departments represented in the parliament of religions and denominational congresses, with a total membership of 228. In many cases the men and the women's committee have elected to work as one, and in others the women have held separated congresses. Sixteen women have spoken in the parliament of religions, and that more did not appear is due to the fact that the denominational committee had secured the most prominent women for their presentation.

Dr. Barrows treated the woman's branch with that
courtesy and consideration, and, I may add, justice which he has extended to the representative of every creed.

In the denominational congresses the first in order was that of the Jewish women, and here is the keynote to woman's position in the modern religious world. It is that of the worker, for it is not in the parliament of religions, as able as has been the women representing her in the parliament, that you can judge of the tremendous power which she wields. It is in the denominational congress that her work is best illustrated.

In the Roman Catholic congress, the work of the women for their church was most ably presented. His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, in his paper, "The Needs of Humanity Supplied by the Catholic Religion," demonstrated that the needs of humanity were ministered unto by women, laity as well as sisters, in the Catholic Church. His paper could fitly have been named, "What Woman has Accomplished for the Catholic Church."

The congress of the Jewish women was a memorable occasion, as it was the first time in the world's history that the Jewish women met together as a religious power. Eighty-five delegates from the different Jewish communities from all parts of the United States were present, and before this congress adjourned an international association of Jewish women was formed, which, if it brings into the religious world the same zeal which has animated that historic race, it is easy to conceive what a tremendous force has here been put into motion.

The committee of Congregational women held an interesting session treating of practical questions connected with church-work.

The women of the Lutheran Church succeeded in uniting the Lutheran women all over the United States in one congress and held four sessions in which Lutheran women spoke on the work of women in their Church. Before this congress closed an international league of Lutheran women was formed.

The King's Daughters presented their work on Monday, Oct. 2. In all the other denominational congresses women have presented their work in the general congress. Two hundred and twelve women have taken part in the denominational and mission congresses.
Now the question presents itself, along what line of thought have most of these women presented papers? And I may truly answer that they have treated of practical efforts for the bettering of social conditions.

It is too soon to prognosticate woman's future in the churches. Hitherto she has been not the thinker, the formulator of creeds, but the silent worker. That day has passed; it remains for her to take her rightful position in the active government of the Church, and to the question, if men will accord that position to her, my experience and that of the chairman of the women's committees warrants us in answering an emphatic yes. Her future in the western churches is in her own hands, and the men of the eastern churches will be emboldened by the example of the western to return to their country and bid our sisters of those distant lands to go and do likewise.

Woman has taken very literally Christ's command to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, heal the sick, and to minister unto those who are in need of such ministrations. As her influence and power increase, so also will her zeal for good works. That the experiment of an equal presentation of men and women in a parliament of religions has not been a failure I think can be proved by the part taken by the women who have had the honor of being called to participate in this great gathering.

I must now bear witness to the devotion, the unselfishness, and the zeal of the chairman of every committee who have assisted in arranging these programmes. I would that I had the time to name them one by one. Their generous co-operation and unselfish endeavor are of those good things the memory of which is in this life a foreshadowing of how divine is the principle of loyal co-operation in working for righteousness.

ADDRESS OF REV. AUGUSTA CHAPIN.

The past seventeen days has seemed to many of us the fulfillment of a dream; nay, the fulfillment of a long-cherished prophecy. The seers of olden time foretold a day when there should be concord, something like what we have seen among elements before time discordant.

We have heard of the Fatherhood of God, the brother-
hood of man, and the solidarity of the human race, until these great words and truths have penetrated our minds and sunken into our hearts as never before. They will henceforth have larger meaning. No one of us all but has been intellectually strengthened and spiritually uplifted. We have been sitting together upon the mountain of the Lord. We shall never descend to the lower places where our feet have sometimes trod in times past. I have tried, as I have listened to these masterly addresses, to imagine what effect this comparative study of religions would have upon the religious world and upon individual souls that come directly under the sweep of its influence. It is not too much to hope that a great impulse has been given to the cause of religious unity, and to pure and undefiled religion in all lands.

