

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 12.—October, 1882.

I.

LYMAN BEECHER ON THE ATONEMENT—ITS
NATURE AND EXTENT.

LYMAN BEECHER, *clarum et venerabile nomen*, was President and Professor of Systematic Theology in Lane Seminary, from the time of its full organization in 1832 to the date of his resignation in 1850; and continued to be Professor Emeritus until his death in 1863. In this relation he was truly eminent as a theological teacher, though his services in that line have been somewhat obscured, in the public estimation, by the superior brilliance of his career in the pulpit, and in the more general service of the church. While he was not remarkable for the extent of his reading, or the scope or comprehensiveness of his theology—while indeed lacking in method and system, and apparently impatient of exactness in definition and completeness in demonstration, he was always vigorous, earnest, broad in his theological conceptions, and always powerful in impressing his own convictions on the minds of those who became his pupils. If they were sometimes carried from point to point in his theological cursus, without due respect for logical order or for scholastic completeness in doctrine, they were often more than compensated by the fervors which he enkindled in their breasts, and by the grandeur of his presentation of his favorite topics in the scheme of grace. Though they may not have gone forth from his training as fully drilled in technical issues, as amply supplied with theological

II.

“THE LIGHT OF ASIA.”

NO epic poem has more quickly gained popularity than that of “The Light of Asia.” Partly owing to the novelty of the subject, this is, no doubt, for the most part due to the admirable manner in which the author has succeeded in placing it before us. During his long connection with the Civil Service of India, he had abundant opportunity for studying the physical features of the country and the national peculiarities of its people. The mountains and rivers, the changing seasons and luxuriant vegetation of that sunny clime, have given to the poet’s fancy an exuberance and beauty of description which have rarely, if ever, been surpassed. The sight of the misery and penury of the priest-ridden multitudes, and the striking contrasts in wealth and social condition presented to the eye at every turn, have made an impression upon his mind, which has caused an undercurrent of pathos to run through the whole course of the poem, causing a corresponding current of sympathy in the heart of every reader. But what adds most interest to the subject is the character of Gautama himself. In his life and words he exhibits those doubts and conflicts which, more or less, have their arena in every human breast; doubts and conflicts, the solutions of which, according to the Buddhistic theory, have been presented in this poem with consummate skill.

But whatever may be the beauties and excellencies of “The Light of Asia,” we believe that the author is inaccurate in his statements of facts and ambiguous in his use of words, and that, owing to these, he has failed in his professed object, *i. e.*, to give us “a just conception of the lofty character of this noble prince and of the general purport of his doctrines.” On the contrary, we believe that he has given us a false and dangerous conception of the teachings of Gautama, against which the reader should be upon his guard. In order to show these inaccuracies and ambiguities, we shall merely avail ourselves of the two pages of the author’s preface; for if misstatements be found here, where exactitude is most reasonably de-

manded, much more can we expect to find them in the poem itself, where such strict exactness is not required.

I. THE AUTHOR IS INACCURATE IN HIS STATEMENT OF FACTS.

In the first page of the preface it is asserted, that in the area of its prevalence, Buddhism surpasses any other form of creed. The inexactness of this assertion appears, when we remember that the area of Europe, America, South Africa, and Australia—over which the principles of Christianity prevail—is about 24,000,000 square miles, which is almost half the land-surface of the earth. Inclusive of India, the countries claimed as being occupied by the followers of Buddha would only cover about seven-twelfths of this area.* Any deduction that might be required for icy and sandy desert lands and for the uninhabited regions of America and Australia, is more than proportionately offset by the wild regions of Buddhistic Siberia and the uninhabitable mountains and desert portions of Central Asia.

