

The
OPEN COURT

Devoted to the Science of Religion,
the Religion of Science, and the Extension
of the Religious Parliament Idea

FOUNDED BY EDWARD C. HEGELER

AUGUST, 1930

←—————→
VOLUME XLIV NUMBER 891

Price 20 Cents

The Open Court Publishing Company

Wieboldt Hall, 339 East Chicago Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

THE PHILOSOPHICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND
FRANK THILLY

and G. WATTS CUNNINGHAM

OF THE SAGE SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY, CORNELL UNIVERSITY
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF

ÉTIENNE GILSON (Paris)
ARTHUR LIEBERT (Berlin)

GEORGE SANTAYANA (Rome)
A. E. TAYLOR (Edinburgh)

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

HAROLD R. SMART

OF THE SAGE SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Contents for July, 1930

Meditation on a Hill.....	M. C. Otto
On the Reality of Things.....	William Curtis Swabey
Louis de la Chambre, 1594-1669.....	Albert G. A. Balz
Discussion.	
Of the Spurious Mystery in Causal Connections.....	C. J. Ducasse
Of a Curious Reluctance to Recognize Causal Necessity.....	
.....	Sterling P. Lamprecht

Reviews of Books.

James H. Dunham's Principles of Ethics, by Warner Fite—*John Baillie's* The Interpretation of Religion, by Edgar Sheffield Brightman—*Leon Brunschwig's* Le progres de la conscience dans la philosophie occidentale, by Arthur E. Murphy—*Clement C. J. Webb's* Ioannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Metalogicon Libri IIII, by Gerald B. Phelan—*Edward Bradford Titchener's* Systematic Psychology: Prolegomena, by W. B. Pillsbury—*Frederick J. E. Woodbridge's* The Son of Apollo, by Rupert Clendon Lodge—*Heinrich Ratke's* Systematisches Handlexikon zu Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft, by G. Watts Cunningham—*H. G. Creel's* Sinism, and *L. Adams Beck's* The Story of Oriental Philosophy, by Alban G. Widgery—*Emile Meyerson's* Identity and Reality, translated by Kate Loewenberg, by H. R. Smart.

Notes.

Charles A. A. Bennett. Ralph Barton Perry. John Baillie. The philosophical section of the Ohio College Association. The Facsimile-Text Society. Current philosophical periodicals.

PUBLISHED BI-MONTHLY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND COMPANY

LANCASTER, PA.

55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

SINGLE NUMBERS \$1.00 (5s.). PER ANNUM \$5.00 (25s.).

THE OPEN COURT

Volume XLIV (No. 8)

AUGUST, 1930

Number 891

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Frontispiece.</i> HENRY D. THOREAU.	
<i>In Promotion of Character Training.</i> EDWARD L. SCHLAUB.	449
<i>Asmodeus, Dandy Among Demons.</i> MAXIMILIAN RUDWIG.	459
<i>Paul, Alias Simon the Magician.</i> ROBERT P. RICHARDSON.	467
<i>The Use of the Word Tao in the Confucian Analects.</i> HUANG KUEI YUEN AND J. K. SHRYOCK.	489
<i>Two Notable Philosophic Works.</i> VICTOR S. YAKROS.	496
<i>The Insights and Raptures of the Mystic.</i> (Concluded) RADHAKAMAL MUKERJEE	502
<i>Henry D. Thoreau, Oriental.</i> FRANCES FLETCHER.	510

Published monthly by
THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

337 East Chicago Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Subscription rates: \$2.00 a year; 20c a copy. Remittances may be made by personal checks, drafts, post-office or express money orders, payable to the Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago.

While the publishers do not hold themselves responsible for manuscripts sent to them, they endeavor to use the greatest care in returning those not found available, if postage is sent. As a precaution against loss, mistakes, or delay, they request that the name and address of the author be placed at the head of every manuscript (and not on a separate slip) and that all manuscripts and correspondence concerning them be addressed to the Open Court Publishing Company and not to individuals.

Address all correspondence to the Open Court Publishing Company, 337 East Chicago Ave., Chicago.

Entered as Second-Class matter March 26, 1897, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Company, 1930.
Printed in the United States of America.

THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS

Announces

LOGIC AND NATURE

By Marie C. Swabey, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Philosophy
in New York University

TO vindicate logic as the method of metaphysics and to show its applicability to current problems of science and nature, is the purpose of this volume. This involves a demonstration of the priority of logic to experience and a discussion of the nature of reason. Hypothetical judgments, non-syllogistic arguments, the paradoxes of Russell, the relation of the form and matter of inference, the nature of postulational systems, the problem of truth, and the theory of universals are among the logical topics considered. Nature is held to be interpreted by science in the light of a set of logical assumptions. In this connection, probability is shown to be the basis of induction, and atomism an indispensable methodological presupposition of science. It is urged that measurement is an operation of rational comparison; while a logical interpretation is also offered of the appearance of seemingly irreversible statistical tendencies and laws in nature.

"A strong case for the primordially of logic."—Professor Cassius J. Keyser, Columbia University

"Marked by a fine capacity for logical analysis and reasoning. . . . It holds the attention continually."—Professor Robert MacDougall.

"The book is founded on a detailed, lucid, and convincing criticism of naturalism. Its positive thesis . . . is closely and vigorously argued. The book is written in a style unusual for its clarity and brevity, and reveals the wide reading of its author in classical and in contemporary modern philosophy."—Professor Mary Whiton Calkins.

8vo, xiv + 384 pages. Bound in blue cloth, gold-lettered. Price \$4.00.

For Sale By

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

337 East Chicago Ave., Chicago, Ill.

JOURNAL of PHILOSOPHY

This periodical is the organ of active philosophical discussion in the United States. There is no similar journal in the field of scientific philosophy. It is issued fortnightly and permits the quick publication of short contributions, prompt reviews and timely discussions.

*Edited by Professors F. J. E. Woodbridge,
W. T. Bush, and H. W. Schneider,
of Columbia University*

515 WEST 116TH STREET, NEW YORK

\$4 a Year, 26 Numbers

20 Cents a Copy

NOW READY

The Paul Carus Foundation Lectures
2nd Series

The Revolt Against Dualism

By ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY

Professor of Philosophy in the Johns Hopkins University

Is dualism—the concept of subjective appearance and objective reality—a “passed mode, an outworn theme”? Or is it the corner stone of the new physics? Is Descartes dethroned or is his sovereignty vindicated in the light of modern philosophy? Do the results of scientific research justify or overthrow the old ideas of dualism of mind and matter? ¶ This last quarter century will have distinctive interest to future historians of philosophy as the age of the great revolt against dualism, a phase of the wider revolt of the 20th against the 17th century. Dr. Lovejoy traces this revolt, brilliantly analyzing modern scientific philosophy, in a lucid, penetrating volume necessary to an adequate understanding of philosophy’s most important problem.

Price \$4.00

The Open Court Publishing Company
337 East Chicago Avenue Chicago, Ill.

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

COLLOQUIUM SERIES

Published in May, 1930:

Dunham Jackson, *The Theory of Approximation*. About 200 pp. \$2.50.
(Volume XI of the Colloquium Series.)

EARLIER VOLUMES

Volume I. *Linear Systems of Curves on Algebraic Surfaces*, by **H. S. White**; *Forms of Non-Euclidean Space*, by **F. S. Woods**; *Selected Topics in the Theory of Divergent Series and of Continued Fractions*, by **E. B. Van Vleck**. (Boston Colloquium.) New York, 1905. \$2.75.

Volume II. *New Haven Colloquium*, by **E. H. Moore**, **E. J. Wilczynski**, and **Max Mason**. Out of print.

Volume III. *Fundamental Existence Theorems*, by **G. A. Bliss**; *Differential-Geometric Aspects of Dynamics*, by **Edward Kasner**. (Princeton Colloquium.) New York, 1913. \$2.50.

Volume IV. *On Invariants and the Theory of Numbers*, by **L. E. Dickson**; *Topics in the Theory of Functions of Several Complex Variables*, by **W. F. Osgood**. (Madison Colloquium.) New York, 1914. \$2.50.

Volume V, Part I. *Functionals and their Applications. Selected Topics, including Integral Equations*, by **G. C. Evans**. New York, 1918. \$2.00.

Volume V, Part II. *Analysis Situs*, by **Oswald Veblen**. Out of print.

Volume VI. *The Logarithmic Potential. Discontinuous Dirichlet and Neumann Problems*, by **G. C. Evans**, New York, 1927. \$2.00.

Volume VII. *Algebraic Arithmetic*, by **E. T. Bell**. New York, 1927. \$2.50.

Volume VIII. *Non-Riemannian Geometry*, by **L. P. Eisenhart**. New York, 1927. \$2.50.

Volume IX. *Dynamical Systems*, by **G. D. Birkhoff**. New York, 1927. \$3.00.

Volume X. *Algebraic Geometry and Theta Functions*, by **A. B. Coble**. New York, 1929. \$3.00.

Orders may be sent to the American Mathematical Society,
501 West 116th Street, New York City, or to

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

337 East Chicago Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

THE HISTORY OF MATHEMATICAL NOTATIONS

By FLORIAN CAJORI

Vol. I—Notations in Elementary Mathematics

Vol. II—Notations Mainly in Higher Mathematics

Price, Cloth, \$6.00 each

"The first volume deals with the history of notations from the days of the ancients and by nations as far apart as the Babylonians and the Aztecs, Egyptians and Chinese, Arabs, Germans, Italians and English. The second volume gives a history of the symbols that have accompanied the great advance of mathematics from the days of Newton to the present times.

"Professor Cajori's book will be indispensable to the historian of mathematics."—*The Times Literary Supplement, London.*

"The amount of research that this work represents is extraordinary and the history will be of great usefulness to mathematicians."—*Journal of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers.*

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

Chicago

London

ANNALEN DER PHILOSOPHIE

UND PHILOSOPHISCHEN KRITIK

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

HANS VAHINGER, JOSEPH PETZOLDT

UND

RAYMUND SCHMIDT

Abonnementspreis für den im Erscheinen begriffenen *Band VIII*: Jährlich ein Band von 10 Heften. *RM 20.*—

Die Zeitschrift dient keiner philosophischen Schule. Sie berücksichtigt in erster Linie die Beiträge zur philosophischen Problematik, welche von den Einzelwissenschaften ausgehen. Sie ist die einzige philosophische Zeitschrift, die nicht lediglich von Fachphilosophen redigiert wird, sondern *Wissenschaftler aller Gebiete zu Mitherausgebern und Mitarbeitern hat.*—Am Schluss jedes Hefts ein

Literaturbericht

der in systematisch geordneten Einzelreferaten, unter Zurückstellung von Werturteilen, über den Inhalt der Neuerscheinungen berichtet und *bibliographische Vollständigkeit* anstrebt. Ein Probeheft versendet umsonst und postfrei

FELIX MEINER VERLAG IN LEIPZIG C 1,

Kurzestr. 8.

Fourth Carus Mathematical Monograph

PROJECTIVE GEOMETRY

By

JOHN WESLEY YOUNG

Professor of Mathematics, Dartmouth College

Price, \$2.00

Projective Geometry may be approached by various routes: postulational or intuitive, synthetic or analytic, metric or purely projective. In a monograph which is to give a first approach to the subject it has seemed to me that the treatment should be based on intuition, should develop the subject by synthetic methods, and should keep projective properties sharply distinguished from the metric specializations. The reader will accordingly find in the first five chapters a systematic and thoroughly elementary treatment of the most fundamental propositions of projective geometry, culminating in the theorems of Pascal and Brianchon and the polar system of a conic. My purpose in these chapters has been to develop on an intuitive basis the concepts and the properties of projective space, without any admixture of metric ideas. Only in this way, I believe, can the reader gain a clear impression of what the word projective means. [Extract from Preface.]

THE RHIND MATHEMATICAL PAPYRUS

CHANCELLOR ARNOLD BUFFUM CHACE, of Brown University, is rendering signal honor to the MATHEMATICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA by publishing under its auspices his RHIND MATHEMATICAL PAPYRUS.

Volume I, over 200 pages (11¼"x8"), contains the free Translation, Commentary, and Bibliography of Egyptian Mathematics.

Volume II, 140 plates (11¼"x14") in two colors with Text and Introductions, contains the Photographic Facsimile, Hieroglyphic Transcription, Transliteration, and Literal Translation.

This exposition of the oldest mathematical document in the world will be of great value to any one interested in the work of a civilization of nearly 4,000 years ago.

LIMITED EDITION

\$20.00 Plus Postage

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

Chicago



HENRY D. THOREAU, 1817-1862.

Frontispiece to The Open Court.

THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

**Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and
the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea.**

COPYRIGHT BY OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY 1930

Volume XLIV (No. 8) AUGUST, 1930

Number 891

IN PROMOTION OF CHARACTER TRAINING

BY EDWARD L. SCHAUB

WHETHER or not our contemporary western civilization deserves the epithet of materialistic may be open to question. That it is technological in nature, however, may scarcely be doubted. Now the very term technological most commonly carries the connotation of a manipulation of physical materials. It is understood as the application of scientific knowledge, and this more especially in connection with the industrial and mechanical arts. The scientific knowledge in question is therefore essentially that of the natural sciences. In the field of these sciences man has acquired exceptional powers of prediction. Not alone this. The results have been such as to yield an almost incredible measure of control over the factors of the physical environment. Indeed man's achievements along these lines have been so rapid, and so sweeping in their consequences, that many fears have been aroused lest they prove a humanly destructive boomerang if notable advances are not made in the development of the moral outlook and in the fashioning of sound character.

On all hands, therefore, we note a growing consciousness of the imperative need for scientific investigations into the nature of character, the laws of its development and the methods of its training. This is true of parents, teachers, and citizens, in their capacity as individuals; but we find also that all manner of associations are turning their attention to the problems mentioned. Ever more numerous, for example, are coming to be the committees and other groups charged with investigating the methods of character education that are in operation in schools, churches, homes and other institutions. In general there is an acute sense of the darkness

which still shrouds this field. Here, too, it is felt, there are secrets which if we could but learn them would enable us to direct activity intelligently, and to make more fully attainable the goals which upon reflection we set ourselves.

A notable incident in this development was the Morality Codes Competition arranged during 1916 through the Character Education Institution of Washington, D. C. This was designed to bring to light, with a view to subsequent dissemination, the moral ideas which should be inculcated into the appreciation and into the lives of individuals beginning with earliest childhood. In the realization that this was but the beginning of investigative work, a prize of \$20,000.00 was then offered through the Executive Committee of the Character Education Institution for the best program of ways and means for imbuing children with the ideals which commend themselves to intelligent public opinion. The aim was the promotion in general of right character. It was believed that while our public education had given much effective attention to programs for intellectual education, and that while it had likewise provided to some extent for vocational and physical training, it was as yet relatively backward in the furtherance of the supremely important objective of character formation.

Typical of the questions which the competitors for the \$20,000.00 prize were asked to consider were the following: "How to get children to understand and appreciate the wisdom of moral experience? How to develop personal convictions in matters of morality in the minds of the children themselves, and the will to live up to these convictions? How to correlate school and home life so as to influence character development together? What character education should be given teachers themselves as a preparation for personal influence over character development of children? How shall teachers be enlightened as to the moral ideas to be inculcated, and how trained to efficiency in the use of methods of character?"¹

The plan which most commended itself to the judges, and which was therefore awarded the prize, was elaborated by a group of Iowa educators, working under the chairmanship of Professor Edwin D. Starbuck. This plan made fundamental the clear envisagement of definite goals and stressed the need of measurements, as accurate

¹ *Character Education Methods: The Iowa Plan \$20,000.* Arcard, 1922, p. V. This brochure is available from the Character Education Institution, Washington, D. C., and from the Institute of Character Research, Iowa City, Iowa.

as possible, of progress made in their realization. It developed primarily the contentions that our ends must be personal and social; that moral persons must be productive as well as creative; that character must be practiced rather than dreamed or thought of; that conduct must be vitalized through sympathies, and the mind be richly furnished with effective imagery; that moral thoughtfulness and conscious self-control should be gradually but continuously fostered; that sheer duty must be transformed into a joyful sense of beauty; that children should be familiarized with the best of our racial tradition and be awakened to loyalty as well as stimulated to reverence. It insisted upon the necessity, in the case of the average normal child, of a three-fold recentering, described as follows: "(1) The transformation of a lower selfhood of cruder instincts and desires into 'higher' personality of refined tastes, of insight, outlook and intelligent purpose. (2) An awakening into wholesome appreciation of the interests and well-being of others and participation in their programs, customs, conventions and institutions, and loyalty to their ideals. (3) A disinterested admiration of the non-personal values in Nature and Life that glorify both the self and other-than-self and culminate in a spirit of reverence."²

That the numerous influences converging from various directions upon the issues of character training were powerfully reinforced through the activities of the Character Education Institution is very apparent. It was in a large measure these latter that gave impetus to the establishment, in 1923, of the Institute of Character Research in Iowa City. This Institute was legally recognized by the Iowa State Board of Education in 1927 and represents an integral part of the State University of Iowa. It includes among its objectives instruction of a sort similar to that of a department in one of our colleges of Liberal Arts. Thus, a survey course on "Character and its Development" seeks to provide the Juniors and Seniors admitted to it with some insight into the intricate problems of character, with special reference to the early formative factors and with particular emphasis upon the home and school. In fact the aim of the course is described as practical: it "looks for the preparation for family life and for teaching." A further course offered by the Institute seeks to give to more advanced students a better orientation in the field of character analysis and development, and primarily to lay the basis for research on their part. And it is,

² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

indeed, upon research that the ultimate interest of the Institute may be said to focus. It is realized that we have as yet but a very partial and unsatisfactory knowledge respecting the nature of character and personality, their elements and their laws; and it is likewise realized that there is urgent need of understanding better "the sorts of influences or training on which they depend, the bodily and mental processes conditioning them, the right content of the curriculum, the proper placement of materials, and the best methods of character training."³

Thus the Institute makes its contribution to the general program of studies pursued by students, and likewise gives stimulus and equipment for the enrichment of knowledge and the perfection of the technique within its field. More than this. It also seeks to prepare its students for service in various vocations, such as deanships, directorships of personnel, specialists in character problems in public school systems, superintendentcies and principalships.

