

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

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

Founded by EDWARD C. HEGELER

VOL. XLI (No. 9)

SEPTEMBER, 1927

(No. 856)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Frontispiece.</i> George Sand.	
<i>The Supernatural of George Sand.</i> MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN.....	513
<i>The Historicity of Sakyamuni.</i> HOWARD W. OUTERBRIDGE.....	520
<i>The Actual History of the Origin of Judaism and Christianity in a Nutshell.</i> A. KAMPMEIER.....	527
<i>The Soul of Islam.</i> AMOS L. DUSHAW.....	537
<i>Transubstantiation and Ecclesiastical Philosophy.</i> (Continued) ROBERT P. RICHARDSON.....	549
<i>Primitive Reminders in Religion.</i> W. P. McGEHEE.....	562
<i>Anticipating the Norge—A Forgotten Jules Verne.</i> CHARLES KASSEL.....	570
<i>Chinese Shrines of Healing.</i> GEORGE BALLARD BOWERS.....	575

The Open Court Publishing Company

Wieboldt Hall, 337 East Chicago Ave., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Per copy, 20 cents (1 shilling). Yearly, \$2.00 (in the U.P.U., 9s. 6d.)

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

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

Founded by EDWARD C. HEGELER

VOL. XLI (No. 9)

SEPTEMBER, 1927

(No. 856)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Frontispiece.</i> George Sand.	
<i>The Supernatural of George Sand.</i> MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN.....	513
<i>The Historicity of Sakyamuni.</i> HOWARD W. OUTERBRIDGE.....	520
<i>The Actual History of the Origin of Judaism and Christianity in a Nutshell.</i> A. KAMPMEIER.....	527
<i>The Soul of Islam.</i> AMOS L. DUSHAW.....	537
<i>Transubstantiation and Ecclesiastical Philosophy.</i> (Continued) ROBERT P. RICHARDSON.....	549
<i>Primitive Reminders in Religion.</i> W. P. McGEHEE.....	562
<i>Anticipating the Norge—A Forgotten Jules Verne.</i> CHARLES KASSEL.....	570
<i>Chinese Shrines of Healing.</i> GEORGE BALLARD BOWERS.....	575

The Open Court Publishing Company

Wieboldt Hall, 337 East Chicago Ave., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Per copy, 20 cents (1 shilling). Yearly, \$2.00 (in the U.P.U., 9s. 6d.)

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Company

Announce the Publication
of a Complete

INDEX

of

The Philosophical Review

Volume I to XXXV

(1892-1926)

Price \$3.00

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

55 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK



GEORGE SAND

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.

VOL. XLI (No. 9) SEPTEMBER, 1927 (No. 856)

Copyright by THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1927

THE SUPERNATURAL OF GEORGE SAND¹

BY MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN

GEORGE SAND (1804-1876) retained longer than any other member of the Romantic generation of 1830 a distinct liking for the fantastic. In contrast to the majority of the French Romantics, for whom the employment of the fantastic in fiction was but a part of their aesthetic theories, it was with her a matter of temperament. George Sand had from her tenderest childhood a disposition for the mysterious and marvellous, which her early environment tended to develop still further. The supernatural surrounded on all sides a child who was only too much disposed to enjoy its charms. The superstitions of the peasants of Berry in the midst of whom George Sand passed her childhood took a strong hold on her mind. During the long winter evenings, the hemp-dresser of Nohant, seated in a corner of the hearth, would tell some lugubrious legend in which figured demons, ghosts or goblins, and the mind of the child who listened to it on her visits to the villagers was kindled.

George Sand's early reading still further increased her natural propensity toward the prodigious. Already as a child, prior to her entry into the convent, she came in contact, as she tells us herself, with the English "roman noir" and read with delight and terror the works of Anne Radcliffe.² The effect of this early reading remained with her to the end and can be traced in the works of her maturity. George Sand, just as the other Romantics in France, was, in her treatment of the fantastic, subject to impressions from abroad. In

¹Written on the occasion of the demi-centenary of her death (June 7, 1876).

²*Historic de ma vie*, t. III, ch. ii.

her novel, *le Château des déserts* (written in 1847 and first published in 1851), the supernatural is in the end explained away exactly in the manner of Mrs. Radcliffe. Reminiscences of Lewis' novel, *The Monk*, with which George Sand must have become acquainted at the same time, may be detected in her novel *Lélia* (1833). The monk Magnus, who is in love with Lélia, believes that he has been fascinated by the eyes of the Fiend and is on the point of exorcising him with book and bell. It will be recalled that, in the English novel, Ambrosio also believes that the woman he loves is an incarnation of the Devil.

But greater than English influence on George Sand was that of Germany. The woman novelist, together with the other French Romantics, fell under the spell of the fantastic fiction of the German Romantic School. E. T. A. Hoffmann, the most prominent among the German fantastic fictionists, exerted, as is well known, a very great influence in France. He practically directed the French Romantic movement about the year 1830. At a time when Heinrich Heine could write: "In Germany to-day Hoffmann has no vogue whatever," all the great French writers of the Romantic generation read and imitated him. George Sand held him in high esteem and employed his stories as models for many of her writings. Her play, *la Nuit de Noël* (1863), is drawn from Hoffmann's *Meister Floh*, and her novel *le Diable aux champs* (written in 1851 and first published in 1855-56), also shows the influence of this German story-writer. Her fantastic tales written toward the end of her life, *la Reine Coax* (1872), *le Nuage rose* (1872) and *le Géant Yéocis* (1873) are fully in the manner of Hoffmann.

Goethe was next to Hoffmann in his influence on George Sand. This woman writer was attracted to *Faust* primarily through its fantastic element. The philosophical content of Goethe's great poem first escaped the French Romantics. Their interest was limited to its fantastic parts. George Sand thus counted *Faust* among the great fantastic plays in her *Essai sur le drame fantastique: Goethe, Byron, Mickiewicz* (1839).

In her novel, *le Château des déserts* previously mentioned, we find a Witches' Sabbath which recalls the Walpurgis Night in *Faust*. Goethe's influence is especially evident in her fantastic drama, *les Sept cordes de la lyre* (1839), which is no more than a copy of *Faust*. Albertus, the principal character in this play, is an off-spring of the German philosopher. He too is tempted by Mephistopheles

in his ambition to wish to know and comprehend all. Supreme wisdom finally fills his soul when he has learned to know love. This play has also a philosophical import. It symbolizes by the harmony of the strings of the lyre the harmony to which humanity should be attuned.

The supernatural figures principally in the pastoral romances of George Sand. This novelist found pleasure in seeking the marvellous among the classes of men who wish to find relief in their imagination from the humdrum rounds of their daily occupations. She wished to show that the countryman, in contrast to the city-dweller, still has eyes to behold wonders. The fantastic element seems to George Sand to be one of the forces of the popular mind. It is interesting to note that the writer who had the honor of giving to the peasant his place in literature and who was the first to consecrate a series of great works to the portrayal of rustic life was also the first to discover the part that the marvellous plays in the mind of the peasant. George Sand describes the tiller of the soil with his joys and sorrows, his songs and dances, his beliefs and customs, his traditions and superstitions.

The fantastic not only figures in her fictional writings; it was also deemed worthy of special critical consideration. On the occasion of the exhibition of paintings of rural customs in Berry by her son, Maurice Sand, she wrote an article on the rustic legends of the region. This article, which appeared anonymously under the title "Légendes rustiques" in the *Magazin pittoresque* for November, 1857, is also known, on account of its subject-matter, as "Légendes fantastiques."

George Sand was interested in illuminism and occultism and wrote mystic and symbolic books, such as *Consuelo* (1842-43) and its sequel, *la Comtesse de Rudolstadt* (1843-45). In the thirteen "books" of these two novels, the lives of the principal characters are so to say bathed in an atmosphere of mystery and marvel. Count de Rudolstadt, a man of a mystical mind and an adept of occultism, is persuaded that he has seen again the soul of his deceased mother incarnated in an old beggar-woman. When he, in his turn, is laid to rest in the vault of his ancestors, Consuelo believes that she sees him in the magic mirror of Count de Saint-Germain and imagines on several occasions that she hears the sound of the divine bow of his violin.

George Sand, together with the other Romantics, was inter-

ested in the Devil. But it must not be inferred that she held a belief in the Devil and all his works. Like all Romantic humanitarians, this woman writer did not believe in a personal Devil and a material hell. Already as a child she was repelled by what she called "the fiction of hell." In her *Essai sur la drame fantastique* already mentioned, she brands as an intellectual crime "the frightful belief in eternal damnation, the most guilty notion that one can have of the Deity." Baudelaire, who hated George Sand, remarked a propos of her disbelief in the Devil and hell that she had "good reason to wish to suppress hell."

Satan was to George Sand as to many other Romantics the symbol of revolt and the support of all the weak and downtrodden. In her novel *Consuelo*, she puts into the mouth of the rebel archangel the following words:

"I am not the demon. I am the archangel of rightful revolt and the patron of great combats. Like Christ, I am the God of the poor, the weak and the oppressed."

George Sand, as a good Romantic, admired Milton's Satan and praised the Puritan poet's portrayal of the fallen angel. She says somewhere in her writings: "Milton made the thunderstruck forehead of his rebel angel so noble and so beautiful." In her description of the legends of Berry, she tells of Georgeon, the evil spirit of the Black Valley and mentions the local belief that the Devil holds his Sabbath at the cross of the Bossous.

But George Sand is wary in conjuring the Devil up from his subterrenean habitation. In a letter dated September 2, 1838, she praises Hoffmann for making the Devil appear in his "ecstasies" not in person but as a philosophical concept.³ The appearance of Mephisto in her play previously mentioned must be considered as an exception. The Tempter was brought over bodily from *Faust*. Although the word "diable" appears in a few of the titles of her works, the Devil does not show himself in person in them. The novel, *le Diable aux champs* previously mentioned, does not contain the Devil. Nor is the principal character in her comedy, *le Démon du foyer* (1852), a horned and hoofed individual. The romance, *la Mare au diable* (1846), deals not with the Devil but with Death. This story of a diabolical pond takes its title from the dismal engraving of Holbein's *Laborer*, in which the skeleton Death

³*Lettres d'un voyageur* (1837).

is represented as skipping along whip in hand by the peasant's side in the field and urging on the team drawing the plough so that he may finish his work and follow him.

In her novels *Consuelo* and *la Comtesse de Rudolstadt* George Sand deals with a medieval sect which is supposed to worship Satan. Our novelist, together with many other members of the Romantic group, wished to bring about a reconciliation of good and evil, aspired to marry Hell to Heaven. Lélia already said that "the spirit of evil and the spirit of good are but one spirit: God." In *Consuelo*, George Sand puts this idea in the mouth of the heretical sect of the Lollards: We read:

"A mysterious and singular sect dreamed . . . of uniting these two arbitrarily divided principles into one single principle. . . . It tried to raise the supposed principle of evil from its low estate and make it, on the contrary, the servant and agent of the good."

George Sand, along with the other Romantics, predicted the day when the Devil should regain Heaven and occupy his former seat at the right hand of the Lord. Further on in this novel the following paragraph will be found:

"In the opinion of the Lollards, Satan was not the enemy of the human race, but, on the contrary, its protector and patron. They held that he was a victim of injustice and jealousy. According to them, the Archangel Michael and the other celestial powers who had precipitated him into the abyss, were the real demons, while Lucifer, Beelzebub, Ashtaroth, Astarte, and all the monsters of hell, were innocence and light themselves. They believed that the reign of Michael and his glorious host would soon come to an end, and that the Devil would be restored and reinstated in Heaven with his accursed myrmidons. They paid him an impious worship and accosted each other by saying, *Celui à qui on a fait tort te salue*—that is to say, He who has been misunderstood and unjustly condemned, salute thee—that is, protect and assist thee."

The French Romantics held views which were already taught by the Gnostics, are found in the books of the Kabbalists and the Magi, and were shared by many medieval sects. The German Luciferians of the thirteenth century, among other heretical sects, believed that Lucifer had been unjustly banished from Heaven and pronounced anathema against St. Michael, his conqueror. In our own country,

a Universalist minister, the Reverend Mr. Tillotson, was deposed from his church for wishing to extend its doctrine of universal salvation to Satan. The orthodox teaching is that the Devil cannot do penance and receive pardon like Adam. The Church has always taught that Satan is a devil through all eternity. He is damned beyond redemption. In the Persian eschatology, however, Ahriman will be the last to arrive purified in the paradise. According to the belief of the Yezidis in Asiatic Turkey, the rebel angel will some day be restored.

The belief in the Devil's pardon and restoration to Heaven was also held by several Church fathers. The germ of this belief is in the passage: "Even the devils are subject unto us through thy name" (Luke x. 17). Origen entertained the hope for the Devil's restoration to Heaven. His belief in the salvability of the Satanic nature was shared apparently by Justin, Clemens Alexandrinus and afterwards by Gregory of Nyssa and Didymus. Thomas Aquinas, it is said, could hardly be happy from thinking of the irreversible doom of Satan. He passed a night in prayer for the salvation and restoration of the Devil. "O God," he prayed, "have mercy upon thy servant, the Devil." Father Sinistrari, the famous *Consulteur* of the Inquisition, argued that demons were included in the atonement wrought by Christ and might attain final beatitude. He even intimated, though more timidly, that their father, Satan himself, as a participator in the sin of Adam and sharer of his curse, might be included in the general provision of the Deity for the entire and absolute removal of the curse throughout nature. Saint Theresa did not wish that one should speak ill of the Devil and pitied him for not being able to love.

In a thirteenth century poem, *A Moral Ode*,⁴ we find the assertion that the Devil himself might have had mercy had he sought for it.

The idea of the salvation of Satan was a part of the Romantic humanitarian movement which a misanthropic humorist has named "redemptorism," that desire to rescue criminals and courtesans by means of love, that hope of the final triumph of universal good. This ideal found expression in different forms in Goethe, in Burns, in Byron, in Blake, and in Victor Hugo. Goethe intimated that he had written a passage "where the Devil himself receives grace and

⁴*Old English Miscellany*. (Early English Texts.)

mercy from God." Byron shared this Romantic belief in the salvation of Satan in predicting a time

"When man no more can fall as once he fell,
And even the very demons shall do well!"

This ideal has been expressed by Robert Burns in a single verse of his "Address to the De'il", which touches the heart without offending the intellect.

Henry Mills Alden has uttered his belief in the following words:

"Lucifer is the light-bearer, the morning-star, and whatever disguises he may take in falling, there can be no new dawn that shall not witness his rising in his original Brightness."⁵

⁵This *motif* has also been treated by Bailey in his *Festus*, by Wilfred S. Blunt in his *Satan Absolved: A Victorian Mystery* (1899) and by Kurt von Rohrscheidt in his *Satan's Erlösung* (1894). The Romantic dream of the salvation of Satan has been treated at length in the present writer's recently published book: *Satan et le Satanisme dans l'Oeuvre de Victor Hugo* (Paris: Les Pelles Lettres).

THE HISTORICITY OF SAKYAMUNI

BY HOWARD W. OUTERBRIDGE

LIKE many other great characters of antiquity, the historicity of Sakyamuni has been called into question. Up until the year 1856 doubts were frequently expressed as to whether there really existed such a person as Sakyamuni the Buddha. So well versed a scholar as H. H. Wilson, Professor of Sanscrit at Oxford University was able to say, "It is very uncertain whether such a person ever lived."

The reasons for this spirit of incredulity are not hard to find. The stories of the life of Sakyamuni which are most generally accepted by the Buddhist believers today, are so full of impossible tales of miracles and inconsistencies as to make them absolutely unacceptable to any scientific mind. The figure there portrayed is evidently the product of the pious imagining of the Buddhist disciples of a later day. It is easy to draw the conclusion that, since so little is really known about him, and the stories we have so largely false, in all probability there is no basis for them whatever. If ninety percent is fictitious, why not the whole.

The question cannot be dismissed so easily, however. There still remains the movement of Buddhism to account for. This cannot be done upon the basis of a slow evolution, such as we find taking place in the development of the Vedic religion, or Shinto, through animism and nature worship to more theistic forms. On the contrary, Buddhism belongs very definitely to the type of religions which rise as the result of the work of a founder, whose inspiration and personality, rather than any set of teachings or ceremonies, are the real fountain head. A study of the earliest records of Buddhism reveals a personality, which, in spite of the meagerness of detail, stands out as the dominating and determining character of primitive Buddhism. Were there no other grounds for our belief in the historical existence of

the great founder of Buddhism, I believe that a thoroughly satisfactory case could be made out on the basis of the nature of the system which he founded.

We are not forced to rely upon such arguments alone however, During the present generation data have come to light which make certain that there was such an historical character as Sakyamuni. In the year 1897, Dr. A. Fuhrer, archaeological surveyor of the North-western Provinces and Oudh, published his "Monograph on Buddha Sakyamuni's Birth-place" in the *Archaeological Survey of North India*, Vol. VI, giving an account of the discovery, or more correctly the re-discovery, of the Horse-Pillar, erected by King Asoka to mark the birthplace of the great Buddha, in the Lumbini Grove at Kapilavastu.

