

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 15.—July, 1883.

I.

MODERN MIRACLES.

WE have not to argue in this paper the abstract possibility of miracles, nor to defend the historic verity of the Gospel and apostolic miracles. Our question lies within the circle of the miraculous. The principal form in which it arises in our day, is the claim to the power of healing the sick by the prayer of faith. This claim is preferred upon scriptural, rational, and historical grounds.

The main positions assumed in its defence are the following :

1. There is no evidence that miraculous gifts were ever withdrawn by God from the Church.
2. The promises of miraculous power given to the first disciples and apostles were for the *whole* Church of *every* age.
3. God is clearly revealed by His word as the Healer of the body no less than as the Saviour of the soul.
4. The reason why the Church does not now enjoy these miraculous powers in greater measure is her weakness of faith.
5. The Church everywhere needs to be reshaped to the apostolic model, and reinvested with her apostolic powers.*

The most thorough consecutive discussion from this point of view is the book of the Reverend A. J. Gordon, of Boston, entitled "The Ministry of Healing," which is written in an excellent spirit, and is plausible and ingenious. A large part of this paper will be devoted to the discussion of the positions of this volume.

* Rev. A. J. Gordon, "The Ministry of Healing," pp. 2, 3, 7; Rev. W. E. Boardman, "The Great Physician," pp. 28, 117; Theodore Christlieb, D.D., "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," p. 336.

II.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE BUDDHA AND THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHRIST.

IT is a familiar fact of our times that a large and increasing class of writers on religious topics deny, ignore, or seek to minify to the utmost the differences between the religion of Christ and other religions. Of this the necessary and already manifest effect has been to weaken and break the force, for many, of those high and exclusive claims which the Gospel makes to the faith and obedience of all mankind. Hence it is that the comparative study of the various religions of men has come to hold a place of very high importance in modern apologetics. As a contribution to this subject it is proposed in the present article to compare, in particular, the teachings of Buddhism with those of the Christian religion, as regards the fundamental topics of the being of God, the nature and character of man, the doctrine of salvation and of the future, both of the individual and of the world.

As regards this matter, there are many who seem to have persuaded themselves, and would fain persuade others, that the difference between the Christian and the Buddhist religions concerns not fundamental doctrines, but merely questions of unimportant detail. This is assumed or argued by different parties upon different grounds. In the first place, there are those who—whether on atheistic, pantheistic, or deistic assumptions—deny the possibility of any supernatural revelation from God to man. This being granted, evolution is called upon to explain the origin and the relations of all religions. All alike are merely products of the human mind, working under various environments. Christianity and Buddhism thus appear to be—like all other religions—systems purely human. Of these, indeed, one may be more perfect than the other; one may have more, the other less of error; but in neither have we absolute divine truth. Both are made up of reasonings and speculations purely human, wherein there is much, no doubt, that is true, but no less certainly much that is erroneous and is to be rejected.

Others profess to occupy a different position. They adopt the language of orthodox Christianity and speak of the Christian religion as a revelation from God. But they insist that for us to regard Christianity as the only religion which may be truly so described is altogether wrong, and can only serve to evince a narrow and unscientific spirit. Christianity, we are told, is no doubt from God, and—more than that—the clearest and fullest revelation of His will that has yet been given. But so also, and none the less, are the other religions of the world, each in their measure, revelations from Him. We are forbidden to contrast non-Christian religions with the Christian as the false with the true, or the natural and human with the superhuman and divine. That may have done for a former and less enlightened age, but not for these days of education and progressive thought. Rather are we to think of Buddhism, for example, as standing to Christianity in a relation analogous to that of Judaism. Both are from God; both are, or have been, in their time and place, as lights to the world. Only, in both and in all cases, the truth which other religions set forth imperfectly and incompletely, Christianity reveals in its fulness, or at least in greater fulness than any religion yet made known to man. Thus, Prof. Max Müller* complains that “we have ignored or wilfully narrowed the sundry times and divers manners in which God spake in time past unto our fathers by the prophets”; and again tells us that “if we believe that there is a God, and that He created heaven and earth, and that He ruleth the world by His unceasing providence, we cannot believe that millions of human beings, all created like ourselves in the image of God, were in their time of ignorance so abandoned by God that their religion was a falsehood, their whole worship a farce, their whole life a mockery. An honest and impartial study of the religions of the world will teach us that it was not so, . . . that there is no religion which does not contain some grains of truth. . . . It will teach us to see in the study of the ancient religions more clearly than anywhere else, the divine education of the human race.” †

In this we shall all admit that there is much that is true. No Christian apologist will feel called upon to dispute his assertion that “there is no religion which does not contain *some grains* of truth.” No less true is it that we are to regard all the religions of the nations, according to the very teaching of the Christian Scriptures themselves, as serving a divinely ordained purpose in the education of the race. But surely it is not involved in either of these facts that all religions alike

* *Science of Religion*, p. 103.

† *Ib.*, pp. 105, 106.

must be revelations from God, so that no one of them can be called false. That individual truths are wrought into a system either of scientific or religious truth, surely does not prove that such a system is true as a whole. We may admit, what is true, that Buddhism recognizes and insists upon many indubitable truths and unquestionable duties, in full accord with the teachings of the religion of Christ, and yet it may be none the less just that speaking of it as a system—we should call it, as contrasted with Christianity, a *false religion*. Nor does the presence of such truths and the injunction of undoubted duties in the Buddhist or any other religion prove that in those instances, at least, there must have been a supernatural revelation. Revelation is not the only way by which men may come to know moral and spiritual truth. “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth forth his handiwork.”* So, also, according to the teaching of the New Testament, in full accord with what we may learn by our own observation, those who have not the law, “are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts.”† But this argues no revelation in any supernatural way from God. No more does the admitted fact that God uses all religions alike for the education of the race, warrant any one in concluding that therefore they must all have God in some true sense as their author. A parent may, and often does, teach a child no less truly and effectually by withholding direct instruction than by imparting it. In this way very often the child will learn better than was possible in any other way, from the consequences of his own errors, the extent of his ignorance, and his great need of that instruction which perhaps he had before despised. Yet, while this should all be quite plain to any ordinary mind, it is evident that these false and anti-Christian conceptions concerning the non-Christian religions and the religion of Christ—supported as they are by the influence of not a few great names—powerfully influence very many of those who write in our days on the subject of comparative religion.

The general confusion of thought on the subject is the more increased by the constant use of English terms expressing various Christian conceptions, to express ideas peculiar to one or another false religion. In this way it comes to pass that the doctrines characteristic of these erroneous systems are made to appear to the ordinary reader, uninstructed in the technicalities of Oriental theology, as only slightly variant renditions of the most fundamental and essential truths of the Gospel of Christ. Especially is this true with re-

* Ps. xix. 1.

† Rom. ii. 14, 15.

gard to the religion of the Buddha. English terms which in the Christian religion have come to have a very precise and definite meaning, are employed by such word-mongers to translate Buddhist terms, with the actual historical sense of which they have little or nothing in common, while often not a hint is given of the foreign meaning which has been attached to the words. Hence arise in the minds of very many the most woful and mischievous misapprehensions as to what the Buddhist religion really is. From such misconceptions, again, such persons commonly draw one of two equally erroneous and anti-Christian conclusions. Either, holding on to the old faith in the Gospel as a divinely-given revelation, men conclude that it is not, after all, as once had been supposed, the only supernatural revelation of the will of God to man ; or, on the other hand, assuming that Buddhism is not a revelation from God, it is inferred that if so many of the distinctive truths of the Gospel are to be found also in the Buddhist scriptures, where undeniably they must be regarded as a product of mere human thought, then there is no reason any more to attribute a supernatural origin to anything that we find in the New Testament. Practically, Christianity, in either case, is taken to be simply a Jewish form—as Buddhism is an Indian form—of the one universal religion.

It needs no argument to make clear the immense importance of the comparison of doctrine to which we are thus challenged. Is there then between Christianity and Buddhism such a degree of doctrinal agreement as to compel us to infer that they must have had a similar origin? Is it such as to force upon us—as some insist—the alternative either of a supernatural origin for both, or, a supernatural origin for neither? This is the question before us. Buddhism has been lately held forth to the admiration of the English reading public as “The Light of Asia.” If Christianity is the light of the West, in Buddhism we are asked to behold the light of the East! But if Christianity is the light of the West, it is so only because it is a revelation of the truth of God. Falsehood is not light, but darkness. In like manner if Buddhism be the light of Asia, it must be so because it also is a revelation of the truth of God. Furthermore, since truth is one, whether in the East or in the West, it follows that if Christianity be the light of the West and Buddhism be justly called the light of the East, then the fundamental teachings of the two religions must be identical. It is indeed true that the same doctrines might quite conceivably be expressed in the two religions in widely different forms ; it is also true that it is quite possible, on this assumption, that of two religions, both true, like ancient Judaism and Christianity, the one may be a much fuller revelation of the truth than the other. But,

for all this, they cannot in any matter contradict each other. If contradiction be proven, then it is utterly irrational to speak of both of them as being revelations, in any sense, from God.

Should this prove to be the case as regards the religion of the Buddha and that of Christ, then if any one will still hold Buddhism to be "the Light of Asia," he must make up his mind to let Christ go. While, on the other hand, if we admit that the Gospel of Christ is the Light, because it is the truth, then in such case of proven contradiction, it will follow that Buddhism, so far from being the *Light* of Asia, is, instead, very *darkness* and death.

Now we affirm and expect to prove that precisely this is the real state of the case. We affirm that the fundamental doctrines of Buddhism, when rightly understood, are not in agreement with those of Christ, but in direct contradiction to them. We affirm that the difference between the two religions does not lie in a more or less full and clear enunciation of truth, but in the difference of affirmation and denial, of point-blank contradiction. We affirm, moreover, that these contradictions have to do, not with unessential details, but with the most fundamental matters conceivable,—matters which must be considered in any and every religion, if it is to be called a religion at all. These are strong affirmations, but it will not be hard to make them good. Indeed, so clear and unmistakable are the facts, that it is matter for ever-growing astonishment that any who have had any opportunity to acquaint themselves with the facts, should have ever been able to persuade themselves that Buddhism, like Christianity, might be rightly set forth as a "light" for erring men, divinely given for human salvation.

1. First of all, we have to do with the question whether there be a God or not? Assuredly no question can be of more fundamental consequence. If there be a God and I fail of knowing this, I must therefore fail of serving Him. If there be a God and He has revealed Himself, even in ways of nature, so that I might know Him, then not to recognize Him and my relation to Him must be nothing less than fatal. Failure to know and recognize God, if there be a God, must inevitably vitiate all doctrine and all practical ethics as well. For if there be a God, then all truth must exist in relation to Him; and—since His will must be law—all right action must be to Him and for Him. What Jesus taught on this question we all know. He said: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."* And so had taught the Old Testament proph-

* John iv. 24.

ets before Him. They spoke of a God who formed the earth and made it; who "measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance."* So also according to the apostles of the New Testament, it is God who created all things and upholds all things, and will at last judge the secrets of all men, and reward every man according to his works.†

Now Buddha, we are told, was "the Light of Asia." What then does he teach on this vital question? The answer does not seem to be even a matter of dispute with competent authorities. "There is no God" is the initial assumption of Buddhism. To this effect is the testimony of all the Buddhist books, and in this respect it is generally agreed that the authorities, however late, do not materially misrepresent the opinions of the Buddha himself. The Light of Asia has thus no light at all to give on this most momentous of all questions! It is true that some have questioned whether the Buddha himself went so far as to deny in so many words the existence of a God, and have thought that his actual position might better be described by the term "agnostic" than "atheist." Some representations that we find in the Buddhist books seem to favor this, as some also the other opinion.‡ Thus the Rev. Mr. Hardy tells us in his *Manual of Buddhism* that "When Malunka asked the Buddha whether the existence of the world is eternal or not eternal, he made him no reply; but the reason of this was that it was considered by the teacher as an inquiry that tended to no profit."§ Still further, in his chapter on the Buddhist Ontology in the same work, Mr. Hardy translates a yet more explicit statement from a Buddhist authority, thus: "All being exists from some cause; but the cause of being cannot be discovered."|| Other Buddhist authorities, however, go further, and formally deny and argue against the possibility of the being of a God. But whether we call the doctrine of Buddhism atheism or agnosticism, it makes little difference. Agnosticism—whether it be that imputed by some to the Buddha, or that of Mr. Herbert Spencer—is virtual

* Is. xl. 12.

† New Testament, *passim*.