Typical of the Institute's work in the genetic psychology of morals are studies now being made with respect to the origin of the moral impulses and the mental processes involved therein. Investigations are in progress as to the beginnings and the growth of the imagination in pre-school children; the development of abstract notions; the relation of delayed response to moral attitudes; and the mental and physical processes involved in self-other reactions. On a grant from the Boy Scouts of America a genetic study has been undertaken of the abstract-concrete interests and skills of children between the ages of nine and twelve. Already there has been published a doctoral dissertation relating to children's attitudes toward the law.⁴

Promising attacks have been made by the Institute upon the analysis of character and personality. These include not only more or less general essays such as that of Dr. Rachel Knight on the personality of George Fox,^b but also more technical studies pursued by objective methods and under carefully controlled conditions. Such, for example, is the investigation by Dr. W. E. Slaght^c into the factors conditioning truthfulness and untruthfulness in children.

³ This quotation and all others unless otherwise stated are taken from bulletins which the State University of Iowa has published on the work of the Institute.

⁴ See item a in the list which we append to this article of publications by those connected with the research work of the Institute. References by letters in the text from this point on will refer to the same list.

By the use of three ingenious tests, a selection was effected of two groups (the truthful and the untruthful) of 70 pupils each. Intensive study led to the conclusion that the major factors conditioning untruthfulness are impulsiveness, suggestibility, lack of inhibition, inadequate moral discrimination, and unfavorable home surroundings. The factor of intelligence, in its aspects other than are involved in the factors just mentioned, seems to be relatively negligible, though the truthful children exhibited a decidedly wider range of information and a better fund of thoughtful experience. The common belief that lying is related to imaginativeness was lent some support by the investigation, though at this point the latter was incomplete and therefore urges the need for further research on the topic.

Members of the Institute have succeeded in throwing some light on certain aspects of character by use of a method of correlations in which evaluations are made, singly and severally, of the interacting elements in combinations of relations. Thus Dr. R. D. Sinclair^d has compared mystically minded persons with those of the non-mystical type. Dr. T. H. Howells^e selected from 542 students the 50 who had the greatest measure of belief in orthodox statements and the 50 who ranked lowest in this respect. These groups, designated as the conservatives and the radicals, were subjected to some 30 psychological tests. A variety of conclusions emerged. Thus, the radicals showed themselves more intelligent than the conservatives; religious beliefs, experiences and practices, it seemed, are conditioned by a general tendency towards suggestibility; the conservatives improved on threat of punishment while the radicals did not.

The valuable monograph by Professor Shuttleworth on "The Measurement of Character and Environmental Factors Involved in Scholastic Success"^f is concerned directly with the problem of scholastic maladjustment; as its title indicates, however, it makes a distinct attack upon questions as to how we may measure character traits. Realizing the need for the measurement of the non-intellectual factors in scholastic success or failure, the author attempts to devise objective tests for the subtle factors of environmental background and character traits, as well as for the prediction of scholastic success.

An important feature of the Institute's activity is its attention

to curriculum problems, more especially to the proper grade placement of materials within the curriculum. For example, the parables and sayings of Jesus have been studied with respect to their difficulty of comprehension and their place in a course of study adapted to the mental maturity of children.^g Something of a similar sort has been done in connection with selections from the Old Testament prophets.^h

A useful piece of research by Dr. P. R. Hightowerⁱ led to the conclusion that there is essentially a zero correlation between Biblical knowledge and moral conduct. Confirmation was found of the more general conclusion that moral conduct has its springs elsewhere than in clear idea and in reasoned judgment. The conviction reached is that direct moral instruction issues in negative rather than in positive results in respect to both conduct and attitude.

Attitudes in respect to other national groups were the object of study by Dr. James C. Manry^j. Carefully constructed tests of information and judgment on world affairs were given to freshman, sophomore, junior and senior classes of various colleges with a view to ascertaining the degree to which the objective of world citizenship was actually being realized. Moreover, considerable information was secured about nationality, extent of travel, previous studies, place of birth, etc., in order to discover the factors that seem to favor the development of a practical sense of world citizenship. Of these factors important ones are an initiatory or orientation course, and social studies in general. An understanding of foreign nations seems to be rendered easier if there are opportunities for a sympathetic understanding of remote sections of one's own native land. Hence Dr. Manry would encourage the free movement of teachers and students about the United States. In general it might be said that the typical errors made in the tests that were given indicate that "sheer ignorance, together with the democratic impulse to entertain opinions notwithstanding, is responsible for the most part for the purely emotional and verbal thinking about international affairs."

In Dr. Searles's research^k into the study of religion in the State Universities of the United States, we have an illustration of a piece of work involving historical orientation and present trends, as well as an examination of the State Constitutional, legislative and Supreme Court provisions relating to sectarian religious influence in the Public Schools. Nevertheless the research was motivated

essentially by an interest in character development. Religion, it was felt, could function satisfactorily in the training of character only if students were provided with a greater informational and intellectual background than has in the past been provided. When religion is recognized as a fact of human experience amenable to interpretation through definite methods, its scientific study carries decided cultural and liberating influences. Hence the problem as to the place of such study in our State universities is one of significance from the standpoint of character formation. The conclusion reached by Dr. Searles is that these institutions may very properly claim "the right to carry on that aspect of religious education which involves research, investigation, and teaching in those fields where there is little difference of opinion among taxpayers." On the other hand, the churches "either singly or unitedly should be free to carry on a high grade of academic work commensurate with university standards in those fields more closely related to the practical work of the church in which it is felt they can make a significant contribution." Through this union of forces it is believed that religious motives may be made to function in the ethical lives of the students.

Very shortly there will be available in printed form the results of some research by Dr. George W. Beiswanger on "The Biblical Narratives Judged as to Their Character Value." This study employs a carefully developed technique of which a monograph by Dr. Shuttleworth¹ offered a description. The technique is one utilized by the Institute in a most comprehensive and significant enterprise which is designed to issue in a series of volumes bearing the caption "A Guide to Books for Character." These guides will aim to give to parents and teachers, as well as to librarians, effective aid in so directing the reading habits of children up to the 9th grade that very definite results may be achieved in the stimulation and correction of specific traits of personality. The importance of this undertaking is suggested by the fact that the finer features of morals cannot issue from preachment or indoctrination but are the results of contagion. Investigations have shown that one should not tamper directly with the morals of children, and that progress in character may not be secured through the action of a corps of moral drill-masters. It is spontaneous choice of values that brings grace and strength. Children and youth should be provided with desirable cultural sustenance: we should "trust literature to do its own work."

Two volumes of the above-mentioned guides have thus far appeared, those relating to "Fairy Tale, Myth, and Legend"^m and to "Fiction."ⁿ Another volume grading the voluminous literature on biography is well under way, and in due course the various other realms of literature possessing value for character training will be considered. A general idea of the objectives, method and value of the project as a whole may most conveniently be given by some specific statement respecting the most recent volume, that dealing with fiction. The tremendous dynamic inherent in fiction and available for character training will be obvious to all who realize that nine-tenths of the reading of America's children would seem to consist of novels, and also to all who, in the words of Professor Moore's review of the volume on fiction, have "ever observed a girl curled up on a davenport lost to the world about her as she follows the golden threads of a fascinating story or perchance a lad stretched out on the floor so absorbed in the adventures recited between two covers of a book that even the call to dinner is unheard." In preparing the guide to the literature of fiction Professor Starbuck's collaborators selected as worthy of recommendation and report 663 from approximately 2000 volumes mentioned in lists of fiction alleged to be suitable for children. This selection was made by use of eight standards of excellence as follows: unity, right craftsmanship, agreeable emotional tone (these three having to do with literary form and quality), effectiveness, artistry in appeal, truthfulness (these three relating to educational fitness), refinement of the fundamental human attitudes, and proper orientation (these last two referring more specifically to the work that literature should do in the changing of attitudes). All selected material received the independent judgment of at least three readers, on all of whom periodic statistical checks were made to determine the extent of their agreement. The readers' judgments were weighted so as to make them comparable, and special study was made of all cases of wide disagreement. Before publication there was "a final editing in the light of the whole process and range of judgments." In view of the author's clear envisagement of his problem and of the careful procedure employed in its solution, the results that are presented may be considered trustworthy in a high degree. And it should be noted that tests carried on in the Institute have shown a "reasonably high positive correlation between children's ratings and the

judgments of experts as to the character and cultural value of selections."

The investigators have offered their results in the form *first* of a *book list*, grouping the 663 recommended titles according to school grade, arranging them within each group in the order of their excellence, indicating the situations and moral attitudes involved in the story, and providing short comments; *second* of a *situations list*, in which the same titles are similarly graded and ranked but are grouped according to specific situations; *third* of an *attitudes index*, which lists in alphabetical order all the attitudes exhibited toward given situations and gives reference numbers to titles in the book list; *fourth* of a *classification index*, which provides "a grouping of material according to type, subject matter, and the background, with reference by number to the complete analysis in the book list."

Worthy of note is a feature that should be of value to students of genetic psychology as well as to all who are interested in character training. We refer to a chapter touching upon numerous works of fiction that throw light on the motivations and the inner life of children and of adolescents. This literature richly supplements one's own informal observations and supplies suggestions for further observations and for verification. Thus also it bridges the gap between haphazard experiences of children and scientific studies of them.

This account of the one volume of the series "A Guide to Books for Character" should express more effectively than could mere eulogistic words the high practical importance, as well as the careful scientific basis and procedure, of the enterprise. As one of its by-products we are now shortly to have a work "The Wonder Road," which, in its three volumes, will make conveniently available more than sixty of the selections that ranked highest in the study that was made of fairy tales, myths, and legends. Thus the children's book-shelf will receive a notable addition.

The work of the Institute is supported in part by Graduate College and other funds available to the State University of Iowa. The Institute, moreover, has received valuable co-operation from the Institute of Social and Religious Research. It is, furthermore, very specially indebted to the generosity of private individuals who have recognized the high value of its aims and the promise of its further fruitfulness in a supremely important field of inquiry and

of social concern. Within recent months the State University of Iowa has put at its disposal an extensive section of East Hall, and thus the Institute is at present provided with satisfactory working quarters. It now remains to be hoped that the Institute may not be crippled or restricted in its activities by a lack of funds, but that it may be enabled to build up an organization within which its gifted leader may acquire an adequate number of effective collaborators and may make satisfactory provision for the permanence of the enterprise to which he has dedicated himself.

List of publications referred to above as growing out of the Institute:

^a Lockhart, Earl G., "The Attitudes of Children toward Law," Iowa Studies in Character, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^b Knight, Rachel, "The Founder of Quakerism," London: Swarthmore Press, 1922.

^c Slaght, W. E., "Untruthfulness in Children: Its Causes and Setting in Child Nature," Iowa Studies in Character, Vol. I, No. 4, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^d Sinclair, R. D., "A Comparative Study of Those who Report the Experience of the Divine Presence and those who do Not," Iowa Studies in Character, Vol. II, No. 3, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^e Howells, Thomas H., "A Comparative Study of those who Accept as against those who Reject Religious Authority," Iowa Studies in Character, Vol. II, No. 2, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^f Shuttleworth, Frank K., "The Measurement of the Character and Environmental Factors Involved in Scholastic Success," Iowa Studies in Character, Vol. I, No. 2, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^g Franklin, S. P., "An Attempt to Measure the Comprehension Difficulty of the Precepts and Parables of Jesus," Iowa Studies in Character, Vol. II, No. 1, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^h Case, Ralph T., "A Study of the Placement in the Curriculum of Selected Teachings of the Old Testament Prophets," Iowa Studies in Character, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

ⁱ Hightower, Pleasant R., "Biblical Information in Relation to Character and Conduct," Iowa Studies in Character, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^j Manry, James C., "World Citizenship," Iowa Studies in Character, Vol. I, No. 1, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^k Searles, H. L., "A Study of Religion in State Universities," Iowa Studies in Character, Vol. I, No. 3, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^l Shuttleworth, Frank K., "Statistical Studies in Children's Literature," Iowa Studies in Character, Department of Publications, State University of Iowa.

^m Starbuck, Edwin D., assisted by Shuttleworth, Frank K., and Others, "A Guide to Literature for Character Training: Vol. I, Fairy Tale, Myth, and Legend," New York, The Macmillan Company, 1929.

ⁿ Starbuck, Edwin D., and Others, "A Guide to Books for Character: Vol. II, Fiction," New York, The Macmillan Company, 1930.

NOTE.—After the manuscript of the above article was already in the hands of the printer, announcement was made of the transfer of Professor Starbuck to the University of Southern California. There he is to inaugurate work similar to that undertaken in Iowa City by the Institute of Character Research. The activities of this latter organization, according to present reports, are to be continued under new direction.

ASMODEUS, DANDY AMONG DEMONS

BY MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN

OF all the demons of distinction, Asmodeus has had the greatest fall in power and prestige. This Asmodeus, who has now become a laughing-stock, was in his day, on the authority of Anatole France, our great contemporary diabolist, "an important demon, more powerful than Ashtaroth, Cedon, Uriel, Beelzebub, Aborym, Azazel, Dagon, Magog, Magon, Isaacharum, Accaron, Orphaxat, or Beherith, who are nevertheless devils not to be despised."¹ Asmodeus, according to the demonologists, originally was a shining angel in heaven, and, after his fall, was counted among the most eminent personages in hell. In fact he was linked with Lucifer and the other luminaries of limbo. Medieval writers called him "Prince of Demons." In the opinion of Pope Gregory IX, Asmodi was the name under which the Devil was worshipped by the Stedingers of Friesland in the thirteenth century.

But if the demon Asmodeus is now treated by the Christians with derision, he is still in favor with the Jews, among whom he has enjoyed great popularity to this day. The sons of Israel speak of Satan with respect, but for Asmodeus they evince a warm affection. The mention of the Tempter of Job fills them with fear and trembling, but Asmodeus is their darling devil. King Ashmodai, as this demon is popularly known among the Jewish masses, plays a prominent part in Jewish mythology. Many legends have been woven by the rabbis around this "king of the shedhim," the demons who are the offspring of fallen angels and human mothers.²

¹ Anatole France: "M. Maurice Bouchor et l'Histoire de Tobie," *le Temps*, December 8, 1899. Reprinted in *la Vie littéraire*, 3me série (1891), pp. 218-28. Quotations in this paper are taken from the English translation, *On Life and Letters*, 3rd series (1924), pp. 214-27.

² The *shedhim*, according to Talmudic tradition, are the demons who came from the union of the sons of heaven and the daughters of the earth, whereas the *satanim* are the fallen angels themselves. Samael is regarded by the Talmud as the head of the latter group of demons.

Asmodeus himself, according to one Jewish tradition, is a *shed*, being the child of Shamdon, a fallen angel, and of Naamah, the sister of Tubal-Cain.³ According to another Jewish tradition, however, he is the son of Samaël and Lilith.

The Jews claim Asmodeus as their own. The truth of the matter is that they borrowed him from the Persians during their captivity under Zoroastrian kings. Asmodeus is no other than Æshma-dæva who, in the Persian religion, is the personification of violent wrath and carnal lust. In *Friar Rush*, a romance of the sixteenth century, this demon is called "Prince of Lechery." In popular belief, he is the prince of pleasures, the patron of passions, and the lord of luxury and lust. LeSage, in his novel, *le Diable boiteux* (1707), has Asmodeus say himself, "I am the demon of lewdness, or to put it more splendidly, the god Cupid." This devil is sensuality in person.⁴ In this capacity, he is the counterpart of Lilith, the demoness with the long golden hair. Just as Lilith is dangerous to men, so is Asmodeus dangerous to women. This danger to women from Asmodeus is due to the fact that he is the greatest dandy among the devils. For the Devil is most fascinating to fastidious women when he patronizes a good tailor.