The Chinese Scholars, Fa Hien and Hiuen Tsiang, who visited the vicinity of the reputed birth-place of Sakyamuni, near Kapilavastu, in the fifth and seventh centuries A. D., have both left us comparatively clear accounts of having found the spot where the birth took place. Fa Hien says,¹⁷ "Fifty li (8 1/3 miles) east from the city (Kapilavastu) was a garden named Lumbini where the queen (Mahamaya) entered the pond and bathed. Having come forth from the pond on the Northern Bank, after walking twenty paces, she lifted up her hand, laid hold of the branch of a tree and, with her face to the east, gave birth to the heir-apparent. When he fell to the ground, he (immediately) walked seven paces. Two dragon kings appeared and washed the body. At the place where they did so, there was immediately formed a well, and from it, as well as from the above pond, where (the queen) bathed, the monks even now constantly take the water, and drink it.

Hiuen Tsiang¹⁸ has given an account of the Lumbini Garden. He says, "Here is the bathing tank of the Sakyas, the water of which is bright and clear as a mirror, and the surface covered with a mixture of flowers. To the North of this, twenty-four or twenty-five paces, there is an Asoka tree, which is now decayed; this is the place where the Bodhisvattva was born on the eighth day of the second half of the month Vaisakha. . . . East of this is a stupa built

¹⁷See Legge, *A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms: being an account of the Chinese monk, Fa Hien, of his travels in India and China in search of the Buddhist book of discipline*, Oxford, 1886, p. 67. Also Giles, *Record of Buddhist Kingdoms*, translated from Chinese. Shanghai, 1887, p. 51.

¹⁸See Beal's *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang, 1884, Vol. II, p. 24.

by Asoka-Rajah, where the two dragons bathed the body of the prince." A little farther on in the narrative he says, "Close to this there are four stupas to denote the place where the four heavenly kings received the Bodhisattva in their arms. . . . By the side of these stupas and not far from them is a great stone pillar on the top of which is the figure of a horse, which was built by Asoka-rajah. Afterward by the contrivance of a wicked dragon, it was broken off in the middle and fell to the ground. By the side of it is a little river which flows to the south-east. The people of the place call it the river of oil. This is the stream which the Devas caused to appear as a pure and glistening pool for the queen, when she brought forth her child, to wash and purify herself in. Now it is changed and become a river, the stream of which is still unctuous."

These two quotations give us the situation as the two Buddhist scholars found it in the fifth and seventh centuries respectively, when they made their visits to the Lumbini Grove. At the time of their visits the lower portion of the pillar which had originally held the horse-statue, was still standing. Not far away were the four stupas, and near the pillar, the pool, and its oily stream.

With this data before him, it was not difficult for Dr. Fuhrer to identify the place. The remains of the four stupas were still clearly visible, and near them the pillar, which he describes¹⁹ as a "slightly mutilated pillar, rising about ten feet above the ground, and being covered with many records of pilgrims' visits, one of which was incised about 700 A. D." and therefore not long after the record of Hiuen Tsiang. The story thus far, however remains unconvincing. There was no evidence beyond the tradition which the two Chinese monks had picked up, to show that this was in reality erected by Asoka to commemorate the place where the Buddha had been born. The interval of nearly a thousand years gave ample opportunity for traditions of any kind to arise, between the time of King Asoka and the journey of the monks in the seventh century, A. D. From the stories which they tell, it is evident that there was no inscription visible on the pillar at the time of their visits. Dr. Fuhrer, however, dug away the earth around the pillar, and discovered that the base of the pillar was some distance below the surface of the ground as he found it. When the pillar was revealed, it was found to be a "monolith 22 feet 4 inches high, stand-

¹⁹*Op. cit.*, p. 27.

ing upon a masonry platform, and to bear about 9 feet 8 inches from its base a well preserved inscription of the Maruya period, in five lines."²⁰ This inscription which was evidently unknown to the two Chinese travellers, proves the truth of their statement to the effect that the pillar had been erected by King Asoka. The fact seems to be that, at the time of their visit, the debris had already accumulated to a place above where the inscription was, though the tradition as to the origin of the pillar was still well known. The inscription is in Megadhi of the third century, B. C. and reads as follows. "King Piyadasi, beloved of the gods, having been anointed twenty years, came himself and worshipped saying: 'here Buddha Sakyamuni was born.' And he caused to be made a stone (capital) bearing a horse, and he caused (this) stone pillar to be erected. Because here the Blessed One was born, the village of Lumbini has been made free of taxes and a recipient of wealth."

This evidence seems indisputable. Here must be the spot which was pointed out to King Asoka about the year 239,²¹ which would be 238 years after the death of Sakyamuni²² as the spot where he had been born. The upper portion of the pillar, bearing the horse, had not been discovered when Dr. Fuhrer's monograph was published, but probably lies below the debris. There is a likelihood that it was broken off by lightning, which the Chinese Buddhists ascribe to the anger of "dragons", thus giving rise to the story told by the two monks. The top of the pillar may some day be found.

We have, therefore, a very satisfactory reason for believing that within less than two and a half centuries of the death of Sakyamuni, the place of his birth was known and accepted, and apparently had been ever since his death. The evidence for this latter statement we shall now proceed to examine. It is found in the story of King Asoka's visit to Kapilavastu, as told in the Divyavadana.²³

This work tells us that Sthavira Upagupta, the fifth Elder of Northern Buddhism, and the converter of Asoka to Buddhist belief, was invited by that monarch to come and visit him at his capital, Pataliputra. Upon his arrival, the story proceeds, Asoka said to him. "You who resemble the Master, you who are the sole eye of the Universe, and the chief interpreter of the Sacred Law, be my

²⁰*Op. cit.*, p. 27.

²¹Asoka came to the throne twenty years before, viz. 259 B. C.

²²The most generally accepted date for Sakya's death is 477 B. C.

²³Edited by E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil, Cambridge, 1886.

refuge, Reverend Sir, and give me your command!" "I shall hasten, great sage, to obey thy voice." Upagupta replied. "O great King, the Lord, the Blessed Tathagata, has entrusted to me as well as to you the depository of the Law. Let us make every effort to preserve that which the Leader of the World has entrusted to us, when he was in the midst of his disciples." The king then fell at the feet of Upagupta, and said, "This, O Sthavira, is my desire: I wish to visit, honour, and mark by a sign, for the benefit of remote posterity all the spots where the Blessed Buddha has sojourned". The Sthavira replied, "Very well, O great king, this thought of thine is good. I shall go this day to show you the spots where the venerable Buddha resided." They thereupon proceeded with a large and gorgeous equipage to Lumbini, where the Sthavira Upagupta, pointing out the place, said to the King, "Here, O great king, the Lord was born; at this site, precious to behold, the first monument in honour of the Buddha should be consecrated." Asoka not only carried out this intention, but, the story tells us, presented one hundred gold coins to the people of the country as well.

This story is of value chiefly in the fact that it indicates to us that the site of the birthplace of the Buddha was a well-known spot to the leaders of Buddhism even before the erection of the pillar by Asoka. This is of course quite to be expected, in view of the direct and definite charge attributed to the Blessed One himself, that his followers should keep sacred in his memory four holy places, the scenes of the most important events in his life. The Mahaparinibbana Sutta,²⁴ which of all the stories of the life of the great founder is generally conceded to be among the oldest, gives the list of four places which must thus be kept holy: (1) The birthplace of the Tathagata Kapilavastu; (2) The place of his enlightenment, Buddh-gara or Naranjara; (3) The Deer-park, near Benares, where he first proclaimed the Law; and (4) Kusinara, the place where he obtained Nirvana. It then proceeds: "All believers, brethren and sisters of the Order, or devout men and women, who shall die while they, with believing heart are journeying on such a pilgrimage, shall be reborn after death, when the body shall dissolve in the happy realms of heaven." With such a declaration made by the Blessed One himself, and going back, most certainly, to the very earliest traditions, it is scarcely conceivable that the birthplace of Sakya-

²⁴S. B. E., XI, p. 90-1.

muni should have been forgotten, or the continuous stream of tradition in regard to the authentic spot have been broken, right back to the very earliest period of Buddhist history. We are fairly safe therefore, in claiming that we have unbroken and well-authenticated evidence as to the birthplace, and the consequent historicity of the great Founder of Buddhism. The burden of proof is upon those who would claim the origin of Buddhism in a Hindu-Sun-myth, or some other such story. The necessity of explaining away the facts which Dr. Fuhrer's explorations have revealed will greatly add to their task. In fact it seems to make such a position untenable.

There still remains one question however, which seems to present difficulties in the way of accepting the data given above. How is it that, if this birthplace were so well known by the Buddhists, it was not marked in some way before the time of Asoka, and later was allowed to fall into decay and neglect, so that even the inscription on the pillar was, for a thousand years or more, covered up by debris, and unknown?

The answer to the first part of this question is found in the fact that the Order founded by Sakyamuni was composed of semi-ascetic mendicants who had definitely given up wealth and material prosperity, and were therefore financially incapable of any elaborate recognition of the sacred places. It was only when the Rajah Asoka with large resources at his disposal, became a devotee, that the building of Stupas and the erection of monoliths became possible. Before this time the pious Buddhist pilgrim was satisfied to visit the sacred places, unmarked by monuments, and leave there, perhaps, his simple tribute of devotion. The beautiful palace which had once been there, and the garden where the sacred event had taken place, were all a scene of desolation, as they have been, indeed ever since. For during the lifetime of Sakymuni, Kapilavastu, the capital of the Sakya Clan, was destroyed by Vidudabaha, the son of the king of Kosala, and the Sakya clan almost entirely exterminated, in consequence of an insult given by the Sakyans to the people of Kosala.²⁵ Fa Hien, who visited Kapilavastu about 46 A. D. says of the city at that time. "In it there was neither King nor people. All was mound and desolation. Of inhabitants there were only some monks and a score or two of families of common people. . . . On the roads

²⁵See note at end of chapter.

people have to be on their guard against wild elephants and lions, and should not travel incautiously."²⁶

Similar testimony is also borne by Hiuen Thiang, a couple of centuries later.²⁷ It seems probable, therefore, that there has been no effort since the time of Sakyamuni himself to rebuild, to any large extent at any rate, the site of the ancient kingdom. The general neglect which has been accorded the sacred place, even since Asoka's time is due, in part perhaps, to the fact that it has been a deserted land, with but few inhabitants. This however, would scarcely have been possible had it not been for the general decline of Buddhism throughout India soon after the period of Asoka. While there have been occasional pilgrimages from other Buddhist lands, such for instance as those just mentioned, these apparently have been rare. Buddhism in India has almost ceased to be. Mahayana Buddhism, which has developed in the lands farther to the east, has been much less concerned with keeping up these sacred pilgrimages than were the disciples of the first few centuries. In respect of the three other sacred sites, there is the additional fact that they were not marked by any enduring monument, and are therefore less clearly authenticated. As anyone familiar with sacred sites in the orient is well aware, unless there is very definite evidence of early date, little credence can be placed upon the traditions which identify the various sacred places. What has already been brought forward, however, is of such a nature as to appear indisputable, and to fix with as large a degree of certainty as we could well expect, not only the fact of the historicity of Sakya but the actual place of his birth as well.²⁸ Unless new and unexpected data to the contrary should be discovered, there is little likelihood of the matter being again called in question.

²⁶Legge, *op. cit.*, 64, 68, and Giles, *op. cit.*, 49-50.

²⁷Beal, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 13-14.

²⁸Note on the Fall of Kapilavastu. There is a legend to the effect that the King of Kosala asked for one of the Sakya women in marriage. The Sakya nobles considering this beneath the dignity of their clan, sent the bastard daughter of a slave woman instead. This insult was avenged as told above. The King of Kosala was in turn defeated by Agatasattu, son of King Bimbisara of Magadha, about 491 B. C., and the influence of Magadha made supreme.

THE ACTUAL HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY IN A NUTSHELL

BY A. KAMPMEIER

I. ORIGIN OF JUDAISM

YAHVEH, as the Hebrews pronounced Jehovah (in the English version "Lord") was first a national deity only, like Chemosh, Malkom and Baal of the related Moabites, Ammonites and Phoenicians. Yahveh was originally a very concrete god of nature, meaning "one that fells," swoops down like a bird of prey, not that abstraction: "I am, that I am," as later redactors in Ex. iii. 14 explain the name. His seat was Mt. Sinai on the northwest coast of Arabia.¹ Yahveh was imparted to the Hebrews by the related Midianitic tribe of the Kenites, who joined the Hebrews in the conquest of Canaan. Jethro the priest and father-in-law of Moses, to whom he gave instructions in the government of the tribes, was a Kenite. Moses did not give all that law, which now goes under his name, centering in the idea of the imageless worship of one universal God, but in consistently to be worshipped at one place only and not at whatsoever time by elaborate sacrifices, bloody and unbloody, (as

¹The tradition that Sinai was located in the so-called Sinaitic peninsula first started with Christian monasticism. Sinai was evidently a volcano, according to the descriptions in the Old Testament, and because the Israelites, when leaving Egypt, were guided by a pillar of fire by night and a cloud-pillar by day, just as today the fire and smoke pillars of volcanoes can be seen enormous distances. The Sinaitic peninsula has no extinct volcanoes, while all along the western coast of Arabia there are enormous lava-masses, due to extinct volcanoes, an eruption of one of them, that of the fire-harra near Medina, occurring even after the beginning of our era. In northwestern Arabia further lay Midian, the Sinai country, along the Gulf of Akaba, the *Jam suph* (sea of reeds) of the Hebrew Bible. (comp. I. Kings ix. 26; Jer. xlix. 21; Ex. xxiii. 31) erroneously translated in the English version "Red Sea", while the Gulf of Suez is called "the tongue of the Egyptian sea in Isa. xi. 15. The Sinaitic peninsula besides would not have been a safe place of refuge, neither for Moses, when fleeing before Pharaoh, nor for the Hebrews, since it was under Egyptian dominion, garrisoned, and its copper mines worked.

if he needed them) offered only by one special divinely appointed class of priests, headed by a highpriest.

This law was very much later attributed to Moses, according to the ancient custom of subsuming all law, developed in course of time, under the name of some previous great leader and giver of the first simple laws, or else the Hebrews, even the most loyal worshippers of Yahveh, would not have had images and symbols such as the *e-phod*, meaning a draped image, and the *teraphim*. Besides this they worshipped at sacred trees and rocks, believing the Deity dwelling in them, like the ancient related Arabs. Jacob anointed the rock at Bethel, meaning the house of God. *Baitylia* and *baetuli* were also the names of sacred rocks among Greeks and Romans, this custom of stone worship having been brought to them by the Phoenicians. Later the Hebrews, when having special sanctuaries throughout Canaan, set up pillars and poles (*asherahs*) at them, substitutes for sacred rocks and sacred trees. Even Solomon's royal temple had them, though they are forbidden in the so-called Mosaic law, although his temple is supposed to have been the only legitimate place of worship chosen by Yahveh. Other sacred stones were the stones of the ark, which the Hebrews carried into battle, like the Phoenicians and Carthaginians their arks. Very probably these stones were from Sinai, just as the Chinese set up stones everywhere of the holy Taishan mountains, as a protection against evil spirits. The stones of the ark were later imagined to have been tables of law by the redactors of Hebrew history, when the original meaning was not understood anymore or to be concealed. The tent harboring the ark was likewise not the precious tabernacle of the desert, a later fictitious copy of Solomon's temple, but the simple tent, which Moses pitched outside of the camp according to Ex. xxxiii. 7, to receive oracles from Yahveh, just as the Romans pitched a similar tent outside the city, wherein to observe auspices, before holding voting assemblies.

Of this tent and its ark, Joshua, an Ephramite is the guardian. For this office the Hebrew text employs a word used of priests with regard to sacred worship. This tent with the ark was later always in Ephraimite territory, its palladium, till the ark was taken by the Philistines in battle, then returned to the Hebrews, upon which David built a new tent for it in Jerusalem, because the old tent at Shiloh had been destroyed. The ark was later placed by Solomon in his temple. That the ark and tent was not the ark of covenant and the

precious tabernacle of the Mosaic law, is shown by the fact, that Samuel, a non-Levitic Ephramite slept near the ark, which was not permitted to non-Levites, according to the Mosaic law, as also that David and Solomon, non-Levites worshipped before it as priests. The fact that the Babylonian calendar is used in connection with the description of the tabernacle is also a proof of the late origin of this story, as the Jews first used this calendar after the Babylonian exile 586-537 B. C. The use of this calendar in the Mosaic law in connection with many other things in contrast to the use of the old Hebrew calendar in other older portions of the law, shows that those things were also a later development.