‡ Compare words attributed to the Buddha, translated by Oldenberg from the *Samyutta Nikāya*: "Ye disciples, think not thoughts, as the world thinks them: 'The world is eternal or the world is not eternal. The world is finite or the world is infinite.' If ye (so) think, ye disciples, ye might thus think: 'This is the sorrow'; ye might think: 'This is the origin of sorrow'; ye might think: 'This is the removal of sorrow'; ye might think: 'This is the way to the removal of sorrow.'"—*Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, S. 258.

§ *Manual of Buddhism*, 2d ed., p. 389.

|| *Ib.*, p. 414.

atheism. All agree, moreover, that, in any case, the Buddha constructed his whole system without once introducing in any way the idea of God. We read much of "the law" which he preached, but he did not regard it as the law of God. What he called sin was not conceived or represented as having anything to do with a God or our relation to Him. We read, indeed, in the Buddhist books, much of "the gods," but never once of God. As for these imaginary beings which Buddhism calls gods, none of them are held, either singly or jointly, to be creators or rulers of the world. They are only beings of a higher order than man, but like man, subject to impermanence and death, as also to sin and moral infirmity. Of any Being, even in the most general way corresponding to the ordinary theistic conception of God, Buddhism knows nothing. To the correctness of this assertion the most abundant and unimpeachable testimony may be adduced. Prof. Monier Williams tells us: "The Buddha recognized no supreme deity. The only God is what man himself may become." * Prof. Max Müller assures us: "Difficult as it seems to us to conceive it, Buddha admits of no real cause of this unreal world. He denies the existence not only of a creator, but of any absolute being." Archdeacon Hardwick says: "Of Buddhism . . . we need not hesitate to affirm that no single trace survives in it of a supreme being." † Köppen is no less decided. He assures us that Buddhism recognizes "no God, no spirit, no eternal matter as to be supposed antecedent to the world. Only . . . the act of movement and change is without beginning,—is eternal; but matter . . . is not eternal,—has a beginning. In other words, there is only an eternal *Becoming*, no eternal *Being*. . . ." ‡

Among the very latest investigators of Buddhism is Prof. Oldenberg. Scholars will generally agree that no one can be held higher authority as to the real teaching of Buddha than he. He has expressed himself in terms of the same purport as the foregoing. Contrasting Buddhism with Brahmanism, he says: "The speculation of the Brahmins laid hold of the Being in all Becoming; that of the Buddhists, the Becoming in all apparent Being. *There* we have substance without causality; *here*, causality without substance. Where the sources lie from which this causality derives its law and its power, this Buddhism does not inquire. . . . Where there is no being, but all is a coming to pass, there can be recognized as the First and the Last,—not a substance, but only a law." § To the same effect as this

* *Indian Wisdom*, p. 57.

† *Christ and other Masters*, p. 163.

‡ Köppen: *Die Religion des Buddha*, S. 230.

§ *Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, S. 257, 258.

testimony of eminent scholars in Europe, is that of missionaries in Buddhist lands. Thus the Rev. Mr. Hardy, long a missionary to the Buddhists of Ceylon, tells us that "by Buddha all thought of dependence on any other power outward to man . . . was discarded." He writes that although there are some among the Buddhists of Ceylon, "more especially among those who are conversant with the truth of the Bible, who believe in the existence of one Almighty God; while others confer upon the *devas* the attributes of God," yet "the missionaries are frequently told that our religion would be an excellent one, if we could leave out of it all that is said about a creator." * To the same effect is the testimony of Dr. Edkins, missionary to China. He says: "Atheism is one point in the faith of the southern Buddhists. By the Chinese Buddhists each world is held to be presided over by an individual Buddha, but they do not hold that one supreme Spirit rules over the whole collection of worlds." † But it is needless to multiply witnesses. Such beyond doubt is the teaching of Buddhism as to the existence of a Supreme Being. ‡ Christianity tells us of an almighty, most wise and most holy personal God, who is the Creator of the world and the Father of our spirits. Buddhism, on the authority of its founder, denies that there is any such being. It declares that there is no God. The world had no maker; the idea of a Father in heaven is a delusion and a dream. And we are asked to recognize *this* as "the Light of Asia," and are even called upon by some to admire the marvellous *agreement* between the teachings of the Buddha and the doctrine of the Christ! Truly, in the presence of this momentous contradiction, all agreements upon other points, if such there be, seem little worthy to be mentioned.

2. But the contradictions between the two religions by no means end here. It were indeed impossible that they should. For if according to Buddhism there is no God, it follows by necessary consequence that there can be, according to the Buddhist doctrine, no such thing as *revelation* or *inspiration*. To speak of the inspiration of the Buddhist scriptures, as many do, were according to those scriptures themselves, to use words without meaning. Without a God inspiration and revelation are alike impossible and inconceivable. Hence all the Buddhist authorities with strict consistency represent the doctrine they contain, *not* as having been revealed to Buddha by any

* *Legends and Theories of the Buddhists*, p. 221.

† *Chinese Buddhism*, p. 191.

‡ In the light of the facts it is truly incomprehensible how Mr. de Bunsen, in his *Angel-Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes and Christians*, could assert as he does, that "The doctrine of Gautama Buddha centered in the belief in a personal God." See *The Angel-Messiah*, etc., p. 48.

superior power, but as having been thought out by the Buddha himself. Thus—to illustrate—we are told in the *Nidāna Kathā*, that the Buddha spent a week seated in a house of gems, thinking out the *Abhidhamma Pitaka*, both generally and in respect of the origin of all things as therein explained.* So also in the *Abhinishkramana Sūtra*, the Buddha is declared to be “the supreme teacher of gods and men. . . . In him alone can be found the source of the true faith.” †

So again in the *Abhinishkramana Sūtra* we are told that the Buddha, after his victory over the evil one under the Bo-tree, remained there seven days and nights. “On the first night he considered in their right order the twelve *Nidānas*, and then in a reverse order. He identified these as one and the same; he traced them from the first cause and followed them through every concurrent circumstance.” ‡ All this he did, we are expressly told again and again, not as a god or as a superhuman being, or as a man under some special influence unattainable by other men. On the contrary, what the Buddha became, all may become; what he attained is attainable by all, and that through the mere persevering exercise of our native powers. Thus we are told that when the Rájá *Bimbāsara* asked Gautama who he was, he “answered plainly and truthfully, ‘Maharājā! I am no god or spirit, but a plain man, seeking for rest.’” § To the same effect, in the same work, the Buddha is represented as saying in reference to his own attainment of supreme wisdom :

“Let a man but persevere with unflinching resolution.

“And seek supreme wisdom, it will not be hard to attain it.” ¶

Such words, it is clear, entirely exclude everything like revelation or inspiration from any superhuman source whatever. How marked the contrast here again, with the Lord Jesus, with the apostles and prophets, scarcely needs to be illustrated. Whatever any may think as to the *fact* of a revelation in the Christian Scriptures, there can be no doubt that they *profess* to contain a revelation from God to man; that the writers profess to be speaking, *not* by their own unaided powers, but by the Holy Ghost. We read of Scripture which is “given by inspiration of God,” ¶ *lit.*, “God-breathed.” Buddha expressly professed to come in his own name; Jesus as expressly claimed to have come in the name of God the Father. ** The former is said

* Fausbøll's *Buddhist Birth Stories*, p. 106.

† *The Romantic Legend of Śākya Buddha*, from the Chinese Sanscrit. Prof. S. Beal, p. 246.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 236.

§ *Ib.*, p. 182.

| *Ib.*, p. 225.

¶ 2 Tim. iii. 16.

** John v. 43.

to have proudly claimed that his doctrine was his own ; the latter as explicitly claimed that He spoke not of Himself, and that His doctrine was not His own, but the Father's which had sent Him.* Here then again is a full and explicit contradiction between the word of the Buddha and the word of Christ. The one declares that not only is there a God, but that He has spoken to man. The other, as it denies the former, denies of necessity the latter also. No wisdom higher than the wisdom of man has ever found a voice in this world.

3. Again, it is agreed by the highest authorities on the subject, almost without exception, that Buddhism, according to the teaching of the Buddha himself, does not admit the existence of the soul. There are indeed a very few who doubt or deny this. Thus, *e. g.*, Prof. Beal refers disparagingly to "numerous writers on Buddhism who, in their lectures and articles, tell us that it teaches . . . atheism, annihilation, and the non-existence of the soul." He says on this subject that such statements "are more easily made than proved," "and that it were well if they were not so frequently repeated in the face of contradictory statements made by those well able to judge."† Proof of the opinion thus suggested, he does not, however, offer. Prof. Max Müller admits that certain of the Buddhist scriptures do undoubtedly teach the non-existence of the soul, but does not think that this could have been the teaching of the Buddha himself, but a later corruption. . . . His argument is briefly as follows: He admits that the orthodox metaphysics, as contained in the third *Pitaka*,‡ denies any substantial reality to the soul. He urges, however, that passages occur in the other two *Pitakas*, which are not to be reconciled with this utter nihilism, and also refers to the asserted fact that the doctrine in question does not appear in its crude form in the first and second *Pitakas*, and refers to the opinion of some ancient authorities that the third *Pitaka* was "not pronounced by the Buddha." He also urges that not only is this true, but that certain passages occur in the first and second *Pitakas* which are in open contradiction to this metaphysical nihilism. According to him, therefore, the Buddhist scriptures contradict themselves on this most weighty question of the existence of the soul. The Buddha himself, he thinks, could not have taught the doctrine of the non-existence of the soul; he argues, that if the sayings which teach the other doctrine have maintained themselves, in spite of their contradiction to orthodox metaphysics, the only ex-

* John viii. 28.

† *Romantic Legend* : Introduction, p. x.

‡ The Buddhist canonical writings are known as the three *Pitakas*, called respectively *Vinaya*, *Sutta*, and *Ashidhamma*.

planation, in his opinion, is, "that they were too firmly rooted in the tradition which went back to Buddha and his disciples." *

To our mind, the Professor, however, does not prove his point. As to the alleged absence of the doctrine in question, from the first and second *Pitakas*, he appears to have been mistaken; for Mr. Davids has given two lengthy extracts from two different portions of the second *Pitaka* which *formally* teach that man has no soul.† And even if we admit that the Buddhist scriptures in this matter contradict themselves, instead of arguing—for the reason given by the Professor—that the doctrine of the existence of the soul must needs be the original teaching of the Buddha, we should rather argue that such a preposterous doctrine as the contrary, flatly denying—as it does—the testimony of our own consciousness, was not likely to have gained currency at so early a date, except it were under the influence and personal authority of the Buddha; and that the intimations of the being of the soul, which are supposed by a few to be scattered through the Buddhist books, are most naturally to be explained as simply the protest of the human consciousness against the nihilism with which the religion began. The unanswerable testimony of the consciousness was too much even for the authority of the Buddha himself.

The direct and positive testimony to the fact, however, that Buddhism, according to its own highest authorities, does deny that there is a soul, seems unanswerable. Mr. Davids sums it up as follows: "In the first place, the *Pitakas* teach the doctrine directly and categorically. Thus we are told in the *Sutta Pitaka*:—From sensation . . . the sensual, unlearned man derives the notions 'I am,' 'this I exists,' 'I shall be,' etc., etc. But the learned disciple of the converted . . . has got rid of ignorance and acquired wisdom; and therefore, . . . the ideas 'I am,' etc., do not occur to him." So, also, he refers to another passage in this first *Pitaka*, wherein the Buddha is said to have enumerated sixteen heresies teaching a conscious existence of the soul after death; then eight heresies teaching that it has an unconscious existence after death; and, finally, eight more which teach that the soul exists after death in a state neither conscious nor unconscious. It is truly difficult to see how the doctrine of the non-existence of the soul could be more explicitly set forth than by these two passages. But in the second place, Mr. Davids argues that this understanding of the teaching of the Buddhist

* *Lecture on Buddhist Nihilism in Science of Religion*: pp. 140–143.