We who welcomed now speed the parting guests. We are glad you came, O wise men of the east. With your wise words, your large toleration, and your gentle ways, we have been glad to sit at your feet and learn of you in these things. We are glad to have seen you face to face, and we shall count you henceforth more than ever our friends and co-workers in the great things of religion.

And we are glad, now that you are going to your faraway homes, to tell the story of all that has been said and done here in this great parliament, and that you will thus bring the Orient into nearer relations with the Occident, and make plain the sympathy which exists among all religions. We are glad for the words that have been spoken by the wise men and women of the west, who have come and have given us their grains of gold after the washing. What I said in the beginning I will repeat now at the ending of this parliament. It has been the greatest gathering ever, in the name of religion, held on the face of this earth.

ADDRESS OF JULIA WARD HOWE.

DEAR FRIENDS, I wish I had brought you some great and supreme gift of wisdom. I have brought you a heart brimming with love and thankfulness for this crown of the ages, so blessed in itself and so full of a more blessed prophecy. But I did not expect to speak to-night.
ADDRESS OF BISHOP BENJAMIN W. ARNETT, AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

It is an old saying, and true, that there is no road however long, but by continued marches you will find its end. We have come to the end of our deliberations and are about to close one of the most historic meetings that has ever occurred among the children of men. It was my pleasure and privilege, at the meeting of the parliament, to welcome the delegates from the different parts of the world to this historic city. We have met daily and have formed friendships, and I trust they will be as strong as steel, as pure as gold, and as lasting as eternity. I have never seen so large a body of men meet together and discuss questions so vital with as little friction as I have seen during this parliament. The watchword has been "toleration and fraternity," and shows what may or can be done when men assemble in the proper spirit.

As was said 2,000 years ago, we have met together in one place and with one accord, each seeking for the truth, each presenting his view of the truth as he understands it. Each came with his own fund of information, and now we separate, having gained information from each other on the subject of God, mankind, and the future life. There is one thing that we have all agreed upon—that is, that the source of the true, beautiful, and the good is spirit, love, and light of Infinite power, wisdom and goodness.

Thus the unity of the spirituality of God is one thing that we have all agreed upon. We have differed as to how to approach Him and how to receive His favor and blessing. If the parliament has done nothing more, it has furnished comparative theology with such material that in the future there will be no question about the nature and attributes of God. The great battle of the future will not be the Fatherhood of God, nor that we need a redeemer, mediator, or a model man between God and man.

There was some apprehension on the part of some Christians as to the wisdom of a parliament of all the religions, but the result of this meeting vindicates the
wisdom of such a gathering. It appears that the conception was a Divine one rather than human, and the execution of the plan has been marvelous in its detail and in the harmony of its working and reflects credit upon the chairman of the auxiliary, Mr. Bonney, and also on Rev. J. H. Barrows, for there is no one who has attended these meetings but really believes that Christianity has lost nothing in the discussion, but stands to-day in a light unknown in the past.

The Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and the golden rule have not been superseded by any that has been presented by the various teachers of religion and philosophy, but our mountains are just as high and our doctrines are just as pure as before our meeting and every man and woman has been confirmed in the faith once delivered to the saints.

Another good of this convention: it has taught us a lesson, that while we have truth on our side we have not had all the truth; while we have had theory we have not had all the practice, and the strongest criticism we have received was not as to our doctrines or methods, but as to our practice not-being in harmony with our own teachings and with our own doctrines.

I believe that it will do good not only to the dominant race, but to the race that I represent it is a godsend, and from this meeting we believe will go forth a sentiment that will right a great many of our wrongs, and lighten up the dark places, and assist in giving us that which we are now denied—the common privileges of humanity—for we find that in this congress the majority of the people represented are of the darker races, which will teach the American people that color is not the standard of excellency or of degradation. But I trust that much good will come to all, and not only the Fatherhood of God be acknowledged, but the brotherhood of man.

And now, to my brothers and friends of foreign lands, as I bade you welcome, I now bid you good-by, and I assure you that your coming and your staying has been a benediction to us. And I trust that you will feel that your long travel has been fully repaid by the hospitality of the American people and what you have witnessed of the progress of our Christian civilization. As you return to your homes, be assured that loving hearts will follow
you with their prayers, that you may enjoy the blessings that belong to mankind; and should we never meet again (which we never will any more), may each of us so live and so conduct ourselves that our last end may be one of peace and joy. I bid you, in the name of those I represent, a long and affectionate farewell.