The most loyal worshippers of Yahveh also sacrificed to him (every one could do it) at any place and at any time, they saw fit, especially on hill tops, the "high places", denounced in the law and the books of Kings. Elijah rebuilds the altar of Yahveh on Mt. Carmel long after Solomon had built his temple, the supposed place, Yahveh had chosen for his only place of worship, while Solomon rather wished to have a royal sanctuary of his own, besides the other common sanctuaries in the country, just as Jeroboam I built his royal sanctuaries after the secession of the Northern tribes.

Elijah, it may be inserted here, though raging against the foreign worship of Baal, does not condemn the bull images of Yahveh, erected by Jeroboam, symbolizing the power of Yahveh like the horns on the altar in Solomon's temple. Elijah, a rude old-fashioned semi-nomad from the other side of the Jordan may have preferred the old rude images and symbols to the new fashioned bull symbols, but as long as they represented Yahveh and not Baal, he was satisfied. The story of the golden calf in the desert is a later story invented to ridicule "the sin of Jeroboam." The same words which Jeroboam used of his symbols are used with reference to the golden calf. By the way, nomads of the desert raise no big cattle.

Levites, a kind of professional priests, they were of course early. They were such either by descent from Moses, a grandson of whom served as priest of an *ephod* according to Judg. xviii. 30 at a sanctuary, or because belonging to the tribe of Moses, Levi, either by birth or adoption (both constitute an Oriental tribe), thus claiming a kind of prerogative, because of its great son, or by necessity, because the tribe of Levi had become decimated in the conquest and had no hereditary territory and was scattered throughout the other tribes. (The decimation of Levi and Simeon and their scattering

throughout the other tribes is told in several places. The treachery of Levi and Simeon against the Shechemites is a story prefiguring later history as there are other such stories in the Hebrew patriarchal period.) The Levites also decided questions of dispute by casting the holy lot, called *Urim* and *Thummim*, the ancient way of deciding disputes, and later, when laws had developed, became expounders of them. The Hebrew word for law, *Thora*, was originally connected with the term used for casting the holy lot.

But though the Levites were a professionally priestly clan, hiring themselves out for service at the different sanctuaries, they were not the exclusive priests. David appoints his own sons as priests and Jeroboam I also appoints non-Levitic priests. The kings in Jerusalem appoint and depose their head-priests (not one at a time, but several) at their will. Where the word "high priest" in the sense of the Mosaic law occurs outside of the Pentateuch in the historical books, it is a later interpolation. The author of the book of Chronicles, written as late as 250 B. C., who already 2000 years ago, noticed that the older historic sources of the Old Testament and the Pentateuch mutually exclude each other, and who represents Hebrew history, as it ought to have happened, had the Mosaic law stood at its head, changes the priestship of David's sons into a political office (only one instance of his numerous perversions of Hebrew history), and represents the whole elaborate cult, as prescribed in the Pentateuch, headed by a high priest, as functioning down to the minutest details from the time of David to the end of the kingdom of Juda.

From the writings of the first great literary prophets, Amos, Hoshea, Micha, Isaiah and Jeremiah 800-600 B. C. (as far as they are not tampered by additions of later redactors and the inclusion of different writers, 150 years apart, as in Isaiah for instance in one book, in order to conform to the Mosaic law and later developed religious and political views) we see that they first expanded the conception of the national Yahveh to a more universalistic and spiritual God-conception and demanded also a spiritual ethical worship of him, consisting in deeds of righteousness, justice and mercy, not in external worship of offerings combined with carousals and feasting. They condemn not only the worship of foreign gods, as already earlier prophets, Sanniel and Elijah had done, but the service of Yahveh also, as it was hitherto done at all sanctuaries, Jerusalem included, whose temple is not holier to them than the other sanctuar-

ies in the country. They also for the first time criticize image and symbol worship, but never doing this by appealing to the Mosaic law. Their standpoint in this respect was therefore an entirely new and revolutionary one. Had the forbiddance of image worship in the Mosaic law been existing, they would have appealed to it. They also know of no such elaborate worship of Yahveh as prescribed in that law, transcending all earlier worship in ritualism and ceremonialism. They even outrightly deny that Yahveh had given a command of such elaborate worship. Comp. Jer. vii. 22, Amos, v. 25.

In 722 B. C. the Northern kingdom came to an end by Assyria. This kingdom is represented in the books of Kings and Chronicles as the worst of the two Hebrew kingdoms on account of the sin of Jereboam, from the later developed religious standpoint, that all the misfortunes which befell the two kingdoms, Israel and Juda, in their people being led into captivity, was due to their disloyalty to Yahveh in serving strange gods and in not serving Yahveh rightly, as the mentioned prophets had taught. But according to the characterization of all the tribes in the blessing attributed to Moses in Deut. xxxiii, which must have been written about 810 B. C., Israel, or Joseph as it poetically was called, is not that reprobate as described in the later historical representation. Israel is the most important kingdom and as well as Juda called *Jeshurun*, meaning as much as "the dear darling" of Yahveh.

In 621 B. C. occurred the so-called reformation of King Josiah in Jerusalem according to II Kings xxii, as a consequence of the law, said to have been found in the temple. This book of the law must have been the groundwork of the present book of Deuteronomy, for in it occurs that passage, that Yahveh should be worshipped in that place only, which he would choose, and because in the reformation, which followed, all places of worship outside of Jerusalem were done away with not only in Juda, but also in the former territory of Israel. In the story of the finding of the law this law is called "the book of covenant," and because in Exod. xxiv. 7 some of the oldest portions of Hebrew laws (those in Ex. xxi-xxiii), which had in course of time developed, and which to a great extent recur in Deuteronomy, are also called "the book of Covenant," it was evidently this portion which was worked over with the addition of that law forbidding all places of worship save one (of course Jerusalem). In Deuteronomy also occurs the command to read the law before all the people every seventh year at the place chosen by

God, a thing which could only be done in the small Juda after the destruction of the Northern kingdom. Naturally such a command was never known before, or else the entire ignorance of the law would not have existed among the most loyal worshippers of Yahveh.

In order to show convincingly that Deuteronomy in its present form did not exist up to the time of the discovery of the law in the temple, and that with that law the beginning of the present Mosaic code was made a few other examples are here inserted. In Deuteronomy occurs that law about kings, of which Samuel knew nothing, when he was asked to his astonishment by the people to give them a king, although Deuteronomy makes especial provision for such a case. Further if the law in Deuteronomy, that the Moabites shall be absolutely excluded from the community of the Hebrews, had been of Moses, one of the most honored Hebrews perhaps would never have been born. David, the great king, at the same time a loyal worshipper of Yahveh, though he consults him before undertaking anything important under the form of the *ephod*, was according to the book of Ruth a great-grandson of a Moabite, and in his persecutions by Saul was on very friendly terms with the Moabites. Another case will show, how different versions of laws gradually were developed. In Deuteronomy occurs the oldest version of the ten commandments, differing from the later one in Exod. xx. in the point why the Sabbath should be kept, basing rest on that day on purely humane reasons, and not because God rested on that day.

Thirty years after the reformation of Josiah, the Jews, as they were from now on called, being of Juda, were led into Babylonian exile 585 B. C. From this on developed the Mosaic law, as we now have it in the Pentateuch. The service of foreign gods had been done away with entirely and Yahveh had been expanded to a universal god. Consistency to the ideas of the prophets would have demanded to worship him spiritually and ethically, without any bloody and unbloody sacrifices. But this was not done. A system of sacrificial and priestly worship, supposed to satisfy Yahveh entirely, was worked out, more elaborate and ritualistic than ever before. Of this the prophet Ezekiel, a man of thoroughly moral earnestness, but at the same time an exiled priest of the temple of Jerusalem in Babylonia made the beginning. He designed a theory of worship, as he thought it should be, if the Jews would again return to their native country. Naturally we ask if the Mosaic law, as we have it at present, was long ago already existing and divinely

given, what right did Ezekiel have, to devise a new theory? By him, two customs, which the Hebrews had in common with other peoples, but which were not followed in the sense as later, were made special Jewish customs, "signs between Yahveh and Israel". One was circumcision, originally a puberty ritual as with other peoples (some even have circumcision of the other sex). This practice was made by Ezekiel into a kind of mystical sign of union with Yahveh. The other was the Sabbath which the Hebrews very probably adopted from the Canaanites, who in turn got it from the Babylonians. for nomads of the desert require no Sabbath like an agricultural people. New moon and Sabbath were about the same thing based on the phases of the moon during a month. The Sabbath was of course a day of rest for humane reasons, as Deuteronomy still gives it, but also a day of rejoicing and festivity in connection with sacrifices, when the ancient Hebrews sat down, so to say, to feast with Yahveh, which the prophets had castigated so often, because such sacrificings were often nothing but carousals and debauchery instead of worship. The Sabbaths also were used for making a longer journey for which there was no time during the busy week, as the story of the Shunamite woman (II Kings iv. 23) shows. But this was different from the later Sabbath of which Ezekiel made the beginning, when the law forbade even to kindle a fire in the dwellings. The Sabbath from now on began to be a perfectly rigid ascetical performance. In this case as in many other instances we see that penance for the past became the slogan for the future. After Ezekiel, it may be inserted here, another reason for keeping the Sabbath was developed, namely because God rested on that day. The proof for this lies in the fact that *rakia*, Hebrew for "firmament", as it occurs in Gen. i. is a late Hebrew word, and was first used in that sense by Ezekiel. The idea of the heavens as a firmament, was a Babylonian idea. As the book of Ezekiel shows, the author was thoroughly imbued with Babylonian ideas and imagery, naturally due to the surroundings in which he lived. In his fantastic vision of the new future temple in Jerusalem he borrows from Babylonian temple figures and architecture and at the same time proves that he knew nothing of a binding Mosaic law. The altar, that is to be in the new temple, has steps leading up to it, a matter strictly forbidden in some of the oldest portions (Exod. 20, 26) of the law, dating from the time, when the early primitive Hebrews only knew of altars of earth and unhewn stones. Ezekiel, a former

priest of Solomon's royal temple, prefers an altar with steps, as that temple had.

Ezekiel also makes the first distinction between Levites and priests at the temple in Jerusalem. The Levites which had till then served as priests at the different sanctuaries of Yahveh outside of Jerusalem, shall according to his theory in the new temple after the exile only be temple servants, the priests shall be the descendants of Zadok, the priest whom Solomon had appointed as his head-priest, after banishing Abjathar, the other head-priest beside Zadok, because Abjathar has been of the court party, which intended to put Adonia, the oldest of David's remaining sons on the throne, while Zadok had belonged to the court party of Bathsheba, who prevailed upon old David to appoint her son Solomon as successor. This theory of Ezekiel was contrary to Deut. xviii. 6-8, which says that the Levites who served at the country sanctuaries, should have the same rights as priests in Jerusalem as the Jerusalemite priests, after the centralization of worship. But although Ezekiel reserves the right of priesthood only to descendants of Zadok, he does not say anything yet of a high priest, who was the only one allowed to enter the holiest of the temple once a year to perform the atoning sacrifice for himself and the whole people. This was a later development. The fiction was invented, that in the desert already God had chosen the tribe of Levi, from the rest of the tribes as a holy tribe, and from this again the house of Aaron, subjected to an elaborate and detailed system of purification rituals, to serve sacrifice, because the people could not always be ritualistically clean. Of the actual existence of such a divinely chosen tribe and only one priestly Aaronitic family we find no trace in the former history of the Hebrews till up to the exile, but only in the Chronicles, written as said 250 B. C., and with the purpose of showing that in Juda all this actually existed in order to make the history of Juda agree with the present Mosaic law.

Besides making the priesthood the only mediator between God and the people, also all the former nature festivals, as the shepherd festival (passover), in which the Israelites, when yet nomads, brought the firstborn of their flock to Yahveh and which was combined with the *Mazzoth* festival, when becoming agriculturists, on which hastily baked flat cakes (*Mazzoth*) from the newly harvested barley was eaten without leavening them, because both festivals happened about the same time in spring; further the wheat harvest fes-

tival seven weeks later, and the autumn festival, when grapes and olives were gathered, were changed into festivals of a churchly character, because the Jews had become rather a church than a people after the exile. The character of church festivals was given them, because, as was taught, God had done some great act to his chosen people in former times. The greatest change was made in regard to the first two festivals. As they happened at the time of leaving Egypt, the story arose, that Yahveh had commanded that every household should slaughter a one year old lamb (not a first born, as the English version wrongly implies) on the passover, in remembrance of the time, when Yahveh had spared all the first born of the Israelites in Egypt, because the blood of the slaughtered lamb had been put on their doorposts, while all the first born of Egypt were killed. This story arose from the misunderstood custom of the Hebrew nomads of sprinkling the blood of the first born lamb on their tents to protect their flocks against some evil demonic influences. The late origin of this story (Ezekiel still knows nothing of it when speaking of atoning sacrifices on the passover) is proved again by the stamp of the Babylonian calendar in Exod. xii. It is easily understood that later in the origin of Christianity the idea was attached to the person of Jesus by his followers, that he was the true atoning Passover lamb, He, who had celebrated this custom with his disciples the last evening before his crucifixion.

The eating of the *Mazoth* in the Passover story was explained as due to the haste, with which the Israelites left Egypt, so that they had no time to leaven their dough, while the actual cause in the original *Mazoth* festival was the busy barley harvest time. The feast of weeks seven weeks later (originally the wheat harvest festival) was in course of time celebrated in remembrance of the giving of the law at Sinai, and the autumn festival in remembrance of the time, when the Hebrews lived in huts in the desert, while the huts of the original autumn festival were those of the vine and olive yards in which the people lived during the ingathering of grapes and olives.

The Mosaic law as we presently have it, worked out in Babylonia, brought to Jerusalem by the priest Ezra 450 B. C., and the people pledged to it by him and Nehemia 444 B. C., made the Jews the most exclusive religious community from that time on. The elaborate external ritualism of this law, which became a regular burden and yoke, was surely entirely against the ideas of the first great

literary prophets, who demanded a purely spiritual and ethical worship of God. In spite of a rigid monotheism, the Jewish God was still too anthropomorphic, requiring innumerable sacrifices and atoning offerings, culminating in the great atonement day, when the blood of one goat was sprinkled by the high priest in the holiest of the temple, and the sin of the whole people laid upon another goat, to be sent into the desert to Azazel, some demon. This peculiar rite, alone occurring in Lev. xvi, and mentioned no where else in the law, nor even by Nehemia (Chap. 9), when he speaks of a general day of confession of the whole people, is a later addition after Nehemia, as there are others, in the law, and a return to one of the modes of primitive times, which we find among other peoples, of transferring guilt to some animal, bird or bug and then sending or letting it fly away, as for instance among the Tobabatacks of Sumatra today.

Hecatombs of sacrifices were to be brought, in spite of the teachings of the first great prophets, for still several hundreds of years in the temple of Jerusalem till another prophet, Jesus of Nazareth, taught in the similar spirit as they, but also to be heeded as little as they. His death was interpreted by his followers as the complete absolute atonement, which once for all times should make an end of all sacrifices. The destruction of the second temple 70 A. D. by the Romans accomplished what the destruction of the first temple by the Babylonians 588 B. C. did not accomplish, the abolition of all external sacrifices for Judaism forever.

(To be continued)

THE SOUL OF ISLAM

BY AMOS I. DUSHAW

THE study of comparative religion has taught us to appreciate the religions of other civilizations, and also has enabled us to understand the fuller meaning of it, so that, we of the Occident, no longer divide humanity into two classes: Christians and Heathens. We realize today, as we never did before that all religions are fundamentally one, each phase of it having developed along different lines. The writer of the Fourth Gospel sensed this when he wrote, "There was the true light, even the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world." This noted Christian writer and propagandist of the first century, coming face to face with the ancient religions of Rome, Greece, and Egypt, and other religions of the East, saw that all religions are like moons, which shine by reflected light, but back of them all is a common, central sun, the source of all religious truth. Hitherto, Christians of all sects have refused to recognize the spiritual and moral value of other religions, including Islam. This attitude of Christians towards Islam finds its fullest expression in the Collect for Good Friday as found in "The Book of Common Prayer," "O Merciful God, who hast made all men, and hatest nothing that thou hast made, nor desirest the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live; have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics; and take from them all ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt for thy Word." But such opinions have been changed, and for the good of all, due to a better knowledge of Religion as a whole. The modern missionary goes out to meet the followers of other religions with a nobler spirit than did the missionary of a generation ago. His purpose is not to save heathens, so-called, from a hell of fire, but to share with them the fruits of different civilizations. He knows that the representative of one civilization to another civi-

lization has something to receive as well as to give. This attitude is a healthier one, and brings about better results. It makes for union and harmony rather than for separation and dissention.