† *Buddhism*: p. 94, et seq.

scriptures is confirmed by what they indirectly teach as bearing on the same subject. In particular, he calls attention to the fact that the Buddhists have two words in their religious vocabulary expressly denoting as a *heresy*, the doctrine that man has a soul. These words are *sakkdyaditthi*, "the heresy of individuality," and *attavadda*, lit., "saying self," i. e., the doctrine of soul or self. Another proof that Buddhism denies the existence of soul is found in the fact that their opponents, the Brahmans, so understood them to teach. Finally, the parables and illustrations used by the Buddhists themselves to set forth and explain their meaning, show that they themselves so understood the doctrine of their sacred books. For example, it is argued that just as a chariot is made up of various parts, no one of which is the chariot, but which by their union form the chariot, while yet there is no separate existence, separate and distinct from these, which constitutes them jointly a chariot; so also is man made up of various parts, and when these are united, we say, "This is a man"; while yet it does not at all follow there is any essence separate from these which we should call the soul or man.* So Prof. Oldenberg, in the recently published work already cited, expresses himself to the same effect. He says that "while we are wont to regard our interior life as only comprehensible, if we are allowed to regard its changing content, every individual feeling, every individual act of will as in relation to one and the same abiding ego, to think in this manner is in total opposition to Buddhism. . . . A seeing, a hearing, a becoming self-conscious, above all, a suffering takes place; but an essence which is that which sees, hears, suffers,—this the Buddhistic doctrine does not recognize." He gives several illustrations out of the Buddhist texts, of which we may instance the following:

"Māra, the tempter, who strives to confuse men with error and heresy, appeared to a nun, and said to her: 'Thou art the one by whom personality is created, the creator of the person: the person which comes into being, thou art that: thou art the person which ceases to be.' She replies: 'How meanest thou, that there is a person, Māra? False is thy doctrine. This (which thou callest a person) is only a mass of changing forms: † there is no person here. As where the parts of a wagon are combined, the word "wagon" is used, so where the five groups ‡ are, there (we apply the word) "person." That is the catholic doctrine. Suffering alone it is, that comes into being: suffering, that which exists and ceases to be: nothing else than suffering comes into being: nothing else disappears again.'" §

* The argument in full will be found in Mr. Rhys Davids' *Buddhism*: pp. 94-100.

† Pāli, *sankhārā*, is a term very difficult to translate; Mr. Rhys Davids renders it, "tendencies," "potentialities"; Oldenberg, "Gestaltungen."

‡ Pāli, *Skandha*, including *Rūpa*, *Vedanā*, *Saññā*, *Sankhārā*, *Viññāna*, rendered by Rhys Davids, 'material qualities,' 'sensations,' 'abstract ideas,' 'tendencies of mind,' and 'mental powers.' Man is regarded as the sum total of these. See Rhys Davids' *Buddhism*, p. 90, et seq.

§ *Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, S. 259, ff.

Yet other testimony might be added, no less weighty, as, *e. g.*, that of Oldenberg,* and St. Hilaire,† but this should abundantly suffice to show how baseless, in the judgment of the highest authorities, is the opinion of a few, as Mr. James Freeman Clarke,‡ Mr. De Bunsen,§ and a few others, that Buddhism teaches the existence of the soul. If any still doubt such testimony as the above, surely special reliance is to be placed upon the statements of missionaries who have lived their whole life in intimate association with Buddhists, in daily conversation with them on these very matters. And while they tell us that many Buddhists, constrained by the testimony of their own consciousness, believe in the existence of the soul, they also agree that those who thus believe, believe, not according to their scriptures, but in opposition to them. Just in the same way is it also true that while, as all admit, Buddhism, as such, knows nothing of a God, yet men, urged on by the inextinguishable instincts of the soul, have made Buddha himself into a god, and have even—as in Thibet—imagined a Supreme Buddha out of which, as they fancy, all the human Buddhas, by a kind of emanation process, have proceeded. But this no one would take to prove that the doctrine of a God properly belonged to Buddhism as a system.

Of missionary testimonies may be instanced the following:—The Rev. Mr. Hardy tells us that “the belief in a soul is perhaps general among the Singhalese, *though so contrary to the teaching of Buddha.*” || What Buddhism, by its highest authorities, teaches its votaries on this subject he very clearly tells us. He says: “To prove the impossibility of the existence of a soul, many a long and weary conversation is recorded in the *Abhidhamma*. All thought is regarded as a material result. The operation of the mind is no different in

* *Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, S. 258–269.

† *Le Buddha et sa Religion*; p. vi. Mr. J. F. Clarke—if we understand him—seems to regard St. Hilaire as admitting the existence of the soul as a doctrine of Buddhism, because he emphasizes the doctrine of transmigration as one of the *principia* of Buddhism. For, he says, if there be no soul, there can be no transmigration (*Ten Great Religions*, p. 167). But Mr. Clarke omits to note the fact that St. Hilaire, while emphasizing the place of transmigration in the Buddhist system, was nevertheless convinced that Buddhism did *not* teach the existence of soul, and asserts this in the most explicit terms. St. Hilaire's words are: *Le textes à la main, je soutiens que le Bouddha n'admet pas plus l'âme de l'homme qu'il n'admet Dieu. Je ne crois pas qu'il soit possible de citer un seul texte bouddhique où la distinction la plus simple et la plus vulgaire de l'âme et du corps soit établie, ni paraisse même soupçonnée. Le Bouddha et sa Religion*, Paris, 1866, p. vi.

‡ *The Ten Great Religions*, p. 167.

§ *The Angel-Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes and Christians*, p. 48.

|| *Legends and Theories of the Buddhists*: p. 220 (italics ours).

mode to that of the eye, or ear."* The teaching of the Chinese Buddhists Dr. Edkins gives us, in the following citation from the *Leng-ycn-king*, one of their chief authorities. Buddha, we are therein told, taught as follows:

"The mind . . . is without substance and cannot be at any place ; . . . that the mind is unsubstantial can easily be shown, etc."† And Bishop Bigandet, of Burmah, tells us that the same is the teaching of the Burmese Buddhists. In the end of his volumes on the *Legend of Gaudama*, he gives us an abridged translation of a Burmese work, entitled *The Seven Ways to Neibban*, which he tells us may be looked upon as a faithful exposition of the tenets of Buddhism as they are held both in Siam and in Burmah. Therein we read that "in the five aggregates constituting man . . . there is nothing else to be found but form and name. We are thus brought to the materialist conclusion, that in man we can discover no other element but that of form and name."‡ Here, then, we have explicit testimony, not from scholars at a distance and acquainted with Buddhism only at second hand, but from missionaries who have had everywhere the advantage of ascertaining from the Buddhists themselves what they understand their scriptures really to teach. The testimony cited comes from each of the three great Buddhist countries—China, Farther India, and Ceylon, and from men whose names are of high authority. They all agree that the teaching of Buddhism is understood by the people, alike in China, Siam, Burmah, and Ceylon, to deny the existence of a soul.

It is indeed true that, as Prof. Max Müller asserts, much may be produced from the Buddhist authorities which—if understood as we in the West naturally understand it—appears to teach, or at least imply, the existence of the soul. This is especially true as regards what is written in the *Jatakas* and elsewhere touching the transmigrations and previous existences of the Buddha and others. The Rev. Mr. Hardy notices this difficulty, and in the Appendix to his *Legends and Theories of the Buddhists*, gives at length an extract from the writings of another learned missionary, his predecessor, the Rev. M. R. Gogerly, with the remark that among the Buddhist priests of Ceylon "there are none of authority who now dispute his conclusions." Not to give the whole of his argument, we are told that the King Milinda inquired "if a living soul is received upon transmigration; and the priest replied, 'In the higher or proper sense of the

* *Legends, etc.*, p. 211. See also *Appendix*, note Z.

† *Chinese Buddhism*, p. 299.

‡ *The Legend of Gaudama*, vol. ii., p. 213.

word, there is not.' . . . The king inquired further, 'Is there any body or being—*satto*—which goes from this body to another body?' 'No, great king, . . . by this *nāmarūpa** actions are performed, good or bad, and by these actions another *nāmarūpa* commences existence.'" From these and other like explicit statements of the Buddhist authorities, Mr. Hardy concludes—in full accord with the eminent European savants above cited—that "Buddhism denies the existence of a soul,—of any thing of which a man may rightly say, 'This is I myself.'" The unanimity of the testimony of missionaries upon this subject surely ought to be decisive. What, in fact, is to be understood by the Buddhist doctrine of transmigration, if the existence of an abiding soul is denied, Mr. Davids, in the Preface to his translation of the book of *Jatakas*, or Tales of the experiences of Buddha in what we should call his previous births, has clearly explained. He says:

"The reader must of course avoid the mistake of importing Christian ideas into the conclusions (of these several birth-stories), by supposing that the identity of the persons in the two stories is owing to the passage of a 'soul' from the one to the other. Buddhism does not teach the transmigration of souls. Its doctrine . . . would be better summarized as the transmigration of character, for it is entirely independent of the early and widely prevalent notion of the existence with each human body of a distinct soul, or ghost, or spirit. The *Bodisat*,† for example, is not supposed to have a soul, which on the death of one body is transferred to another, but to be the inheritor of the characters acquired by the previous *Bodisats*. . . . The only thing which continues to exist when a man dies is his *karma*, the result of his words and thoughts and deeds, *lit.*, 'his doing'; and the curious theory that this result is concentrated in some new individual is due to the older theory of soul."‡

And in the Preface to his translation of the *Sabbāsava Sutta* he sums up the case as regards the Buddhist position on this question as follows:

"Buddhism is not only independent of the theory of soul, but regards the consideration of that theory as worse than profitless, as the source of manifold delusions and superstitions. Practically this comes, however, to much the same thing as the denial of the existence of the soul; just as agnosticism is, at best, but an earnest and modest sort of atheism. And we have seen above that *anattam*—the absence of a soul or self as abiding principle—is one of the three parts of Buddhist wisdom and of Buddhist perception."§

We have been thus full in the discussion of this subject, because on nothing, as it seems to us, is Buddhism more commonly misunderstood than on this point. Those who are anxious to reduce to a minimum the contrasts between Christianity and other religions, or ignore them altogether, seem especially loth to admit the clear teach-

* *Lit.*, 'name (and) form'—that which is the sum total of the man.

† *I. e.*, Buddha, that-is-to-be.

‡ Fausböll's *Buddhist Birth-Stories*: Translator's Introduction, pp. lxxv., lxxvi.

§ *Sacred Books of the East*, edited by Max Müller, vol. xi., p. 294.

ings of the authorities on this subject—teachings utterly fatal to their pet theories. To sum up the case, so far is it from being true that “the soul’s immortality is a radical doctrine in Buddhism,” and this doctrine “one of its points of contact with Christianity,” as has been asserted,* that even the existence of the soul is not admitted, and the affirmation of its being is specially stigmatized as a *heresy*. There is nothing but name and form,—that is all. No God! No revelation! No soul! And we are told that Buddhism is the *Light* of Asia! Truly the words, to one who has learned from Him who is the Light of the world, seem to have a ring of irony!

4. But, obviously, having gone so far, the Buddhist cannot stop here. We have next to compare the teaching of Buddhism concerning *sin*. We hear much of the high morality of Buddhism, and, by consequence, it seems to be commonly imagined that however the Buddhist and the Christian religions may differ in other respects, they must at least be very much at one in their teachings as to sin. What, for example, could sound more like Christian teaching than the following words from the Dhammapada:

“ Rise up ! and loiter not !
 “ Follow after a holy life !
 “ Who follows virtue rests in bliss,
 “ Both in this world and the next !
 “ Follow after a holy life !
 “ Follow not after sin ! ” †

Such words as these, however, greatly mislead those who will read into the essential terms their Christian sense. The Buddhist idea of sin is as far as possible from the conception which Christianity holds forth. What the Bible teaches on this subject is sufficiently clear. We may define sin, with the Divines of the Westminster Assembly, as “any want of conformity to, or transgression of, the law of God,” or, with others, as “the voluntary transgression of known law”; or in any other way that any Christian theologian has adopted: as regards the present point, it will make no difference. For all these various definitions agree in this, that they affirm sin to be a disorder in the normal relation of the soul to God. As John the Apostle puts it, all “sin is the transgression of law,” and that law is the law of God. Even where the sin, as to its outer form, is a sin against one’s neighbor, it is none the less, in its innermost essence, sin against God. Thus, while as to its outer form, the sin of David, which he laments in the 51st Psalm, was adultery and murder, yet in his confession the thought

* *Ten Great Religions*, p. 167.

† *Dhammapada*, 168, 169. We follow Mr. Davids’ translation in his *Buddhism*, p. 65.

which above all others burdens him is this—"Against *thee, thee only*, have I sinned, and done this evil in *thy* sight."* Although this conception of the nature of sin finds its fullest expression in the Christian Scriptures, it is by no means peculiar to them. On the contrary, it is found among all those who—whatever of error they may hold on other subjects—have at least held fast their faith in a personal God. Granted the existence of such a Being as the Creator and moral Ruler of the world, this idea of sin follows by necessary consequence.