ADDRESS OF RT. REV. J. J. KEANE, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

Friends and Brethren.—When in the midst of the wise men who were intrusted with the organizing of the Columbus celebration, Mr. Bonney rose up and said that man meant more than things and proclaimed the motto: "Not things, but men," people said: "Why, that is only a commonplace. Any man could think that."

"Yes," said Columbus, "any man could do that," when he put the egg upon its end. Mr. Bonney proclaimed that motto. May it make him immortal.

When in the midst of the men who, under the inspiration of that motto, were organizing the congresses of the world, Dr. Barrows arose and proclaimed the grand idea that all the religions of the world should be brought here together, men said: "It is impossible." He has done it, and may it make his name immortal.

When the invitation to this parliament was sent to the old Catholic Church, and she was asked if she would come here, people said: "Will she come?" And the old Catholic Church said: "Who has as good a right to come to a parliament of all the religions of the world as the old Catholic Universal Church?"

Then people said: "But if the old Catholic Church comes here, will she find anybody else here?" And the old Church said: "Even if she has to stand alone on that platform, she will stand on it."

And the old Church has come here, and she is rejoiced to meet her fellow-men, her fellow-believers, her fellow-lovers of every shade of humanity, and every shade of creed. She is rejoiced to meet here the representatives of the old religions of the world, and she says to them:

We leave here. We will go to our homes. We will go to the olden ways. Friends, will we not look back to this
scene of union and weep because separation still continues? But will we not pray that there may have been planted here a seed that will grow to union wide and perfect? Oh, friends, let us pray for this. It is better for us to be one. If it were not better for us to be one than to be divided, our Lord and God would not have prayed to His Father that we might all be one as he and The Father are one. Oh, let us pray for unity, and taking up the glorious strains we have listened to to-night, let us, morning, noon, and night cry out: “Lead, kindly light; lead from all gloom; lead from all darkness; lead from all imperfect light of human opinion; lead to the fullness of the light.”

ADDRESS OF REV. JOHN HENRY BARROWS, D. D. CHAIRMAN OF PARLIAMENT COMMITTEE, PRESBYTERIAN.

The closing hour of this parliament is one of congratulation, of tender sorrow, triumphant hopefulness. God has been better to us by far than our fears, and no one has more occasion for gratitude than your chairman, that he has been upheld and comforted by your cordial co-operation, by the prayers of a great host of God’s noblest men and women, and by the consciousness of Divine favor.

Our hopes have been more than realized. The sentiment which has inspired this parliament has held us together. The principles in accord with which this historic convention has proceeded have been put to the test, and even strained at times, but they have not been inadequate. Toleration, brotherly kindness, trust in each other’s sincerity, a candid and earnest seeking after the unities of religion, the honest purpose of each to set forth his own faith without compromise and without unfriendly criticism—these principles, thanks to your loyalty and courage, have not been found wanting.

Men of Asia and Europe, we have been made glad by your coming and have been made wiser. I am happy that you have enjoyed our hospitalities. While floating one evening over the illumined waters of the “White City,” Mr. Dharmapala said, with that smile which has won our hearts, “All the joys of heaven are in Chicago,” and Dr. Momerie, with a characteristic mingling of enthusiasm and skepticism, replied: “I wish I were sure that all
the joys of Chicago are to be in heaven." But surely there will be a multitude there whom no man can number, out of every kindred and people and tongue, and in that perpetual parliament on high the people of God will be satisfied.

Seventeen days ago there dawned in many hearts a new world-consciousness, a sense of universal brotherhood, and to this fact, in part, I attribute it that this parliament of all the faiths has been marked by less acrimonious discussion—although we have been separated by immense doctrinal distances—than is often found in a single meeting of Christians bearing the same doctrinal name.

Now, that the parliament is over, we almost wonder why it was not called earlier in human history. When the general committee discovered that a wondrous response followed their first appeals, that they struck a chord of universal sympathy, they were firm in their determination to go forward, in spite of ten thousand obstacles, and do what so many feared was impracticable.