"Allah akbar, God is great," is the foundation and corner-stone of Islam. To the Moslem it means complete submission to Allah, for this world and for the next. The true Moslem would not find it difficult to understand the sentiments of Job when he said, after he lost his children, property, health, and the confidence of friends, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust him." He believes that Allah knows what is best, and always does what is right. Allah must not be questioned. It is this that has made Islam a great power for the past thirteen hundred years. The chief place of interest in any Moslem city is the Mosque, with its minaret, and the Muezzin calling the faithful ones to prayer five times a day. It is a religion that cannot be despised by the student of religions. Its millions of faithful followers are more loyal to Mohammed than Jews are to Moses, or Christians to Jesus. Carlyle writes as follows of Islam and Mohammed, "Our current hypothesis about Mahomet, that his religion is a mere mass of quackery and fatuity, begins really to be now untenable to anyone. The lies, which well-meaning zeal has heaped round this man, are disgraceful to ourselves only. Islam is definable as a confused form of Christianity; had Christianity not been, neither had it been." And Renan states, "Islam is a version of Judaism adapted to the Arab taste." Carlyle calls attention to the fact that Moslems really believe in their religion. "No Christians, since the early days, except perhaps the English Puritans in modern times, have ever stood by their faith as the Moslems do by theirs. Allah akbar, Islam, sounds through the souls and the daily existence, of these dusky millions." All who have lived in Moslem lands know this to be so. The great problem confronting the ministers of Judaism and Christianity is to hold their own followers. This is not true of the leaders of Islam. The followers of Mohammed are extremely zealous of their religion, and no one dare speak disparagingly of it in their presence. The following incident will throw light on this zeal of Moslems for Islam.

I was sailing on a Lloyd Trestinto boat during the month of August from Haifa to Venice. We stopped for three days at Alexandria. This city was founded by Alexander the Great, and was for many years the leading city in the world, prominent in commerce, science, politics and religion, and is still a city of prominence.

It is the leading port of Egypt, and is really more European than African. One evening, as I was going ashore, accompanied by an Austrian, the Egyptian custom officer on the dock, searched us for dutable articles. The Austrian chanced to say something to this Egyptian Moslem that sounded to him as being derogatory to his faith. He stepped up, and looked at him, with fire in his eyes, and a voice trembling with rage, and said in Arabic, "Shoo?" "What?" I knew some Arabic, and it sounded to me as if the Austrian said something that no man should have said to a Moslem, in a Moslem land. I asked the Austrian what he said. The poor man did not know why the Egyptian looked so angry. I learned that the Austrian had said something to him in Italian, and that his words had nothing to do with religion. He wished him good luck. It did not take me long to explain to the Egyptian the meaning of the Italian words. His expression changed, his words were more gentle, and he said to me, "Any man who curses my faith dies." Needless to say, the Egyptian was not looking for trouble, and was glad to listen to my explanation. He took a few cigarettes we handed to him, and we parted as friends.

In these days, there are Christian ministers who talk about making their churches, "Inclusive," rather than, "Exclusive." But Islam has been that more so than Christianity or Judaism. An Egyptian gentleman who had studied in one of the Mission schools of Egypt explained this to me. I met him while returning from the Gizeh Pyramids to Cairo. Our conversation drifted to religion. He said to me, "The Christians are intolerant and bigotted. Who has ever heard a Moslem speak unkindly either of Moses or Jesus, but one seldom hears Christians speak kindly of Mohammed. We recognize both Moses and Jesus as great teachers. They both have places of prominence in Islam, but Christians generally insult the memory of our prophet."

What this Moslem said came back to me with great force the following day when I was visiting the Alabaster or Citadel Mosque of Cairo. I was taken to this place by an Egyptian, formerly a member of the Coptic Church, and at this time a member of an American Mission. I was walking arm in arm with the caretaker of this wonderful building. He was pointing out to me the various interesting spots. In the course of our conversation I told him that I was not unfriendly towards Islam, and was not in sympathy with religious bigotry. I said, "Let us all be friendly, and respect

the religions of others. We all worship the same God, but in our own way. Let us try to surpass each other in good deeds, and thus let our conduct prove the real worth of our respective religions, as Jesus said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." When we departed my Christian friend was angry, and said to me, "You have not been true to our faith. You have conceded too much to this Mohammedan. He has a false religion. Ours is the only true religion."

This Christian spoke for the millions of Christendom, but one who knew spoke truer words when he said, "Call it not false; look not at the falsehood of it, look at the truth of it. For these twelve centuries, it has been the religion and life-guidance of the fifth part of the whole kindred of mankind. Arabia first became alive by means of it. A poor shepherd people roaming unnoticed in its deserts since the creation of the world: a hero-prophet was sent down to them with a word they could believe: see, the unnoticed became world-notable, the small has grown world-great: within a century afterwards, Arabia is at Granada on this hand, at Delhi on that—glancing in valor and splendor and the light of genius. Arabia shines through long ages over a great section of the world."

In actual practice there is more true democracy in worship in Islam than in the Christian churches of America. I saw it in this Mosque, and in all the Mosques I visited in Egypt, Syria, North Africa, Turkey, etc. If this Alabaster or Citadel Mosque of Cairo, or the Sancta Sophia, and Achmed Mosques of Constantinople, or the Dome of the Rock, also known as, the Mosque of Omar, of Jerusalem, were located in America they would be Cathedrals for the rich. The Citadel Mosque, like all Mosques, had no seats, but was beautifully carpeted, and all who entered, either to worship or to visit had to cover their shoes with sandals before entering. This applied to rich as poor. Having no seats it meant that within this House of God there were no reserved seats. The worshippers, rich and poor, knelt on the richly carpeted floor, and prayed to Allah, fully conscious that Allah was no respecter of persons. In his presence they all are equal. Within this House of God there was no evidence of pride of wealth or race. Not only do poor as well as rich feel at home here, but there is no color line drawn. In one of the choicest corners of this cathedral-like building I saw a poor, filthy Moslem beggar, clad in rags, kneeling and quietly worshipping Allah. He did not feel out of place there. It was his

spiritual home. Is it any wonder then that Islam has made such tremendous progress among the races of Asia and Africa, in the past, and also at the present time? It goes forth with the true spirit of brotherhood. Its success in its missionary efforts is most phenomenal. All Christian missionaries engaged in similar effort in Africa know that in Islam they encounter a most formidable rival. A French Protestant missionary, speaking of the missionary zeal and success of the Sennussi members said, "We see Islam on its march, sometimes slowed down but never stopped, toward the heart of Africa. Despite all obstacles encountered, it tirelessly pursues its way. It fears nothing. Even Christianity, its most serious rival, Islam regards without hate, so sure is it of victory. While Christians dream of the conquest of Africa, the Mohammedans do it." An English writer said, "Mohammedanism is making marvelous progress in the interior of Africa. It is crushing paganism out. Against it the Christian propaganda is a myth."

How are we to explain this? Islam both in theory and practice removes all racial barriers. This is true of Christianity only in theory, but not in practice. I have met hosts of Oriental converts to Christianity who feel that in Christianity they face a double-standard, and that Christianity,—the Christianity of the West fails to break down racial barriers. In many instances native churches have been denied self-government, and the native workers, no matter how efficient, have been denied a compensation for their services equal to that of the missionary from the West. I have known some who have gone into other callings, because they have refused to be considered inferior. In addition to this the only propagandists of the Christian faith have been paid missionaries, whereas every Moslem in pagan lands is a missionary. A writer on the subject said, "Islam, like any great faith, and insight into the essence of man, is a perfect equalizer of men: the soul of one believer outweighs all earthly kingships; all men, according to Islam too, are equal." It is a religion of compassion. Mohammed insists not on the propriety of giving alms, but on the necessity for it; he marks down by law how much you are to give, and it is at your peril if you neglect it. The tenth part of a man's annual income, whatever it may be, is the property of the poor, of those that are afflicted and need help.

It is a man's, as well as a woman's, religion. The Christian clergy of every sect know how difficult it is to command the deep-

est interest and fullest cooperation of their men. How many Christian churches would cease to exist if the women did not take a commanding part to keep them alive. Not so with Islam. At every regular service the men are present in large numbers. Men are the backbone of Islam. Christian leaders of every sect are telling us that the American Protestant Church is in danger of disintegration because of the spirit of indifference on the part of the majority of its followers. That religion has been banished from the homes, and that the Bible is not read, and that millions of children are not receiving instruction in the Christian religion. But Mohammedans cannot be accused of having lost interest in their religion.

Where is Allah? The Moslem would have no difficulty to understand the meaning of the words of Jesus to the woman of Samaria. This woman was a typical modern denominationalist, confining God into sectarian spaces, and within prescribed creeds. Jesus said to her, "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth." To Moslems God is a spirit in reality, present everywhere, and when the stated hour for worship comes, not only on Sunday, but five times a day, they go down on the knees and worship Allah. He is neither afraid nor ashamed to do it in the presence of others. They do it on the sandy and desolate desert, in the crowded market place, on the deck of steamers and on running trains.

I was one of a party travelling on a special train from Asswan to Luxor. The weather was terribly hot, sultry, and dusty, and we were all more or less exhausted. The cars with special colored glass windows to keep out the blinding glare of sand and sun. Large quantities of iced-drinks were consumed, and none of us were in conversational moods. About three o'clock in the afternoon, I stepped out for a moment on the rear platform of our car, and there I saw a sight that thrilled me. One of the dining car waiters, a Moslem, was saying his afternoon prayer. Totally oblivious to everybody and everything, he was kneeling, rising, and stretching out his hands, and praying very quietly. But this was not an uncommon sight. It is such zeal that makes Islam the mightiest religion of today.

Couple this zeal with its spirit of brotherhood, and one can

easily understand the secret of its power. A Christian missionary writes of the spirit of brotherhood in Islam, "The bond of Brotherhood is more real in the world of Islam than in the world of Christianity." An Englishman writes, "The bonds of unity and brotherliness bind together different races in Mohammedanism. Islam is today closer knit together than Christendom was even in the times of the medieval crusades." Stoddart writes, "The bond between Moslem and Moslem is today much stronger than between Christian and Christian. There has been no single instance where a people, once became Moslem, has ever abandoned its faith."

Contrast this spirit of brotherliness in the Mohammedan world with the terrible world-wide race prejudice of the Christian world. Christendom is like a house divided against itself; divided by race, class, creed, and nationality. A Moslem's country is the whole of Islam. Wherever Allah is worshipped there he is at home, regardless of race, class, or nationality. Whereas in Christendom nationality is the great barrier dividing Christians. A Protestant, or a Roman Catholic, is a foreigner everywhere when he is away from his native land.

It is a simple religion, not primarily a religion for theologians. Like Judaism, it is strictly a Monotheistic faith, but surpassing Judaism in its catholicity. All of the conflicting Christian theologies are totally alien to its spirit. It has none of the thousand and one theories and dogmas which have obscured the character and mission of the founder of Christianity, and turned Christendom into warring camps, hating and slaughtering one another because of different theologies. Islam has both suppressed and destroyed many worthless idolatries and quarreling Christians sects of the East. Carlyle says, "Mahomet's creed, if we look at the wild rapt earnestness with which it was believed and laid to heart, I should say a better kind than that of those miserable Syrian sects, with their vain janglings about homoiousion and homoousion, the head full of worthless noise, the heart empty and dead! Islam devoured all these vain juggling sects; and I think had right to do so." H. G. Wells calls attention to this aspect of Islam as contrasted with what is generally known as Christianity. "Islam from the outset was fairly proof against the theological elaborations that have perplexed and divided Christianity and smothered the spirit of Jesus. It was not simply a new faith, a purely prophetic religion, as the religion of Jesus was in the time of Jesus, or the religion of Gautama in the

lifetime of Gautama, but it was so states as to remain so. Islam to this day has learned doctors, teachers, and preachers; but it has no priests. All sacrifice was barred to the faithful; no loophole was left for the sacrificial priest of the old dispensation to come back into the new faith. Without any ambiguous symbolism, without any darkening of altars of chanting priests. Mohammed had brought home those attractive doctrines to the hearts of mankind."

Mohammed refused to claim for himself the power to work miracles. He says of himself, "I can work no miracles. I? I am a public preacher; appointed to preach this doctrine to all creatures." What is it? Monotheism pure and simple, the destruction of idolatry, purity of life, compassion, etc. In a word, simple doctrines which the most illiterate can understand. On the other hand, to Mohammed, the whole of nature, and every manifestation of nature is one continuous miracle. He sees the hand of God in the earth, the clouds, the seas, the animals that minister to the comforts of man, every stage of life, from the cradle to the grave, and the nobler emotions of the heart. He does not claim to differ from other men. He is simply a preacher of great fundamental truths.

Its fraternal spirit is also seen in all of its social relations. The deep chasms which separate the classes in Christendom do not exist in Moslem circles. I am referring especially to the relationships that exist in Mohammedan homes between masters and servants. In the vast majority of homes in America, or for that matter in Christian Europe there exists an almost unbridgeable gulf between masters and servants. In America it is next to impossible to get Americans to enter this line of service, because they do not wish to be treated merely as menials. American young women prefer the factory and store to service in homes, in spite of the fact that the latter form of work offers better remuneration. The same is true of American men. The servants in the wealthy homes, from the butler to the chore boy, are generally of European birth. But in the average Mohammedan homes this line of cleavage between masters and servants does not exist. In the Mohammedan homes, not only do we find a spirit of rare politeness on the part of servants, but it is very noticeable that these servants do not consider themselves merely as servants, but as members of the household. They expect to be treated with courtesy. The master is in reality the father of the entire household. In my journeys through the East I have always found the servants obliging, courteous, and never

too subservient. They are never too familiar, never overstep the bounds of propriety, and always appreciate generous treatment at the hands of Occidentals. The following will throw some light on this matter.

Three of us, all Americans, started on a trip through central Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. Two Arabs accompanied us to look after our material needs, and two donkeys to carry our equipment. We made the trip on foot. It was our plan to see Palestine, on and off, but especially off the beaten paths. It took us about eight days to make the trip from Jerusalem to the Plain of Esdraelon, and during the whole time we never had occasion to reprimand these Arabs. They were always the last to go to bed, and the first to rise in the morning, trying in all ways even to anticipate our wishes and needs. During this trip they were our comrades rather than servants, and always delighted with any courtesy shown them. I still remember two incidents of that trip. One of our objectives was a monastery, situated on one of the highest spots on Mount Carmel. It was the el-Muhraka, or the Place of Burning, where the prophet Elijah is supposed to have had his famous contest with the priests and prophets of Baal.

We reached this spot towards evening after a very strenuous climb, and when the sun sank, as it were in the depth of the blue waters of the Mediterranean, a strong cold breeze swept over the mountain. Like Pilgrims, we knocked at the door of the monastery for the night's shelter, and we were instantly admitted. But our servants were refused admittance. They were assigned a place in the stable with the donkeys. A few minutes later they knocked at our window, and told us that they were practically shelterless, and cold. They had no protection from the cold wind. We were in a dilemma for a moment. We did not feel free to ask the father-superior to give them a room, because he had already shut them out, and we did not have the heart to let them stay out all night in the cold. We took them into our room. The five of us slept that night on the floor. But they always fared better when we camped for the night at Moslem places.

It was at Taanach, overlooking the great Plain of Galilee. Here the sheikh welcomed us into his own home, placing at our disposal the guest chamber. We, including our servants, were given places of honor, and served with food, such as olives, cheese, sweet and soured milk, and native bread. All this was served not only for the

Americans, but also for the servants. We ate from the same dishes, and when the time came to go to bed, beds were made for all. Our servants were their guests just as we were.

The spirit of hospitality. This spirit is very strong with Moslems. The rich give of their abundance, and the poor give of their little. But it is free and spontaneous, asking nothing in return, save a kind word.

The typical American village, as contrasted with the typical Moslem village is cold and repellant. To the stranger, especially without means it offers neither food nor shelter. In these Moslem villages, food and shelter are offered to all, with or without means, to the foreigner as well as to the native. Every village throughout Syria and Palestine has the regular native guest chamber, known as *te Medafeh*. It is generally a part of the sheikh's home. This room is also a rallying place for the men of the village. Here they spend their spare hours. These rooms are equipped with bedding for strangers. It is next to impossible to pass through one of these villages without being urged by the men to stop for a chat, a smoke, and a cup of coffee. On several occasions our party planned to remain in the open all night, and if it happened to be near a village, the men came out, and compelled us to accept their hospitality. They considered it an insult not to take advantage of their guest chamber, and such food as they had to give. On parting, a little money was generally left with the sheikh, which was not considered compensation for services given, but as a little present for the poorer members of the community. But no money was ever asked for. In offering this hospitality they never enquired one's creed or race.

This spirit of hospitality is not only to be found in the villages, but also in the cities. Every Moslem home incarnates it. About ten of us made a special visit to the home of a Moslem squire in northern Galilee. He was a man of much wealth and had many wives. He seemed really a patriarchal character. The day before we arrived his place was attacked by a band of robbers from Syria. The four native policemen he had with him ran away, but he rallied his sons and servants and defeated these robbers. His place was a Garden of Eden. Everything was well arranged, with shaded gardens and waters flowing through the midst of them. In one such bower there were tables, all for the benefit of friends and passing visitors. When we arrived this spacious spot was placed at our disposal. In the midst of this bower was a channel of flow-

ing water. Here we spent a most delightful afternoon. Our host gave us olives, oranges, grapes, and coffee. Later in the afternoon the ladies of our party were asked to visit his wives. One of our party, an Englishman said, "Imagine an English squire of his wealth and standing opening his home to a band of passing strangers!"