Asmodeus, in addition to the qualities already mentioned, is also the father of new fads and fashions in dress, namely, the demon of frills and finery.⁵ He is so fashionable that Calmet, the French demonologist of the eighteenth century, believed that the name Asmodeus signified fine dress.⁶ This demon's beautiful clothes and fine manners represent the "pride of life" in Christian symbolism.

In this connection, the story told by Henry Stubbes, in his *Anatomic of Abuses* (1583), as a warning against the fashionable folly of starched ruffs, which prevailed in his day, will be of interest. According to this tale, there lived in Antwerp in 1582 a lady with a passion for dresses, the ruffs of which her washerwomen

³ Cf. Louis Ginzberg: *The Legends of the Jews* (4 vols., Philadelphia, 1909-25), I, 150-51.

⁴ This is the reason why Marcel Barrière named his highly sensual novel, *le Sang d'Asmodée* (1924).

⁵ In Jewish mythology it is Azazel who has devised the cosmetics and jewelry, with which women attract men; cf. Louis Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, I, 125.

⁶ Dom Augustin Calmet: *Dissertations sur les apparitions des anges, des démons et des esprits, sur les revenants et les vampires de Hongrie, de Bohême, de Moravie et de Silésie*, Paris, 1746. English translation (*The Phantom World; or, the History and Philosophy of Spirits and Apparitions*), 2 vols., London and Philadelphia, 1850.

could never succeed in starching to her satisfaction. One day in a rage she flung the starched ruffs to the ground, swearing that the Devil might take her if she wore such things again. Straightway in came the Devil himself in the guise of an elegant young man, holding out to her a beautiful ruff which he offered to adjust for her. Having done this to the great satisfaction of the lady, he wrung her neck.⁷



Asmodeus is primarily a ladies' demon. He tempts and torments especially the members of the fair sex. When he tries to bring men to fall, he employs women as his accomplices. "It is in this," says Anatole France, in the essay on Bouchor already quoted, "that his power lies in this world, especially among the white peoples." Asmodeus is the Don Juan among the devils. The story of his love-affairs would fill volumes. To attempt only to give the names of the ladies with whom he had a *liaison* would be beyond the powers even of the Recording Angel. This demon is often called the genius of matrimonial unhappiness. He is very cosmopolitan in his love-affairs, and disregards all tribal and ecclesiastical distinctions.

Tradition has it that Asmodeus plied Noah and Solomon with wine and seduced their wives. It is further recorded in the Book of Tobit (vi. 14) that this demon loved to distraction the beautiful Sarah, daughter of Raguel, and, out of jealousy, successively slew seven men to whom she was married as soon as each had entered the nuptial chamber. Asmodeus, you must know, is a fastidious devil and will not allow the object of his passions to be exposed to the embrace of any other person, terrestrial or infernal. His menace to newlyweds is, moreover, due to the fact that he maintains for himself a kind of *jus prima noctis*. He claims this right probably as a reward for his successful efforts in obtaining from the Church the

⁷ This story may have formed the subject of the play, *Friar Rush and the Proud Woman of Antwerp*, written by Haughton and Day and mentioned by Henslowe on July 1, 1601; cf. Robert Dodsley: *A Select Collection of Old Plays* (12 vols., 2nd ed., London, 1744-80), I, 192. Professor Schelling, in "Some Features of the Supernatural as Represented in Plays of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James," *Modern Philology*, I (1903-4), 31-47, has put erroneously Amsterdam for Antwerp. Of interest in this connection is an old Breton legend, representing the Devil as a tailor. This legend was dramatized, in 1894, by Louis Ciercelin and published with the title *le Diable couturier*.

sacramental inclusion of marriage.⁸ Raphael finally smoked him out of Sarah's chamber by the smell of fish-liver so that the angel's friend Tobias, who also loved Sarah, could marry her. Asmodeus, it should be mentioned, has delicate nostrils and cannot stand bad odors. The demon fled from the "fishy fume" to Upper Egypt with Raphael hot on his heels, and was finally bound by the angel in a cavern on the Nile, where the unfortunate demon long remained (Tob. viii. 3).⁹

"For he was still there in 1707 [says Anatole France in the essay on Bouchor already quoted], when a Rouen goldsmith called Paul Lucas, going up the Nile to Fayoum, saw and spoke to him, as he assures us in the story of his voyage, which was published in 1719, and forms three volumes in 12mo with maps and drawings. Few facts are better attested. None the less, this fact is embarrassing. For it is certain, on the other hand, that he was in Loudun on the 29th day of May, 1624; as he wrote on that day, in the register of the Church of Sainte-Croix, a declaration by which he engaged himself to torment Mme de Belciel, whom, in fact, he did torment. The document is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, in the department of manuscripts, where anyone may use it. It is equally certain that in 1635, in the same town of Loudun, he possessed Sister Agnes, who was seized with convulsions in the presence of the Duke of Orleans. She refused to kiss the pyx, and twisted herself so that she formed a perfect circle, her hands touching her feet. Meanwhile she uttered horrible blasphemies.¹⁰ At this period Asmodeus appeared before the Bishop of Poitiers; and as Paul Lucas found him in Egypt, it must be supposed that the devil left his cavern whenever he pleased, and that the angel Gabriel (*sic*) did not tie him up well. . . .

"After Colbert's edict forbidding devils to torment ladies, Asmodeus appeared in France only in the excellent company of LeSage, the author of *Gil Blas*. Asmodeus

⁸ Mephistopheles in Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* (ii.1), on the other hand, is opposed to marriage.

⁹ Maurice Bouchor, who, in 1889, has dramatized this story, has not taken the jealous Asmodeus very seriously.

¹⁰ Anatole France has reference to the famous episode of the Devils of Loudun, in which the priest Urbain Grandier was accused of having handed over the Ursuline nuns to the demons. This very interesting case of diabolical possession in modern times was treated by Alfred de Vigny in his romance, *Cinq-Mars* (1826). See also [Aubin:] *Histoire des diables de Loudun, ou de la Possession des religieuses Ursulines et de la condamnation et du supplice d'Urbain Grandier, curé de la même ville* (Amsterdam, 1737). A popular essay on "The Devils of Loudun" appeared in the *National Review*, XI (1860), 70-93.

lost his theology here, but he became a man of wit. He was then playing a rather low game, but it was at least a cheerful one."

The work to which Anatole France refers in this passage is LeSage's already quoted work, *le Diable boiteux*. In this novel, a young Spanish student from Alcala, named Don Cleophas Leandro Zambullo, for whom, on a certain evening, an ambush was laid by his perfidious mistress, escapes by jumping from roof to roof until he lands in a neighboring garret, which happens to be the laboratory of a magician. Upon entering this garret, he is besought by a voice out of a phial to deliver the speaker from durance by breaking the glass-bottle. The request is complied with, and the imprisoned sprite turns out to be Asmodeus. In gratitude, the demon bestows upon his rescuer the power to sail through the air, and brings him upon the tower of the Church of San Salvador in Madrid. From this vantage-point, by lifting the roofs of all the houses of the Spanish capital with a sign from his right hand, he shows the student the secret sights of a big city at midnight. With a cynical amusement the demon then explains to his friend the sufferings, transports and agitations thus revealed. The new confederates also journey to the different parts of Spain. The good-natured and grateful Asmodeus assists the student Cleophas in his various pranks and carries him triumphantly through a series of amusing adventures. He even takes the shape of his human companion in rescuing a young lady of high birth and thereby procures for his liberator a prosperous marriage. In the end, Asmodeus is recaptured and put back into the phial by the powerful conjurer with the help of envious demons.

In this novel, Asmodeus shows himself an excellent critic of men and morals, and a splendid satirist of the follies and foibles of the human family. As a result of this feat, he became very popular in France and even in other countries. His friends imposed upon him and had him lift the roof of every house for them so that they might see the life that went on within. He was called upon so often to perform the job of roofer, or still better, of unroofer, that, as it was said, "he was not even given the time to get dressed."

Through this novel, Asmodeus won a respectable position in French literature, and his resulting renown did much to bring about in France the friendly feeling for the Fiend which has long been a marked characteristic of the literature of that country. A great number of books, periodicals and newspapers have gained

popularity through this demon's name for half a century following the publication of LeSage's novel.¹¹

*

* * *

Asmodeus has many other accomplishments and achievements to his credit. He is also a scholar, the most learned master of arts and the most prominent professor at his alma mater, the astrological college founded by the fallen angels Asa and Asael. Asmodeus is versed in the black arts and well known for his occult wisdom. In this quality, he is the successor to Thoth, the god of wisdom and learning in Thermopolis, who was identified by the Egyptians with Sirius, the god of occult and infernal arts.

Asmodeus is also a great philosopher, deriving his ideas from the various schools of thought. "Asmodeus is the very philosophy of all ages summed up in a caricature," says Jules Janin, the French dramatic critic.

Asmodeus also has a reputation for slyness and subtlety. In fact he is the most cunning spirit of hell (Goethe's *Faust* ii. 6961). This demon cheated Aladdin out of his ring in order to secure the magic lamp, and he also tricked Solomon out of his signet ring in order to obtain possession of the latter's harem. The Jewish monarch had great need of Asmodeus when he built the temple at Jerusalem. He wished to learn from this versatile demon the whereabouts of the worm *Shamir*, which splits and shapes stones noiselessly.¹² During their negotiations, the wisest of men and the wisest

¹¹ Among the books named after Asmodeus, mention may be made of S. Foote's farce *The Devil on Two Sticks* (1768); *Asmodeus; or, The Devil in London* (3 vols., London, 1808); William Combe: *The Devil Upon Two Sticks in England* (6 vols., London, 1817); and *Asmodeus in New York, or, Society and Manners in Gotham* (New York, 1868). Among the periodicals which bore his name, may be mentioned the following: *le Diable boiteux; journal critique et littéraire* (1810-1826); *le Diable boiteux; recueil politique et littéraire* (1818); *Asmodée*, a satirical periodical founded by the poet Louis Berthaud in Lyons in 1833; *le Diable boiteux; journal politique, véridique, charivarique*, a review started in 1848; *le diable boiteux à l'assemblée nationale*, a journal founded likewise in 1848 by Ch. Tondeur to report the deliberations of the French deputies; *le Diable boiteux*, which ran as a "feuilleton littéraire" in the *Journal des spectacles, des mœurs, des arts et des modes* from 1823 to 1825; *Asmodée à New York; revue critique des institutions politiques et civiles de l'Amérique; vie publique et privée, mœurs, coutumes, anecdotes romanesques, etc.* (Paris, 1868).

¹² Cf. Louis Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, IV. 166 ff.

of demons fought many a duel of wits. Asmodeus propounded difficult questions which Solomon was able to answer only with the help of his ring. The demon then tempted the king to lay aside the ring. He taunted Solomon with the challenge that all his wisdom lay in his ring and that he would be but an ordinary mortal without it. Solomon, being piqued into a denial and proudly thinking that he could answer the demon's questions by his unaided intelligence, rashly removed the ring. But the demon seized it, and, having by its might metamorphosed the monarch beyond recognition and transported him four hundred miles away, he himself assumed the appearance of Solomon, and for three years resided in the royal seraglio. According to this tradition, Asmodeus was the real author of the offences which history ascribes to the Jewish king. Solomon, after a long vagrancy, became the cook of the king of Amon. One day, as he was dressing a fish for dinner, he found in it the ring which Asmodeus had thrown into the sea, and with its aid he recovered from the demon his throne and his harem. As a punishment Solomon imprisoned Asmodeus together with many other demons in a bottle of black glass, which he cast into a deep well near Babylon. But the Babylonians, hoping to find a treasure in this well, descended into it, broke the bottle, and thus liberated the demons.¹³

Asmodeus is, moreover, the diabolic patron of letters and arts and even has literary aspirations himself. In his modesty, he refuses to publish anything under his own name, but he has helped many another writer. Among the great authors who owe their inspiration to this demon, we will mention Boccaccio, who is said to have composed his *Decameron* from the dictation of this demon, who thus wished to take his revenge on the monks, who maligned him.

But Asmodeus with all his learning has remained a play-boy. He is, in fact, an arch-Bohemian, a charlatan, a juggler and a mountebank. Asmodeus played a prominent part in the deviltry of the Middle Ages and charmed our ancestors with his tricks and antics.

Asmodeus is also addicted to gaming and card-playing. According to Johannes Wierus, the famous German demonologist, he is the banker at the *baccarat* table in the casino of hell and the superintendent of gambling houses on earth.

¹³ Cf. Moncure Daniel Conway: *Solomon and Solomonic Literature*, Chicago, 1899.

In brief, Asmodeus is the most energetic of all demons. He is, as he himself claims in the already quoted LeSage's novel, "the liveliest and the most laborious devil in hell." Asmodeus explains his profession in this book as follows: "I arrange ridiculous marriages; I unite gray-beards with minors, masters with servants, and ill-dowered girls with tender lovers who have no fortune. I am he that introduced into society extravagance, debauchery, games of chance, and chemistry. I am the inventor of tournaments, dances, music, comedy, and the new French fashions. . . ." But the foregoing list by no means exhausts the multitudinous and various tasks of our demon, who has all the world for his province.

Asmodeus is also the most sympathetic of all the demons of hell. He is the most engaging of friends, ready to lend a hand when man is at the end of his natural resources. Shakespeare was very fond of him, and called him *Modo* for short.

Asmodeus has a very pleasing personality and is as beautiful as Apollo. But he has one physical defect. He limps slightly with one foot. The demonologists say that he may be recognized by the fact that one of his limbs is like a cock's leg. The other is normal, but provided with claws. In LeSage's novel, Asmodeus appears walking with the aid of two sticks, which support will account for the English title of the book, *The Devil on Two Sticks*. His portrait, drawn by Collin de Plancy, was approved by the Archbishop of Paris. But Anatole France, in the essay on Bouchor already mentioned several times, with good reason, doubts whether it is a faithful likeness. Whatever his proper shape may be, it is known that, in order to appear among men, he adopts various forms, all of which are engaging. His manners are always refined, and his conduct is that of a perfect gentleman. It may well be said that, through Asmodeus, the Devil has become perilously associated with wit and wisdom, gaiety and gallantry, *finesse* and finery.

PAUL, ALIAS SIMON THE MAGICIAN

BY ROBERT P. RICHARDSON

DEVOTION to historical truth has never been the distinguishing feature of religious writings, and nowhere has its lack been more in evidence than in the orthodox works dealing with Paul, the Christian saint. Here the reverential attitude taken by modern Christians towards their canonical scriptures have made them reluctant even to listen to hostile extra-biblical accounts of Paul's career. To take this stand is obviously to stultify common sense which bids us give at least a hearing to the enemies of a historic personage and not trust solely to the *ex parte* tales of himself and his friends. Yet not satisfied with leaving entirely out of consideration the accusations that tradition says his enemies levelled against him, his modern admirers are even unwilling to accept Paul's own story when this runs counter to their preconceptions of apostolic harmony.

That controversy soon arose between Paul and the original disciples of Jesus is clearly evinced in Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians*. The Galatians, we here learn, had "quickly" fallen away from their newly acquired Christian faith as taught to them by Paul, and had harkened to certain persons who "would pervert the gospel of Christ." These perverters, it appears, were Judaizers, that is Christians who contended that no one could be saved, even though he believed in Christ, without submitting to the restrictions of the Mosaic law, which for the Gentile converts to Christianity had as prime condition circumcision. Paul, on the contrary, affirmed that "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law," and warned the Gentile Christians not to become circumcised, saying: "Behold, I Paul, say unto you, that if ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing." He held that a Jew, though circumcised, by becoming a Christian released himself from all obligation to obey the

Jewish law, but contended that a Gentile who on conversion to Christianity took the first step of submitting to circumcision thereby obligated himself to the whole Mosaic code. "Yea, I testify again to every man that receiveth circumcision, that he is debtor to do the whole law." So firmly did Paul adhere to the doctrine that he had originated that he admonished the Galatians: "though we or an angel from heaven should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." He asserted that "as touching the gospel which was preached by me . . . neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." What is implied here is that the Judaizing mischief-makers were trying to destroy the confidence of the Galatian Christians in Paul by showing the divergence of his teachings from those of the personal disciples of Jesus, and to obviate this difficulty Paul boldly repudiated the authority of the apostles who had known Jesus during the latter's earthly career, and contended that his own "revelations" from Christ in heaven, obtained when Paul was in a state of ecstasy, completely superseded what Christ was known to have taught while on earth.