But it is no less plain, that, in the very nature of the case, such a conception of the nature of sin can have no place in Buddhism. It presupposes a personal God, who is at once the giver and the executor of law; whereas Buddhism knows nothing of any such Being. It follows from this of necessity that if there be no Being above man whose will, imposed as law, is the standard of action for man, then law, *i. e.*, the ultimate standard of moral action, must be found in the will of man, and sin can only be defined as an evil having a certain relation to the will of man. Now, in fact, this is the highest conception of sin which is to be found in any Buddhist book. Nowhere do we meet with the slightest intimation that sin has to do with any but man. That which Christianity regards as the essence of all sin is the revolt of the will against the authority of God. That which Buddhism regards as the essence of sin is as different as possible from this. The one element, which is present in all sin, is always represented as *tanhà* or *trishnà*, lit., "thirst." The word, in English translations of Buddhist works, is often rendered "lust," and thus, again, is the teaching of Buddha made to seem very like that of the New Testament; for has not the Apostle James said: "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin."† But "lust," in the mouth of a Buddhist, has no such meaning as *epithumia* in the mouth of James or of Paul. In the New Testament, it is hardly necessary to say—it is not desire, *as desire*, which is declared to be sin and the parent of sin, but desire, *as desire of that which God has forbidden*. In Buddhist books, however, the *tanhà*, "lust," or "desire," which is stigmatized as *sin*, and the source of all evil, is not merely the desire of anything supposed to be by any power or law forbidden, but desire, *simply as desire*. The desire may be of that which is good, or it may be of that which man regards as evil; in either case the desire is evil, *because* it is desire, and to be rid of it—rid of *all* desire—is to be rid of sin. Everywhere in the Buddhist books we meet with this teaching. Thus, we read:

* Ps. li. 4.

† James i. 15.

"He who fosters no desires for this world or for the next, has no inclinations and is unshackled, him I call a Brahman."

"He who, having no desires, travels about without a home, in whom all concupiscence is extinct, him I call a Brahman."*

To the same effect is the interpretation which Prof. Max Müller gives of the Buddhist terms *dsrava*, rendered in the *Lalita Vistāra* and elsewhere, "vices." He defines the essential idea of the word to be a "running toward or attending to external objects," and quotes with approval the explanation of Colebrooke, that "*dsrava*, 'vice,' is that which directs the embodied spirit toward external objects." † How wide asunder is this conception from the New Testament idea of sin needs not to be pointed out. Thus the man who, wherever he meets in Buddhist writings the word "sin" or its equivalents, understands by it what in Christendom is meant by sin, reads into the text an idea which has no place there whatever. What the Buddhist really does understand in such cases is well put by the Rev. Mr. Hardy, from whom again we quote :

"The proper idea of sin cannot enter into the mind of the Buddhist. His system knows nothing of a Supreme Ruler of the universe. . . . There is no law because there is no law-giver,—no authority from which law can proceed. Buddha is superior in honor and wisdom to all other beings ; but he claims no right to impose restrictions on other beings. He points out the course to be taken if merit is to be gained ; but he who refuses to heed his words does the *Tathāgato* no wrong. Religion is a mere code of proprieties, a mental opiate, a plan for being free from discomfort, a system of personal profit. . . . As there is no infinite and all-worthy being to whose glory we are called upon to live, when we commit evil the wrong is done to ourselves and not to another. ‡ . . . Hence the impossibility of making the Buddhist feel that he is a sinner, when the commandment is brought home upon his conscience. A native has been heard to say that he never committed sin since he was born, unless it were in catching fish ! " §

And this is what the "*Light of Asia*" has taught men as to the nature of sin !

5. It follows, both logically and actually, from all the above, that the Buddhist doctrine of *salvation* stands in no less open contradiction with that which was taught by Christ. This is true as regards every point involved in the Scriptural doctrine of salvation—as to its nature, its ground, the means thereto, and the author of the salvation. In each and every one of these points the teaching of the Buddha stands in the most unqualified antagonism to that of the Christ. The teaching of the Scripture is so clear as scarcely to need a statement here.

* *Dhammapada*, vv. 410, 416.

† *Buddhaghosha's Parables*, by Capt. Rogers and Prof. Max Müller, p. lxxviii.

‡ One is reminded of Feuerbach's definition of religion as "the relation of a man to himself."

§ *Legends and Theories of the Buddhists*, pp. 213, 214.

As to the *nature* of the Salvation, all agree that the salvation which is offered by Christ is a salvation, not, primarily, from suffering, but from sin, and from suffering only in that it is the penal consequence of sin. In other words, Christ in His salvation proposes to deliver man from sin and death, and give him everlasting life in holiness. The formation of an eternally holy character is the objective point of Christ's work as regards the individual man.* As regards the *ground* on which any man receives this immeasurable blessing, Christ uniformly taught that His *death* was the ground. He gave His life "a ransom for many." † His blood, He declared, was "shed for many for the remission of sins." ‡ So also His apostles taught that this salvation, being wholly on the ground—not of what the sinner had done, or could do, or become,—but wholly and exclusively on the ground of what Christ had done for us, was all of grace and not of works.§ As regards the *means* of salvation, we are everywhere told that it is received by faith, and maintained by the believing use of all the ordinances appointed by the Lord for this end. ¶ As regards the *author*, it is everywhere taught in the Christian Scriptures that whether we regard salvation as *objectively* wrought out for us on the cross, or as originated and carried on for us *subjectively* in regeneration and sanctification—in every point of view the author of our salvation is Christ. ¶ Salvation is not of man in any way; he neither saves himself, nor helps to save himself; "salvation"—wholly and absolutely—"is of the Lord."

Now this doctrine of salvation taught by Christ, so far from having any similarity or analogy with that set forth by the Buddha, as some would persuade us, stands contrasted with it in every particular. As to the *nature* of salvation, whereas Christ makes it to consist essentially in salvation from *sin*, Buddhism makes it to consist, *not* in deliverance from sin,—not even from that which the Buddha calls sin,—but in salvation from *sorrow*, and that, ultimately, through salvation from *existence*. It is quite true that the Buddhist books are full of exhortations against sin, and many of these, according to the letter, are, as all will agree, most excellent. But none the less is even the highest and purest morality represented, *not* as an end in itself, but only as a means to an end, which end is, to bring to a final termination that line of personal existence of which the life I now live is the present manifestation. Thus, even if the Buddhist conception of sin were identical with that of the Christian—as it is not—still there would

* Rom. v. 9; Eph. v. 25-27.

† Matt. xx. 28.

‡ Matt. xxvi. 28.

§ Rom. xi. 6; Eph. ii. 8.

¶ Rom. iii. 28; John xv. 1-10.

¶ Tit. iii. 4-6.

be a *vital* difference as regards the nature of salvation, in that *character* is made—not the *end* of salvation—but merely a *means* to an end.

For, according to the Lord Jesus, the supreme evil is sin; according to the Buddha, the supreme evil is not sin, but *existence*, as necessarily involving pain. Hence their respective teachings as to the nature of salvation differ utterly. The whole doctrine of the Buddha as to salvation is summed up in what are called the four words of truth, namely: *Dukkha*, 'pain,' *Samudaya*, 'origin,' *Nirodha*, 'destruction,' and *Marga*, 'road.' The signification of these four words, which expanded, form what are known as "the four noble truths," is set forth in the following verses from the *Dhammapada* :

"He who with clear understanding sees the four holy truths ;

"Pain ; the origin of pain ; the destruction of pain, and the eightfold holy way that leads to the quieting of pain :

"That is the safe refuge, that is the best refuge.

"Having gone to that refuge, a man is delivered from all pain." *

Prof. Max Müller correctly expounds these verses as follows: "The four holy truths are the four statements that there is pain in this world, that the source of pain is desire, that desire can be annihilated, that there is a way shown by Buddha, by which the annihilation of all desires can be achieved, and freedom be obtained." †

Thus we have the highest authority for affirming that not the removal of *sin*, but the removal of *pain* is the objective point of the whole Buddhist system of salvation. And it is also of the greatest importance to observe that even pain is misunderstood. For pain is not in Buddhism regarded as merely the necessary effect of sin, but as the necessary condition of *all existence*, alike in earth and hell and heaven, in bird, beast, worm, or man or god. For pain, argues the Buddhist, is because of *tanhà*, *trishnà*, 'desire.' By this, as already noted, is intended, not desire after that which is morally evil, but desire as desire. It denotes that state of mind which is usually enkindled by the contact of the mind or the senses with the external world. Wherever this state of mind exists, continued existence is made necessary. For desire is the cause of 'action,' or in Buddhist phraseology, *karma*. I die and pass away, but my *karma* lives on, and renders necessary the production of another being after me to reap the fruit of my action. And so long as this chain of existence is continued, so long is there with existence the continued liability to new desire and therefore to new pain. I see, I hear, I feel, I taste, I remember, and because of this arises desire; and because so much that I per-

* *Dhammapada*, vs. 190-192.

† *Buddhaghosha's Parables*, p. cxiii.

ceive seems good, I desire to live and I love the world. And this desire—whether it be of that which is evil or of that which is good—even desire to live in heaven, as well as the desire to live on earth—is the root and source of pain and sorrow. It is so because desire implies the non-possession of that which is desired; and not to have what we desire of necessity means pain and sorrow. The desire may be of that which is good, but except it be at once completely satisfied, it must become a cause of pain. This is by no means saying that all desires are equally reprehensible. *Gautama* clearly saw that certain things were evil in a sense in which other things were not. Conscience, despite the power of a false philosophy, never becomes extinct. Hence the Buddha freely admitted that certain desires having an intrinsic evil character, brought more pain than others, and therefore were to be the more carefully avoided. Hence lying, hatred, and anger are denounced as being in an especial sense occasions of pain and sorrow. Thus we read:

“The fields are damaged by weeds, mankind is damaged by hatred.

“The fields are damaged by weeds, mankind is damaged by vanity.”

All this is true, but then we also read in the next verse:

“The fields are damaged by weeds, mankind is damaged by wishing.

“Therefore a gift bestowed on those who are free from wishes brings great reward.”*

“Wishing” is the root of all evil, and hence is inferred the third of the noble truths, namely: that since desire is the cause of all pain, the extinction of all pain will follow the extinction of all desire. And thus we are brought to the fourth and last of the four noble truths that this end—the extinction of desire—can only be attained by walking in what is called “the eightfold way.” What that way is we need not consider just here. At present we are to note the contrast between the Christian and the Buddhist doctrine as to the nature of salvation. Salvation, as regards the individual man, consists in the extinction of sorrow by means of the extinction of desire. Its relation to what we call sin is merely casual and incidental.

Here we do well to observe that the Buddhist salvation in this sense does not consist in the cessation of existence. This is plain, to go no further, from the Buddhist doctrine as to the nature of man. For, according to the Buddhist authorities, when a man dies, his body having perished, there remains no other part of him which can continue to exist. This is as true of the worldly as of the religious man.

* *Dhammapada*, vs. 357-359.

It is plain from this alone that when the Buddhists speak of *Nirvāna* as the object of salvation, they cannot mean the extinction of the individual personality. This befalls every one, whereas *Nirvāna* is the attainment of comparatively few. That *Nirvāna* is not to be understood as meaning 'annihilation,' is further manifest from the use of the term in the Buddhist scriptures. Prof. Max Müller, in his Lecture on *Buddhist Nihilism*,* cites various passages where *Nirvāna* is described as something which is attained and enjoyed before death, and in this world. Thus we read :

"When a man can bear everything without uttering a sound, he has attained *Nirvāna*.

"Desire is the worst ailment, the body the greatest of all evils. Where this is properly known, there is *Nirvāna*, the highest bliss."

The truth is, the Buddhist authorities seem to represent the salvation, to the attainment of which the religion of the Buddha professes to direct men, as of a twofold sort. In the first place, *Nirvāna*, as Prof. Max Müller has clearly shown, sometimes denotes a mental and spiritual state, attainable in this present life. It denotes the condition of the man who has succeeded in overcoming desire, and thus is victor over "the ten sins." In this sense of the word, *Nirvāna* or salvation refers to the attainment of a certain state of mind, which being reached, the man is in this life freed from pain. But to use the term 'holiness,' as some have done, to express this state of mind, is utterly misleading. Such a use of the word cannot be too severely condemned. It naturally produces an impression of agreement between Buddhism and Christianity, where, in fact, no agreement exists at all; for the Biblical idea of holiness—like that of sin—never loses sight of a person. It is not mere morality, which is rightness toward men; it is more than this: it is rightness toward God, which indeed implies morality, but is yet much more. Shall we then say that the Buddhist idea of salvation is the attainment of an ideal morality? This neither can we do, though he who has attained *Nirvāna* will be a moral man. To reach the Buddhist idea of salvation, we must recur to the Buddhist doctrine concerning sin. Not only does the Buddhist idea of sin have nothing at all to do with a man's relation to God, but, also,—along with many acts which are sins—either against ourselves or against our fellow-men, it includes many other acts and states of mind which in fact have nothing sinful in them, and in yet other instances, even stigmatizes as evil that which is good. A sufficient proof of this we have in the common enumeration of "the ten sins."