I have been entertained at the homes of those prominent in governmental, educational, and religious circles, and in the homes of the poorer people, and everywhere the same spirit of courtesy, refinement and real hospitality prevailed. This is why those from the Occident who have had intimate contact with life in the East are usually free from the prejudice which is part and parcel of those who have never had the good fortune to travel in these lands. The occidentals who live there as missionaries, teachers, and business man, and those in the service of their governments are also free from this prejudice. These beautiful touches of hospitality have captured their hearts.

Temperance. Every Christian land, every Christian community, large and small, has its battle with the liquor problem. So far Christian communities have not discovered the key to the temperance problem. Not so with Islamic lands. Islam is the greatest temperance society on earth. It is a part of their creed to leave liquor alone. And it is strictly lived up to, with the few exceptions of such who live in cities like Algiers, Cairo, Alexandria, and Constantinople, where the influence of vast numbers of Christians is not always of the best. Away from Christian contacts there are no liquor establishments and no drunkenness of any description.

The following lines are from a prominent American Christian magazine, "Because of its historic Moslem attitude against intoxicating drink, and because practically the entire liquor business in Constantinople is in the hands of non-Moslems, or "Christians" as they are officially classed, it is quite natural that drink should be the principal target against which Turkish reform activities are directed. And drink is the vulnerable point that is open to attack by the Turk. In a survey made of Constantinople under the direction of Clarence Richard Johnson, professor of sociology of Robert College, and published by the Macmillan company, the following facts were given as regards the liquor problem of that city. Of the 1413 liquor places, 1,169 were Greek, 97 Turkish, 57 Armenian, 44 Russian, and 17 Jewish."

This investigator also reported the social vice of Constantinople,

and here again we see that Islam has had ennobling influences. He reported that of the 175 houses of vice, 79 were Greek, 45 Jewish, 35 Armenian, and 11 Turkish. Of the inmates of these places actually canvassed by the investigators, 386 were Greeks, 125 Jewish, 91 Armenians, and 43 Russian. But no Moslem women were among these. Of the 2,177 women of this class registered at the Central Sanitary Bureau, 1,367 registered as Christians and Jews, and only 358 Moslems. In view of this fact we can understand why the work of Christian missionaries in Moslem lands like Egypt, Syria, and Turkey is largely among native Christians.

We will take a glance into an Egyptian city, far removed from Occidental contacts, save with the highest class of tourists, and that for only four or five months of the year. I am referring to Asswan in Upper Egypt. The town has a population of about eighteen thousand, and is of interest to tourists because of its proximity to the Great Asswan Dam. I was walking one evening with a native of this town, and I noticed that the town was strangely quiet and orderly. He told me that this town was noted for its orderly spirit. He took me to the police station and prison, and showed me that the prison was totally empty, and that it was generally that way.

Islam has a great past, and it also has a great future. Islamic nations are coming to life again, and demanding for themselves places in the sun. Turkey has already freed herself, and become master of her own household, and is making progress in western ways of living. Other Moslem nations in Asia and Africa are demanding the same for themselves. The People of the West, calling themselves Christian, might as well realize the folly of trying to meet these nations in any other way save of real honesty, justice and truth. The West had tried the sword and questionable methods of diplomacy, and failed to build for itself a lasting foundation. The old adage, that honesty is the best policy, will certainly hold good in all relations between the Christian and Moslem. Let Christians try to approach Moslems with the spirit of Jesus, and we are sure they will make greater progress in international good will, justice and peace.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND ECCLESIASTICAL PHILOSOPHY

BY ROBERT P. RICHARDSON

IF you have a friend who is a good Catholic—the adjective must be emphasized in these impious days—and happen to walk with him past a church of his persuasion you will notice that he reverently lifts his hat. This act of homage is not directed towards a priest within the edifice, still less is it paid to stones and mortar. It has as its object the Host, the consecrated wafer which, if not reposing inside the “tabernacle” is liable to be found exhibited in the ostensorium on the altar.

You yourself, not being a son of the True Faith, may without giving offense, pass the Host with head unbared. But it was not always so. Only a few years ago in certain parts of the world, a non-believer who did not imitate the faithful in saluting the Host when carried by in a religious procession was liable to be mobbed, and in Austria, in the twentieth century before the fall of the Hapsburgs, Protestants have been jailed for merely refusing to uncover as the ostensorium passed by.

The devotion thus exhibited towards the Host is based on the theory that it, through the ministrations of a priest, has been actually transformed into the body of Jesus Christ, and one of the chief aims of ecclesiastical philosophers has been to justify this dogma of the “Real Presence.” Belief in the latter is, indeed, an offshoot from a widely held but erroneous philosophical doctrine sometimes known as Realism but better designated by the name of Noumenalism; a doctrine which regards as real, not the things we actually see and feel (the Phenomena of Nature) but things unknown and unknowable underlying the phenomena; the mysterious Noumena or Substrata.

The Noumenalism in vogue when the dogma of the Real Presence arose was of the variety known as Hylomorphism. The Hylomorphic theory holds that every thing, whether a stone or a tree, a wafer or a man, has an underlying "reality" a substratum made up of two factors: the primordial matter (Hyle) and the essential forms (Morphe). This primordial matter must not be confused with the matter known to science. The latter is what we deal with in daily life: what human beings see and feel. The former is far more recondite, and indeed in the view of the philosophy of experience (Phenomenalism) is a non-existent figment of muddy thought, the only matter that a Phenomenalist recognizes being that dealt with in the Arts and Sciences and continually at our fingers' ends.

Essential (or Substantial) Forms, according to the Scholastic philosophy (based on Aristotelianism) were what made a thing what it was, while its having a being at all was supposed to be due to primordial matter. Primordial matter was thus, so to speak, the existence element of a thing, the internal cause of its existence, and the more consistent theologians naturally ascribed primordial matter to God Himself. The essential forms constituted the characterizing element, and were those internal causes of a thing which made it possess its distinguishing characteristics. These two elements were held to underly as a substratum the attributes we perceive in a thing, and this substratum—the "thing in itself" or noumenon—was taken as the very type of reality, though human beings never came in contact with it or cognized it with their senses. On the other hand, the things which we can directly perceive and with which we are put in direct touch through our senses—the phenomena—were despised by the Noumenalist and contemptuously stigmatized as mere "Accidents", scarce worthy of attention in his theory of knowledge.

With a chalice of wine and a wheaten wafer ready to consecrate there are evident to human senses only what can be smelled and tasted and seen and felt, etc. (that is, mere accidents) and various chemical and physical characteristics (also mere accidents) that scientific apparatus reveals to our senses when the latter are thus aided. A priest now steps to the altar and murmuring a few words changes the wine and the wafer into flesh and blood—so at least theologians say. The wine and bread smell and taste the same as before, and will respond precisely as before to all chemical and physi-

cal tests. But what we thus perceive are, says the theologian, mere accidents: the "real" wine and bread is completely gone; existence element as well as characterizing element has been annihilated; the primordial matter and likewise the essential forms have ceased to exist. There remains only the accidents which by a miracle exist without any supporting substratum. On the other hand there have been brought to the altar the Blood and Body of Christ; the very same human Body in which the Logos toured Palestine nineteen hundred years ago. Our theologian admits that the bystander can see nothing of such a body, but in any event what could be perceived by the senses would be mere accidents, and the accidents which accompanied the Logos on his journeys are not here now. Here in the Eucharist, says the theologian, exist, not the unimportant accidents of a body but the real "thing in itself", the substratum or noumenon of a body, whose office it is to uphold corporeal accidents yet here does not uphold them at all.¹

The infallible Church tells us that what appears to our fallible senses as a little bread disc, just an ordinary creation of the baker, is now in reality the Body of Jesus Christ. And notwithstanding the diminutive size of the wafer that our senses perceive and the very moderate capacity of the ostensorium holding it, there is in that small ostensorium where we imagine we see a wafer, a full sized human body comprising head and trunk, legs and arms, heart and kidneys, stomach and intestines, and in short every anatomical part of a human male. Or rather, every part of a male Jew, for theologians with their usual delicacy, have gravely debated whether or not the Host contains that portion of the body of which a Jewish boy is deprived in accordance with the covenant of Abraham, and the consensus of opinion seems to be in the negative. Unsavory thoughts along such lines seem to be suggested even to the laity, for Count Von Hoensbroech tells us that when a priest he was once confronted after Mass by a woman who held in her hand a moist consecrated wafer. This, she said, she had duly put into her mouth when communicating, but had been unable to swallow, since there had arisen in her mind the inhibiting thought that she would be eating those male organs which women are not supposed to talk about.² Von Hoensbroech took the wafer, wet with the woman's saliva, and in duty bound ate it himself, for the Eucharis-

¹Sometimes it is held that even the accidents of Christ's Body are present, but that these are veiled from our profane gaze by a second miracle.

tic bread once consecrated, must not be thrown on a rubbish heap. When by mischance the wafer gets in a condition so foul that it cannot possibly be eaten, it must be reverently put in a vessel of water which is allowed to remain by the altar until the wafer has putrified and disintegrated. Then the Body of Christ will have departed, and the putrid liquor, having no trace of divinity in it, may be discarded.

The miracle of Transubstantiation of course, carries with it Multilocation of Christ's Body, since the latter, at one time, is being exhibited on the altars of thousands of churches scattered over the globe. To the theological mind however, being in different places at the same time offers no difficulty; the feat has been accomplished tradition tells us, by various saints. In the case of Saint Alphonsus of Liguori bilocation is so well authenticated that the legend, says modern Catholic authority, "cannot be arbitrarily cast aside as untrustworthy."² And not only is Christ's Body on different altars at one and the same time: it is even multilocated within a single wafer. For the tiniest crumb that can be broken off from a consecrated Host, every particle that can be detached down to the *minimum divisibile*, is the integral Body of Christ with its entire organization of full sized limbs and members. To a heretic this may seem impossible, but, as Guimond (who wrote against the heretic Berenger) tells us: "It is only to sense that a single part of the Host appears less than the whole, but our senses often deceive us. I acknowledge that there is a difficulty in comprehending this, but there is no difficulty in believing it." Here the heretic may perhaps feel like repeating what Winnington said to his Catholic friend, Lord Stafford, "Damn it, what a religion is yours! They let you eat nothing and yet make you swallow everything!" But the doctrine of the Totality of the Real Presence is not yet exhausted, and gives the believer still more to swallow. In preliminary explanation it must be noted that the Hypostatic Union joined the Logos, the Divine Soul, to a human body and likewise to a human soul. For by the Diphysite dogma Jesus Christ has not one but two souls,

²See *Fourteen Years a Jesuit*, by Count Paul Von Hoesbroeck, translated by Alice Zimmern, Vol. II, p. 23.

³Prof. Joseph Pohle in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, article *Eucharist*, p. 584. This authoritative work was published under the auspices of Cardinal Gibbons, 1907-1914. Any reader who may feel a misgiving as to whether the doctrine of Transubstantiation is fairly presented by the present writer is advised to consult the volumes of this product of Catholic thought.

welded together so to speak, but yet not fused into one, being so distinct that by the Dithelite variety of Diphysitism (the only variety that Rome sanctions in these days) Christ has two distinct Wills—which fortunately never conflict. The Hypostatic Union, theologians assure us, was dissolved but once, namely at the crucifixion, the cry on the cross, “My God, My God, Why hast thou forsaken me?” being sometimes interpreted as a reproach addressed to the Logos by the Human Soul of Jesus. After three days the Logos returned and the resurrection took place and ever since then the Union has remained unbroken. And hence Catholic theologians argue, quite logically, that each little crumb of apparent bread is at once the Logos, the Human Soul of Jesus and His entire Body! Nothing daunted the faithful churchman swallows all this without flinching, and apparently accepts the dictum of that learned divine who at the Council of Constance said to Hus that if the Council told him he only had one eye he ought to believe it, even though he knew he had two!

It is obvious that those philosophies which take a phenomenalistic stand and deny the existence of “matter” (in the noumenalistic sense), and the existence of essential forms as well, are in inevitable antagonism to the Real Presence doctrine and to the religions that uphold it. An example of this is found in the philosophy of Bishop Berkeley, who denied the existence of any noumenal substratum, and took as the touch-stone of reality Perceptibility. With all bodies, he contended, the *esse est percipi*. This philosophy cannot possibly be reconciled with the teachings of Catholicism, and Arthur Collier, Berkeley’s contemporary, who in his *Clavis Universalis* took much the same ground as the bishop, pointed out as one advantage of these teachings that they do overthrow the dogma of Transubstantiation. Berkeley himself was less explicit, though he must have seen the trend of his arguments. His bow was bent, however, not against the Hylomorphists, but against the Cartesians who, subdividing the attributes of the bodies perceived by our senses into “Primary” and “Secondary”, ascribed the former to the substratum which they called “matter” and denied extra-mental reality to the latter.⁴ Berkeley’s contention was that both were equally real, or, if you refuse to ascribe reality to “mere phenomena”, both equally unreal. His doctrine implies that things are what they seem, while Noumenalists of all varieties declare that they are quite different

⁴The doctrine did not originate with Des Cartes though it bears his name.

from what they appear to be. Cartesian noumenalism, like hylomorphism has its doctrine of the Real Presence, though a heretical one. Varignon, who as a geometrician could not be very favorably disposed toward the multilocation doctrine, put forward the suggestion that every *minimum divisibile* of the Host was a miniature replica of the Body of Christ. This replica, while exceedingly minute, was a faithful copy in every respect, save for the accidents or secondary attributes, such as taste, color, etc. But this view was promptly condemned by the Church, which valiantly stuck to its guns in the question of multilocation, and disdained the idea that God would palm off on poor humanity a copy in place of the original.

The miracle of Transubstantiation has as starting point a chalice of wine and one or more pieces of bread usually in wafer form. The composition of both wafer and wine is, it seems, of considerable importance. The former must be made of unadulterated wheat flour, any substitution of barley, rye or buckwheat products being out of the question. This wheaten bread may be leavened or unleavened. Though the Roman Church prefers the former her Uniate branches are none the less permitted to use the latter. The Jacobite Schismatics of Syria knead their wheaten flour into a dough with oil and salt, the ancient Phrygian Monanists heretically mixed cheese with bread in their sacrament, and, according to Epiphanius, some of the ancient Gnostic heretics kneaded their Eucharistic dough with the blood of a child, but it would be a mistake to believe all the evil one Christian denomination says of another.

As to the contents of the chalice, it must be real fermented wine, the heresy of the ancient Hydroparastatae or Aquarians, who used plain water, and that of certain modern heretics who take unfermented grape juice, being equally reprehensible. The wine must not have turned sour, since vinegar is not a valid material. It must be the pure and unadulterated product of the grape, reinforced, if this be thought desirable with spirits that have been distilled off from pure grape wine. In this way the alcoholic contents may be brought up to eighteen per cent, which rather generous limit has been fixed as the maximum. It has not always been easy to carry out the canonical regulations and in the early days of Christianity these were even a source of danger to the faithful. In time of persecution if a man, known to be of sober habits, was, at an early hour in the morning, found redolent of wine, the authori-

ties drew the inference that he was a Christian who had just communicated and he was promptly arrested. The rise of Islam to the overhand in Christian communities was likewise a source of difficulties. Thus in Egypt in the tenth century the Moslems adhering to the anti-alcoholic fanaticism of their prophet, destroyed all the vineyards and absolutely prohibited the making or importing of wine. And for the Eucharistic Sacrament the Copts had to import raisins and make a simulacrum of wine from these, though their early canons forbade the use of such a product. American politicians under Prohibition have proved less intransigent in this respect, for notwithstanding the Eighteenth Amendment they allow the use of real wine in the Eucharistic ceremonies.

To perform the Eucharistic miracle a "real" priest is necessary; one who has had this and other miraculous powers transmitted to him through the apostolic succession, and Protestant ministers, unless they happen to have been ordained by a bishop of proper spiritual pedigree, are void of the power. The ecclesiastics who are understood to possess it are naturally not given to self-depreciation, and just before the Reformation, priests would sometimes boast that they were greater than the Virgin Mary, as she gave birth to her Creator only once, while they created their Creator every time they said Mass. To speak of creation taking place in Transubstantiation really seems in harmony with the customary ecclesiastical statement that the noumenon of the bread is "changed into" the noumenon of the Body. The phrase "change into" would certainly imply production of something; not merely bringing an already existing noumenon to the altar. But the latter is evidently what is understood to take place, for it is held that the incoming noumena of Body and Blood already exist, and there can thus be no "change into" but at most (that is, if the old noumena are supposed to be merely driven away) an exchange, while if the old pair of noumena are deemed to be destroyed neither "exchange" nor "change into" is the proper description of the process.