Paul was anxious to show his followers that he had never submitted to the authority of the original apostles, and in doing this gave a resume of his career which, from a historical standpoint, is invaluable. He told how in the beginning he persecuted "the church of God, and made havoc of it; and I advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of mine own age among my countrymen, being exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers." However, it pleased God "to reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles," or, in other words, he became a convert to Christianity—of a sort. This conversion, as we learn elsewhere, was occasioned, not by the exhortations of those who were Christians before him, but by a vision vouchsafed him direct from heaven as he was on his way to Damascus. And "immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned to Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and tarried with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother. . . . Then I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia. And I was still unknown by face unto the churches of Judaea which were in Christ; but they

only heard say: 'He that once persecuted us now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc'; and they glorified God in me."

At first the Jerusalem Mother Church was content to let Paul go his own way while converting the Gentiles and made no attempt to meddle with him and his converts. "After the space of fourteen years," continues Paul, "I went up again to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me. And I went up by revelation; and I laid before them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately before them which were of repute, lest by any means I should be running or had run in vain." Conybeare¹ comments that the gospel which Paul thus laid before the Jerusalem apostles "he had evolved out of his own inner consciousness, so we are not surprised to learn . . . that he only laid it 'privately before them who were of repute.' It was clearly so remote from the gospel with which the mass of believers were familiar in the very home and diocese of Christ himself that it was expedient not to communicate it to them. We infer that if he had broached it to them there would have been such a general outcry against him as would have deprived him of the 'liberty in Jesus Christ' which he and his converts enjoyed; and he 'would be running' in the future and 'have run' in the past 'in vain.'" Paul emerged triumphant from the ordeal, and tells us that "Not even Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised." Evidently the trend of Paul's remarks, here and elsewhere, puts beyond the bounds of credibility the statement of *Acts* XVI, 3 that in the neighborhood of Derbe and Lystra, "because of the Jews that were in those parts," Paul circumcised a Christian offspring of a Greek father and a Jewish mother. As has been well said: "No manipulation can obliterate the fact that the St. Paul of the *Acts* differs considerably from the St. Paul of such Epistles as rightly bear his name; so that the alternative lies between believing his own words, or those of the unknown writer who describes him long after in the *Acts of the Apostles*," and unfortunately it is still the prevalent custom to accept the latter alternative—the natural result of making apostolic harmony the criterion of Pauline biography. A rational view of the career of Paul must have taken contrary ground and in consequence recognize that the contentions of the Tuebingen School were sub-

¹ *Myth, Magic and Morals*, third ed. 1925, p. 15.

stantially correct and that relations between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles were by no means uniformly harmonious.²

There were in evidence, according to Paul's account, Judaizers in the Mother Church who desired to subject Paul and his Gentile converts to the Mosaic law. He describes these as "the false brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus that they might bring us into bondage," but denies having yielded to them even temporarily: "to whom we gave way in the place of subjection, no not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." To be regarded as in any way subordinate to the original apostles was highly repugnant to Paul: "I reckon that I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles" (2 *Cor.* XI, 5). He assures the Galatians that he learned nothing from those whom he met in Jerusalem. "Those who were reputed to be somewhat," he says, "they . . . who were of repute imparted nothing to me; but contrariwise, when they saw that I had been intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles); and when they perceived the grace that had been given unto me, James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave unto me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles and they unto the circumcision; only they would that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do. But when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas, before them all: 'If thou, being a Jew livest as do the Gentiles and not as do the Jews, how compelleth thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?'"

² The harmonious relation which is commonly assumed to have existed between the Apostle Paul and the Jewish Christians with the older Apostles at their head is unhistorical." F. C. Baur: *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his life and work, his epistles and his doctrine, a contribution to a critical history of primitive Christianity*, V.I, p. V.

It would seem then that while the Mother Church had at first been willing to tolerate the ignoring of the Mosaic law by the Gentile converts, it had later taken quite another stand. And the reason for this is to be found in *Galatians* VI, 12-13 where Paul says of those who "compel you to be circumcised" that they do this "only that they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ. For not even they who receive circumcision do themselves keep the law, but they desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh." In other words, when Christianity merely manifested itself as a particular school of the old Judaism, the Jewish Christians were in large measure tolerated by the other Jews, notwithstanding a certain laxity in practice concerning the law which they continued nominally to accept *in toto*. But when uncircumcised Gentile Christians arose who could claim as coreligionaries the Jewish Christians, the latter began to be regarded as renegades to Jewry and suffered from the animosity of the Jews who had not accepted Christ. An attempt was being made at the time Paul wrote to avoid this persecution by forcing circumcision and the law on even the Gentiles whom Paul had converted to Christianity, so that the Jewish Christians might in face of the other Jews, glory in what Christianity had accomplished towards the spread of Judaism. The attempt was not successful; it was Paulinism, not the doctrine of the Mother Church which survived and became the progenitor of the "Christian" religion of our day.³ For many years, however, there was conflict between two bitterly hostile factions of Christians, the one taking the point of view of Paul, and the other that of James, the brother of Jesus. The believers who adhered to the original Christianity of Jesus as transmitted to posterity by his brother and those who had followed the Prophet of Nazareth in his lifetime, and hence refused to accept the innovations of Paul, were, in post-apostolic times, known as Ebionites, that is "Poor Men," this designation being probably a sneer, directed by the more prosperous Pauline Christians at their poverty. The name Nazarene was also used to designate them, and one ancient historian, Epi-

³ Even the most liberal theologians are inclined to balk at full recognition of this fact, and to take the stand that by some sort of compromise there was ultimately effected a reconciliation between the Judaizers and the Paulinists. And in fact it is not surprising that a biblical critic who finds it convenient to remain a member of some modern "Christian" Church should be loath to stultify himself by admitting he belongs to a religious body whose spiritual lineage is essentially anti-Christian.

phanus, draws a distinction between these two terms, under which the Nazarenes are described as less intransigent than the Ebionites, though it is doubtful whether there were really two distinct sects known by these names.

All the Judaizers held to the reputed saying of Jesus found in our present Bible: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. . . . Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." (*Matthæw*, V, 17-18.) In this they differed strikingly from the Pauline Christians of their own day and the orthodox Christians of ours. The less strict Judaizers, though they themselves adhered to the law, were willing to concede that Gentile converts were not bound by the Jewish ordinances and to grant Paul the rank of an apostle—but of an apostle to the Gentiles alone. They strenuously objected however, to the Jews among the Pauline converts breaking the Mosaic law.

The more intransigent Ebionites had a horror of Paul and all his works, and contended that the real acceptance of Christ, with Gentile as well as with Jew, necessitated circumcision and strict obedience to the Mosaic law. In the canonical Christian Scriptures there has survived what is very like an Ebionite work the so-called *Revelations of St. John the Divine*. Whatever view may be taken of the main body of the work the exhortations of the first three chapters to the "seven Churches of Asia" have plain reference to the factional disputes of the Christians of the day, and give us some interesting revelations as to the feelings of the Judaizers towards the followers of Paul. The writer was evidently a Jewish Christian who adhered to the old Jewish law and abhorred all Christians who did not submit to its yoke. He regarded the true Christians as *ipse facto* numbered among the Children of Israel, and heartily hated the brand of Christianity which disregarded the ordinances of Judaism. There can be no questions but that it is Pauline Christianity which is referred to in such passages as "the blasphemies of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan," "thou [the Church of Ephesus] hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars" and "thou [the Church of Pergamum] hast there some that hold the teachings of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit

fornication." Chief among those whom the Ebionites classed as liars, falsely claiming to be Jews and apostles, was Paul. We know from his Epistles how hard pressed he was to maintain his claims to apostolic dignity, and from other sources we find that his opponents did not always admit his claims to Jewish blood. For though, according to the *Epistle to the Phillipians*, Paul was originally "of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless," we learn from Epiphanius that the Ebionites had a different tale to tell. Their tradition, which would seem to be the more congruous with the assertion in *Acts XXII*, 28 that Paul was "a Roman born," alleged that Paul was not a Jew by birth but a "Greek," born of Gentile parents. Going to Jerusalem and settling there he had aspired to marry the daughter of the High Priest. With this in view he became a proselyte to Judaism and submitting to circumcision and accepting the yoke of the Jewish law, made himself prominent as a persecutor of the followers of Jesus. He was however frustrated in his ambition and did not obtain the spouse he desired, this, declared the Ebionites, being the cause of his coming over to the side of the Christians. It was, they said, to revenge himself for the affront put upon him by the High Priest that Paul decried circumcision, the Sabbath and the whole Mosaic law.

Paul, as we know, explicitly repudiated the Jewish law, saying "All things are lawful for me." (*1 Cor.* X, 23.) He taught his followers to eat meat set before them without too closely inquiring into its origin (*1 Cor.* X, 25-27, VIII, 4-8) at a time when aside from the strictly kosher fare of the Jews practically all the meat eaten was the by-product of idolatrous sacrifices. The liberalism of Paul in this respect, though endorsed by the practice of the orthodox Christians in succeeding ages, was in flagrant disaccord even with the apostolic decision recorded in *Acts XV*, 20: that converts to Christianity must abstain "from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood." The best opinion of biblical critics is indeed that this alleged decision was never made by an apostolic council but represents merely the terms on which the author of *Acts* thought the differences between Ebionites and Paulinists might be compromised. And there is no

ground for believing that the compromise thus proposed in the guise of a decree of apostolic times was ever accepted by any considerable body of Christians of either faction. Moreover, as Zeller has pointed out, if James really entertained the principles which *Acts* represents him as enunciating at this apostolic council, if when he granted Paul the field of labor claimed by the latter he was not merely yielding to the force of an accomplished fact, but was also himself convinced that the Mosaic law was not binding on the Gentiles and openly and decidedly acted on this conviction, it is quite inconceivable how he could have been the highest authority of a party which everywhere zealously opposed the freedom of the Gentile Christians and assailed Paul, who advocated this, so vehemently and malignantly. Peter, likewise, can by no means have stood as far aloof from the Judaizers as *Acts* would have us believe. On the other hand if the Pauline faction had been unanimous in approving the admission of the Jewish Christians to the Mosaic law, the unquenchable hatred of the Ebionites against Paul and Pauline Christianity would have been incomprehensible. Ultimately the uncompromising Paulinists became predominant in Christianity, and succeeded in stigmatising as "heretics" the Ebionites, that is the Christians who held to the line of tradition handed down from the personal disciples of Jesus. Even with such of these as had become resigned to the violation of the Mosaic ordinances by the Gentile Christians and maintained these ordinances to be binding on the Jewish Christians alone, heresy was found, as we see from the fact of the "Nazarenes" who took this stand being denominated heretics by Epiphanius. And unquestionably any Christian faction which had accepted the decree imagined by the author of *Acts* and endeavored to constrain the Gentile Christians to conform to the Noachic ordinances (as those laid down by the alleged Apostolic Council are sometimes called) would have been more remote from orthodox "Christianity" than the Nazarenes and would in the time of Epiphanius have been deemed far more heretical. The Catholic Church has done all in her power to destroy the documents giving the Judaistic side of the controversy between Paulinists and Judaizers. But modern scholarship, by a critical survey of the data that has survived, has enabled us to read between the lines in many cases, and has shed much light on the relations between Ebionism and Pauline or "orthodox" Christianity.

The Balaam so vigorously denounced in *Revelations* is almost certainly Paul⁴ and Balak is presumably one of his chief lieutenants, perhaps Barnabas, though it is possible that some particularly uncompromising Ebionite, writing this denunciation, might couple together, under the names of Balaam and Balak, Paul and Peter, blaming the latter almost as severely as the former for this casting of a stumbling block before the children of Israel. Peter, by Paul's account, was shifty and evasive, and might have appeared to some of the extreme Ebionites as a traitor to their cause, though most of them supposed him to have shared their own views and to have been an invincible opponent of Paul. According to *Galatians* Peter, at Antioch, had no scruple in following the lead of Paul and disregarding the Jewish taboo against eating with Gentiles, until he saw there was danger of the news reaching James, when he timidly took on the yoke once more, while Paul openly defied the authority of the Bishop of Jerusalem. And incidentally it is noteworthy that here we are shown the spectacle of him to whom alone—the modern Catholic Church tells us—was given the power to bind and loosen on earth and in heaven: Peter, the first Pope, upon whose right to dominion depends all the authority of the Papacy, going around in fear and trembling of another leader and recognizing the superior authority of James. The "Clementine" *Recognitions* (IV, 35) gives an endorsement of this view of the supremacy of James, Peter being here quoted as telling his audience to "believe no teacher unless he brings from Jerusalem the testimony of James, the Lord's brother, or of whosoever may come after him," there being here no hint of Petrine supremacy or of authority of the see of Rome. The words can hardly be authentic, but they are interesting as showing that those who looked upon Peter as the champion of Ebionism as well as those who claimed he sanctioned the opposing doctrine of Paul, alike accepted as a matter of course the supremacy of James.

Most of the Judaizers, as has been said, claimed Peter as one of their champions, and the heretical work which corresponded to the orthodox *Acts of the Apostles* was usually referred to as *The Circuits of Peter*. This *Circuits of Peter* was an Ebionite Scripture alleged to have Clement of Rome as author, and there are still extant writings purporting to be the account, sent by Clement to James, the brother of the Lord, of Clement's own conversion and his adventures

⁴ For the grounds for identifying Balaam with Paul see an article by the present writer, *Jesus and Jewish Tradition*, in a future number of *The Open Court*.

as a companion of Peter. The story survives in two forms: the one in Greek, under the title of the Clementine *Homilies* and the other in a Latin translation by Rufinus, called the Clementine *Recognitions*. Both are regarded as having the Circuits of Peter as basis, though the narrative has undoubtedly been much garbled by the redactors. We notice in the "Clementine" writings passages in which ring unmistakably the voice of those early Christians who hated Paul, and these passages are in all probability part of the original tradition, since (as it has been put by Schmiedel) it is "psychologically impossible" that Paul should have been so intensely hated by Christians in later days.

That the *Recognitions* and *Homilies* which accredit themselves to Clement of Rome cannot be from his hand has long been known, but it was reserved for the brilliant critics of the Tuebingen School to discover that these works contained a bitter attack on Paul whose name is veiled under the alias of Simon the Magician. Whether the original Circuits likewise abstained from properly naming Paul in attacking him cannot be ascertained, but it is not impossible that this course may have been followed. Each of the Christian factions may have feared to make too open an attack on the other lest the scandal arising thereby should react to their own injury and excite the derision of their pagan and Jewish enemies. An expression of this fear is found in a parable which the *Gospel of Matthew* (XII, 24-30) attributes to Jesus, but which is thought to have really been an interpolation, originating at a later date during the conflict between the Ebionites and the Pauline Christians. In this Parable of the Tares among the Wheat an enemy (Paul) sows tares (false teachings) among the wheat (the original teachings of Jesus preached by the true apostles). When the growing tares make their appearance to the discomfit of the Master he cries out "An enemy hath done this" (Jesus being thus represented as emphatically condemning the work of Paul) whereupon his servants (certain over-zealous Ebionites) wish to pull the tares up by the roots. But he refuses to allow this lest the wheat too be uprooted, saying that both were to be permitted to grow until the harvest (the Judgment Day), when the reapers should first gather the tares (the Pauline Christians) and burn them, subsequently reaping the wheat (the Ebionite Christians) and putting it in his barn: that is, the Pauline Christians were foredoomed to hell, while the Ebionites alone would be granted entry into heaven.

An attack on Paul which appeared on its face to be against some one else outside the Christian fold could easily prove too subtle for Christian readers of later generations, who might take it at its face value, especially if the ultimate transcriber purposely modified what he could not suppress, and turned an unseemly attack on a fellow Christian into an edifying tale of controversy with a Samaritan magician. This, it is thought, is precisely what has happened with several passages that have found their way into the orthodox Scriptures, notably the story told in *Acts* VIII, 9-24. Here, remarks Zeller, if "we substitute the name Paul for that of Simon we have a narrative which says in a historical form what according to 2 *Cor.* XI, 4 sq., XII, 11 sq., 1 *Cor.* IX, 1 sq. the anti-Pauline Judaists affirmed as a general truth." And it is held that the redactor who gave to *Acts* its present form, perfectly aware of the true import of the story, to forestall any application of it by his readers to Paul, placed it before the latter's conversion in the narrative, thus falsifying the historical order of facts. Simon in the tale is represented as proffering money for the purchase of apostolic powers, and this seems to have been the Ebionite version of Paul's transaction with the Jerusalem Mother Church, whereby he bargained for liberty to proselytize in Christ's name as Apostle to the Gentiles, agreeing in return to contribute funds towards the support of the poor among the Jerusalem Christians. Paul, the Ebionites held, was, through his collections for the Jerusalem Saints (see 1 *Cor.* XVI, 1-3 and *Gal.* II, 10) attempting to purchase an apostleship; to bribe the Mother Church into recognizing him as a true apostle by means of the contributions of his Gentile converts to the needy Christians of Jerusalem. The feature of "Simon" offering money that he too might have the power of imparting the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands implies the thought that the power of conferring the Holy Ghost belonged exclusively to the apostles, and this (it has been shown) is an anachronism, being an unhistorical transference of the ideas of a later age into the times of the primitive Church. An interesting fact is that from this passage arose the horror Christians of later days professed for "simony," i.e. the purchase and sale of offices in the Church. In *Acts* "Simon's" offer is rejected with scorn, but according to Paul's story the transaction was carried through successfully, and in his Epistles he frequently reminds his followers to keep on sending to the Mother Church the subsidies

which were the consideration he had promised to pay for recognition as Apostle to the Gentiles. Now it was from Pauline Christianity, not from the Ebionite Mother Church, that the orthodox "Christian" Church took its rise, and it must hence perforce be admitted that the whole of modern "Christianity" is tainted by simony at the very root.

The Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions are two variations of a single tale of the adventures of Clement and preachings of Peter. Clement is portrayed as accompanying the apostle in a missionary tour beginning at Caesaria Stratonica and extending northward along the coast-lands of Syria as far as Antioch. The original Circuits of Peter would thus seem to have been a sort of Ebionite Acts of the Apostles, and even orthodox tradition admits as authentic a portion of this Ebionite work, though claiming that the greater part of the Circuits was a heretical fabrication. In the Clementines Paul is doubly assailed, on the one hand under the alias of Simon, on the other under the cognomen of the Enemy, the latter referring particularly to Paul's activities before he became a Christian. The Ebionite story is that once James, the brother of the Lord, was preaching in Jerusalem and the conversion of the whole populace of that city was imminent, when "The Enemy," that is, Paul, raised a tumult in the Temple where James was preaching, and caused the brother of the Lord to be thrown headlong down the steps of the edifice. As a result, the expected conversion of Jerusalem never took place, and The Enemy proceeded to Damascus where he had been commissioned by Caiphas to carry on his deadly work.

The animus of the author is clearly shown in the preface to the Homilies, where in a letter alleged to have been written by Peter to James, we find remarks that the most conservative scholars are constrained to admit are aimed at Paul. "For some of the converts from the Gentiles have rejected the preaching through me in accord with the law, having accepted a certain lawless and babbling doctrine of The Enemy. And this some people have attempted while I am still alive, by various interpretations to transform my words, unto the overthrow of the law; as though I taught thus, but did not preach it openly, which be far from me. For to do so is to act against the law of God as spoken through Moses, the eternal duration of which is borne witness to by our Lord. Since he said thus: 'Heaven and earth shall pass away; one jot or tittle shall not pass

away from the law.' Now he said this that all might be fulfilled. But they professing somehow to know my mind, attempted to expound the words they heard from me more wisely than I who spoke them, telling those who are instructed by themselves that this is my meaning, which I never thought of. But if they venture on such falsehoods while I am still alive, how much more when I am gone will those who come after me dare to do so."

The Simon of the Clementines cannot in every respect be identified with Paul, as there has been here put in the mouth of Simon doctrines which it was desired to refute but were not precisely Pauline. Especially is this noticeable as regards the Gnostic doctrines which the Ebionites probably regarded as the logical outcome of Paulinism. The "Christianity" of the Gnostics was more remote even than that of Paul from the earthly teachings of Jesus. Some Gnostics, in fact, utterly repudiated the God of the Old Testament, and represented him as the Lord of Evil, between whom and the Lord of Good: the God of the New Testament, revealed by Jesus Christ, there was an irrepressible conflict. The real Simon Magus, as depicted by such writers as do nothing towards identifying him with Paul, was indeed the reputed father of Gnosticism, being a native of Samaria, many of the people of that country having accepted his doctrines and his leadership. In giving the alias of Simon to Paul the Ebionites were able to express their contempt for the Pauline Christians by likening them to the Samaritans who had long vainly endeavored to secure their recognition as part of the chosen people. The Pauline demand that the uncircumcised be acknowledged as partakers in the Messianic salvation seemed, in fact, to the Judaizers, simply an attempt on the part of the heathen to intrude themselves into Israel. As Zeller puts it: "There was no more descriptive expression to denote the opinion of the severe Jewish Christians respecting Paulinism than to proclaim the Pauline uncircumcised Gentile Christians Samaritans." Another reason for giving Paul the alias of Simon may have been the fact that there was a Simon of ill repute connected with Felix, that Procurator of Judaea mentioned in *Acts* XXIII and XXIV and there depicted as inclined to shield Paul from his Jewish enemies. This Simon, Josephus tells us, was a Jew, claiming magical powers, who acted as a pander and go-between for Felix in the latter's amours with Drusilla, the wife of Azizus, King of Emesa.

“Simon” who taught a “Christianity” all his own, maintained (according to the seventeenth Homily) that he had a better knowledge of the doctrines of Jesus than the disciples who had seen and conversed with the Lord. As ground for this presumptuous statement he alleged that visions were as superior to waking reality as the divine is superior to the human. He is quoted as saying to Peter: “You professed that you had well understood the doctrines and deeds of your teacher because you saw them before you with your own eyes, and heard them with your ears, and that it is not possible for any other to have anything similar by vision or apparition. But I shall show that this is false. He who hears anyone with his own ears, is not altogether fully assured of the truth of what is said; for his mind has to consider whether he is wrong or not inasmuch as he is a man as far as appearance goes. But apparition not merely presents an object to view, but inspires him who sees it with confidence, for it comes from God.” Peter, in a crushing retort, remarks: “But can anyone be educated for teaching by visions? And if you shall say ‘It is possible’ why did the Teacher converse with waking men for a whole year?⁵ And how can he have appeared to you seeing that your sentiments are opposed to his teaching? But if you were seen and taught by him for a single hour, and so became an apostle, then preach his words, expound his meaning, love his apostles, fight not with me who had converse with him. . . . If you call me ‘condemned’ you are accusing God who revealed the Christ to me, and are inveigling against him who called me blessed on the ground of the revelation. But if indeed you truly wish to work along with the truth, learn first what we learnt from him, and when you have become a disciple of truth become our fellow workman.”

The insinuation here that Paul did not preach and expound the doctrines of Jesus is wholly justified by all that we know of the early Christian Church. For it is a curious fact that in the Epistles of Paul we find hardly a reference to any of the teachings of Jesus recorded in the Gospels. The Pauline Church from which modern “Christianity” has descended seems to have utterly ignored the exhortations of Jesus to his disciples and to have given ear solely to

⁵ Here is perhaps a confirmation from an independent source of the tradition of the Synoptic Gospels, fixing the public career of Jesus at the short period of one year as contrasted with the longer period of activity alleged by the fourth Gospel.

the doctrines originated by Paul. Peter in his remarks shows indignation at being called "condemned" by "Simon" and this is unquestionably a reference to Paul's criticism of him recorded in *Galatians* II, 11 where the same Greek word is used (a word which the King James version saw fit to translate by the milder periphrase "was to be blamed.") In retaliation Peter, in the Clementine and in the *Actus Petri cum Simone*, denounces "Simon" as a cheat and impostor, significantly using the very same words that were applied to Paul by his opponents.

Peter, in the Clementines, reproaches "Simon" for the fact that "instead of Christ he proclaims himself." He remarks that "as the true Prophet has told us, a false prophet must first come from some deceiver; and then in like manner, after the removal of the holy place, the true gospel must be secretly sent abroad for the rectification of the heresies that shall be." And "it would be possible, following this order, to perceive to what series Simon belongs, who came before me to the Gentiles, and to which I belong who have come after him, and have come in upon him as light upon darkness, as knowledge upon ignorance, as healing upon disease"—a passage which undubitably identifies "Simon" with the inceptor of the mission to the Gentiles, i.e. Paul. "Some men" remarks Peter, "do not know who is my precursor Simon. For if he were known, he would not be believed; but now, not being known, he is improperly believed; and though his deeds are those of a hater, he is loved; and though an enemy, he is received as a friend; and though he be death, he is desired as a saviour; and though fire, he is esteemed as light; and though a deceiver, he is believed as a speaker of truth." Peter affirms that Satan, "the prince of wickedness . . . fearing lest the true religion of the one and true God should be restored, hastened straightway to send forth into this world false prophets, and false apostles, and false teachers, who should speak indeed in the name of Christ, but should accomplish the will of the demon. . . . Let neither prophet nor apostle be looked for by you at this time, besides us. For there is but one true prophet, whose words we twelve apostles preach; for he is accepted year of God, having us apostles as his twelve months."

The Clementines take the ground that genuine Christianity and the old Judaism differ only as regards whether or not Jesus was "the prophet whom Moses foretold, who is the eternal Christ. For on

this point only" says Peter "does there seem to be any difference between us who believe in Jesus and the unbelieving Jews." It is rather curious however that although Judaistic ordinances are so vociferously upheld in the Clementines, there is not the slightest question of requiring circumcision of Gentile Christians. This, provided it were also the case in the original Circuits of Peter, would indicate for the latter a date at which even the Ebionites had, for the most part, given up as hopeless the attempt to force this surgical operation upon the Gentile converts. It appears indeed that circumcision must have been very soon put in the background, for although it loomed large in the controversy when Paul wrote to the Galatians, he did not need to argue about it in his subsequent Epistles, but was able to give all his attention to others of the points at issue between him and the Judaizers.

It seems to have been upon the Jewish dietary laws that the Ebionites laid the most stress, and they saw grave danger in eating meat derived from pagan sacrifices, holding that this food, which Paul deemed innocuous, might cause those who partook of it to become subject to diabolic influences. It was, they contended, with a deliberate view to this end: to putting people in subjection to his masters, the powers of evil, that Paul told his followers: "Whatsoever that is sold in the shambles eat, asking no questions. . . . If one of them that believeth not biddeth you to a feast, and ye are disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no questions." (1 *Cor.* X, 25-27.) "Simon" had, in fact, the Clementines tell us, successfully made use of this scheme at Tyre where he found many opponents "who attempted to prove him an impostor." Beguiling these adversaries into a reconciliation "under pretence of a banquet, having slain an ox, and given them to eat of it, he infected them with various diseases, and subjected them to demons." And from this we may quite fairly conclude that Paul actually did give a noteworthy banquet at Tyre and succeeded in inducing some of the Jewish Christians of that place to throw aside the Mosaic food ordinances, which had as ultimate result the entire abandonment of the Jewish law by his guests.

The necessity of accepting the Jewish scheme of life is emphasized in the Ebionite version of the event mentioned in *Mark*, VII, 24-30. The Clementines tell us that on this occasion a Canaanite woman whose daughter was oppressed with a grievous disease

came to the Lord entreating him to heal her daughter. "But he" narrated Peter "being asked by us, said 'It is not lawful to heal the Gentiles, who are like unto dogs on account of their using meats without distinction and such practices, while the table in the kingdom has been given to the sons of Israel.' But she, hearing this, and begging to partake like a dog, of the crumbs that fall from this table, having changed from what she was by living like the sons of the kingdom, she obtained healing for her daughter, as she asked. For she being a Gentile, and remaining in the same course of life, he would not have healed her had she remained a Gentile, on account of it not being lawful to heal her as a Gentile." In other words, the woman had first to conform to the Mosaic dietary laws and other ritualistic ordinances before Jesus would heal her child.

Going beyond the demand that Christians should eat only ritually pure food, the Ebionites took the stand that eating at the same table was an admission of religious brotherhood, and that dining with an unbelieving Gentile was a grievous sin. Peter will not even allow a baptised Gentile convert to eat with his converted but as yet unbaptised father, saying to the latter: "But this also we observe, not to have a common table with Gentiles, unless they believe, and on the reception of the truth are baptised, and consecrated by a certain three-fold invocation of the blessed name; and then we eat with them. Otherwise, even if it were a father or a mother, or wife, or sons, or brothers, we cannot have a common table with them. Since, therefore, we do this for the special cause of religion, let it not seem hard to you that your son cannot eat with you, until you have the same judgment of faith that he has."

Simon Magus is represented as having a wonderful command of the necromancer's art. At his command statues walk about like men and locked doors fly open of themselves—a feature of his career that is perhaps to be correlated to the tale of Acts XVI, 26, where we are told that when Paul and Silas were imprisoned at Philippi at midnight miraculously "all the doors were opened; and everyone's bands were loosened." He promenades through blazing fires without injury, and at his will is transformed into a serpent or a goat. From town to town goes Simon, followed up by Peter, who refutes his false teachings, and expounds the true Christian doctrine. The climax comes at Antioch, precisely where *Galatians* records there took place a heated controversy between Peter and Paul in the

course of which the former was denounced by the latter in no gentle terms. According to the Clementines, Peter, at Antioch, was told that Simon "doing many signs and prodigies in public, has inculcated upon the people nothing but what tends to excite hatred against you, calling you a magician, a sorcerer, a murderer." Finally Simon bewitches Faustus, the father of Clement, imposing his own personal appearance upon the latter, whereupon Peter, turning this to the advantage of the true believers, has Faustus stand in a public place and make a recantation of the Simonian aspersions upon Peter, saying "I, Simon, declare to you, and confess that all that I have said concerning Peter was false." As reason for his confession the pseudo-Simon gives out that he has been soundly scourged by angels the preceding night. "I will tell you" he says "why I now make this confession to you. This night an angel of God, rebuked me for my wickedness, and scourged me terribly, because I was an enemy to the herald of truth." And Schmiedel holds that here the author, seizing upon Paul's own words, recorded in *2 Cor. XII, 7*. "There was given me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me" has spitefully twisted an utterance of Paul regarding himself to his own disadvantage.

While the open conflict in Palestine and Syria came to an end with this occurrence, Simon, we are told, subsequently "began, though secretly, to go amongst his friends and acquaintances, and to malign Peter worse than before." Peter however, in another pseudo-Clementine work, *The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, after giving a summary of the struggle against the false teachings of "Simon" (recorded at greater length in the Homilies and Recognitions) boasts that "when I had overcome him by the power of the Lord, and had put him to silence, I drove him into Italy." Here, evidently, we have the Ebionite version of Paul's going to Rome. It is probable that the lost Circuits of Peter gave an account of how Peter, following "Simon" to Rome there renewed the warfare, but no record of this has been preserved in the Clementines. The missing finale is however to be found in the apocryphal *Acts of Peter*, a work of Ebionite tendencies, which seems like the Clementines to have taken the Circuits as a source. Several fragmentary versions of these Acts are now extant, these documents, in their present form, bringing Paul on the stage as well as Peter and "Simon," thus covering up the original use of the latter name as an alias for

the Apostle to the Gentiles. Peter here relates that he "drove this Simon out of Judaea where he did many evils with his magical charms, lodging in Judaea with a certain woman, Eubula, who was of honorable estate in this world, having store of gold and pearls of no small price. Here did Simon enter in by stealth with two others like unto himself, and none of the household saw them two, but Simon only, and by means of a spell they took away all the woman's gold and disappeared." Eubula lamenting complained that she had received "Simon" as "a servant of God, and whatsoever he asked of me to give to the poor, I gave much by his hands, and besides I did give much unto him!" Obviously this story, in the original Circuits of Peter, may have had a geographical setting quite other than that of Judaea, so there is some ground for identifying this Eubula with one mentioned in a work of which Niphorus tells us: *The Travels (or Acts) of Paul*. The Eubula of the latter work was an "attached disciple" of Paul and the wife of an "eminent Ephesian."

Simon subsequently settled in Rome where he "with his charms of sorcery and his wickedness made all the brotherhood fall away this way and that" and Peter was warned by a vision to pursue him there. Taking ship at Caesarea, Peter sailed to Puteoli where he disembarked and received an urgent message to "go up unto Rome without delay, lest the teaching of this wicked man prevail yet further." In the imperial city Peter found his adversary lodged "in the house of Marcellus a senator, whom he had convinced by his charms." Going to the senators' house, Peter "called the porter and said to him: 'Go, say unto Simon: Peter because of whom thou fleddest out of Judae waiteth for thee at the door.' The porter answered and said to Peter: 'Sir, whether thou be Peter, I know not; but I have a command, for he had knowledge yesterday that thou didst enter into the city, and said to me: Whether it be by day or by night, at whatsoever hour he cometh, say that I am not within.'" Peter then, seeing "a great dog bound with a strong chain, went to him and loosed him, and when he was loosed the dog received a man's voice." This beast Peter sent inside to say to Simon: 'Thou Simon, Peter the servant of Christ who standeth at the door saith unto thee: Come forth abroad, for thy sake am I come to Rome, thou most wicked one and deceiver of simple souls.' And when Simon heard it and beheld the incredible sight he lost the

words wherewith he was deceiving them that stood by, and all of them were amazed."