Again, when it is said that 470,000,000 of our race live and die in the tenets of Gautama, it ought not to be accepted without serious qualifications. For although it is probable that the population of Buddhistic countries exceeds that of Christian, yet it is only by a great stretch of the truth that it can be said that the people of these countries still hold the tenets of Gautama. If it had been said, “the tenets of Buddhism,” we might have agreed with the statement—with the proviso, that we should always remember that the inhabitants of China hold as of equal importance the doctrines of Confucianism and Taoism.† But when it is asserted that these millions live and die in the tenets of Gautama himself, we object to the accuracy of the assertion. Gautama taught that he was only a man, an instructor rather than an authoritative superior.‡ But even so early as the time of the Legends, we have him worshipped as a god, ac-

*According to the latest statistics in the 2d edition of Meyer's “Handlexicon,” it would be almost exactly three-fifths. This makes Asia to have 44,782,916 Qt. M. Turkey in Asia, Persia, Afghanistan, Arabia, and the Caucasus have together, 8,017,509 Qt. M.; which leave for the Buddhists and India, 36,765,407 Qt. M. Europe, less Turkey, has 9,333,848; Brit., S. Af., Madag. and Or. F. S., 1,960,518; America, N. and S., 41,134,062; Australasia, less Polynesia, 7,967,379. Total, 60,395,807.—*vd. Meyer's Handlexicon, Art. Erde.*

† Martin: “The Chinese,” p. 118, and Edkins, “Religion in China,” p. 58.

‡ Le Bouddha reste homme, et ne cherche jamais à dépasser les limites de l'humanité. St. Hilaire: *Le Bouddha*, p. 168. See also the preface and many places in the poem, *e.g.* pp. 804, 833, 858, 859. In his “*Doctrina de Buddhaistaram*,” Wuttke says that Buddha is “*merus homo humanitatis summum exemplar, nihil in eo est quod naturam hominis superat*,” p. 38.

counted omniscient, possessing superhuman powers.* The author well asserts his "firm conviction, that a third of mankind would never have been brought to believe in blank abstractions"; and so, indeed, we find that they did not. For although Gautama taught virtual agnosticism, Buddhists, as Dr. Flint well argues, have not been found to be atheists.† They have gods many and lords many, for whose worship they have countless shrines and images, although these were discarded by Gautama himself.‡ But above all these gods, inconsistent as it may be with his assertion that he was merely a man, they believe Gautama to have been raised in becoming Buddha;§ and "though he discountenanced ritual, and declared himself, even on the threshold of Nirvana, to be only what all other men might become—the love and gratitude of Asia, disobeying his mandate, have given him fervent worship." Yes, disobeying his mandate, they hold his tenets! But why, counting in the same way, should not Mohammedans be said to hold the tenets of Jesus Christ? Mohammed professed to receive the Bible as the word of God, making the Koran mainly an attestation or confirmation of the preceding scriptures;|| yet no one speaks of Mohammedans as holding the tenets of Jesus, because they reject the most fundamental of His doctrines—His divinity and atonement. In like manner, is it not a great latitude, if not inaccuracy, of expression, to speak of the majority of modern Buddhists as holding the tenets of Gautama; when this most fundamental of all religious doctrines—the belief in a God—is ignored by him, and accepted by them as a living truth? For, as Prof. Tiele, of Leiden, says: "It was only when in opposition to its first principles, Buddhism had made its founder its god, that the way was open for its general acceptance."¶

* Monier Williams: "Indian Wisdom," xlv. Dr. Edkins: "Chinese Buddhism," p. 197. "Die reine Lehre des Propheten wurde bald verändert und den Götzendienerrischen Gewohnheiten der Menschen angepasst. Während Sâkyamuni ein höchstes gottliches Wesen leugnete, führten spätere erst Dämonen, dann Gottheiten ein und machten Buddha selbst als höchste Intelligenz zum höchsten Gott."—*Meyer's Handlexicon*, Art. *Buddha*.

† "Antitheism," p. 282 sq.

‡ Martin: "The Chinese," p. 119. J. Talboys Wheeler: "History of India," vol. iii., p. 97, note.

§ Edkins: "Religion in China," p. 104. Bunsen: "God in History," vol. i., p. 373. Even Brahma is said to have come from heaven, to have bowed his knee before the Buddha, and raising his hands to have besought him to preach the law. *vd.* Oldenberg: "Buddha; Sein Leben, seine Lehre, und seine Gemeinde," p. 123.

|| Muir's "Mahomet," pp. 104, 154, sq. Hughes' "Notes on Mohammedanism," p. 270.

¶ Tiele: "History of Religion," p. 137.