While Transubstantiation can, it is held, be brought about only by a duly ordained priest, the laity sometimes thought the virtue resided in the mere words that were uttered, and the clerical habit of mumbling at Mass was interpreted as an endeavor to keep the common herd from learning the magic ritual. There was even a legend to account for the necessity of secrecy. Once, it was said, some poor peasants had mastered the hocus pocus (as it was called

by corruption of the words *Hoc est corpus*) and had committed the horrid sacrilege of using the formula to change their frugal daily fare of bread into meat. Such fables were not believed by philosophers, who denied that the Eucharist had the nourishing qualities of meat and blood, and sometimes even declared it did not nourish as the original bread and wine would. For, said they, the accidents without the substratum would not nourish, but merely comforted the stomach or the palate by their scent. And Pope Innocent III declared that after consecration there really did remain in bread and wine a certain paneity and vineity which satisfied hunger and thirst. It was however usually thought derogatory to the Blessed Body and Blood to imagine they underwent digestive processes: hence those who claimed the consecrated bread and wine went the same way as the unconsecrated were in the old days stigmatised as Stercorarists. Zonares, a Greek friar, unable to deny the patent fact that a Host would rot just like ordinary bread, put forth the doctrine that the consecrated bread, the flesh of Christ, was at first corruptible but that when once eaten, having gone, so to speak, into the sepulchre, it became incorruptible, because after the burial of the Saviour His Body did not become corrupt but rose again.

It was regarded as important that the Holy Body and Blood should not mix with ordinary food in the stomach, and for that reason communicants fast before communion and come to the ceremony with an empty stomach. This does not however mean that an ecclesiastic need put too long a time between drinks, as was demonstrated by a priest who consecrated the entire contents of a large cask of wine in his cellar, and thus could, before he went to Mass, drink to his heart's content. Jesuitism gets around such difficulties still more smoothly. At the Jesuit school at Feldkirch, Count Von Hoensbroeck tells us, Mass was celebrated at midnight Christmas eve. Pupils who were going to communicate twenty minutes after twelve were allowed to gorge themselves with cake from eleven until up to half a minute before midnight, a Jesuit Prefect standing by with a watch in his hand to give the signal to stop eating at that time. And thus the letter of the Canon Law was obeyed and prospective young Jesuits made familiar with the methods of the order!

While administering the wine to a communicant great care must be taken not to spill any of it, and should this mischance happen, it is the duty of the priest (according to the decision made by a Synod at Cologne in 1280) to get down on all fours like a dog

and lap up the "blood" like a dog! In view of this we can comprehend why, when the laity were given the Eucharist in both kinds, the priests denounced as "beasts and ribalds" those of their parishioners who insisted on coming to communion too frequently. The consecrated wafer was popularly supposed to have magical properties, and sometimes instead of swallowing it the communicant would carry it home and use it as a charm. Crumbled up and strewn on the growing crops it was thought to keep caterpillars away, and there is a record of one man who put the Body of Christ in his beehive, hoping that all the bees in the neighborhood would come and leave their honey near the sacred wafer. The bees, history says, duly gathered from the neighboring hives and built a perfect miniature cathedral in wax around the Host, but spent their time worshipping in the church they had built, instead of making honey.

Sometimes a heretic or some one unabsolved from mortal sin would try to take communion, in which case, tradition tells us, the wafer would turn to stone in the mouth of the hapless communicant. Among the other miracles which served to strengthen the faith of the believer may be mentioned an especially noteworthy one which, history tells us, occurred at Favernav, France in 1608. On the night of May 23, the altar in the Benedictine Abbey there took fire and was completely consumed. On it was an ostensorium containing two consecrated Hosts, and although the altar burned away beneath, the ostensorium remained miraculously suspended in the air without any support whatever for thirty-three hours. The miracle was witnessed by thousands of people, and was authenticated, modern churchmen tell us, by an official investigation, records of which remain even unto this day.

Transmutation was the early name for what is now called Transubstantiation, the latter term having been introduced by Hildebert of Tours in the eleventh century. The first systematic formulation of the doctrine was made by Saint Paschasius Radbertus in the ninth century. It has been claimed that Paschasius foisted an innovation on the Church in the doctrine he expounded, but the adherents of Transubstantiation assert he simply followed the traditions of the Fathers. At all events that great ecclesiastical philosopher, Gerbert, who as Pope took the title of Sylvester II, added the weight of his authority to the teachings of Paschasius on the Real Presence, these, Gerbert declared, being perfect in every detail.

Paschasius ardently upholds the identity of the Host with the historic Body of Christ: that human Body in which the Saviour preached to the people of Palestine. He relates in support of his thesis the history of a miracle that happened in his days to a certain priest, Plegibus. The latter, after consecrating some wine (how much history sayeth not) beheld, not the drink which inebriates as well as cheers, but Jesus Christ Himself "under the sensible form of a child." Plegibus pressed the Holy Infant to his heart and then requested the Lord again to veil Himself under the appearance of wine. This request was complied with, and Plegibus was once more able to assuage his thirst. In modern days, alas! what one beholds after partaking of eighteen per cent wine is more likely to be a green snake than a smiling child.

In this ninth century the opposite view, that the Host is merely representative of Christ's Body, was upheld by Ratramnus, who like Paschasius, was a monk of Corby, and who, at the request of Charles the Bold wrote a treatise *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, and by John Scotus Erigena. The latter, the story goes, was ultimately called to England by Alfred the Great to become reader of divinity at Malmesbury Monastery, where, at the instigation of the monks (whose animosity had been aroused, it is conjectured, by Erigena's views on the Eucharist) he was stabbed to death by the young scholars. But this account is not well authenticated, and Erigena may perhaps have died peacefully in his bed.

Another pestiferous heretic in the matter of the Real Presence was Berenger of Tours in the eleventh century. Berenger's opinion was that accidents could not exist without a substratum, and he hence denied that consecration had any effect on the noumena of the bread and wine. He was sometimes understood to uphold a heretical doctrine of the presence of Christ known as Impanation, but his enemies claimed that he and his adherents rejected the Real Presence altogether. He was accused of having said: "So many people have eaten of the body of Christ that even if it had been originally as large as yonder tower there would be nothing left of it by this time!" Great excitement was aroused by this, and in 1050 four different synods of the French clergy condemned the heretical doctrine. The bishops assembled in council at Paris said: "If the authors and promoters of this perverse heresy do not disavow it the entire French army will be mobilized, and with the clergy marching at its head will attack them wherever they may take refuge, forcing them to

profess the Catholic faith or seizing them and inflicting on them the just punishment of death." Berenger was compelled to sign a recantation and to repeat this a second and a third time, the endeavor being to frame a declaration so precise that it would not be possible for anyone save a truly orthodox son of the Church to accept it. Berenger, who had written against Paschasius, was compelled to admit that the latter's doctrine of the identity of the Eucharist with the historic Body of Jesus was indeed correct. In his recantation Berenger was constrained to profess that the bread of the altar, after consecration is the "real Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and suffered on the cross" and that the wine becomes the "real blood which flowed from the side of Christ." He was forced to admit specifically that after consecration the bread and wine are "not merely sacramentally but also really body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" and that "not only sacramentally but in reality the body is taken up by the hand of the priest, broken apart and macerated by the teeth of the communicant." This last item of "physical manducation" of the flesh of Jesus is one at which heretics have often balked, but Berenger accepted it and saved himself from the stake. The Catholic Church now teaches that the Host is not a single Body of Christ, but that each smallest possible subdivision that can be made of it is already a complete body of the Saviour: hence it is evident that the doctrine to which Berenger was forced to subscribe is not in harmony with other pronouncements of the Church that never changes. And if it be asked how this can be, we can only reply by quoting the words of an eminent Catholic apologist, Bossuet: "If the Church [in the case of Berenger] said also in a certain sense, that the body of Jesus Christ is broken, it was not from her being ignorant that in another sense it is not so!"

Heresy, as regards the Real Presence, was also in evidence with Wyclif, who, it is noteworthy, was, in his conflict with the papacy, treated with the greatest respect by his opponents, until in 1381 he began to attack Transubstantiation. Wyclif very sensibly said that if you once admit phenomena ["accidents"] can exist without support in this particular case of the Eucharist, you have no justification for assuming such noumenal support to be at hand in any case whatsoever. He did not however reject noumenalism, but held that accidents could not exist if their substratum were taken away. He thus repudiated Transubstantiation, and he ridiculed another theory, Identification, which holds that the incoming noumena com-

bine with those already at hand, giving a nondescript bread-body substratum to support the accidents of the bread, and an equally composite nondescript wine-blood substratum to support those of wine. Wyclif sarcastically asked, supposing God should identify an ass and a man, whether the resulting compound would be an ass or a man or neither? Impanation, a doctrine according to which it is the Divine Soul of Christ, not His Body, that united with the substratum of bread, Wyclif likewise rejected. Aside from these two theories Wyclif at first seemed willing to accept almost any doctrine that would leave the substrata of bread and wine supporting their accidents. He specified three ways in which this could be done: First, since Scripture does not tell us the bread is or was Christ's body but merely gives us to understand that the Host is sacramentally Christ's Body the believer may make his confession of faith in these vague words, provided he does not violate the Decretal Ego Berengarius by regarding *Hoc est corpus meum* as merely a figure of speech. Second, the bread may be regarded as representing Christ's body. Third, it may be regarded as a sign that Christ's body is really present.

Finally however the Doctor Evangelicus broke completely with accepted doctrine, and fearlessly advocated the Berengarian heresy, saying that since none of the various theories of the Real Presence could be true the only thing left to do was to take Christ's words "tropically." He denounced, as Priests of Baal and Adorers of Accidents, the ecclesiastics who sanctioned the adoration of the Host. By parity of reasoning, he claimed, one might proceed to worship a grape vine, since in *John XI* Christ is twice quoted as saying, "I am the vine." Wyclif stigmatized as most horrible the thought of actually eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the beloved Saviour. He cast scorn on the prescription to fast before taking communion, saying that the bishops knew more about collecting gold and silver coins than about the Sacraments. Managing during his lifetime to escape the rack and the stake, Wyclif was condemned as a heretic by the Council of Constance which ordained that his books be burned and his bones be exhumed and these too reduced to ashes. The sentence was duly executed by the ecclesiastical authorities of England who cast the ashes into a running stream.

Wyclif's followers, the Lollards, likewise found the Real Presence too great a strain on their faith. To them it was sacrilegious to think the Lord's Body could become "rat's bread" or "food for

spiders" which, according to Catholic teaching may be its fate should the priest carelessly lose a crumb of the consecrated wafer. The horrible thought that, if the Real Presence were a fact, in breaking the wafer you broke the arms and back and legs of Christ was another adverse argument with the Lollards. Their denial of the Real Presence and other "damnable" thoughts about the Sacraments was the primary reason given in justification of the English law enacted against these heretics some sixteen years after Wyclif's death. Under this law the diocesan could arrest and try heretics who after conviction were turned over to the sheriff. The latter was bound to execute the sentence of the ecclesiastical court, burning at the stake being duly provided as an admissible penalty. Thus armed with the power of answering an argument about noumena by burning its proponent alive, the authorities succeeded in suppressing the doctrine of Wyclif. The comparatively late penalization of Lollardism was not due to any scruples on the part of the Church, which had long sought to have laws against heresy enacted in England, and in fact in 1382 the clergy had taken a step which, as Sir James Fitzjames Stephens remarks (*History of Criminal Law in England*, Vol. II, p. 443) "can probably not be paralleled in the history of England," deliberately forging an act of Parliament! The measure they desired for the suppression of heresy had not been passed by the House of Commons, but none the less the authorities published it as a law, and only the subsequent protest of the Commons prevented it from being applied.

(*To be continued*)

PRIMITIVE REMAINDERS IN RELIGION

BY W. P. MCGEHEE

AMONG the brief definitions of man that is, on the whole, the most satisfactory which distinguishes him as a rational animal. It recognizes the common nature of man and all other forms of animal life, while it definitely indicates the particular qualification which raises the human species so conspicuously above any other.

Some time after man had become set apart from the lower forms of animal creatures by the capacity to think the germs of the ideas which grew into religion were developed. Mankind conceived objects of cult. Why or how this came about are still matters of controversy.

When early man conceived of higher powers which it was expedient to stand well with, he instinctively carried over into his notions of them the impressions of his daily existence. The unseen and unknown must be greater and more powerful likenesses of the seen and known. Hence at a certain stage of man's long ascent from animalism his objects of cult were theriomorphic or anthropomorphic. Zenophanes said twenty-five hundred years ago that if cows and horses could make gods their gods would have horns or hoofs. A whole philosophy of religion is implicit in that old aphorism.

Much of the history of religion subsequent to that stage is concerned with the efforts humanity has made to shake off and rise above the cruder elements in its beliefs. Whether this has resulted from the working of revelation in the human spirit or from the progress of enlightenment is still in debate, but the historical facts are unaffected by the truth or error of either theory.

While it is wholly understandable that primitive cults should include large material elements, it is surprising at first view that the growth of intelligence has not eliminated a larger proportion of

them in course of time. But religion is timorous and conservative. Primitive man cowed before the unknown and advanced man stands in awe of it. Religious beliefs have been only modified timidly and reluctantly under pressure of unevadable conviction.

When the average person thinks to find something unbecoming or unreasonable in accepted religious doctrine, he or she is apt to hear an inward voice saying, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet for the ground whereon thou standest is holy." This whole mental region is tenanted by the spectres of ancient taboos, and at such junctures atavism awakes and arouses them and the prudent intruder is halted on the threshold.

The higher religions, and this is especially true of Christianity, have discarded many elements long embedded in them of ideas and rites originating in periods when material or superstitious conceptions dominated religious thought. Of many of these, such as incubi, succubi, werewolves, ghosts, black magic, the evil eye, and touching for the King's evil, the more intelligent peoples have virtually rid themselves. The Devil has lost his horns, hoofs, tail, and upcurving eyebrows. He is not only no longer "coming among us with great power," but, as a personal being, seems to be vanishing from belief; or, if still apparent there, sunken into a state of feebleness approaching that of Bunyan's piteous old giant Pope.

Many other minor remainders, such as the various methods of divination, the superstitions connected with the moon, the dowsing-rod, salt, sneezing, All Saint's Day, mirrors, itchings in different parts of the body, and various others, are still half believed in more or less contemptuously or somewhat sheepishly by many people. Of course these slighter residues of early ideas and customs have lost their practical force in religion, and are now significant only as showing how difficult it is for humanity to liberate itself from old cultus ideas and habits long embedded in hereditary consciousness.

A number of the familiar objects of daily life may be traced to their sources in superstitious practices which have been so completely lost sight of that the things themselves no longer carry any suggestion of their origins. How many of us when listening to church bells or chimes are aware that they were first rung to scare away evil spirits at a time when they were numerous and rampant? When we see harness decorated with ornamental metal discs, how

many of us know that they were primarily amulets against the evil eye?

Beliefs as to some questions of more serious importance, among them being those of the future states of reward and punishment, have been so much mooted and such diversity of views concerning them have developed that they may be said to be now rather matters of personal opinion than formal doctrine. Every one holds more or less individual notions regarding them, among which there is no longer an authority capable of so influencing belief as to assure acceptance of any.

The trend of thought is toward more logical interpretations of the future life. Heaven is no longer a place of dazzling brilliance, with golden pavements and gates of pearl or jasper; nor is hell a vast murky sea of burning brimstone, whose material flames possess the astonishing faculty of torturing immaterial beings. Indeed reflective minds are beginning to apprehend that light and darkness as being physical phenomena would be extraneous and nugatory in spiritual existence, insomuch as spiritual beings have no retinas, or other physical sense organs, and consequently their perceptions must depend upon the operations of faculties wholly inconceivable to man.

While a large number of minor primitive ideas have died out altogether from belief, and others remain only on somewhat the footing of anthropological curios, certain others much more significant unfortunately still have a firm hold on the faith of the major part of the most advanced peoples. To understand this situation it is necessary to go back in religious history as far as the period of the matriarchy. In that stage, certainly of motherkinship, possibly in some instances of the rule of women, the great deities were females, each one of the Nature Mother, universal ancestresses, sources of all fertility from which all things proceed. In early stages, when the function of the male in procreation is not comprehended, it is not thought that anything can originate save in the creative fecundity of the female.

When the matriarchy was superseded by the patriarchy these great goddesses were supplanted in course of time by the supreme gods of the new regimes, and fell into subordinate positions, or gradually vanished from belief. Among the more advanced Semites, owing probably to the low estimate formerly accorded to women by that race, the great goddesses were eclipsed comparatively prompt-

ly. Even among them, however, their worship did not succumb without a protracted struggle. The prophets continued to denounce the worship of Astarte as evil and pernicious down to the time of the captivity of Judah. We know from the Elephantine papyri that a great mother was worshipped as Anath in the considerable Jewish colony there remote from prophetic influence down to about 400 B. C., on a footing of practical equality with Jahweh, and in complete unconsciousness of wrongdoing. The Semites of Arabia, more primitive than their northern kinsfolk, continued to worship a great mother as Al-lat down to the time of Mohammed, and the Prophet in the Koran converted her into a daughter of Allah.