I thank God for these friendships which we have knit with men and women beyond the sea, and I thank you for your sympathy and overgenerous appreciation, and for the constant help which you have furnished in the midst of my multiplied duties. Christian America sends her greetings through you to all mankind. We cherish a broadened sympathy, a higher respect, a truer tenderness to the children of our common Father in all lands, and, as the story of this parliament is read in the cloisters of Japan, by the rivers of southern Asia, amid the universities of Europe, and in the isles of all the seas, it is my prayer that non-Christian readers may, in some measure, discover what has been the source and strength of that faith in divine Fatherhood and human brotherhood which, embodied in an Asiatic peasant who was the son of God and made divinely potent through Him, is clasping the globe with bands of heavenly light.

Most that is in my heart of love and gratitude and happy memory must go unsaid. If any honor is due for this magnificent achievement, let it be given to the spirit of Christ, which is the spirit of love in the hearts of those of many lands and faiths who have toiled for the high ends of this great meeting. May the blessing of Him who rules the storm and holds the ocean waves in His right
hand, follow you, with the prayers of all God's people, to your distant homes. And as Sir Joshua Reynolds closed his lectures on "The Art of Painting" with the name of Michael Angelo, so, with a deeper reverence, I desire that the last words which I speak to this parliament shall be the name of Him to whom I owe life and truth and hope and all things, who reconciles all contradictions, pacifies all antagonisms, and who, from the throne of His Heavenly kingdom, directs the serene and un wearied omnipotence of redeeming love—Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world.

ADDRESS OF C. C. BONNEY, PRESIDENT OF WORLD'S CONGRESS.

Worshippers of God and Lovers of Man:—The closing words of this great event must now be spoken. With inexpressible joy and gratitude I give them utterance. The wonderful success of this first actual congress of the religions of the world is the realization of a conviction which has held my heart for many years. I became acquainted with the great religious systems of the world in my youth, and have enjoyed an intimate association with leaders of many churches during my maturer years. I was thus led to believe that, if the great religious faiths could be brought into relations of friendly intercourse, many points of sympathy and union would be found, and the coming unity of mankind in the love of God and the service of man be greatly facilitated and advanced. Hence when the occasion arose it was gladly welcomed, and the effort more than willingly made.

What men deemed impossible, God has finally wrought. The religions of the world have actually met in a great and imposing assembly; they have conferred together on the vital questions of life and immortality in a frank and friendly spirit, and now they part in peace with many warm expressions of mutual affection and respect.

The laws of the congress forbidding controversy or attack, have, on the whole, been wonderfully observed. The exceptions are so few that they may well be expunged from the record and from the memory. They even served the useful purpose of timely warnings against the tendency to indulge in intellectual conflict. If an unkind hand threw a fire-brand into the assembly, let us be thank-
ful that a kinder hand plunged it in the waters of forgiveness and quenched its flame.

If some western warrior, forgetting for the moment that this was a friendly conference and not a battlefield, uttered his war-cry, let us rejoice, our Orient friends, that a kinder spirit answered: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they say."

No system of faith or worship has been compromised by this friendly conference; no apostle of any religion has been placed in a false position by any act of this congress. The knowledge here acquired will be carried by those who have gained it as precious treasure to their respective countries, and will there, in freedom and according to reason, be considered, judged, and applied as they shall deem right.

The influence which this congress of the religions of the world will exert on the peace and the prosperity of the world is beyond the power of human language to describe. For this influence, borne by those who have attended the sessions of the parliament of religions to all parts of the world, will affect in some important degree all races of men, all forms of religion, and even all governments and social institutions.

And now farewell. A thousand congratulations and thanks for the co-operation and aid of all who have contributed to the glorious results which we celebrate this night. Henceforth the religions of the world will make war, not on each other, but on the giant evils that afflict mankind. Henceforth let all throughout the world who worship God and love their fellow-men join in the anthem of the angels:

"Glory to God in the highest! Peace on earth, good will among men!"

At the close of President Bonney's speech Rabbi Hirsch led the great audience in the universal prayer. Bishop Keane then said a prayer of benediction.

The audience led by the chorus sang "America."

THE END.
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