* See his *Lectures on the Science of Religion*, p. 142.

While among these are counted "hatred," "pride," "selfishness," we also find enumerated with these, "belief in the existence of the soul," "desire of life on earth," and "desire of life in heaven." * Since the saved man, the *Nibutta*, is a man "who has overcome the ten sins," he will, therefore, without doubt, be conceived of as a man who has been freed from hatred, pride, and selfishness and all unlawful lusts, and thus will be, according to the theory, what we call a moral man: and yet that is not a full account of him. To be kind, humble, chaste, this alone is not *Nirvāna*. Not until a man has also extinguished the delusion of the existence of a self, the desire of life on earth and even the desire of life in heaven, has he attained *Nirvāna*. The truth is that even taken in the best sense possible, that of deliverance from what the Buddhist holds as sin, *Nirvāna* or 'salvation' is something utterly diverse from the Christian idea of deliverance from sin. To use, therefore, such Christian terms as 'salvation,' 'holiness,' 'saved,' and 'holy,' in describing the nature and result of the Buddhist salvation—except the reader be put on his guard—is only to lead the common reader, unfamiliar with the technicalities of Buddhist theology, utterly astray. Buddhism, indeed, makes salvation to involve deliverance from what *it* calls sin, though always as a means to an end; but as its idea of sin differs almost *in toto* from that of the Christian Scriptures, its salvation, in the best construction, is a very different thing from that which is offered us by Christ.

But is this all that Buddhism presents as involved in salvation? We think not. While this is a true account of the Buddhist salvation as far as it goes, and explains all those passages which speak of *Nirvāna* as a present possible attainment of the living man, it is not all that the word involves. It does not bring before us the absolute ultimatum of the Buddhist system. For while it is true that, according to the Buddhist scriptures, there is after death no surviving soul of *any* man, yet though my soul does not survive me, my *karma*, or my works do survive me. And if I die, with the craving after life still unextinguished, then the power of this, my *karma*, will necessitate the birth, in heaven, earth, or hell, of a being,—*another* being, according to Western metaphysics, the *same*, according to the Buddhist,—in which this unextinguished *trishnā* or 'desire' will burn on, and so continue all its possibility of woe. But it is the blessed issue of the state of mind described as *Nirvāna*, that—desire being now at an end—nothing now remains in the man, which could entail any moral necessity for the production at his death of a being who should

* See Rhys Davids' *Buddhism*, pp. 109, 110.

reap the fruit of his *karma*. In other words, that particular continuous chain of personal existence in which I, for example, as now existing, am a single link, is thereby brought to an end. And this, according to Mr. Davids, is what the Buddhists call—by way of distinction—*Parinibbàna*,* the supreme *Nirvāna*. While then the extinction of the *individual* as such is not the essence of salvation, seeing that the individual perishes at death in any case, yet Buddhism does hold up as the ultimatum of salvation an annihilation of existence far more sweeping and comprehensive, namely, the eternal extinction of that particular line of sentient being which I represent. And that is brought about by the annihilation of the generating power of my works, through the extinction in me of all desire for existence.

And this is the highest ideal of salvation that Buddhism has to offer. This was the salvation which we are told the Buddha found—for himself first of all—under the bo-tree. This was the gospel the discovery of which, according to Mr. Arnold, made that morning after the great temptation, “break gloriously,” “radiant with rising hopes for man”! This is the nature of that great salvation over the discovery of which Mr. Arnold waxes so enthusiastic, when he tells us in language as far from the descriptions of the Buddhist books themselves as it closely approaches blasphemy, that even in nature—

. . . . “The spirit of our Lord
Lay potent upon man and beast.” †

This is what he calls

. . . . “That life which knows no age,
That blessed last of deaths when death itself is dead.” ‡

Bliss indeed it may be, but the bliss of extinction and absolute unconsciousness, better described by Mr. Arnold himself elsewhere as “*lifeless, timeless* bliss,”—a bliss which has its final and uttermost expression in eternal lifelessness, absolute and everlasting cessation of existence. Even this most beggarly salvation, we are told, can be attained by scarcely any, and by none except those who give up the world, put on the yellow robe, and enter a Buddhist monastery. Only two laymen are said ever to have attained this salvation, and even among the monks, only one or two since Buddha. And all the morality, the conquest over the ten sins, and the renunciation of all the best of what men naturally hold dear, comes to this in the end! And yet Mr. Arnold has the assurance to tell us, not in the enthusi-

* *Nibbàna* is the Pāli form of *Nirvāna*.

† *The Light of Asia*, book vi.

‡ *Ib.*, book viii.

asm of the poet, but in the plain language of the prose of the Preface to his *Light of Asia*, that Buddhism has in it "the eternity of a boundless hope," and "an indestructible element of faith in final good!" Could words be chosen which should be further from describing the actual state of the case? Could there well be a contrast more profound than between the salvation which the Buddha proclaims, and that which is offered to us in the Gospel of Jesus Christ?

It is indeed true that there are a few who refuse to admit that this is the doctrine of Buddhism. Thus we must do Mr. Arnold the justice to say that he will not admit that nothingness is the final goal set before the Buddhist. While claiming in the Preface to *The Light of Asia*, that the views of the Buddha, set forth in his poem, "are at least the fruit of considerable study," he adds, frankly enough, that they are not derived from the study of the authorities alone, but "also of a firm conviction that a third of mankind would never have been brought to believe . . . in nothingness as the issue and crown of being." We venture, however, to suggest that a correct judgment as to the actual teachings of a religion cannot be easily attained by either the exclusive or the partial use of the *a priori* method. Whether or not nothingness seem to Mr. Arnold a desirable issue of life, it is absolutely certain that to a very considerable proportion of our fellow-men the case appears quite otherwise. The proven increase of suicide in modern Christendom, concurrently with the growth of atheism and disbelief in a hereafter, is an ascertained fact which must not be lost sight of, and which may be set over against Mr. Arnold's *a priori* assumption. But even if we should grant what some urge, even against the highest authorities, that Buddhism *does* teach the existence of a soul, and its survival after death, therein agreeing with the Brahmanical doctrine which preceded and in India has outlived it, yet, practically, the case is not altered. *Practically*, it is still true that death ends all. For no one, either among the Brahmans or Buddhists, maintains that in the transmigration of the soul, memory and the consciousness of personal identity go over into the life after death. For, as in the present life, I have no memory of the life before the present, so it is freely admitted that there is no reason to believe that in the life after this I will have any memory of the present, or any recognition of myself as the same person. So far from teaching that the sense of personal identity commonly survives death, the Buddhist scriptures clearly teach the contrary. They teach that the power of thus looking backward through the series of bygone lives—whatever the phrase may mean—was one of the *special* attainments of the Buddha. In this respect it was, among others, that he,

as "the enlightened one," was distinguished from other men. But if it is believed that personal consciousness ends with death, then it is plain that this must have the same practical effect as a belief in the most absolute annihilation. To me, *as a self-conscious person*, existence will come to an end. And that this cessation of *personal* existence seems to multitudes of our fellow-men a blessing to be supremely desired, of this—Mr. Arnold and others to the contrary notwithstanding—we have no doubt. It may indeed be hard for us, under so different and more tolerable conditions of existence, to understand how the principle that existence is *per se* an evil can be assumed as fundamental in so many Oriental religions and philosophies. But under conditions such as prevail in India and China, the case is very different. Through the overcrowding of population the phrase "struggle for existence" comes to have an intensity of meaning which it has not in America, or even in Europe. Moreover; the various public philanthropies which do so much to mitigate the evils of poverty in Christian lands are wanting there. Finally, the conception of a kind and good God, a Saviour, and a hope of a blessed immortality beyond death, which lightens for millions among us the burden of life, is absent from the mind of the Hindoo and the Buddhist. And if even in Christian lands, at this late day, the question has been soberly raised, and has been earnestly discussed in our leading reviews, whether, even at the best, life be worth living, how is it inconceivable that to millions living as the great mass of the population have lived for ages in India, the assurance that "nothingness is the crown of being," should come as a kind of gospel? If it bring nothing better, it at least brings the faith that suffering is not—or at least *may* not be—everlasting; and to millions there is a sad comfort even in that. And howsoever our Western littérateurs and professors, writing in their comfortable studies,—surrounded from their earliest recollection with all the external blessings that Christianity brings with it, even to those who reject it,—may think it inconceivable that life should not seem sweet to all, yet it is the stubborn fact, that annihilation,—if not of the essence, yet at least of self-consciousness and personality,—has been the *summum bonum* offered in all the great Indian religions and philosophies.* The form in which

*Prof. Oldenberg's remarks (referring to Prof. Max Müller's opinions on this same subject) are quite to the point. He says: "We do not follow the renowned investigator, when he seeks for the limit between the possible and the impossible in the development of religion. In the sultry, dreamy stillness of India thoughts arise and grow,—every anticipation and speculation grows in another way than in the cool air of the West."—*Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, p. 274.

it is taught may vary; it may be pantheistic, as among the modern populations of India; or atheistic, agnostic, or materialistic, as in other Indian philosophies, and especially in the religion of the Buddha; but the essential idea is ever the same. The eternal extinction of personal self-consciousness is the best that any of them has to offer as the end of life, and to attain this is the supreme object of religion. In this the gospel according to the Vedantist, and the gospel according to the Buddha are at one, and thus in the very nature of the salvation which they promise, they alike stand in direct contradiction to the Gospel of Christ. Where Christ promises "eternal life," they agree in promising eternal extinction of life as the highest end of being and of all religion. Call it what they will, *parinibbàna*, *mukti*, *nistàra*, it all comes to this. The long, long chain of births and deaths shall end, and in one way or another man may help to speed the issue. And that is the gospel alike of Buddhism and of Brahmanism. Existence is *per se* an evil; for so long as there is existence, there is no security from pain. Hence salvation must have cessation of personal existence as its ultimatum. To be is to suffer. The thought finds an expression singularly sad and touching in the following words of a Canarese song:—

" A weary and broken-down man,
 " With sorrow I come to thy feet :
 " Subdued by the fate and the ban
 " That hides the long future I meet.
 " I suffer, without ceasing, the pain
 " Of sorrowful, infinite life."*

Does it appear as if the extinction of existence which Mr. Arnold finds so inconceivable as an object of desire, seemed wholly undesirable to the man who wrote those words?

But higher authorities than Mr. Arnold have sought to convince their readers that the Buddhist ultimatum of salvation could not be imagined to lie in this final extinction of existence. Thus, while Prof. Max Müller admits that "no person who reads with attention the metaphysical speculations on the *Nirvāna* contained in the Buddhist canon can arrive at any other conviction than that expressed by Burnouf, namely, that *Nirvāna*, the *summum bonum* of Buddhism, is absolute nothing," † he yet pleads, in part on grounds which have been already reviewed, that this could not have been the teaching of the Buddha himself. To the arguments previously criticised, however, he adds another consideration which shows us that his judgment

* *Folk-Songs of Southern India*, p. 39.

† *Lecture on Buddhist Nihilism*, in *Science of Religion*, p. 140.

also was determined in part by considerations purely *a priori*. He says: "If the soul becomes quite extinct, then religion is not any more what it ought to be—a bridge from the finite to the infinite, but a trap-bridge hurling man into the abyss, at the very moment when he thought he had arrived at the stronghold of the eternal." * But this argument plainly rests on the assumption that every religion *must* be "what it ought to be," namely, a means of salvation to those who hold it, or in the language of the Oxford professor's theology, "a bridge from the finite to the infinite." † But what warrant has any one for this assumption? It will certainly not be accepted by any who hold the teachings of Christ to be the unerring standard of faith. And yet as regards the special point of the present argument, it will not be weakened even if we should assume the views of the Buddhist salvation which are held by Mr. Arnold and Prof. Müller to be correct. For, even in that case also, it were still true that the salvation which was preached by the Buddha, was not, as to its nature, the salvation which Christ preached, but something totally different. There is no evidence that the Buddha ever so much as had an idea of such a salvation as that which the Lord Jesus proclaimed and which He claimed to have secured for men.