Simon, none the less, continued his evil practices, and one day defiantly "ran unto the house where Peter lodged, even the house of Narcissus, and standing at the gate cried out: 'Lo, here am I Simon; come thou down Peter.'" On this message being brought to Peter the latter sent unto Simon "a woman which had a sucking child, saying unto her: 'Go down quickly, and thou wilt find one that seeketh me. For thee there is no need that thou answer him at all, but keep silence, and bear what the child whom thou holdest shall say unto him.' The woman therefore went down. Now the child whom she suckled was seven months old, and it received a man's voice and said unto Simon: 'O thou abhorred of God and man, and destruction of truth, and evil seed of all corruption. O fruit by nature unprofitable, but only for a short and little season shalt thou be seen, and thereafter eternal punishment is laid up for thee. Thou son of a shameless father, that never putteth forth thy roots for good but for poison, faithless generation void of all hope! Thou wast not confounded when a dog reproved thee; I a child am compelled of God to speak, and not even now art thou ashamed. But even against thy will, on the Sabbath day that cometh, another shall bring thee into the forum of Julius that it may be shown what manner of man thou art. Depart therefore from the gate wherein walk the feet of the holy; for thou shalt no more corrupt the innocent souls whom thou didst turn out of the way and make mad; in Christ, therefore, shall be shown thine evil nature, and thy devices shall be cut to pieces. And now speak I this last word unto thee: Jesus Christ saith to thee: Be thou stricken dumb in my name, and depart out of Rome until the Sabbath that cometh.' And forthwith he became dumb, and his speech was bound; and he went out of Rome until the Sabbath and abode in a stable."

On the Sabbath there was duly staged in the forum a public contest between Peter and Simon in the presence of "the senators and the prefects and those in authority." The corpse of a youth named Nicostratus was brought forward, and Simon, to demonstrate his power of raising the dead, "went to the head of the dead man and stooped down and said thrice: 'Raise thyself;' and showed the people that he lifted his head and moved it and opened his eyes and bowed a little unto Simon." But when Simon was constrained to remove to some distance from the body "again the dead man lay as

he was before." Peter now surpassing his rival, merely touched the side of the dead lad and said "Arise!" when "the lad arose and put off his grave clothes and sat up and loosed his jaw and asked for other raiment; and he came down from the bier."

None the less Simon, though "they that were firm in the faith derided him" continued to do "many lying wonders." "For in dining-chambers he made certain spirits enter in, which were only an appearance, and not existing in truth. And . . . he made lame men seem whole for a little space, and blind likewise, and once he appeared to make many dead to live and move as he did with Nicostratus." Finally Simon announced he would give an exhibition of his power to fly through the air. "And already on the morrow a great multitude assembled at the Sacred Way to see him flying. And Peter came unto the place to see the sight, that he might convict him in this also; for when Simon entered Rome he amazed the multitudes by flying; but Peter that convicted him was then not living at Rome; which city he thus deceived by illusion, so that some were carried away by him." "And behold when he was lifted up on high, and all beheld him raised up above all Rome and the temples thereof and the mountains, the faithful looked towards Peter. And Peter seeing the strangeness of the sight cried unto the Lord Jesus Christ: 'If thou suffer this man to accomplish that which he hath set about, now will all they that believe on thee be offended, and the signs and wonders which thou hast given them through me will not be believed; hasten thy grace, O Lord, and let him fall from the height and be disabled; and let him not die but be brought to nought, and break his leg in three places.' And he fell from the height and broke his leg in three places. Then every man cast stones at him and went away home, and thenceforth believed Peter. . . . But Simon in his affliction found some to carry him by night on a bed from Rome unto Aricia; and he abode there a space, and was brought thence unto Terracina to one Castor that was banished from Rome upon an accusation of sorcery. And there he was sorely cut by two physicians, and so Simon, the angel of Satan, came to his end."

This story and Simon's claim of special knowledge of things above the heavens have been correlated to Paul's remark about a man who had been "caught up even to the third heaven." And indeed in the Recognitions Peter reproaches Simon for thinking "there is easy access for your mind above the heavens." It is

probable that in the tale of the original Circuits of Peter the fall of Simon did not bring about his death, for there is extant another account which implies that Simon ultimately recovered from his injury, telling us that subsequent to his fall "many left him, but some who worthy of perdition continued in his wicked doctrines. After this manner was the most atheistical heresy of the Simonians first established in Rome; and the devil wrought by the rest of the false apostles also." At all events we may quite safely surmise that the death of Paul, alias Simon Magus, was the occasion, not of the shedding of tears, but of grim rejoicing among the Ebionites—the Christians who took James, not Paul, as their master.

THE USE OF THE WORD TAO IN THE CONFUCIAN ANALECTS

BY HUANG K'UEI YUEN AND J. K. SHRYOCK

TAO is defined by the Erh Ya, which is attributed to Tzu Hsia in the fifth century B. C., by three words; Ti, meaning progress or principle, Yiu, meaning cause or reason, and Hsun, meaning teaching or training. If Tzu Hsia really wrote the Erh Ya, this would represent the standard Confucian interpretation of the word as recorded by one of the master's own disciples.

The Hsueh Wen, which appeared in 100 A. D., says that in ancient China the character was written differently from the modern usage, and was composed of two characters, one meaning head, and the other a short distance which we translate by the word inch. Later Tao came to be written with the character for head, and a character meaning to act and stop suddenly. These component parts may be still further subdivided, but without shedding much light on the origin and meaning of the term.

Tao as a whole is defined by the Hsueh Wen in two sentences, as that which acts, and as that which is universal, or pervades. We are safe in saying that by the time of the great philosophers of the Chou period, Tao when used as an abstract noun by itself meant a principle which underlies the universe, permeating all things, the cause or reason of phenomena. This definition is not taken from Taoist works, but from recognized Confucian classics.

A recent source book of words and phrases, called the *Tsu Yuen*, published by the Commercial Press in Shanghai in 1917, gives thirteen different meanings to the word, some of which are not ancient. They are as follows:

- 1—A road.
- 2—Law or principle.
- 3—Method or policy.

- 4—To go through; to understand thoroughly.
- 5—Favorable.
- 6—The name of a teaching or doctrine. Taoism.
- 7—A political division. There are several Tao in a province.
- 8—A surname, or clan name.
- 9—To speak, or words.
- 10—Cause.
- 11—To govern.
- 12—To lead, to conduct.
- 13—To follow.

All these meanings belong to the same character, and most of them are supported by quotations from the classics. Besides this, the source book gives seventy-two common phrases in which the word Tao occurs. Only two of these need be considered.

In the *Book of History*, (2,2,15), there is a sentence in which Jen Hsin, or the heart of man, is balanced by Tao Hsin, or the heart of Tao. Legge translates the latter phrase by "that which is right," which is unsatisfactory because the expression Tao Hsin and Jen Hsin are frequently used in later works, man being balanced by Tao as an opposite.

Another expression is Tao Teh, which is the title now given to the work of Lao Tzu. The commentator Wang Pi, 226-249 A.D., explains this phrase by saying, "Tao is the cause; Teh is that which is gained by men." Legge calls Teh the attribute of Tao, in his translation of the Tao Teh Ching. The ordinary translation of Teh is virtue, and in the Book of Rites, Tao and Teh are coupled with Love and Righteousness, but the Taoist writers make a sharp distinction between them.

Tao also occurs in the *Book of History* and the *Book of Changes*, as well as in other classic works, in the expression T'ien Tao, or the Tao or Principle of Heaven. The *Book of History* says, (4,3,2), "The Tao of Heaven is to bless the good." Lao Tzu also uses this expression. It is evident that even before Lao Tzu the word had an abstract meaning, so that if we assume that the original meaning was a road or way, there had already been a considerable philosophic development by the sixth century B. C.

In Lao Tzu, Tao is the fundamental principle of the universe, which cannot be described except by a series of antinomies. These opposites, such as changed and unchanging, known and unknowable,

active and passive, all imply a unity, and that unity is Tao.

Lao Tzu founded a school of thought which took its name from the word which he chose to express his idea of the absolute, and so Tao has come to be inseparably connected with Taoism. This conception has been intensified in the west by the habit of western scholars of translating Tao when it occurs in Confucian works, but simply Romanizing it when it is in a Taoist book. The result has been to make those who do not read Chinese think of Tao as a mysterious entity, a vague something which has significance only to the followers of Lao Tzu. This is unfortunate, because the Confucianists used the word quite as much as the Taoists, and when it occurs by itself as an abstract principle, the meaning is much the same in the early books of both schools.

In the Confucian Analects alone the character Tao is used eighty-eight times.

Eight times it occurs as a verb, as in the following sentences:

"The master said, 'To govern (Tao) a country of 1000 chariots, there must be a reverent conduct of affairs. . . .'". (1,5).

"If the people are led (Tao) by government. . . ." (2,3).

"Happy in speaking (Tao) of the goodness of others. . . ." (16,5).

It will be noticed that in these three sentences where the verb is Tao, it must be translated by three very different English words.

Once only in the Analects is the word used in the sense of an actual road.

"Although I may not get a great burial, shall I die on the road (Tao)?" (9,11,3).

In the remaining seventy-nine places where the term occurs it is used as an abstract noun, either by itself, or as the property of certain men or classes of men.

When it is used in the latter way, it is usually translated by way, or characteristic. There is the Tao of the Superior Man, (5,15-14,30,1), the Tao of men of high rank, (8,4,3), the Tao of the good man. (11,19), the Tao of the father, (1,11-4,20), the Tao of the former emperors, (1,12,1), the Tao of ancient times, (3,16), the Tao of Wen and Wu, (19,22,2), and finally the Tao of the Master, Confucius himself. (4,15.) Lao Tzu also uses the word in this way in the phrase, the Tao of Heaven. (*Tao Teh Ching*, 73-77-79.)

Tao as a quality of something or someone, is sometimes con-

nected with lists of virtues. Once, it is with humility, reverence, kindness and justice. (5,15). Again, it is self-control, sincerity and propriety. (8,4,3). In a third place, it is benevolence, wisdom or being without doubts, and courage. (14,30,1). Lao Tzu also does something like this when he says that "the Tao of Heaven has no favorites; it is always with the good man." (*Tao Teh Ching*, 79.)

There is one passage in the Analects which is a connecting link between the use of Tao as a quality of something else, and as an abstract principle.

"When superior men learn Tao they love men; when the common men learn Tao, they are easily commanded." (17,4,3.) Here Tao is something which can be learned by all men, no matter what their ability.

On the other hand, Lao Tzu contrasts Tao with the virtues in several passages.

The Use of the Word Tao in The Confucian Analects 2

"When great Tao fell into disuse, (or ceased to be practiced) benevolence and justice appeared." (*Tao Teh Ching*, 18.) This distinction between Tao and ethics is sharpened by Chuang Tzu, and is one of the differences between the Taoists and the followers of Confucius, but only the beginnings of this gap are present in Lao Tzu and Confucius themselves, and neither of the sages is altogether consistent with the doctrines which go by their names. Lao Tzu in the passage already quoted does connect Tao with virtue, and when Confucius uses Tao by itself as an abstract principle, it is in much the same sense as his older contemporary. In fact, the best definition of Taoism is to be found in Confucius' description of his own teaching.

"My Tao," said the sage, "is an all-pervading unity." (4,15).

Having delivered this remark, Confucius left the room, and the disciples asked Tseng Tzu what he meant.

"The Tao of the Master," Tseng Tzu interpreted, "is reverence and love."

The words Chung Hsu, reverence and love, themselves need a good deal of study, for they give the essence of Confucianism. The translators have followed Chu Hsi, the Sung commentator, in defining Chung as conscientiousness, making it apply to oneself, while love applies to one's neighbors. The Erh Ya, however, defines the word as reverence. The important point is that these are the words of Tseng Tzu, and not of the master. In this passage, Confucius

himself described Tao in a way that is as Taoist as any phrase of Lao Tzi, but his chief disciple, who established what is regarded as the orthodox line of Confucian thought, at once turned the remark into a different channel. Was Tseng Tzu right in his interpretation of the mind of his teacher?

Western scholars have followed him, and no one ignorant of Chinese reading their translations would imagine that Confucius had ever used the word Tao, which in Taoist works is left untranslated. Legge and Couvreur render Tao by doctrine, Soothill and Ku Hung Ming, by teaching, and Zottoli, whose translation is in Latin, by *agendi*.

There are other passages in which Tao in the abstract is discussed.

"If Tao is established, it is the Decree; if Tao is destroyed, it is the Decree." (14,38,2.)

Here Legge translates Tao by "my principles," Zottoli by "*rectam doctrinam*," Ku Hung Ming by "my teaching among men," Couvreur by "*ma doctrine*," and Soothill by "my principles." When the word is left untranslated, the sentence might have been written by a Taoist. The instance is particularly interesting because there is no word "my" or "true" in the text, and the translators had to insert it from nowhere in order to square the passage with what they felt Confucius ought to have said. The term Ming, or the Decree, means either Fate, or the Command of Heaven.

Confucius also said, "When a man has heard Tao in the morning, he can die in the evening without regret." (4,8.)

In this case, Tao is translated by "the right way," by sapientiam, by wisdom, and by "the Truth." Yet when Tao is simply Romanized, the sentence might have been taken from the Tao Teh Ching.

Tzu Kung said, "When the Master speaks about the Nature and the Tao of Heaven, he cannot be understood." (5,12). The translations are "the way of Heaven," "*de natura coelique lege*," "metaphysics or theology," and "*l'action du Ciel*." The mysticism of Confucius, which was misunderstood by the matter-of-fact disciples who interpreted his doctrine, is entirely lost.

Tzu Yiu said, "The Superior Man concentrates upon fundamentals, and Tao is born." (1,2,2). Tao is translated by "right courses," "practical courses," and wisdom. It seems as if the translators have been willing to go to any lengths to remove the least

taint of Taoism from Confucius' fair name. Last of all comes a passage that is nearly too much for them.

"The Master said, 'Man can enlarge Tao, but Tao cannot enlarge man'." (15,28.) Tao is rendered by "his principles," and even by "his religion, or the principles he professes."

Chu Hsi, the great Sung commentator, treats the passage as follows:

"Apart from man, there is no Tao, and apart from Tao, there is no such thing as man; but the mind of man is sentient, while the body of Tao is inactive." (Chu Hsi's Commentary on the Analects.) It is significant that here the standard Chinese interpreter of Confucius, in describing what Confucius meant by Tao, uses the very words of Lao Tzu, Wu Wei, or non-action, a characteristic Taoist phrase. The translations of Legge and Soothill do not even make sense, and the latter apologizes for the "apparently fallacious aphorism." He is forced to it because he translates Tao by "principles." In Chu Hsi the meaning is perfectly clear, whether or not it is the real meaning of Confucius.

These passages, in which Tao is considered as an abstract principle and not as the Tao of someone in particular, show that Confucius used the word in a sense that was not very different from that of Lao Tzu, and that the two were not as far apart as has usually been assumed.

This is confirmed indirectly from other sources. Lieh Tzu, the Taoist thinker who lived about a century later, is quite respectful toward Confucius and even attributes miraculous power to him, although admitting that he did not use it. Lieh Tzu also quotes the favorite disciple of Confucius, Yen Hui, and Chuang Tzu makes Yen Hui much more Taoist than Confucius himself, although he interprets a passage in the Analects, (2,4), as showing that the sage became a follower of Lao Tzu. Had Yen Hui lived and become the chief interpreter of his master, instead of Tseng Tzu, Confucianism might have been a very different thing.

There are certain conclusions to be drawn from this brief analysis. As soon as the word Tao is left untranslated and simply Romanized, it becomes apparent that while Confucius did not develop the word and give it paradoxical attributes as Lao Tzu did, nor make it the key-word to his teaching, he did use it in much the same sense as the older man.

This similarity has been almost entirely lost sight of, first, in the

interpretation which Tseng Tzu and the long line of orthodox Confucians have given to the teaching of the sage, and second, in the translations based on this interpretation by western scholars. Tao used as a verb, or as a road, or even as an attribute, may be translated, but Tao as an abstract principle ought to be left untranslated in Confucian, as in Taoist works.

The word itself is difficult, not because of any mystic significance, but because it has so many meanings. When the various words which are used to translate it are brought together, it becomes clear that the complex of ideas which is associated with the character does not correspond with any similar word in English. Yet when the word is used in one sense by a Chinese writer, it carries with it as a penumbra into the consciousness of the reader the other meanings associated with the character. Similar associations will not be found with any English word, and therefore, in translating passages where Tao occurs, one should first try to get into one's mind the varied associations which the word has for a Chinese, and then leave the word untranslated. Perhaps, to paraphrase the famous sentence of Lao Tzu, the Tao that can be translated, is not Tao.