In the next sentence it is said, that “the most characteristic habits and convictions of the Hindus are clearly due to the benign influence of Buddha’s precepts,” and hence, “India itself might fairly be included in this magnificent empire of belief.” Now, some of the later doctrines of Brahmanism and an intensified belief in others, are, no doubt, clearly due to the influence of Buddha’s precepts;* but, on the contrary, it seems equally clear that the most characteristic habits and convictions of the modern Hindus were prior to, and hence independent of, the influence of Gautama; or else, are in direct antagonism to his teachings. Certainly, no one can dispute this in regard to caste, that great social system which binds every action of the Hindu people. As is shown by the Purusha Sukta, caste must have had its beginnings nearly five hundred years before the death of Gautama.† The developed system, as is clearly proven from the Brahmanas and the laws of Manu, and especially from the teachings of Gautama himself, must have existed in almost its present perfection prior to the time of the Buddha. The Purusha Sukta taught that in the sacrifice of the first man, the Brahman was his mouth, the kingly soldiers his arms, the husbandman his thighs, and the servile Sudra his feet. Carrying out this primary law of a book that was thought to be divine, the “distinctions of cast and the inherent superiority of one caste over the three others, were thought to be as much a law of nature and a matter of divine appointment, as the creation of separate classes of animals.” The Brahmins were invested with divine dignity. They were, as Prof. Monier Williams says, “the great central body around which all other classes and orders of beings revolved like satellites.”

Buddha, on the contrary, taught that all men are equal. He says, “There is no caste in blood, which runneth of one hue, nor caste in tears, which trickle salt for all.”‡ Again, he says: “A man does not become a Brahmana by his plaited hair, by his family, or both; and I do not call a man a Brahmana because of his origin, or of his mother.”§ To such teachings, which are diametrically opposed to caste, and to the secret or open rebellion of the lower castes against the Brahmanical hierarchy, it is maintained by all the best writers on

* Monier Williams: “Hinduism,” p. 41.

† The Purusha Sukta is the 90th hymn of the 10th book of the “Rigveda Sanhita.” It was composed some time between 1500 and 1000 B.C. *vd.* Monier Williams: “Indian Wisdom” and Müller’s “History of Anc. Sanskrit Literature.”

‡ *vd.* Poem. Cf. Oldenberg: “Buddha,” p. 154, 57., “Wer Buddha’s Jünger sein will, verz’chtet auf seine Kaste,” “Das geistliche Gewand der Jünger Buddhas macht Knecht und Herrn, Brahmanen und Sudra gleich.”

§ “Dhammapada,” verses 393 and 396.

the subject, that Buddhism owed its rapid and remarkable success in its first attempts at the moral conquest of the world.* So, then, since caste both existed before the time of the Buddha, and was the great social evil against which his doctrine of the universal equality of man was especially aimed; it certainly would be inaccurate to lay the origin and development of this most characteristic habit of the modern Hindu to the credit of the teachings of Gautama.

The next most characteristic habit of the Hindus, according to the almost universal testimony of eyewitnesses,† is the excessive ritualism and gross idolatry of the people. It might, indeed, be said: Are not these characteristic of Buddhistic peoples also? *i. e.*, of those which are acknowledged as such? To which we reply: Certainly; but even here they are clearly not due to the precepts of Gautama. For in the words of the preface, "he himself discountenanced ritual, and it was only in disobedience to his mandate that the people have worshipped him." And in the poem, he is represented as saying:

"Seek nought from the helpless gods by gift and hymn.
Pray not! within yourselves deliverance must be sought."

Again:

"Perchance the gods need help themselves,
Being so feeble, that when sad lips cry,
They cannot save."

And

"There is hope for man only in man."

For

"Which of all the great and lesser Gods
Have power or pity?
What have they wrought to help their worshippers?
How hath it steaded man to pray, and pay
Tithes of the corn and oil, to chant the charms,
To slay the shrieking sacrifice, to rear
The stately fane, to feed the priests," etc.

Moreover, the gods are declared to be less even in importance than the Buddha himself; ‡ for, during his temptation, "surely gods were round about the place, watching our Lord"; watching, because they

* So Tiele, Davids, Müller, Edkins, Hardy, Monier Williams, Burnouf, and Egge-ling.