But, assuredly,—as so often remarked before,—the conclusions of missionaries who, through years, have had daily converse with the votaries of Buddha, whose very object it must needs be, in order to their work, to find out if possible what the people for whom they labor really believe, are above all others deserving of consideration. And their testimony is unanimous and unmistakable. Thus, the missionary Bishop Bigardet, of the Romish mission to Burmah, says:

"The role of Buddha, from beginning to end, is that of a deliverer, who preaches a law designed to secure to man deliverance from all the miseries under which he is laboring. But by an inexplicable and deplorable eccentricity, the pretended saviour, after having taught man the way to deliver himself from the tyranny of his passions, only leads him, after all, into the bottomless gulf of total annihilation." ‡ The bishop tells us that his information "has been derived from the perusal of the religious books of the Burmans, and from frequent conversations on religion during several years, with the best-informed among the laity whom he has had the chance of meeting." §

Who in this matter is more likely to be right—the missionary bishop, or the Oxford professor who quotes this testimony and goes on to show that the Bishop must be mistaken? If we turn to Ceylon we have the same testimony as to the belief of the Ceylonese Buddhists,

* *Lecture, etc.*, p. 140.

† See Prof. Oldenberg's criticism on this argument of Prof. Müller, quoted in footnote, p. 528.

‡ *The Legend of Gaudama*, preface, p. x.

§ *Ib.*, p. xiii.

from the late venerable missionary Hardy, of the English Wesleyans, already cited, one for more than a quarter century in daily converse with that people. He quotes from the *Suttanta* called *Sdmanya Phala*, the paragraphs which end with these words: "He knows I have overcome the repetition of existence, all that I have to do is done." He thereupon makes the following pertinent comment:

"Here I pause; and I ask myself, in bitterness of soul, is this all? With all his reputed wisdom, can Buddha lead his followers to nothing higher, nothing superior? . . . For what is the next stage in the supposed uprising of this privileged priest? He has done all that he has to do. . . . The goal, the long anticipated reward, the final consummation of the whole series of births and deaths is now attained. But what is it? *Nothingness*. In the whole story of humanity, . . . in all the conclusions to which disappointed man has come in his far wanderings from God, there is nothing more cheerless, more depressing, or more afflictive, than the revelations of the *Suttanta*, in which Buddha tries to set forth the highest privilege of the highest order of sentient beings." *

To the same effect Dr. Edkins, of China, enumerating "some of the most prominent doctrines of Buddhism, names first, the happiness of the *Nirvāna* or state of unconsciousness which frees him who attains it from the miseries of existence." We repeat then the conclusion which is inevitable, that as in the former particulars, so, again, as regards the nature of the salvation which man needs, Buddhism not only differs from the doctrine of the New Testament, but differs from it in the way of direct contradiction. If the one is true, the other must be false. Christianity affirms that salvation consists in eternal salvation from *sin*; Buddhism, that it consists in eternal salvation from *existence*. While the former offers us eternal *life*, the latter holds forth, as its *summum bonum*, everlasting *death*. And we are asked to recognize in "this venerable religion," "the eternity of a universal hope," "and an indestructible element of faith in final good"; and because of "this gospel of the Buddha" to revere the Buddha as "the Light of Asia"!!

But the contrasts between the two religions as regards this vital matter of salvation do not end with this, though that were indeed enough. For even if all the above argument be set aside, and the fatal difference as to the nature of salvation be ignored, yet no less momentous contradictions still remain, as regards the *ground* and the *means* of salvation. As to the *ground* of our salvation, the Gospel declares first, negatively, that "by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified." † "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us." ‡ Positively, the

* *Legends and Theories of the Buddhists*, pp. 183, 185.

† Rom. iii. 20.

‡ Tit. iii. 5.

Gospel everywhere asserts that we are saved by the works of another, even Jesus the Christ, who has by His death made atonement and "propitiation for our sins." * "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust." † "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." ‡ Nor is this the teaching of Paul or the other apostles only, as it is the fashion of some to assert. For according to the Gospel of Matthew, the Lord Jesus himself said expressly that He came "to give his life a ransom for many," § and all the synoptists testify that when He instituted the Holy Supper, He declared that His blood was shed for us sinners "for the remission of sins." ¶ This then, according to the Gospel, is the sole meritorious ground of our salvation. All reliance on any works of our own, however excellent they may seem, is everywhere denounced in the most unsparing terms, as sure to end in utter ruin. "As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse." ¶ But what does the Buddha say? All who have ever given the least attention to the subject know that the Buddhist scriptures as constantly insist on the exact reverse of all this. The idea of salvation by the merits of another does not more emphatically distinguish Christianity, than salvation by one's own merits distinguishes Buddhism. The following passages from the *Dhammapada* will illustrate Buddhist teaching on this question :

"By one's self the evil is done ; by one's self one suffers ; by one's self evil is left undone ; by one's self one is purified. Lo, no one can purify another."**
 "O Bhikshu ! empty this boat ! if emptied, it will go quickly ; having cut off passion and hatred, thou wilt go to *Nirvāna*." ††

The *Parables of Buddhaghosha* were composed in exposition of the meaning of the *Dhammapada*. In them the doctrine is expounded, for example, as follows : "Whoever shall do nothing but good works will receive nothing but future excellent rewards." †† Again we read of twenty-one kinds of evil actions, concerning which it is said that among those who commit them "there are nineteen who, if they see to their ways, perform good works, listen to the law, §§ steadfastly observe *Saranāgamana* and the five commandments, and keep good watch over their bodies, shall be released from their sins." ¶¶ Personal merit is then, according to the Buddhist teaching, the sole and exclusive

* 1 John ii. 2.

§ Matt. xx. 28.

** *Dhammapada*, v. 165.

†† *Buddhaghosha's Parables*, p. 123.

§§ The repetition of the formula, "I take refuge in the law, the Buddha and the brotherhood."

¶¶ *Ib.*, pp. 183, 184.

† 1 Peter iii. 18.

‡ Matt. xxvi. 28.

‡ Gal. iii. 13.

¶ Gal. iii. 10.

†† *Ib.*, v. 369.

ground of our salvation. But this merit is not made to consist merely in the practice of moral duties. Great emphasis is laid on the performance or non-performance of actions which have no moral quality whatever. Thus he who seeks the destruction of all desire and thereby his salvation, is exhorted to practice "the duty of eating alone and sleeping alone."* He is told that "if a man has ceased to think of good or evil, then there is no fear for him while watching," and that he will be saved who is "without thirst or desire"; that meditation on the formula called *Saranāgamana* has the "power to destroy all evil emotion." Of atonement for sin by any manner of vicarious suffering or sacrifice, Buddhism knows absolutely nothing. Yet Mr. Arnold could write as follows of the Buddha, making him to say on his renunciation of his home :

"This will I do who have a realm to lose,
Because I love
. . . . these that are mine and those
Which shall be mine, a thousand million more,
Saved by this sacrifice I offer now." †

The parallel with the work and even the words of Christ which these words are plainly intended to suggest, has absolutely no existence save in the imagination of the poet. Such writing is worse than fatally misleading. Even Mr. Arnold himself elsewhere puts in the mouth of the Buddha words which contradict the Christian sense of the above citation. No language could more explicitly deny the possibility of a vicarious atonement than the following :

"Nor, spake he, shall one wash his spirit clean
By blood ; nor gladden gods, being good, with blood ;
Nor bribe them, being evil.
. . . . Answer all must give
For all things done amiss or wrongfully,
Alone, each for himself, reckoning with that
The fixed arithmic of the universe
Which meteth good for good, and ill for ill,
Measure for measure, unto deeds, words, thoughts." ‡

Language such as this, however inconsistent with what we find elsewhere in the poem, is in full accord with what we find in the *Abhinishkramana Sūtra*, wherein the Buddha is made to argue with the sacrificing sages of Vaisali, thus : "I will ask you, then, if a man in worshipping the gods sacrifices a sheep, and so does well, why should he not kill his child, his relative or dear friend, in worshipping the gods, and so do better? Surely then there can be no merit in killing

* *Dhammapada*, v. 305.

† *Ib.*, book v.

‡ *The Light of Asia*, book iv.

a sheep! It is but a confused and illogical system, this." * On this point of the impossibility of atonement by another, Buddhism is so explicit that there is no dispute among authorities upon this subject. Even Mr. de Bunsen, who has so boldly endeavored to connect the doctrines of the Gospel with Buddhism through Jewish Essenism, is constrained to admit, with regard to this most essential and characteristic feature of the teaching of Christ, that "Buddhism knows absolutely nothing of the idea of an offended God who requires reconciliation by vicarious suffering," † and that the doctrine of atonement by vicarious suffering is "absolutely excluded by Buddhism." ‡ As to the ground, then, of our salvation—no less than as to its nature—the doctrine of the Buddha directly contradicts that of the Gospel. The latter affirms vicarious atonement as that ground; the former declares that vicarious atonement is impossible.

It follows that there must be no less total contradiction between the two religions as to the *author* of salvation. According to the Gospel the author and efficient cause of our salvation is the Lord Jesus; according to Buddhism the author and efficient cause of salvation is the man himself. Buddha, therefore, stands in no such relation to his followers as Christ to His. To speak of him as a saviour, a deliverer—if it be understood that these terms mean what they do when applied to Christ—is wholly to misrepresent the case. As for Christ—however a certain class of writers may ignore the fact—He certainly claimed to be much more than a mere preacher; He claimed to be Himself a *Saviour*. He said that He came "to seek and to save that which was lost," § and that, by laying down His life. ¶ He promised further to send the Holy Spirit of God to renew the inner nature of man. ¶ He therefore did not come as so many seem to imagine, to show men how to save themselves, but in His divine power, to save them Himself alone. And this and nothing less is what Christ meant when He called Himself a Saviour, a Redeemer. But we open translations of the Buddhist books and often find these terms applied, without note or explanation, to the Buddha. Naturally those who are uninstructed as to the facts of the case hastily infer that the claims of the Buddha were identical with those of Christ, whereas in point of fact they have nothing in common. So far from professing to have power to save others, the Buddha professed to have been a seeker for salvation—as he understood it—

* *Romantic Legend*, p. 159.

† "The Angel-Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes and Christians," p. 49.

‡ *Ib.*, p. 50.

¶ John x. 11.

§ Luke xix. 10.

¶ John xiv. 16, 17, *et passim*.

for himself. Thus, for example, we read in the *Abhinishkramana Sūtra*, that the *Rājā Bimbāsāra* asked the Buddha, while he was yet living as an ascetic seeking for enlightenment: "Who or what are you? Are you a god or a Nāga, or Brahma, or Sakra, or a man, or a spirit? Then Bodhisatwa, having entirely got rid of all crooked ways, answered plainly and truthfully: 'Maharājā! I am no god or spirit, but a plain man, seeking for rest, and so am practising the rules of an ascetic life.'"* Nor does Buddhism teach that the Buddha, after he had himself attained enlightenment, then gained the power to save others, or ever claimed it. On the contrary, the *Dhammapada* says plainly:

"You yourself must make an effort. The Tathagatas (Buddhas) are only preachers."†

To the same effect we are told in the *Parables of Buddhaghosha* of certain disciples of the Buddha who, on account of a sin formerly committed, although they had reached the state of holy men, fought among themselves, and all killed each other, and *Para Taken* (the Buddha) had no power to prevent their suffering this punishment of their sin.‡ To the same purport the writer gives still other examples to show the absolute powerlessness of the Buddha to save men who have committed sin.

This naturally leads us to a consideration of the doctrine of orthodox Buddhism as to the person of the Buddha. Even Prof. Beal has referred to the Buddhist doctrine of the pre-existence of the Buddha as having an analogy with the Christian doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ. In point of fact, it is certain that there is no such significant similarity as has been suggested. There is, indeed, no difficulty in believing, in view of the early and extensive prevalence of a belief in transmigration in India, that the Buddha probably believed in some sort of transmigration, and by necessary consequence in his own pre-existence. It is quite certain that the Buddhists themselves, on the authority of their scriptures, believe that the Buddha existed before he appeared in this world. But as to how the Buddha pre-existed or any other man has pre-existed, as to that we have seen that there are two opinions. Whichever view of the Buddhist doctrine of transmigration we adopt, in neither case is there any real analogy between the alleged pre-existence of the Buddha and the pre-existence of Christ as taught in the Scriptures. For, first, if we accept the view argued by Mr. Davids and so many of the most eminent special-

* *Romantic Legend*, p. 182.

† *Buddhaghosha's Parables*, p. 154.