TWO NOTABLE PHILOSOPHIC WORKS

BY VICTOR S. YARROS

I.—*Dualism After Thirty Years of Controversy*

NO more important or fascinating theme for a course of lectures on the Paul Carus foundation could possibly have been chosen than that which Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy undertook to discuss when afforded that enviable opportunity. Professor Lovejoy belongs to the very modern school of philosophy which has called itself for some years the school of Critical Realism, and his analytical power as well as sound scholarship have given him a place of distinction in that school.

He was eminently qualified to review and evaluate a movement in modern philosophy which for twenty-five years or more has challenged the minds of the most profound thinkers of Europe and America—namely, the attack upon Dualism.

That attack has not been confined to the Idealists of the old type. Thinkers truly and radically modern, men who are at home in physics as well as in metaphysics, and who are familiar with the latest revolutionary discoveries in all the realms of thought, have endeavored to overthrow Dualism by using the most improved weapons at their command. What are the results of the great battle to date? Is Dualism dead and buried, doomed to everlasting dishonor? Or has the terrific assault, frontal and other, failed, and Dualism still stands intact and solid?

Professor Lovejoy is satisfied that the attack on dualism *has* failed. The philosopher, he thinks, is bound to admit that Animal Faith, as Santayana would put it, or Common sense, as Professor Lovejoy would say, is still amply justified in adhering to the empirical idea of an objective world, with Man as part of it in a sense, yet a part capable of thought, of feeling, of judging, of contemplat-

ing the rest of creation subjectively, of looking even into his own inner self.

Nothing to be found in the works of Russell, Eddington, Whitehead, Jeans and other acute and profound contemporary thinkers, Professor Lovejoy affirms, and successfully shows, has undermined Dualism.

We may resolve matter and apparent objects into mere *events*; we may hold that the same process or phenomenon is physical at one end and mental at the other; we may say that the stuff of the Universe is neutral, or insist that it is mental. We may follow the new physics, the new metaphysics and the new psychology bravely to their revolutionary conclusions, but we have not disposed of Dualism, according to Professor Lovejoy. Relativity, indeterminism, uncertainty and doubt as to the relations between causes and effects, two-way time, and other startling developments in science and philosophy have perhaps obscured and complicated the issue, but it remains a stubborn fact as an issue, and must be faced by philosophers in a co-operative spirit.

Professor Lovejoy himself gives us a fine example of that spirit. He is not dogmatic, despite the irresistible logic of his argument at more than one vital stage. He is tentative and he briefly summarizes his own views in the form of modest observations.

There are those who hold that to criticise the revolt against dualism and convict the insurgents of inconsistency, confusion of thought, use of identical terms in various conflicting senses, is to repudiate Monism as well. But Professor Lovejoy has no quarrel with Monism properly defined and correctly understood.

The essence of Monism is the idea that the Universe is governed by one set of laws, and that its ultimate nature is single. That this has not been fully and conclusively established, is of course incontestable, but neither has an ultimate and essential Dualism been proved. Certain attempts at proof have been made by both sides, and it is Professor Lovejoy's task to show the inadequacy of the cause against Dualism in sundry forms.

Let us grant for the sake of the argument that he is wholly successful. Let us admit that no one has yet demonstrated the unity of the mental and the physical. What of this? It certainly does not follow that mind and matter never meet, never merge into something different from each, or that the laws governing the one have no application to the other.

Professor Lovejoy divides his analysis and review into two parts. The first phase of the revolt is traced to William James and G. E. Moore and the second to the alleged implications of twentieth century science. The conclusion or the verdict is rather *Not Proven* than *For the Defendant, Dualism*.

Philosophy has been warned by thinkers like Whitehead and Russell against leaving common sense and practical reason too far behind their abstractions. Naïve realism is as impossible to reflective minds as naïve idealism. But dualism is not synonymous with naïve realism. Dualism proves that inference plays a large part in our apprehension, and no psychologist can deny this. But it does not take us very far.

Science can prove to the average man that the table or desk at which he sits is not as round or flat or green as he thinks it is. A few tests, instruments and demonstrations will convince him that his impressions are misleading. But he cannot be convinced that, when he turns his chair to the window, the table or desk vanishes into thin air, simply because he does not see it for the moment. He cannot be convinced by any strained subtleties that his friend in another part of the world does not exist when he does not see him or hear his voice over the telephone, or read a letter signed by him. And there is no reason why he should be. The distinction between subject and object is *given*, and there is no arguing it away. We cannot really think that there is no external world. But we do not know just what that world is.

There is, however, a constant action and reaction between the subject and object. Each somehow and in some degree colors and conditions the other. This undeniable fact makes for a Monistic interpretation—as far as it goes.

Again, it is perfectly plain that a given phenomenon may be physical at one end and mental at the other. And some phenomena are both physical and mental at the same time. This, too, is suggestive of a Monistic view of nature.

Yet these lines of argument or evidence are not incompatible with a critical and tentative realism.

Professor Lovejoy has rendered a real service to philosophy and to clear thinking generally by his thoroughgoing but very fair and sympathetic survey of the great and protracted controversy over Dualism. He is not constructive in this work. But he has cleared the atmosphere; he has defined the terms of the problem; he has

disposed of fallacious explanations which leave the central issue unexplained. Let us hope that other philosophers as well equipped and as dispassionate as Professor Lovejoy will perform similar services for other unsolved problems in modern philosophy. The time for a new synthesis is not perhaps at hand, but philosophers should understand one another better than they have done in the past, and they should agree, at least, upon statements of fact and definitions.

Meantime Professor Albert Einstein, of Relativity fame, has announced further discoveries in physics which may greatly strengthen the case for Monism. He is working on formulas which, he hopes, will demonstrate the unity of all cosmic phenomena. Already he has correlated electricity and magnetism. He has also revised his original conception of space. He now regards it as primary, and matter as secondary. Space, he says, is devouring matter. What the genius of Newton began in interpreting space and giving it a physical character, Professor Einstein may finish by revolutionizing our ideas of space and matter alike. Thus what the new physics has failed to do, as Professor Lovejoy shows, it may yet achieve in the not distant future.

Philosophy and metaphysics have been admonished by Dr. Dewey and others not to sever their organic tie with science. In the discussion of Dualism, it is particularly important to keep one eye on the exact sciences. It will doubtless be their good fortune to give dualism the *coup de grace*.

II.—*The Vain Quest for Certainty*

Professor John Dewey, in his Gifford lectures, essayed a task of broader and bolder scope, but one that incidentally touches the particular problem dealt with by Professor Lovejoy. The lectures made a deep impression in England, where the instrumentalist theory of knowledge is not as well known as it is in this country. To Americans the ideas expressed by Mr. Dewey are not novel, and his method of approach has long been familiar to them, but even they will find the book in question, entitled *The Quest for Certainty*, highly profitable.

Professor Dewey does not hesitate to attack what he considers a vice common to all schools of philosophy, ancient and modern

namely, the assumption that thought and action are two distinct categories, and that certainty exists even if imperfect and mal-adjusted human beings have not as yet managed to discover it and make it their firm and cherished possession.

Professor Dewey pleads for a revolutionary reconstruction in philosophy—not only in its methods but in its aims and objectives. He does not want philosophy to continue a vain quest. Certainty is not to be had for the asking or thinking; the only thing certain is the instrumental and experimental method.

Professor Dewey repudiates the notion that the world of thought is radically different from that of action. Moreover, he contends, we do not seek knowledge merely for the sake of action. Knowing is continuous with action; he who thinks and knows is an active participator inside the natural and human drama. There is nothing antecedent or fixed in human affairs; we must inquire, observe, test and compare, to be sure, but knowledge implies action, change of conditions, adaptation of ends to means and means to ends. We make our own world by thought and action, and we never achieve perfection. We cannot use our thought to *escape* the world in which we find ourselves. There are no Eternal Forms or Final Truths; there are problems to solve by means of thought and of its applications. We may remove obstacles, clear up doubts here and there, improve our conditions, create a better world, our own point of view furnishing the standard of goodness, but our standard is itself subject to change in a world full of contingency and uncertainty.

Professor Dewey finds that the assumption of a certainty to be reached by thought plays havoc in politics, in economics, in ethics as well as in metaphysics, religion and philosophy. He endeavors to illustrate this proposition and to trace the evil consequences of the error in every department of human activity and human thought. Not all his illustrations are apt. The individualist will take vigorous exception to his assumption that the school of *Laissez Faire* in economics postulated the existence of fixed laws which men must discover and obey without demur. What the individualists, from Adam Smith down to Spencer and his disciples have maintained is that an "invisible hand" reconciles superficially conflicting commercial interests; that competition in a fair field is better than state monopoly or bureaucratic control of industry, and that liberty is the mother of order and harmony.

Now, all this may be true or it may be false. But the appeal of those who call themselves individualists is to experience, to common sense, to scientific generalization, not to any eternal principle of right.

Dr. Dewey is bound to find instances in support of his theory even where they do not exist. But even if we reject all doubtful illustrations, enough remains to prove the assertion that philosophers have divorced the world of action from that of thought and contemplation. And modern psychology supports the Dewey view of the unity of thought and action, with all the important deductions which he makes in the realm of philosophy.

The truth is, we do not know when or where thought ceases and action begins. We do not even know whether thought is not, as some Behaviorists assert, a form of action. We do not understand the process of thought; and can only analyze certain conditions or phases of thought. But we do know that action aids and stimulates thought, gives it purpose and direction. It would revivify certain schools of philosophy wonderfully if it could free itself of the vice pointed out by Dr. Dewey and make a fresh start from the new basis.

The instrumentalist theory has its limitations, no doubt, but these would be better understood under the Dewey concept of knowledge than they are now. Let us see how far that concept will carry us before complaining of its inadequacy and seeking to modify it. Certain it is that it would brush aside a number of unreal or paradoxical problems in philosophy and permit concentration, in the cooperative way favored by Professor Lovejoy, upon the real and legitimate problems of that department of human intellectual activity.

THE INSIGHTS AND RAPTURES OF THE MYSTIC

BY RADHAKAMAL MUKERJIE

(Concluded)

IN our previous installment conversation between master and disciple is of abiding interest in the history of religious mysticism, as showing a demarcation of the grades of higher mystical experience which all persons engaged in elevated contemplation must reckon with, irrespective of religion and country. In the fourfold sequel of *Arūpa-jhānas*, only attempted by the adept, and as a final step for complete emancipation of the self, all consciousness of detail or of limitations is done away with.

(a) By passing beyond any conception of matter or idea of sensation, and suppressing the idea of multiformity, a bhikkhu attains the state of mind in which the only idea present is the infinity of space (*ākāsaññāyatana*).

(b) On this follows a stage in which the infinity or unboundness of intellect (*viññānaññāyatana*) is alone present.

(c) The next stage is reached when there is nothing at all present to the mind (*akiñcaññāyatana*). Then is achieved the stage when neither the presence of ideas nor the absence of ideas is specifically present (*nevasaññānāsaññāyatana*).

(d) Finally is attained the state where there is suppression of both sensation and idea (*sannavedayitanirodha*).¹² Only the clarity and equanimity remain. The Buddhist *jhayin* in the above manner through the meditation of unbounded void space, of knowledge without object, of nothingness, passes into the stage where there is neither consciousness nor unconsciousness and finally realises the actual disappearance of feeling and notion. He introduces into the series of his thoughts such a number of blank spaces that the further generation of thought and desire is stopped.¹³ Anuruddha, a disciple of the Buddha describes his final experience as follows:—

¹² Keith: *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 124, see also Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Psychology*, pp. 117-119.

"In five-fold concentrated ecstasy (samadhi)
 My heart goes up in peace and unity.
 Serene composure have I made my own:
 My vision as a god's is clarified.
 I know the destinies of other lives;
 Whence beings come and whither they do go;
 Life here below, or other-where of life—
 Steadfast and rapt, in five-fold Jhana sunk."¹⁴

Mrs. Rhys Davids remarks: "The *jhayin* seems to be always master of himself and self-possessed, even in ecstasy even to the deliberate falling into and emerging (as by a spiritual alarm-clock) from trance. There is synergy about his Jhana, combined with an absence of any reference whatever to a merging or melting into something greater, that for many may reveal defect, but which is certainly a most interesting and significant difference."

Quite distinct from the above *jhana exercises*, we have also in Buddhism the cultivation of a positive attitude such as filling the mind with love, with sympathy with sorrow, with sympathy with joy and with equanimity, and "prevading the whole world" with the above four emotions. Such states of emotional as contrasted with intellectual meditation are called Brahma-viharas, and they are sometimes represented as coming after the four *ghanas*, and sometimes as replacing them.¹⁵ If the mind deliberately cultivates charity and harbours no uncharitable thought, charity becomes a psychic force and inundates the world even as the sound of a trumpet spreads in all directions. The ideal is set forth in a most remarkable passage in the Sutta-Nipata:

"Even as a mother watcheth o'er her child
 Her only child, as long as life doth last,
 So let us, for all creatures, great or small,
 Develop such a boundless heart and mind
 Ay, let us practise love for all the world,
 Upward and downward, yonder, thence
 Uncramped, free from ill-will and enmity."

Along with a profounder sympathy for all fellow creatures and a greater intensity of life and vividness of consciousness, the mystic, as we have seen, attains certain powers of both body and mind which, when they are correlated by ordinary faculties, lead to supreme achievements measuring human greatness. We have rec-

¹³ Poussin: *The Way to Nirvana*, pp. 165-66.

¹⁴ *Psalms of the Brethren*, 916 ff.

¹⁵ Eliot: *Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol. I, p. 316.

orders of premonition, pre-cognition, telepathy or clairvoyance, from the mystics of all countries and of all ages. The world's greatest artists have always listened to strange music and rhythm of expression within which emerge with spontaneity in spite of themselves. They have found in their compositions unimagined excellence of technique. They have written at some one else's dictation and when the masterpiece has come out in a flash can hardly attribute it to conscious art or device. The world's finest natures are guided at critical situations by a vision, by a dream, by a mysterious monitory voice within which they revere and for which they embrace suffering and even death. It is thus that out of the raw material of the mystical consciousness genius and inspiration are fashioned. Myers' great work on Human personality and survival of Bodily Death and the Proceedings of the Society of Psychical Research are full of evidence of the communication between minds in the spiritual world which overcomes barriers of time and distance. All this is proving scientifically the intuitional world of the mystic. Para-psychology or physical research is a science now in the cradle though there is a growing recognition that this problematic aspect of psychology is now exceedingly important for the advancement of the science. Telepathy and mind-reading suggest that the individual minds are parts of one super-mind and that under inner discipline and control one individual mind, on the foundation of the one super-mind, knows about the contents of other individual minds, just as in dissociation one ego knows about the other ego's contents. Clairvoyance, lelekinesis, materialization and prophecy are far more difficult to understand. May it be that the mind is a *miroir de l'univers* though in very exceptional persons does the performance of this mirror become conscious in the ego-form? The hypothesis is that when the ego-side of the pure mind becomes, through the process of abstract concentration, free from the disturbance of the sensory and organic processes, the omniscient pure mind operates and apprehends phases or states of reality which are not bound to the spatio-temporal system of relations. The spiritualist hypothesis is also legitimate and the spirit might be a part of this super-mind and might only become individual spirit again under certain conditions and communicate with this world.¹⁶ Patanjali in his Yoga-sutra refers to the following powers which the mystic acquires.—The capacity to enter another's body, to float in water, to walk on thorns,

¹⁶ For a suggestive discussion, see Hans Driesch, *The Crisis in Psychology*, Chap. V.