Outside the ambit of influence of the more advanced Semites the cult of universal ancestresses persisted longer. During the Roman Empire the worship of Magna Mater was widespread and flourishing, and became a serious competitor of Christianity and Mithraism for supremacy among the western peoples. In this competition it was under the disadvantage of having taken form in a more primitive age. Meantime the critical sense and taste of humanity had advanced to new and more refined viewpoints. Some of the rites of Great Mother worship may well have seemed rude and archaic to educated contemporaries in comparison with later cults. Nevertheless the worship of Magna Mater survived as a matter of record to the death of Theodosius the Great.

The patriarchy once established, religion became as Athene, "all for the father". Male gods were enthroned as the supreme deities, and the leading peoples of the world still worship them. The Buddhists, Jews, Christians and Moslems adore a male being. Whether this change has been beneficial to humanity may be questioned? However solicitous we think of a father's love as being, we feel that a mother's is more tender still. Had mankind continued to worship universal mothers instead of great fathers religions might have been more tolerant and conciliative and less inclined to militancy. It can hardly be questioned that the point of view involved has had its full share of influence in the age long subjection of women. Now that women are beginning to reclaim the position to which they are legitimately entitled in the fields of human thought and action, it seems improbable that a conception so unilateral should be permitted to persist very much longer.

Old and deeply rooted religions ideas have great vitality, and often continue to affect opinion long after they cease to be a part

of doctrine. The effects of the worship of a great mother still play a role in our outlook on existence. We think and speak of Mother Nature as a personal being legislating for creation blindly or sagaciously, ruthlessly or solicitously, according to the mental attitude of the thinker, but always effectively. As the Deity becomes more abstract and inscrutable, Mother Nature, as being more familiar and apprehensible may play an even increasingly important part in our thoughts.

The Roman Church has in some degree readjusted the unsettled sex balance in worship in its adoration of the Virgin Mother, which forcibly exemplifies the instinctive human tendency to appeal to the mother rather than to the father. In Catholic worship more personal prayers are addressed to the Queen than to the King of Heaven. With this consequence of the conception of the Virgin Mother as Queen of Heaven we sympathize because of an inward and spontaneous predisposition. It is not only innate and intuitive, but, when carried into practice, introduces a picturesque and touching beauty into worship without which it is less emotionally charming.

Sex and deity are of course rational incompatibles. Sex is a biologic provision for a necessity contingent on morality, the perpetuation of species. It is wholly unthinkable beyond the physical creation, and to ascribe it the Great First Cause, an incorporeal being, an eternal and infinite spirit, is not only irrational but humiliating to human intelligence of the present.

This attribution of sex to the Deity is perhaps the most deplorable of the remainders of anthropomorphism in religious belief. It is, however, so entrenched there that it will probably prove one of the last to be eliminated. It is fixed in our mentalities by many generations of hereditary transmission, and maintained by the portraiture of God in literature and art. The supreme or sole god of literature from Homer to our day, particularly the Grand Monarque of Heaven of Milton is a transcendent man. The wooden god of primitive art, the Zeus of Phidias, the Eternal of Michelangelo, and the Ancient of Days of Blake with the oceanic beard, are each an effort to portray an ideal of a man-god, a male being of superhuman mold and mein. This statement applies with almost equal force to the representations of divine or semidivine beings employed in connection with the public or private worship of some sects, which serve to maintain anthropomorphic conceptions. Per-

haps the Moslems are wise in sticking by the letter of the law and prohibiting all icons either graven or pictured images.

The enormous extension of the limits of science, and the development of means of communication until almost independent of time and distance have shrunk the conceptual earth until knowledge can almost hold it in its palm. As our earth has contracted in our mental view the universe has expanded but in a greatly increased ratio. In proportion as the vastness of the universe grows in our apprehension, our sense of the nearness of God diminishes. When this earth was the center of creation, the heavenly bodies merely lights suspended in the firmament for its illumination, and human affairs God's all-absorbing concern, the Deity was very near to mankind. Now that the earth is but a fretful midge spinning in boundless space, and God's interest parcelled among myriads of them, the Deity has receded from us immeasurably and is becoming increasingly abstruse and inscrutable. How far is the Supreme Being of today from the Yahweh of 1000 B. C., who fought and feasted, sorrowed and rejoiced with his people Israel.

If the ascription of sex to the Supreme Being may be considered the most outstanding and unfortunate remainder of primitive thought in the religious teachings of today, there are still many others which reflect almost as seriously on our intelligence. The great mass of mankind continue to think of spiritual beings in terms of our corporeal life, and picture them as having faculties analogous to our own. The Deity is conceived as thinking, "O Lord—thy thoughts are very deep"; as seeing, "God saw everything that he had made"; as hearing, "God heard the voice of the lad"; as speaking, "They heard the voice of the Lord God"; as smelling, "The Lord smelled a sweet savor."

The activity of the Deity which most nearly parallels our thinking is measurelessly beyond our apprehension. Thinking is the process by which rational animals reach conclusions, and by checking and testing them arrive at knowledge. To conceive Infinite Intelligence as thinking involves the self-contradiction that Omniscience may grow in knowledge. That we may make use of the same word to express both activities in spite of the disparity is due to the inadequacy of finite concepts and language. Unable to conceive the conditions and functions of immaterial being, in order to convey our notions of them we are compelled to employ the terms which express those of our consciousness of physical existence.

So far-reaching is the influence of environmental conditions on our thinking that most persons not only assume that spiritual beings communicate by speech, but take for granted the language they employ is that used by them in the version of the Bible with which the thinker is familiar. Until a time comparatively recent but few persons could imagine living beings as moving beyond the earth's surface otherwise than by flight. Hence spiritual beings good and evil were usually conceived and portrayed as winged creatures, and such they remain in the thoughts of the majority today.

That such inferential conceptions should have prevailed in the Dark Ages is understandable enough. Even then, however, some clear-sighted and open minded adherents of even the most rigid creeds could see beyond them. Maimonides, for example, the Second Lawgiver of Israel, though loyal to Judaism, yet, being a clear-headed man, and influenced perhaps by the effect of Greek thinking on his philosophy, explained such scriptural expressions as, "God's mouth—hands—feet," as figurative. That such ideas should still persist today though is occasion for astonishment until we reflect on the reasons which have coöperated to perpetuate them.

The conclusion has been ably supported that to criticize religious teachings because they contain anthropomorphic elements is to challenge the bases of our tests of knowledge. The argument is briefly that, if the presence of anthropomorphic ideas in our conception of the Deity invalidates our knowledge of deity, then our knowledge of anything else beyond experience is equally invalidated, as there is an inherent infirmity in human reason, because human, and therefore none of its conclusions beyond the test of experience can be proven to be free of error. Our knowledge of pure science, for instance, has been attained through the exercise of human reason, and we cannot therefore demonstrate its truth. But, even admitting that this is true elsewhere, it fails to hold good on its supporters own premises as applied to anthropomorphism. All of our positive knowledge, as distinguished from that which is only conjectural or inferential and cannot be tested, of existence beyond the material universe is derived from revelation, and its truth depends not on reason but on the validity of the revelation. We have no infallible means of distinguishing between true and pseudo-revelation. Extra cosmic existence is therefore wholly incomprehensible, if all revelation is false; or we do not know how much of it is true, if only an unascertainable portion of revelation is valid. It is there-

fore demonstrably unknowable. The infirmity of human reason in pure science is a supposition which may or may not be true, but which cannot be absolutely proven. It results therefore that ideas in one field of thought certainly beyond human knowledge are maintained as being on the same footing, so far as their demonstrability goes, with ideas in another field only hypothetically beyond human knowledge.

It has been inevitable in the passage of time that many of the more material elements in belief should become discordant with advancing ideas and been discarded, occasionally authoritatively, but much more often tacitly. That this process is still operative is evidenced by the rise from time to time of a new sect with a newly fashioned creed, and the promulgation of religious neoisms by individuals.

That this development should progress is inescapable and need not alarm timid minds. It is unthinkable that the intrinsic verities of religion are imperilled. Lucid thinking is beginning to take the role heretofore filled by authority in matters of belief, and the trend of faith will inevitably be toward a conception of spirit existence more in keeping with our vastly enlarged apprehension of the universe and clearer conception of the nature of being.

Heaven is no longer in our planetary zenith just above our heads, and the Deity no longer the god of a tribe, a nation, or of this mote in space on which we live, but the Supreme Being of all existence, having nothing of our physical semblance or material functions.

Human intelligence is advancing toward a more enlightened apprehension of being both temporal and eternal, and continually approximating its essential truths. Each forward step confirms the assertion of that sagacious old heathen who said nearly twenty-five hundred years ago, "The gods are unlike man in mind or body."

ANTICIPATING THE *NORGE*—A FORGOTTEN

JULES VERNE

BY CHARLES KASSEL

TO predict the wireless telegraph, to foretell the conquest of the north pole by a dirigible airship, to envisage a great war in which the United States should be engaged and place its date just *four days* before our actual declaration of war against Germany—and all this more than *thirty-five* years ago—is, as any reader will admit, sufficiently remarkable, waiving wholly aside, for the moment, less extraordinary feats of prevision. Such a performance, though viewed merely as a series of happy guesses, should have won for itself a notable place in the literature of prognostication. In reality, however, the book which embodies these triumphs of foreknowledge—or, if the reader prefers, this rare series of coincidences—fell still-born from the press, and, so far as careful inquiry discloses, the present is the first review of the work, and in fact, with a single exception, the first notice it has ever received.

The volume to which we refer is a scientific romance entitled *A. D. 2000*, published by Laird & Lee of Chicago in 1890 and written by Alvarado M. Fuller, then a lieutenant but later a colonel in the United States army, and who, as the War Department reports, died in 1924, and the exception to the statement at the outset of this paper that no review or notice of the work had been found by the present writer is an article which appeared in the *Washington Times* for September 3, 1905, in connection with designs for a new type of submarine boat submitted by the author of *A. D. 2000* and then under consideration by the Board of Construction of the United States Navy—a vessel which the inventor called the “auto-torpedo submarine” and which, if adopted, would,

according to his prediction, "almost do away with great and costly battleships."

A review of Fuller's extraordinary novel, nearly two score years after publication, would not be untimely in any case but it becomes peculiarly appropriate in view of the passage of the north pole by Amundsen and his associates as recently as May, 1926, since that epochal performance, with the announcement of the event by wireless from the pole itself, exactly parallels the crowning episode of Fuller's story. Such a feat, moreover, was not easily foretold in 1890. It would have been a rather bold prophecy even in 1926, for up to the very hour of its triumph the world of science was skeptical of the Amundsen-Ellsworth-Nobile Expedition.

It is a picturesque civilization which Fuller describes. We behold great cities, with glass-paved streets along the second stories, and imposing structures of the same material, now malleable and fitted to thousand-fold uses. Between great centers pneumatic trains, propelled in tubes, glide at startling speeds, while in the air-ways above huge dirigibles are sailing and in the ocean depths elegantly appointed submersibles.

Many of the dreams cherished by scientists when the book was being written are realized in Fuller's story. Those already in existence, actually or in principle, such as the under-ground street-railway, the telephone, electric traction and electric illumination, are displayed in their perfection.

Daily news, in Fuller's romance, is gathered together at a central point by wireless from all parts of the world, and telegraphically set up in thousands of cities at one operation by synchronized machines—something which recent science has brought within the realm of the possible. Niagara has become a huge dynamo and the Gulf Stream, by a grandiose project, has been controlled so as to moderate the winters in the northeastern states.

In a piece of vaticination amazing for its approximation to exact truth Fuller places the outbreak of a great war on the part of the United States on April 2, 1917. It was on April 6, 1917—just four days after—that our country entered the World War. It is true the struggle, as foretold by Fuller, was with England, but it is fair to forgive this error in view of the uncanny nearness to exactitude in time.

The automobile of the twenty-first century is not the gasoline motor-car but the electric motor car, drawing its power, as does the

electric railway locomotive and the electric street railway of that distant period, from small but tremendously powerful storage batteries,—an ideal in the electrical field which in our own time still awaits the wizardry of science.

The gasolene motor-car seems not to fall within the author's ken. It is well, however, to be patient. Before the dawn of *A. D.* 2000, perhaps, Fuller's vision may be a reality and the gasolene automobile of today—complicated, noisy, dangerous and wasteful of power as it is—may have become a memory and a tale. The quest for the secret of storing powerful and long-lived electrical charges within small space is still on and when that quest is rewarded the electric automobile—simple, safe, silent and swift—should speedily replace the present less perfect instrument. Meanwhile, let us say, for the prophet's credit, that even the electric automobile with its present limitations did not appear until 1892, according to the *Encyclopedia Americana*—two years after the publication of Fuller's book—and did not attract general attention until 1900.

Gasolene itself, if that source of energy fell at all within Fuller's vision, gives place to a synthetic gas of great power created by laboratory methods. The application of gasolene, indeed, to extensive and varied uses in our day the prophet passes by. So, the immense use of the phonograph in the business and musical life of today our author failed to see, although the invention had been perfected in 1878 and Fuller utilized the discovery for a phonographic clock which called sleepers to awake. In this aspect of things, however, the author of *A. D.* 2000 was no more faulty a prophet than Mr. Edison himself, who, in picturing the future of the phonograph in the *North American Review* for May-June, 1878, seemed not to suspect the revolution he was himself about to inaugurate in the musical life of the world and devoted only a few lines to the musical aspects of his great invention.

As in the case of all prophets, in every age and clime, Fuller goes dismally awry when he augurs of woman and her future. Far behind the reality does his halting imagination lag and he fails pathetically to take account of the swiftness with which the gentler sex, once liberated from its slavery to tradition, accomplishes reforms. By the year of grace 2000, it appears, women had consented to raise their skirts eight inches from the ground!

Helium, the x-ray, radium, the radio, the moving picture, Fuller

does not foresee, nor the aeroplane, nor even the use of the submarine boat as an agent of destruction in war. However, we must beware of overworking our prophets. Never in the history of man were so many discoveries and inventions crowded into a brief space as during the few decades following the appearance of Fuller's book. Something, also, we must pardon to the spirit of caution. As to the aeroplane, it is to be remembered that experiments with heavier-than-air flying machines had proven uniformly unsuccessful at the date of the composition of the book. So, too, in so far as concerns the use of the submarine boat in naval warfare, Fuller, if he thought of it at all, was possibly thrown off by the experiment of the United States government in 1810 with Fulton's under-sea boat when the brig *Argus* was successfully protected against torpedo attack by strong netting.

Fuller appears to have completely overlooked the Spanish-American War, which destiny had fixed for a date only a few years distant. With the possibility of embroilment over Cuba constantly present that war might well have been foreseen. Perhaps our soothsayers, like ordinary mortals, are occasionally hypermetropic and the vision declines to focus upon events just under the prophet's nose.

Now and then the author of *A. D. 2000*, stationed as a sentinel on the watch-tower of futurity, nods, and dreams of things which have not been and never can be—so far at least, as our modern knowledge justifies us in speaking—and with the date which stands out so prophetically in the history of our country there are others of no discoverable significance. Thus, for example, in August, 1916, a subsidence takes place in the earth's crust occasioned by an explosion of natural gas and this produces an inland sea of vast extent, reaching from Louisville to Cincinnati and Pittsburg.

Offset against the instances, however, where the oracle was dumb, doubtful or mistaken in the magnificent anticipation of our modern wireless, which Fuller called, not inappropriately—even according to our notions today—the *sympathetic telegraph*. This was a truly daring piece of scientific prophecy, for it was only in 1886-7—about the time Fuller began his book—that Hertz discovered the ether-waves upon which the wireless telegraph and radio vibrations are propagated, and it was not until 1890—almost certainly after the book was in the hands of the printer—that Dr. Branley discovered the "coherer" by which the presence of those

waves could be detected. The Hertzian waves, it is true, Fuller does not mention, nor does he foretell their utilization in our modern wireless and radio, but the wireless itself he predicts, and this, after all, is the most we may ask from the scientific seer who relies only upon his imaginative reason and makes no pretense to divine illumination.

This, then, briefly, is the story of the singular novel which came unnoticed from the press and sank at once into the limbo of forgotten things, but which, all in all, is as astonishing a piece of prophetic fiction as can be found in literature.

CHINESE SHRINES OF HEALING

BY GEORGE BALLARD BOWERS.

CHOLERA, smallpox, and plague are always associated with China by Americans. Within the past ninety years, the many hospitals financed principally through American and European philanthropy have done much in service, and in the dissemination of ideas of modern sanitation to keep in check the epidemics that have always proven so disastrous in the Orient.