‡ *Dhammapada*, v. 276.

ists in Buddhist studies, that Buddhism does not admit the existence of the soul as separate from the body, then plainly enough there was no pre-existence of the soul of the Buddha in the Christian sense of the word at all, for there was no soul to pre-exist. As thus understood, the many stories ascribed to the Buddha in which he tells what he was and what he did in former lives, cannot refer to a pre-existence of his personality, but to the various manifestations of that pre-existent *karm*, or line of moral activity, which in due time necessitated the existence of Gautama Muni. But it needs very little knowledge of the Bible to see that *this* theory has nothing in common with the Scripture doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ. Neither if we reject this interpretation and understand the Buddhist scriptures to teach what no doubt multitudes of Buddhists, unskilled in metaphysics, believe,—that the soul of the Buddha existed before his appearance in this world,—is this a doctrine such as the Scriptures teach concerning Christ. What Christ taught is, according to the Gospel, plain enough. He taught, without doubt, that He had existed before He came into this world. He said, for example, that He had come from the Father and come into the world, even as again He left the world and went unto the Father.* He declared of Himself, “Before Abraham was, I am.”† In the second place, He no less clearly taught that in this respect His case was among men alone and peculiar. For He said again in so many words: “No man hath ascended to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.”‡ In contrast with this the Buddhist books teach us that whatever was the nature of the pre-existence of the Buddha, in this he had no peculiar pre-eminence above others, but simply shared the common lot of all men, and indeed of all organic beings. Moreover, Christ taught that until the time of His incarnation, He had lived a life of changeless glory in the fellowship of the eternal Godhead. The Buddha, on the contrary, is represented as teaching that, previous to the last occasion, he had existed, not only in heaven, but also on earth, and that again and again. Neither had he on these previous occasions always existed as a Buddha or in any condition of either earthly or heavenly glory. For although the Buddha when he appeared in the world the last time is represented as having descended from heaven, yet the same books represent him as having lived previously in no less than 530 different forms, on earth and in heaven. Eighty-three times he had been an ascetic, fifty-eight times a king, twenty-four times a Brahman, twenty times the god

* John viii. 42 ; xiv. 28, *et passim*.

† John viii. 58.

‡ John iii. 13.

Sakka, forty-three times a tree-god, five times a slave, once a devil dancer, twice a rat, and twice a pig!* And Prof. Beal, and others with him, think that they can discover an analogy between the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Buddha and the pre-existence of the Christ!†

It is indeed true that the Thibetan Buddhists have a doctrine of the pre-existence of the Buddha which in its external form at first sight seems much more like the Christian doctrine. They tell us of an *Adi-Buddha*, or Primal Buddha, infinite, self-existent, and omniscient. From this Primal Buddha all things that are, have in order come forth. Hence it is true that in him the Buddha Gautama Muni pre-existed, and from him came forth. And yet even this corrupt form of the Buddhist teaching has only the most superficial resemblance to the doctrine of the pre-existence of our Lord. The true analogy of this theory is not with anything that the Church has ever understood the Gospels to teach, but with the ancient gnostic doctrine of the "emanations," of which Christ was supposed to be one. And it is of significance to note that this doctrine,—with whatever of superficial likeness it may have or seem to have to the Christian doctrine,—does not appear in any of the old Buddhist authorities, nor seems to have existed until about the tenth century of our era,—some fifteen hundred years after the days of the Buddha!

6. Last of all we have to note the Buddhist eschatology. We shall find that in its doctrine as to the future, the teachings of Buddhism are no less in direct antagonism to Christianity than in all the foregoing. Two fundamental questions come up in eschatology. First, What is to be the future of the individual? and second, What is to be the future history of the world?

As regards the first of these questions, the Holy Scriptures, as understood by the great body of Christians in all ages, answer that men after death are consciously happy or miserable, according to their works. It is further agreed that they will continue after death in a disembodied state until Christ shall come the second time: and that when Christ comes, He will come to judge all who have ever lived; that He will raise the dead, and change the living into bodily forms, adapted to an unending state of being. Finally, it has been the general understanding of Christ's teaching that from that time the ultimate destiny of all individuals thus raised or changed and judged

* Hardy: *Manual of Buddhism*, 2d ed., p. 102. The list is given with some variations in the numbers in Fausböll's *Buddhist Birth-Stories*, p. ci.

† *Romantic Legend*, Introduction, p. viii.

shall be eternally fixed ; that the wicked shall go into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal.

But what is the teaching of Buddhism on this subject ? The answer has been already anticipated, and we need to add but little. That answer is twofold, according as we take one or the other interpretation of the Buddhist scriptures. If we take the view which is maintained by Burnouf, St. Hilaire, Rhys Davids, and others, then we must answer that Buddhism teaches that death is the end of man. Since there is nothing to man but *nāmarūpa*, 'name and form,' there is nothing substantial remaining when we die which shall continue after death. Nothing survives us but our works. My works indeed will necessitate the immediate production of another being, god, man, or beast, to reap the fruit of my doings in reward or retribution ; but that new being is not, according to our common use of language, I myself, but another and distinct being. Its connection with me is not by identity of essence, but is only moral and ideal. There is, therefore, if we rightly understand the Buddhist scriptures, no existence of the human personality after death. Death ends all.

But the instinct of immortality and the consciousness of a spiritual and invisible personality are very strong in all men. And so we can easily believe what we are told, that whatsoever may be the teachings of Buddhist metaphysics, very many Buddhists of to-day look forward to a continuance of life after death. Yet even thus they are still in hopeless contradiction with the teaching of Christ. In the first place, the Christian doctrine as to the future life of every man in heaven or hell, is not the doctrine of Buddha, even as thus represented. Buddhism has indeed its heavens many, and also its hells many. And it is also true that after death, according to the view we have at present before us, I may find myself in one or the other of these diverse places. But this is very far from certain. The Buddhist teaching is thus given :

"Some people are born again ; evil people go to hell ; righteous people go to heaven ; those who are free from all worldly desires, enter *Nirvāna*."*

"Some people are born again." That is, instead of going either to heaven or to hell, I may be born again on earth, and go through, no one knows how many stages of existence, before I arrive at the final rest of *Nirvāna*. And even if I go to hell or heaven when I die, what then ? If I go to hell, I may indeed come out again after that, incalculable ages hence, I shall have exhausted the retribution due

* *Dhammapada*, vs. 126.

my sin; there is some consolation in that. But, unfortunately, the same is true as to life in heaven also. There I may remain ages, but it is nevertheless certain that, sooner or later, I leave heaven either to sink into the annihilation of *parinibbana*, or more probably to return to the world and begin again the weary round of birth and death. Of a deathless life, a life of eternal incorruption, Buddhism knows nothing. It tells us indeed, as Mr. Arnold puts it, of "means to live and die no more."* But these words mean, in Buddhist parlance, an end of *living*, as well as of *dying*, to be attained at last, if ever, through the *parinibbana*. Of immortal and unending life, anywhere, we repeat that Buddhism knows absolutely nothing. The idea is utterly foreign to Buddhist thinking. On nothing do the Buddhist books insist more than on the alleged fact that there is nowhere, in heaven, or earth, or hell, any permanence in anything. And inasmuch as, according to Buddha, existence anywhere or in any place involves pain sooner or later, existence, therefore, is *per se* an evil, and eternal existence would be eternal evil. So far, therefore, from existence in heaven being regarded as desirable, desire of life even in the highest and most pure and spiritual of the Buddhist heavens is named—under the name of *arūpārdga*—as the seventh of "the ten sins," which must be overcome before a man can attain *Nirvāna*. Herein again we have reason to complain that Mr. Arnold uses language sinfully misleading. He tells us that the Buddha anticipated that as the result of all his self-sacrifice—

"That should be won for which he lost the world,
And death should find him conqueror of death."†

The analogy with the teaching of Christ which is suggested in this phraseology is without the least foundation. Death, according to Buddhism, is destroyed indeed; but only because that existence is eternally destroyed which is the condition of death. Plainly when nothing is left to die, then death is impossible; but is then to conquer death, the same thing as to be conquered by death! No less misleading—if we have rightly understood the teaching of the Buddha—is the translation which Prof. Max Müller gives of the *Dhammapada*, vs. 21: "Reflection is the path of immortality." Surely not even the Professor will claim that the Christian doctrine of immortality is taught in the Buddhist scriptures! In fact, if we may trust so eminent a Pāli scholar as Mr. Rhys Davids—Prof. Müller has been misled by an etymology. Commenting on the same Pāli word *amata*, which is used here, as translated by Prof. Beal in his *Romantic Legend*, Mr.

* *The Light of Asia*, book vii.

† *Ib.*, book iv.

Dauids uses the following language: "The expression, 'to open the gate of immortality to me,' being quite unbuddhistic, has probably arisen from a misunderstanding of the word *amata*, 'ambrosia,' or 'nectar.' This word, derived from the Sanskrit *amrita* (from *amri*), is applied to *Nirvāna* as being the heavenly drink of the wise, who are above the gods; it never means 'immortality,' and could not grammatically have that sense. So that the striking parallel between the Chinese verses (in the *Romantic Legend*) and 2 Tim. i. 10, falls to the ground." Of an unending life after death, then, Buddhism knows nothing.* And if it does not even admit the immortality of the soul, much less has it any place for the Christian doctrine of a resurrection.

All this being so, it follows that the Buddhist doctrine of future rewards and retributions has little in common with the doctrine of Christ, except the indissoluble nexus between sin and suffering and virtue and happiness. That Buddhism should hold fast to this doctrine and so daringly attempt to reconcile it with its nihilistic metaphysics, is a most impressive and suggestive illustration of the hold which "the fearful looking for of judgment" has upon a sinful man. But even if any insist—as it seems to us, in the face of the clearest evidence—that Buddhism does admit the continuance of the individual after death, to suffer in hell, or enjoy in heaven the reward of his works on earth, yet were this not the Christian doctrine. It were not even equivalent to the teachings of Christian restorationists. For if the retributions of the Buddhist hells might seem to be at least less dreadful, that sooner or later the unhappy victim, having exhausted the demerit of his works, will be released from his torments: yet even this is not, as restorationists teach, in order that the man may enter then upon unending blessedness in heaven. Again he must begin the almost interminable round of birth and life and death with all their possibilities of woe. Or, if, perchance, from hell the sinner mount to one of the Buddhist heavens, neither is there permanency there. For the doctrine of future reward with the Buddhist is not a

* Prof. Oldenberg maintains that the position of the Buddhist authorities as regards a hereafter, is simply non-committal. He cites many passages wherein the Buddha is said to have been asked this precise question, whether there were a life after death or not, and to have declined to answer. Granting this, the Buddhist position would rather seem to be described as agnostic regarding this matter. But even in that point of view, it is still essentially true that Buddhism has no doctrine of a life after death. And when we recall the undisputed teachings already noted, as to the non-existence of the soul, and remember that, according to Prof. Oldenberg, the Buddha, when pressed with the obvious conclusion as regards a future state, declined to disavow the inference, the statements in our article do not appear to be too strong. See Oldenberg: *Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, S., 273, ff.

doctrine of eternal reward. No one in the highest of the formless heavens shall stay there forever. Nowhere is there anything that abides, is the continual and most sad refrain of all Buddhist teaching. The only hope in this life the Buddhist can have, if he do believe in existence for himself hereafter, is that, if he *must* be born again, it may be in a condition more tolerable than this; one in which he may possibly be able by high resolution and endeavor to break the chain which binds him to the wheel of life and death, and end all conscious being. We may well sum up the case as regards this part of the Buddhist eschatology in the eloquent words of the Rev. Mr. Hardy:

“The system of Buddha is humiliating, cheerless, man-marring, soul-crushing. It tells me that I am not a reality; I have no soul. It tells me that there is no unalloyed happiness, no plenitude of enjoyment, no perfect unbroken peace, in the possession of any being whatever, from the highest to the lowest, in any world. It tells me that I may live myriads of millions of ages, and that not in any of these ages, nor in any portion of an age, can I be free from apprehension as to the future until I attain to a state of unconsciousness; and that in order to arrive at this consummation I must turn away from all that is pleasant, or lovely, or instructive, or elevating, or sublime. It tells me by voices ever repeated, like the ceaseless sound of the sea-wave on the shore, that I shall be subject to sorrow, impermanence, and unreality, so long as I exist, and yet that I cannot now cease to exist, nor for countless ages to come, as I can only attain *Nirvāna* in the time of a supreme Buddha. In my distress, I ask for the sympathy of an all-wise and all-powerful friend. . . . But I am mocked, instead, by the semblance of relief; and am told to look to Buddha, who has ceased to exist; to the Dharmma,* that never was an existence; and to the Sangha,† the members of which are real existences, but, like myself, partakers of sorrow and sin.”‡

When the Christian dies, or when we lay a Christian friend in the grave, we sorrow indeed, but *not* as without hope. When the Christian mother lays her beloved child in the grave, we comfort her with the reminder that the child is not lost, but only gone before, and that though the child shall not return to her, she shall go to the child. But what does Buddhism tell such a stricken parent? We have it in a discourse which is said to have been spoken by the Buddha himself—the parable of *Kisagotami*:

Kisagotami was a young mother who had given birth to her first-born, but “when the boy was able to walk by himself he died,” and the story goes on thus: “The young girl in her love for it carried the dead child clasped to her bosom, and went about from house to house asking if any one would give her medicine for it. When the neighbors saw this, they said, Is the young girl mad that she carries about on her breast the dead body of her son? But a wise man,—thinking to himself,—‘Alas! this *Kisagotami* does not understand the law of death, I must comfort her,—said to her, ‘My good girl, I cannot myself give medicine for it, but I know of a doctor who can attend to it.’ The young girl said, ‘If so, tell me who it is.’ The wise man continued, ‘Buddha can give medicine; you must go to him.’ *Kisagotami* went to Buddha, and doing homage to him, said, ‘Lord and master, do you know any medicine that will be good

* Law (of the Buddha).