super-normal hearings, lightness of body, invisibility, etc. It is incontestable that during fervent ecstasy or deep contemplation the sensibility to external impressions diminishes a great deal. This is due to the fact that the motor activity in relation to ordinary sensory objects which gives the sense of life, is suspended, and the incipient responses are all directed to the objects of meditation. Thus when the body is lulled to relative passivity the mind enters upon a new phase of creative activity and working upon the amorphous materials supplied by the organic experiences, fashions a world of symbols, images and transcendental experiences. Such is the origin of the divine vision, the hearing of the divine voice or the healing and soothing touch of the Lord familiar in all religions. As the mystic adapts his behaviour to the constructions of his own imagination, he sees, hears, smells, intuitively, with the senses of the mind, as if they are actually experienced. Severe fasting and deprivation of sleep or isolation, the prolonged maintenance of a characteristic posture, and certain breathing and physical exercises of the chest, diaphragm and abdomen; the rhythm of music; the repetition of rhythmical bodily movement or peculiar dancing, singing or reiteration of a word or formula—all these change or remove the kinaesthetic and visceral feelings, and alter the normal feeling of self. There is thus engendered a different sense of relation between the body and the outside world. Respiration is partially inhibited, and the sensations of pressure and equilibrium may be lost. Thus the mystic may feel that his body has been floating in the air or that he has left the body and ascended the third heaven. A changed visceral sensitivity is the basis of many of the super-normal impressions of mystics, who revel in the separation of the soul or 'the subtle body' from the physical frame. Sweet odour of flowers or incense, characteristic pressure contact shown, for instance, in the laying on of hands and fingers, and in ceremonially holding sacred symbols, deep rhythmical breathing, etc., modify the viscera and organic functions, and induce a feeling of exhilaration, of a successful adjustment within the body and adaptation to its world. The tense nerves throughout the organism bespeak an emotional state in which the mystic feels beside himself. This is the mystic's familiar feeling of ecstasy, which greatly diminishes the sense of fatigue. Unusual physical or intellectual toil may be undertaken at times by the mystic when he is aglow with spiritual fervour. Hunger and thirst may also disappear, and eastern mystics have been known to

shut themselves up underground for months and even years, and to come back to life after a state of suspended animation. Lastly, there may be insensibility to pain altogether. This explains, for instance, the agreeableness of the red hot irons for the Muhammedan darvishes, who stick these in their arms and legs and cool them in their mouth without a complaint, murmur or sign of pain. In fact they call such red hot irons 'roses' because the use of them is as agreeable to them as the perfume of the rose is to the voluptuary.¹⁷ Similarly many of the Christian martyrs suffered torture or died at the stake without a cry or moan of pain. Differences in methods of concentration produce different effects. The fixation of the eyes upon the sun, the moon, or any bright object, or, again, upon the tip of the nose or, again, the prolonged concentration of the pupils towards the forehead produce hyperaesthetic visions. Often, also, there are hyperaesthetic auditions induced by prolonged control of respiration and shutting both the ears by finger tips. Sometimes, again, the normal relation between sense-organs and sensations is changed, and touch, sight and hearing may be the outcome of the stimulation of a different organ. New colours are appreciated, strange music is heard while the familiar sights and sounds take a new brilliance. The modification of breathing, the longer rhythmical spells of inhalation and exhalation as well as cessation of breath influence circulation by acting upon the unstriped muscles and glands—the muscles of the arterial walls (blood pressure). Hence a great variety of new organic sensations emerges, which supplies the physical background of the deeply moving sentiments and experiences of the mystics. The time and space relations are affected. The mystic sees a light that never was on sea and land. He hears a sound which ear has not heard. He conquers space and time. He exists in different places at the same time, according to his sweet will. Strange feelings surge from the unfathomable depths of his heart. The voice of the whole humanity is uttered in his prayer. His body expands into the macrocosm, or shrinks into the electrical sub-atom. There is, as it were, a thorough transformation of his mind and attitudes. Such is the naturalistic explanation of some of the experiences of religious mysticism. But elevated religious meditation delves deeper. Both the sensory phenomena and the ineffable feelings are transcended. The mystic then leaves the wonderful world of rapture. Realising in himself the universal and

¹⁷ *The Awarifu-L-Marif*, p. 167.

permanent conditions of contemplative union with the divine, he arrives at intuitions of a metaphysical import, which reveal a new relation between the Being and things. It is there that he establishes a new relation with an all-inclusive Source of Life and Mind; from here emerge, as a result of fresh efforts, the spiritual infinitudes, which, and not the mystic's efficiency and rapture, are his highest gifts. In Buddhism the following are among the super-ordinary powers mentioned:—the capacity to resist pain and death, the capacity of creating phenomena outside one's body, the capacity of transforming one's body into different personalities, the power of creating one's own double, telepathy of sight or hearing, thought-reading, super-normal insight into the past or the future, improved memory, etc.¹⁸ Such powers are called *kuvveh i roohe*, among the Moslem Darvishes, and enumerated as follows:—the faculty of foreseeing coming events; of predicting their occurrence; of preserving individuals from harm and evil which would otherwise certainly result for them; of restoring harmony of sentiment between those who would otherwise be relentless enemies.¹⁹ Evidence of superior intellectual and spiritual powers (as distinguished from super-normal physical powers described above) of the mystic and the saint has indeed come and still comes from all countries. Such powers are regarded by Patanjali as obstacles to Samadhi; but they are powers in the worldly state. According to the Sankhya the powers attained by *yoga* are not to be denied like recovery through medicines, etc. Cases have been recorded similarly by Myers in which men by experiment leave their bodies and show themselves to their friends. It is not strange that mystics and saints who discipline their intellect and emotions acquire these and other super-normal faculties and that their whole life becomes an inspiration based as it is on the concentration of the best of man's faculties and joys. No doubt when in the ecstatic state the consciousness or reference of self entirely disappears and yet there survives a lucidity and equanimity by which the highest truth of the intuitional world become accessible. This is the experience of all mystics. The process by which these truths are revealed is not yet analysed but that there is such revelation, and that it can be, deliberately sought, are familiar matters of the mystical world. George Russell says "when our lamp is lit we find the house of our being has many chambers, and we must ask whether they have the right to be in our house; and

¹⁸ *Compendium of Philosophy*, pp. 61-64.

¹⁹ Brown, *Darvishes*, p. 129.

there are corridors there leading into the hearts of others, and windows which open into eternity, and we can hardly tell where our own being ends and another begins or if there is any end to our being. If we brood with love upon this myriad unity, following the meditation ordained by Buddha for the brothers of his order, to let our mind pervade the whole wide world with heart of love, we come more and more to permeate, or to be pervaded by the lives of others." He asks 'Is there a centre within us through which all the threads of the universe are drawn, a spiritual atom which mirrors the spiritual infinitudes even as the eye is the mirror of the external heavens'?

No doubt psychologists like Starbuck, Leuba and Coe who have attempted a naturalistic explanation of mystical states so far have confined themselves to those phases of religious experience which are characterised by the play of the emotions arising out of union with a personal God. The mystic's complete personal history and religious tradition as well as his childish affective life have thrown a flood of light on such states. But even in the study of the emotional situation those deeply moving unvertalised responses, which integrate themselves into this ecstasy and higher apprehensions of the mystics are not adequately understood, while the acquisition of super-normal powers also is not fully explained. In more elevated meditation, the explicit emotions and sentiments which only have been attacked by the naturalists disappear. The mystic mediating upon the infinite modes and attributes of God is led to a true intuition of a metaphysical import, viz., that of absorption of the self or soul into the deity without modes and attributes. Here instead of the raptures the insights, deep and intense, dominate. No doubt the insights into an eternal mode of existence which transcends both time and space depend upon a gradual closing and simplification of the avenues through which these ideas come from the defining senses. It is then that the kinesthetic and organic senses intimate those subtle and indefinable adjustments which assures the mystic perfect fulfilment and harmony and constitute his experience and rapture. Time and space are the special objects of the defining sense. But there are deeper experiences like truth, beauty or goodness, which extend beyond the spatial and temporal existences, and which elude definitions and descriptions. Such profounder insights and attitudes are the outcome of a perfect poise and sensitivity of the entire mechanism of body and mind that becomes finely attuned to

the world of experience. Now the mystic's organic sense-complex enters directly into such vital and mental processes, while cognition can only use the language of symbolism, that merely suggests and cannot define.

Gradually he transcends both definite and indefinite consciousness, sensory processes and indescribable feelings. The complex of organic sense experiences which provides the basis of the sense of personality must disappear before the mystic can rise above the duality of self and the divine. Here he enters upon the stage of pure consciousness, in which he realises a union or identity with the object of his contemplation. The inadequacy of religious psychology consists then in this that it is helpless with regard to this aspect of experience which is, however, a real fact with an objective significance. In philosophical mysticism as well as in higher forms of art or music, mind and object are transcended; and the mystic's spirit in its absorption into the Pure Being or the Absolute rises above form, space and time, above consciousness itself, above all relativities. Psychology so far may accordingly analyse mystical experiences into complex, affective and intellectual states but it cannot decide on the value of the deeper insights and attitudes of a metaphysical significance. Nor is a direct examination of such experiences by experimental psychology possible. For this probably we have to depend solely upon the mystic's own testimonies as regards the nature and process of modification, of their imagination and consciousness, and these have to be clarified and reduced to order through the use of comparative and genetic methods. It is then that we shall understand one most significant way of interpreting the world of experience. Science and philosophy in all their forms express the unity of the Idea but cannot exhaust the reality. It is by contemplative union that the mystic feels the concrete unity of Life, and satisfies the fullness of human aspirations. The mystic intuition which alone can express the ever-receding fullness and harmony of concrete individual experience must represent, therefore, the starting point of philosophy. On the other hand, unless the individual's concrete experience is fashioned into concepts and symbols by philosophy it cannot rise beyond the flash of ecstasy, and be preserved as a universal treasure. Philosophy at each step enriches mystical intuition, helping it onward to seek and find fuller and fuller concords.

HENRY D. THOREAU, ORIENTAL

BY FRANCES FLETCHER

“I found in myself, and still find, an instinct toward a higher, or, as it is named, spiritual life, as do most men, and another toward a primitive, rank and savage one, and I reverence them both. I love the wild not less than the good.”

There was none of the Calvinist in Thoreau. Though externally his life was one of negation and great austerity, Thoreau knew the simplicity of his manner of living to be not a virtue in itself, but the path leading towards spiritual self-knowledge and realization. In fact, he often called attention to the lack of sensual perception in mankind, and openly repudiated the religion of his countrymen. “Christianity,” he says repeatedly, “is a religion of philanthropy.” And where is the beauty of necessity of philanthropy in a philosophy which recognizes the true place of man in the natural scheme?

It is rather to the Vedas, the Zendavestas, Upanishads and Puranas that Thoreau gives his loyalty. “Idleness is the most productive industry,” he insists. Only meditation and study enrich the mind. Action in itself is devoid of sense, entirely without meaning. Man, far from being the son of God, or even close to the divine, is conceivably (often Thoreau says certainly) on a lower plane of existence than birds, trees and plants.

Consciousness is continually opposed by Thoreau to *action*. Being is a far cry from appearance. “Why should we be in such desperate haste to succeed and in such desperate enterprises? If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured, however far away. It is not important that he should mature as soon as an apple-tree or an oak.”

And again: “Sell your clothes and keep your thoughts. God will see that you do not want society. If I were confined to a corner

of a garret all my days, like a spider, the world would be just as large to me while I had my thoughts about me."

This is the very essence of Hinduism. Like a spider, the East Indian holy man or saint spins the web of consciousness about him; and in the web he lives and dies. He has no other clothing, no other shelter. *Being* is nirvana. Conscious identity with the spirit of the universe is the goal and attainment of life. The holy man becomes nature itself.

The hatred and contempt with which Thoreau regarded the stupidity and commercialism of the average dweller in the town, is well known. The farmer, tilling his land and growing his beans for profit in the market, was no more worthy in his sight than the publicly exalted politicians and "great men" of the day. The naturalist found them all despicable and ridiculous.

Thoreau liked winter because in that season man seemed to live a "more inward life." He believed with Abu Musa that "sitting still at home is the heavenly way; the going out is the way of the world." He found pleasure in moonlight, and understood perfectly why it is that the Hindus compare the moon to a saintly being who has reached the "last stage of bodily existence." He perceived readily how religions might spring up around the moon as goddess and how the rites of worship might serve to stimulate and invigorate the participants. "The moon is a mediator . . . I am sobered by her light and bethink myself. It is like a cup of cold water to a thirsty man."

Astrology, Thoreau maintained, held within itself the germ of a higher truth than does modern astronomy. Discredited with official academicism though the ancient science was, Thoreau could find nothing to arrest his attention in the dry mathematics and cold deductions of the then current astronomy. "The naked eye," he said, "may see further than the armed. It depends on who looks through it."

Mankind is but a "phenomenon in the horizon." The life of man is mean and trivial. Only nature is "holy and heroic." Man's existence takes on beauty and significance only as it approximates the clarity and simplicity of nature.

"To be awake is to be alive," the New Englander writes again. Yet he confesses never to have met a single man who was quite awake. Only one in a million was capable of intellectual exercise, while only one in a hundred millions might be aroused to the point

of being able to live a poetic or divine life. As for himself, Thoreau wished to "suck all the marrow out of life." He wished not to discover, when he came to die, that he had never really lived. He deliberately sought then to "front only the essential facts of life."

In another civilization this ideal would have been less difficult of achievement. In the civilization into which Thoreau had, however, the accident to be born, to seek out the essential facts of existence implied an extreme individualism very rarely encountered. The birth of so unusual a man was for the age a felicitous anomaly: and for Thoreau himself, we are convinced, a misfortune not so deeply regretted as it might perhaps have been had there existed no Walden Pond, no Cape Cod, no Maine Woods, no adjacent Quebec nor virgin forests through which the seasons swept their changing harmonies of color, sound and animal life.

"The International Journal of Ethics Seeks to Clarify Theory and Improve Practice."--

T. V. SMITH, Associate Editor.

SOCIAL problems will be separately analyzed in special issues of the *Journal* during 1930. Within the province of this publication lie both the central field of ethical knowledge and practice and the bordering fields of law, politics, economics, literature, and religion. The first of these related topics is Law and the Community.

IN THE APRIL ISSUE—the ethics of law enforcement analyzed.

The International Journal of Ethics

Managing Editor, JAMES H. TUFTS
Associate Editor, T. V. SMITH
English Editor, C. DESLISLE BURNS

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| FELIX ADLER, New York | M. JOURDAIN, London |
| CHARLES M. BAKEWELL, New Haven | J. M. MACKENZIE, London |
| JOHN DEWEY, New York | J. H. MUIRHEAD, Birmingham |
| G. C. FIELD, Liverpool | ROSCOE POUND, Cambridge, Mass. |
| L. T. HOBHOUSE, London | FRANK THILLY, Ithaca |
| HAROLD HOFFDING, Copenhagen | JOHN H. WIGMORE, Chicago |

{ Subscription price, \$4.00 a year; single copies, \$1.00. }
{ Canadian postage, 15 cents; foreign postage, 20 cents. }

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

Publishers: DAVID NUTT, London—G. E. STECHERT CO., New York—FELIX ALCAN,
Paris—Akad. Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig—NICOLA ZANICHELLI, Bologna—
RUIZ HERMANOS, Madrid—LIVRARIA MACHADO,
Porto—THE MARUZEN COMPANY, Tokyo.

“SCIENTIA”

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC SYNTHESIS

Published every month (each number containing 100 to 120 pages)

EDITORS

F. Bottazzi - G. Bruni - F. Enríques

IS THE ONLY REVIEW the contributors to which are really international.

IS THE ONLY REVIEW that has a really world-wide circulation.

IS THE ONLY REVIEW of scientific synthesis and unification that deals with the fundamental questions of all sciences: the history of the sciences, mathematics, astronomy, geology, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology and sociology.

IS THE ONLY REVIEW that by means of enquiries among the most eminent scientists and authors of all countries (*On the philosophical principles of the various sciences; On the most fundamental astronomical and physical questions of current interest; On the contribution that the different countries have given to the development of various branches of knowledge; On the more important biological questions; On the great economical and sociological international questions*), studies all the main problems discussed in intellectual circles all over the world, and represents at the same time the first attempt at an international organization of philosophical and scientific progress.

IS THE ONLY REVIEW that among its contributors can boast of the most illustrious men of science in the whole world. A list of more than 350 of these is given in each number.

The articles are published in the language of their authors, and every number has a supplement containing the French translation of all the articles that are not French. The review is thus completely accessible to those who know only French. (*Write for a free copy to the General Secretary of “Scientia,” Milan, sending 12 cents in stamps of your country, merely to cover packing and postage.*)

SUBSCRIPTION: \$10.00, Post free

Office: Via A. De Togni 12, Milan (116)

General Secretary: PAOLO BONETTI

SCIENCE PROGRESS

A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC
THOUGHT, WORK, AND AFFAIRS

Edited by Lieut.-Col. Sir RONALD ROSS
K.C.B., K.C.M.G., F.R.S., N.L., D.Sc., LL.D., M.D., F.R.C.S.

Published at the beginning of JANUARY, APRIL, JULY, OCTOBER

Each number consists of about 192 pages, contributed by authorities in their respective subjects. Illustrated. 6s net. Annual Subscription, including postage, 25s, 6d.

SCIENCE PROGRESS owes its origin to an endeavor to found a scientific journal containing original papers and summaries of the present state of knowledge in all branches of science. The necessity for such a journal is to be found in the fact that with the specialization which necessarily accompanies the modern development of scientific thought and work, it is increasingly difficult for even the professional man of science to keep in touch with the trend of thought and the progress achieved in subjects other than those in which his immediate interests lie. This difficulty is felt by teachers and students in colleges and schools, and by the general educated public interested in scientific questions. SCIENCE PROGRESS claims to have filled this want.

JOHN MURRAY

Albemarle Street

London, W-1