† So Seward: "Around the World," Allen, Ward, *et al.*

‡ In the Mahâparinibbâna Sutta, Buddha says: "Die Erkenntniss, die ich erworben habe, ist zum Heil, zum Segen, zur Freude für Götter und Menschen."—Oldenberg: "Buddha," p. 203. St. Hilaire in his "Examen Critique du Bouddhisme," says, that the "Buddha has put himself personally, or rather has put man, far above all the absurd and cruel gods of the Brahmanic pantheon." In the "Introduction à l'Historie," p. 134, Burnouf declares that Shakyamuni "said, and the authors of the legends believed, that a Buddha was superior in this life even, to the greatest of the gods recognized in his time in India." Müller says: "Die Götter des Veda waren seine Diener und Verehrer geworden."—*vd.* "Einleitung," p. 116.

knew that “if one might save man from his curse, the whole wide world from mote to god would share the lightened horror.” And, finally, all men and even the gnats and worms are equal in kind to the gods; for “each hath such lordship as the loftiest ones. Nothing endures. Higher than Indra’s you may lift your lot, and sink it lower than the worm or gnat, for he who mounts will fall, who falls may mount.”

But the opposition of Gautama to ritualism might be argued even more strongly from his silence than from his precepts. In the multiplicity of his recorded deeds we find no mention of his ever having worshipped the gods in any way. Among his many sayings, we find no trace of a command to honor them. Not only is the one God ignored, but the many gods of Pantheistic Brahmanism are almost equally ignored, and as entirely disrobed of all authority and robbed of all reverence and worship.*

But if this be true of Buddhistic countries, much more is it true of India. By denying all power and sympathy to the gods and by attributing them to himself, Gautama introduced, what Dr. Edkins calls, the essential distinction between his own teachings and the belief and practice of the Brahmans. According to the Buddhistic books, the Buddha taught that the gods of Brahmanism were subject to the same changes and only superior in degree to the insects; that they were lower in degree than any man enlightened by Buddha’s law; that they were merciless and powerless; and hence that they were not to be supplicated, nor propitiated with sacrifices, nor to have temples reared and priests maintained for their worship. Whereas, on the contrary, the Brahmans revere Brahma, Siva, and Vishnu as supreme, and have a superstitious respect for spiritual beings, whom they believe to have both the power and the disposi-

* That the ritualism of the present day, whether it concerns the worship of the gods or of Buddha, is contrary to the teachings of Gautama is attested by some of the highest authorities on the religious history of India. Mr. D’Alwis writes in the *Attanagula Vausa*, as quoted by Prof. Max Müller in a note on the “*Dhammapada*,” page 89, that “orthodox Buddhists do not consider the worship of devas as being sanctioned by him, who disclaimed for himself and all the devas any power over man’s soul. Yet the Buddhists are everywhere idol-worshippers.” In his “*History of Religion*,” p. 137, Prof. Tiele says, that “Buddhism rejects the whole dogmatic system of the Brahmans, their worship, penances and hierarchy, and simply substitutes for them a higher moral teaching.” J. Talboys Wheeler, in his “*History of India*,” vol. iii., p. 147, declares, that “the myth of the temptation of Buddha confirms the view that Buddhism was a reaction from the sensual worship of Brahmanism.” The tempter Mara sent his three daughters in different stages of loveliness to seduce the apostle back to the world of passions; in other words, to win him back to the old idolatry, which he had deliberately abandoned, and against which he was destined to prove the most determined enemy.

tion to interfere in human affairs.* They assert, moreover, that Buddha was but the ninth avatar, or incarnation of Vishnu, and that he took this form for deceiving the enemies of the gods.† His doctrines are heretical. Those who believe and practice them are declared to be deserving of persecution, and by way of reproach are commonly designated by the Hindus by the term "Nāstika." ‡

Essential differences between the teachings of Gautama and the practices of the Hindus can be as strongly demonstrated with regard to other things, as can be of caste and idolatry. The Buddha, for instance, discarded the Vedas, which the Brahmans revere as divine; § and the Hindus, so far from observing the five commandments of Gautama, are characterized by untruthfulness, debauchery, and general immorality. If, then, in the face of these habits and convictions which are most clearly characteristic of the modern Hindus, it be still claimed that they are due to the influence of Buddha's precepts; wherein can that influence be called benign? And if it be admitted that they are not due to the influence of his precepts, how can India be fairly included in this magnificent empire of belief?