† The brotherhood of Buddhist monks.

‡ *Legends and Theories of the Buddhists*, pp. 217, 218.

for my boy?' Buddha answered, 'I know of some.' She asked, 'What medicine do you require?' He said, 'I want a handful of mustard seed.' The girl promised to procure it for him. But Buddha continued,—'I require some mustard seed taken from a house where no son, husband, parent, or slave has ever died.' The girl said, 'Very good,' and went to ask for some at the different houses, carrying the dead body of her son. . . . The people said, 'Here is some mustard seed, take it.' Then she asked, 'In my friend's house has there died a son, a husband, a parent, or a slave?' They replied, 'Lady! what is this that you say? *The living are few, but the dead are many.*' Then she went to other houses, but one said, 'I have lost a son'; another, 'I have lost my parents'; another, 'I have lost my slave.' At last, not being able to find a single house where no one had died from which to procure the mustard seed, she began to think "This is a heavy task that I am engaged in. I am not the only one whose son is dead. In the whole of the *Savatthi* country, everywhere, children are dying, parents are dying.' Thinking thus, she acquired the law of fear, and putting away affection for her child, she summoned up resolution, and left the dead body in a forest; then she went to Buddha and paid him homage. He said to her, 'Have you procured the handful of mustard seed?' 'I have not,' she replied; 'the people of the village told me, *The living are few, the dead are many.*' Buddha said to her, 'You thought that you alone had lost a son. The law of death is that among all living creatures there is no permanence.'"*

And that was all the comfort that he had to give. Could anything be more sad? Could anything more touchingly illustrate the utter helplessness of Buddhism to comfort in the presence of death? How impressive the contrast with the words of Him who once stood near an open grave, and said unto the mourners, "I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." And yet Mr. Arnold, in the sober prose of the preface to *The Light of Asia*, extols Buddhism as having in it "the eternity of a universal hope"!! And even Prof. Max Müller thinks that he sees in this inexpressibly sad story, with its gospel of helplessness and universal doom, 'a specimen of the true Buddhism,'—wherein no doubt he is right,—"language, intelligible to the poor and the suffering, which has endeared Buddhism to the hearts of millions . . . the beautiful, the tender, the humanly true, which, like pure gold, lies buried in all religions, even in the sand of the Buddhist canon!"†

One could wish to place here, for the benefit of any who may have been unable to see any material difference between the hope of the Buddhist and the hope of the Christian believer, the inspired words of the Apostle Paul to the Thessalonians:

"We would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that fall asleep; that ye sorrow not, even as the rest, which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the

* *Lectures on the Science of Religion*, by Prof. Max Müller, pp. 145, 146.

† *Ib.*, p. 147.

voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God : and the dead in Christ shall rise first ; then we that are alive that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air ; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with *these words*."

No brighter prospect does Buddhism hold forth to the world and to the race, than to the individual man. What the Bible promises in this matter we all know. Not only does it hold forth to the individual man the promise of salvation from the guilt and power of sin, and everlasting life in resurrection glory, but also what we might call a social and governmental redemption of the human race on earth. Christ bade us to pray, that the will of God might be done on earth even as it is done in heaven ; and so no doubt it will be. All nations, we are assured, shall serve and obey the Christ of God, and over all the earth " there shall be one Lord and his name one." * Holiness shall so universally prevail that it is said, in the glowing language of the prophet, that even " upon the bells of the horses shall be Holiness unto the Lord." † The law of love shall be the law of the world. And although it is true that the Scriptures do point us forward to a coming judgment and visitation of the world that now is by fire, yet those final judgments are said to be only that the Son of Man may purge out of His kingdom " all them that do iniquity." ‡ And the consuming fires, which, according to the Word of God, shall yet enwrap the world, shall not be for the annihilation of the earth, but that as after the flood, so again life may bloom on earth anew, but not as now in sin, but in redemption. For " we look, according to his promise, for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Thus in the closing chapters of the Apocalypse, dark though they be with excess of brightness, yet so much as this is clear. As in the far distance we lose sight of the history of this planet, it disappears in the full glory of a finished and complete redemption, wherein even the very earth itself has been made to share. And among the last words which are borne to our ears are these, " There shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying ; neither shall there be any more pain." §

Truly these are wondrous words, and full of hope for those whose hearts are heavy now with the burdens and woes of humanity. The Gospel is as full of hope for the world as for the individual man.

But what says the Buddha? No such prospect opened to him. He who guessed at so much did not once guess this. He came, we are told, to preach deliverance to the world. At the best, as we

* Zech. xiv. 9.
† Matt. xiii. 41.

† Zech. xiv. 20.
§ Rev. xxi. 4.

have seen, it was but a sorry deliverance. And yet, worse still, such as it was, it was not to last. On the contrary, we are everywhere assured, that however general the moral reform which may be effected by a Buddha, sooner or later the tide of evil will roll back as before, and the whole human race will sink back into the mire of sensuality, from which the Buddha came to free them. Not only morals, but, we are told, at last even civilization and intelligence will also disappear. This will by and by necessitate the appearing of another Buddha to do the work of his predecessor over again. Yet he will achieve no more permanent success than Gautama Muni. Again will ensue the inevitable moral retrogression, till another Buddha shall appear. And so the dreary history is to go on and on repeating itself, forever and forever, till one cannot but feel that if this were indeed the truth, then Buddha *was* right after all, and *not* to be is better than to be, and to exist is verily the sum and source of all evil. All this can be abundantly proved, did space permit, from the Buddhist authorities themselves. The Rev. Mr. Hardy quotes from Mr. Turnour's translation of the Buddhist *Mahāvanso*, the statement that in the interval between one Buddha and another, "not only does the religion of the preceding Buddhas become extinct, but the recollection and record of all preceding events are also lost."*

With reference to the future of the earth itself, the Christian Scriptures plainly teach—as already remarked—that when the Lord Jesus shall return, the earth shall be visited with a general conflagration, issuing in the final destruction of the wicked from off the face of the earth. But this fiery visitation is not to result in the destruction of the planet as such, but is to be followed by the appearance of a new earth which shall be the abode of righteousness.† Nothing could be plainer than these words of the Apostle Peter:

"The heavens that now are and the earth, by the same word"—which brought about the former destruction of the world by the waters of the deluge—"have been stored up for fire, being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men. . . . The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein, shall be burned up. . . . But, according to his promise, we look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."†

And so also Buddhism teaches a future destruction of the world by fire, and the appearance of a new earth after this present earth shall thus have passed away, wherein many have imagined that they

* *Legends and Theories of the Buddhists*, p. 199.

† 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1 *et seq.*

have seen another point of coincidence, if not a genetic connexion with the Christian doctrine. But like about all the fancied coincidences between the doctrines of the Christian Scriptures and the teachings of Buddhism, the supposed agreement disappears upon examination.

In the first place, while the Scriptures reveal only one such catastrophe in the future, the Buddhist scriptures predict an innumerable series of catastrophes of world-destruction followed by world-renovation. Of these it so happens that the Buddhists say that the next will be by fire; but others will be by water; others, again, by wind. The Rev. Mr. Hardy sums up the Buddhist teaching on this subject as follows:

“The earth inhabited by men, with the various continents, *Lokas* and *Sakvālas* connected with it, is subject alternately to destruction and renovation, in a series of revolutions to which no beginning, no end, can be discovered. Thus it ever was; thus it will be ever. There are three modes of destruction. The *Sakvālas* are destroyed seven times by water, and the eighth time by water. Every sixty-fourth destruction is by wind.”*

Thus, while the Scriptures teach a single destruction of the earth in the future, to be followed by a new earth which shall abide forever, Buddhism teaches the very different doctrine of an unending series of destructions and renovations. Moreover, the Scriptures hold forth the prophecy of the new earth as full of hope and glory. As contrasted with the present earth, the new earth will be one wherein dwelleth righteousness. In it “there shall be no more curse.” † “The creation itself, also,” as well as redeemed humanity, “shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.” ‡ As opposed to all this, Buddhism teaches that both morally and physically, each of the new earths which shall after these great catastrophes succeed to one another will be like unto the earth which now is. As the next destruction of the world shall be produced by the wickedness of men as a moral cause, so shall it always be. In the next earth, men will again be produced and again go through a process of physical and moral degradation, only checked for a season, but not permanently arrested, by the appearance of another Buddha, till again the world shall be destroyed by reason of the wickedness of the men who inhabit it. “As the world is at first produced by the power of the united merit of all the various orders of beings in existence, so its destruction is caused by the power of their demerit.” § “Previous to the destruction by water, cruelty or violence prevails in

* *Manual of Buddhism*, 2d ed., p. 5.

† Rom. viii. 21.

‡ Rev. xxii. 3.

§ Hardy: *Manual of Buddhism*, 2d ed., p. 36.

the world; previous to that by fire, licentiousness; and previous to that by wind, ignorance." *

So far from any agreement here, we thus find, as in everything previously noted, the most complete and total contrast. The Bible teaches us to look for a social regeneration of man upon the earth, and finally, the redemption of the earth itself from sin and the curse. Buddha saw no such bright prospect. As regards the race, his mission of redemption, so extolled by Buddhists and the apologists of Buddhism in Christian lands, according to the uniform teaching of the Buddhist authorities, was, from the first, certain to end in failure. The decay of morals would only be at the best checked for a little, but not stopped. And when at last, because of the wickedness of men, the world and all upon it would be destroyed by fire, then indeed, we are told that a new earth will appear, but *not* a new earth "wherein dwelleth righteousness." It will be another earth just like this present, an earth wherein dwelleth sin, violence, and uncleanness. Again a new race of men shall go through the same long course of dreary and inevitable decline, which no Buddha ever to appear shall be able to prevent; and again shall come the awful world-catastrophe, wherein all shall perish. So shall it be, not once or twice, but in unending cycles of sin and retribution, forever and forever. Where, in all this, is any analogy with the teaching of the Scriptures? And this is all the light which the Buddha had to shed upon the future, either for the individual or the race. The facts are indisputable, and may be verified by any one who will take the trouble to look up the authorities. The truth is, that so far from having in it, as Mr. Arnold ventures to assure us, "the eternity of a universal hope . . . and an indestructible element of faith in final good," these words express the most complete contradiction possible of the actual facts of the case. So far is this from being true, that, to us, it quite passes comprehension, how Mr. Arnold, or any man professing the familiarity that he does with accredited sources of knowledge on the subject, could have so amazingly overlooked or misunderstood the plainest and most matter-of-fact statements. The truth is that Buddhism; judged—not by the words of foreign expositors, intent, at all hazards, on making out an essential agreement between Buddhism and Christianity—but by the repeated and most explicit statements of its own recognized authorities, is one of the most uncompromising and unmitigated systems of pessimism that human intellect, in the deep

* *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 34. See also *Pallegoix* I., 430 and 475, and *A. Rémusat*, III; cited by Köppen: *Die Religion des Buddha*, p. 287.

gloom of its ignorance of Him who is the Light and the Life of men, has ever elaborated. What shall we say then of the many who, in our day, call upon us to recognize Buddhism as the light of Asia, and thereby challenge a comparison of the doctrine of the Buddha with that of the Christ of God, of Him who is, in truth, the Light, not of Asia only, but of the whole world? To what have we come that in the full blaze of our boasted nineteenth century enlightenment, learned professors in Christian universities, poets and editors, men supposed to represent the intelligence of the age, can find it in them to extol and glorify a heathenism which is stamped with the confession of its own impotence, and condemned still more by an unvarying record of two thousand years of spiritual failure to regenerate a single tribe or people, and subdue the inborn evil of the human heart! Buddhism, "the light of Asia!" Can the Christian help recalling to mind those ancient words of the Holy Spirit of God by the prophet: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil: that put darkness for light and light for darkness"?

S. H. KELLOGG.