That I might myself see that progress so widely heralded by friends of China, I visited the Canton Hospital—one of the many in China—in the city of Canton, the oldest medical institution in the Orient, founded ninety years ago by Dr. Peter Parker, an American. Since its foundation, it has cost its American supporters many millions. In this institution, youths of China were first instructed in the science and art of healing. Here modern medical texts were translated into Chinese and here, too, medical research of the Orient was born. The first Chinese to study medicine abroad, financed by American Philanthropy, returned here to serve upon the staff of this institution. Within its walls, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the Chinese hero and patron of Bolshevik doctrines that have made his country almost untenable for white men except Russians, commenced his studies.

Not only has this famous hospital been founded by American philanthropy, but more than eighty per cent of its running expenses have been drawn from the same source.

My visit to the hospital proved disappointing. There was a lock on the door, the great building was deserted, probably never to be retenanted. The local authorities had refused to protect the missionary administrators and the Chinese patients enjoying American charity. More than two million Cantonese had been treated there since its foundation, yet not one has protested.

At the sealed gate of this historic shrine of healing, with concealed chagrin, I turned to my English-speaking mission-educated guide.

"Do your people miss the hospital now that it is closed?"

"No, they have a shrine of healing that is more to their liking."

A five-minute walk through narrow streets of squalor, reeking in filth and smells brought us to the Chinese shrine of healing, a large squat building of stone, with tile roof. The entrance was a wide church-like door that emitted clouds of punk-smoke perfumed with incense. Here I paid the temple entrance fee of twenty cents. Inside I faced the God of Healing, enshrined upon an altar at the end of a windowless hall lit by suppliants. The image was made of lacquered clay painted red and gold.

While we watched the throng within, a mother came seeking a cure for her puny child already choking in the nauseating temple fumes. Her first act was to exchange the family earnings of the week for scraps of soiled paper painted to represent the coins she paid. With the scraps of paper she reverently approached the shrine to deposit them in a pot of live coals at the feet of the image. As soon as her offering has been turned to fluffy white ashes, the attending monk handed her a bamboo tube filled with numbered sticks. With trembling hands, the mother shook the tube until one of its sticks fell out at her feet. Smiling she watched the monk decipher its number.

"Twenty," he muttered; that was the enigmatic answer of the god, that was the number of the envelope containing the medicine prescribed.

The happy mother hurried away, the temple rules forbade that the sick be given their medicine within the temple walls.

"What was the medicine the god prescribed?" I asked.

The monk shook his head and shrugged.

But why do the rules forbid that the medicine you give be taken here?" I insisted.

"Before the rule was made, many died beside our sacred well," he smiled cynically.

As further questioning might have deprived some one of the waiting sufferers quick relief, I reluctantly went out into the village street with its bedlam of noises and smells, wondering where I might find more agreeable evidence of China's boasted six thousand years of civilization and that century of Christian effort.

INVARIANTS AS PRODUCTS
and
**A VECTOR INTERPRETATION OF
THE SYMBOLIC METHOD**

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
Ogden Graduate School of Science in Candidacy
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**Department of Mathematics
University of Chicago**

By
EDWARD HEGELER CARUS

Cloth, Price \$1.50

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

337 East Chicago Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

SCHLEIERMACHER'S SOLILOQUIES

An English Translation

of

The Monologes

With a Critical Introduction and Appendix

by

HORACE LELAND FRIESS

Assistant Professor of Philosophy
in Columbia University

Price \$2.00

Schleiermacher's *Soliloquies*, like Fichte's *Vocation of Man*, is one of the few original expressions of philosophic idealism to become a popular classic.

This latest addition to our Philosophical Classics has appeal both to students of philosophy and students of religion.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

Wieboldt Hall, School of Commerce

337 East Chicago Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

HUMANIST SERMONS

Edited by

CURTIS W. REESE

Within the liberal churches of America there is a religious movement which has come to be known as Humanism. The present volume is a collection of sermons, which have been used in the regular course of parish preaching by Humanist ministers. The sermons are:

RELIGION: A SURVEY AND FORECAST

John Haynes Holmes, Community Church, New York.

HUMANISM AND HISTORY

Charles H. Lyttle, Meadville Theological School, Chicago.

THE FAITH OF HUMANISM

Curtis W. Reese, Secretary, Western Unitarian Conference, Chicago.

THEISM AND HUMANISM

E. Stanton Hodgkin, First Congreg. Society, New Bedford, Mass.

CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANISM

E. Burdette Backus, First Unitarian Church, Los Angeles.

MODERNISM AND HUMANISM

A. Wakefield-Slaten, West Side Unitarian Church, New York.

UNITARIANISM AND HUMANISM

John H. Dietrich, First Unitarian Society, Minneapolis.

THE UNIVERSE OF HUMANISM

Earl F. Cook, Formerly The Unitarian Church, Quincy, Illinois.

THE ARCHITECTURE OF HUMANISM

Eugene Milne Cosgrove, Unity Church, Hinsdale, Ill.

CHANGE AND DECAY IN RELIGION

L. M. Birkhead, All Souls' Unitarian Church, Kansas City.

THE SPIRITUAL VALUE OF THE ETHICAL LIFE

E. Caldecott, First Unitarian Society, Schenectady.

THE UNITY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Sidney S. Robins, First Unitarian Church, Ann Arbor.

HUMANISM AND THE INNER LIFE

Frederick M. Eliot, Unity Church, St. Paul.

THE UNSHARED LIFE

James H. Hart, First Unitarian Society, Madison.

HUMANISM AND THE GOD WITHIN

Frank S. C. Wicks, All Souls' Unitarian Church, Indianapolis.

JUST BEING HUMAN

Frank C. Doan, Formerly First Unitarian Congreg. Society, Rochester, N. Y.

HUMANISM-RELIGION IN THE MAKING

Arthur L. Weatherly, First Unitarian Society, Iowa City.

THE HUMANIST RELIGIOUS IDEAL

A. Eustace Haydon, Department of Comparative Rel. University of Chicago.

PRICE, BOARDS, \$2.50

Send for a catalog of our publications.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

Chicago

London

American Mathematical Society

Colloquium Series

NEW VOLUMES

- G. C. Evans, *The Logarithmic Potential. Discontinuous Dirichlet and Neumann Problems.* Published in August, 1927. About 200 pp. \$2.00.
- E. T. Bell, *Algebraic Arithmetic.* Published in September, 1927. About 200 pp. \$2.00.



IN PREPARATION

- L. P. Eisenhart, *The New Differential Geometry.*
G. D. Birkhoff, *Dynamical Systems.*
Dunham Jackson, *The Theory of Approximation.*



EARLIER ISSUES

(Circular giving full titles sent on request.)

- Evanston Lectures, \$1.25
Chicago Congress Papers, \$3.50
Boston Lectures, \$2.75
Madison Lectures, \$2.50
Princeton Lectures, \$2.50
Cambridge Lectures:
 Part I (Evans), \$2.00
 Part II (Veblen), \$2.00

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 CARUS MATHEMATICAL MONOGRAPHS

The expositions of mathematical subjects which these Monographs will contain are to be set forth in a manner comprehensible not only to teachers and students specializing in mathematics, but also to scientific workers in other fields, and especially to the wide circle of thoughtful readers who, having a moderate acquaintance with elementary mathematics, wish to extend this knowledge without prolonged and critical study of the mathematical journals and treatises.

The Third Monograph

on

Mathematical Statistics

by

PROFESSOR H. L. RIETZ

University of Iowa

is now ready for distribution and will be sent at once to all whose subscriptions have been received. Considerable portions of the present monograph can be read by those who have relatively little knowledge of college mathematics. However, the exposition is designed, in general, for readers of a certain degree of mathematical maturity, and presupposes an acquaintance with elementary differential and integral calculus, and with the elementary principles of probability as presented in various books on college algebra for freshmen.

The sale price is \$1.25 postpaid to members when ordered through the Secretary, W. D. Cairns, Oberlin, Ohio.

The sale price to non-members of the Association is \$2.00 postpaid and all such applications should be made directly to

The Open Court Publishing Company

337 EAST CHICAGO AVENUE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Books Relating to the Religion and Philosophy of the Orient.

HINDU MYSTICISM

By S. N. DASGUPTA

Six lectures on the development of Indian Mysticism, delivered on the Harris Foundation, Northwestern University, Evanston. Cloth \$2.00.

The Bhagavad-Gita, or Song of the Blessed One by Franklin Edgerton. To most good Vishnuites, the Bhagavad-Gita is what the New Testament is to good Christians. It is their chief devotional book. Cloth \$1.00.

The Philosophy of Wang Yang-Ming by Frederick Goodrich Henke. "Too much credit cannot be given to Dr. Henke for this translation." —*International Journal of Ethics*. Cloth \$2.50.

Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism by Franz Cumont. This book is indispensable to any theologian, since other Oriental religions besides Judaism show much kinship with Christianity. Cloth \$2.00.

Cerberus, The Dog of Hades by Maurice Bloomfield. The history of an idea. Boards 50c.

The Canon of Reason and Virtue (Lao-Tze's Tao Teh King). By Dr. Paul Carus. New and revised Chinese-English edition. Cloth \$1.00; paper 50c.

The Gospel of Buddha by Dr. Paul Carus. According to old records. Cloth \$1.00; paper 60c.

The Gospel of Buddha by Paul Carus. Edition de luxe. New edition enlarged and revised. Illustrated in old Buddhist style by O. Kopetzky. Boards \$5.00.

Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia by Lawrence H. Mills. Being lectures delivered at Oxford presenting the Zend Avesta as collated with the pre-Christian Exilic Pharisaism, advancing the Persian question to the foremost position in our biblical research. Cloth \$2.00.

The Story of Samson and its place in the religious development of mankind, by Dr. Paul Carus. Illustrated. Boards \$1.00.

The Pleroma by Dr. Paul Carus. An essay on the origin of Christianity. Cloth \$1.00; paper 50c.

Eros and Psyche by Dr. Paul Carus. A fairy-tale of ancient Greece, retold after Apuleius. Illustrated. Cloth \$1.50.

*Send for complete catalog of books on
Science, Religion and Philosophy.*

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

337 East Chicago Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

BOOKS RELATING TO THE RELIGION OF TODAY

as Preached in Liberal Churches

HUMANIST SERMONS

Edited by CURTIS W. REESE

A collection of sermons used in regular parish preaching by ministers of national reputation. Boards \$2.50.



Humanism by Curtis W. Reese. Presents religion as the quest to find facts and values to be used in the enrichment of human life; represents a complete break with the old theology. Cloth \$1.00.

Relation Between Science and Theology: How to Think About It, by C. Stuart Gager. An attempt to distinguish between religion and theology in their relations to science. Boards \$1.00.

Christian's Appreciation of Other Faiths by the Reverend Gilbert Reid. A study of the best in the world's greatest religions. Cloth \$2.50.

A Modern Job by Etienne Giran. An essay on the problem of evil. Translated by Fred Rothwell. With a portrait of the author and an introduction by Archdeacon Lilley. Cloth 75c.

The Ethical Problem by Dr. Paul Carus. Three lectures on ethics as a science. Cloth \$1.25; paper 60c.

The Dawn of a New Religious Era, And Other Essays by Dr. Paul Carus. Cloth \$1.00.

Life and Ministry of Jesus by Rudolph Otto. According to the historical method. Translated by H. J. Whitby. Boards 50c.

Jesus and Modern Religion by Edwin A. Rumball. "Mr. Rumball is independent. He does one thing well."—*Expository Times*. Boards 75c.

What We Know About Jesus by Charles F. Dole. "We deem this little book one of extremely wholesome worth."—*The Unitarian*. Boards 75c.



*Send for complete catalog of books on
Science, Religion and Philosophy.*

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

337 East Chicago Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

A Debate on the Theory of

RELATIVITY

With an Introduction by

William Lowe Bryan

President of Indiana University

Relativity has finally been explained in non-technical terms. Anyone wishing to know the principles of this theory will find them clearly stated in debate form in this volume.

Favoring the Theory:

Robert D. Carmichael, *University of Illinois* Harold T. Davis, *Indiana University*

Opposing the Theory:

William D. MacMillan, *University of Chicago* Mason E. Hufford, *Indiana University*

Cloth, \$2.00

*If you are interested in philosophy, science, or religion,
let us send you a complete catalog of our books.*

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

337 E. Chicago Avenue

Chicago

HINDU MYSTICISM

SIX LECTURES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF
INDIAN MYSTICISM

By

S. N. Dasgupta

1. Sacrificial Mysticism
2. Mysticism of the Upanishads
3. Yoga Mysticism
4. Buddhistic Mysticism
5. Classical Forms of Devotional Mysticism
6. Popular Devotional Mysticism

These lectures were delivered as the Norman Wait Harris Foundation Lectures, 1926 at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

Price, \$2.00.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

337 East Chicago Avenue

CHICAGO

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 ELEMENTS OF MATHEMATICS FOR STUDENTS OF ECONOMICS & STATISTICS

By D. CARADOG JONES, M.A.

Senior Lecturer in Social Statistics, University of Liverpool

AND

G. W. DANIELS, M.A., M.Com.

Professor of Commerce and Administration, University of Manchester

Price \$3.00

This book is designed to meet the needs of three classes of people: those in Universities and Colleges who intend to study the Theory of Economics or of Statistics; those in business whose interests depend upon some acquaintance with these subjects; and those in the public services, in government offices, and others who have occasion to deal with statistics in the course of their work. At present, the mathematics essential to the student of Economics or Statistics are scattered through different books. The authors have attempted to gather together the elements required and to present them in a concise and understandable form.

AMERICAN AGENTS

OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.,

339 East Chicago Ave.

Chicago, Illinois

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

5750 ELLIS AVE., CHICAGO

Christianity in the Modern World. By ERNEST D. BURTON. \$2.00, postpaid \$2.10.
Popular edition, \$1.00, postpaid \$1.10.

New Testament scholar, leader in denominational and missionary enterprise, and exemplar of the practical Christian life—these aspects of Ernest D. Burton were all reflected in his public utterances. A group of them have here been gathered together.

Jesus and Our Generation. By CHARLES W. GILKEY. \$2.00, postpaid \$2.10.

Forty-thousand people in six great student centers in India heard Dr. Gilkey's interpretation of the personality of Jesus. The lectures which we are now publishing present a unique contribution to the understanding of the founder of the Christian faith.

The Nature of the World and of Man. \$4.00, postpaid \$4.15.

"The divine curiosity" about the ways of life and man's part in them has always driven men to seek beyond the boundaries of the obvious. Sixteen men, impelled by this desire and better trained than most of us in the ways of scientific thought, have sought and found and written down for all other inquiring minds the facts about the world and man as they have found them. Their book, *The Nature of the World and of Man*, is a complete picture of the world as it appears today in the light of man's increased understanding.

Principles of Christian Living. By GERALD BIRNEY SMITH. \$2.00, postpaid \$2.10.

Ethics is not just a principle about which to theorize; it is one to be applied. This is the theme of Dr. Smith's book on Christian ethics. His aim is to indicate the motives which enter into Christian living as the individual finds himself a member of various groups in actual life.

The Psalms. *Newly translated from the Hebrew* by J. M. POWIS SMITH. \$3.00, postpaid \$3.15.

Dr. Smith's purpose is to express as completely and accurately as limitations of language permit the thought and feeling of the original—to incorporate the scholarship of recent decades. In this clear, uncorrupted version are disclosed, unhampered, the beauties and true meaning of the world's greatest hymnbook.

The New Testament. By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. \$1.00 to \$3.00, postage 10c extra.

Continued interest in this modern translation has been met by the publication of seven different editions in styles to suit every purse and every need. The popular edition is bound in cloth, pocket size. The pocket and regular size editions are bound in cloth, leather or morocco.

The Formation of the New Testament. By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. \$1.50, postpaid, \$1.60.

The well-known translator of the New Testament has given us an account of still another phase of the compilation of the New Testament. Here is the complete story of the ebb and flow of the New Testament books through the middle ages, the Reformation, and on down to our own day.

The Story of the New Testament. By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. \$1.50, postpaid \$1.60.
Popular Edition \$1.00, postpaid \$1.10.

It tells who wrote the New Testament and when and where and how. This book presents in a vivid and popular manner the situations out of which the New Testament books arose, the actual conditions of early Christian life which caused the writing of each book, and the manner in which each writer met the problems before him.

The Religion of the Psalms. By J. M. POWIS SMITH. \$1.75, postpaid \$1.85.

The Religion of the Psalms gives an understanding of the purpose for which the Psalms were written and of their function in the Jewish community.

The University of Chicago Press

5750 Ellis Ave., Chicago

Publishers: WILLIAMS & NORGATE, London—G. E. STECHERT CO., New York—FELIX ALCAN, Paris—Akad. Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig—NICOLA ZANICHELLI, Bologna—RUIZ HERMANOS, Madrid—RENASCENCA PORTUGUESA, Porto—THE MARUZEN COMPANY, Tokyo.

“SCIENTIA”

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC SYNTHESIS

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

Editor: EUGENIO RIGNANO

- 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, and in particular on relativity; On the contribution that the different countries have given to the development of various branches of knowledge; On the more important biological questions, and in particular on vitalism; On the social question; On the great international questions raised by the World War*), 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: DR. 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