* Allen's "India," p. 384.

† Vijuāna Bhikshu in his "Sāṅkhya pravachana-bhashya," says: "The abominable Chārvāka doctrine was declared by Dhishana; while Vishnu, in the form of Buddha, with a view to the destruction of the Daityas, promulgated the false system of the Buddhas, who go about naked or wear blue garments. The false doctrine of Maya is correct Buddhism, etc."—*Muir's Sansk. Texts*, vol. iii., p. 202. *vd.* Williams' "Indian Wisdom."

‡ That is, nihilist; the word meaning, "there is not," according to Dr. Kellogg. "Ungläubiger und Häretiker (nāstika, frāshanda) wurden gar bald in Indien erfunden und von feindlichen Parteien hin und her geworfen."—*Müller's Einleitung*, etc.

§ *vd.* Müller's "Einleitung," p. 116. That the Vedas themselves claim to be divine and to have inspired authors, see *Muir's Sansk. Texts*, vol. iii., pp. 232-267. That the Brahmans believed the Vedas to be of superhuman origin, see the same work, pp. v, vii, xxiv, 26, 207-216, especially the excellent summary on page 208. That Buddhism was in direct opposition to this assumed authority of the Veda, D. Muir expresses as follows: "It is quite clear that even in India itself there existed in former ages multitudes of learned and virtuous men who were unable to see the force of this argument (*i. e.*, that the infallibility of the Vedas is established on internal evidence); and who consequently rejected the authority of the Vedas. I allude, of course, to Buddha and his followers"; see p. 210. On page 57, he says in a note: "The authority of the Vedas had come to be generally regarded as paramount and divine; but so long as this authority was nominally acknowledged, independent thinkers were permitted to propound a variety of speculative principles at variance with their general tenor, though, perhaps, not inconsistent with some isolated portions of their contents. It was only when the authority of the sacred books was not merely tacitly set aside and undermined, but openly discarded and denied and the institutions founded on them were abandoned and assailed by the Buddhists, that the orthodox party took the alarm." Foucaux says, that the Brahmans "rejetent avec horreur tout ce qui se rapporte à la religion du Bouddha." *vd.* his Introduction to the "Histoire du Bouddha Sakya Mouni, Traduite du Libétaine," p. ix. *vd.* also Oldenberg: "Buddha," p. 174.

In the next place, let us take a glance at the relative age of the religion of Gautama. The preface says: “The Buddha of this poem—if, as need not be doubted, he really existed—was born on the borders of Nepal, about 620 B.C., and died about 543 B.C.,* at Kusinagara, in Oudh. In point of age, therefore, most other creeds are youthful compared with this venerable religion.” Now, admitting the existence of such a man as Gautama, and admitting the date of his existence to have been as above stated, we deny that, therefore, most other creeds are youthful compared with his religion. For evidently the word creed “is here used in the sense of religious system, rather than that of canon, or symbol.” † But what systems can be meant? Not the Fetish, at least, for surely the author has not had sources of information from which to settle the relative or absolute age of a religion—if religion it can be called—to account for whose origin and age, there are distinctive theories among writers on the philosophy of religion, such as Spencer, Tiele, and Müller. Neither can it be meant, that the atheistic religion of Buddha is more ancient than the polytheism of the Iliad, of the Vedas, and of the Izdubar legends,—this, his own date precludes. But it is not much better with the religious systems of Confucius and Lao Tse. The date of the life and labors of the latter was about the same as that of Gautama; ‡ and Confucius was born during the life-time of his predecessor, probably in 551 B.C. In comparison with Buddhism, therefore, the Confucian system ought hardly be called youthful, even if it were originated by Confucius himself. § But, most probably, the system was not founded by Confucius. It was modified certainly by his views and influence, and has received its name from him; but more than this cannot be said. ¶ He did not claim that he was a founder of a religion; but he said that he was a “transmitter and not a maker, believing in and loving the ancients.” ¶¶ He was “fond of antiquity and earnest in seeking knowledge there.” His grandson

* And yet the Tibetan books give, according to Csoma, fourteen different dates for his death, ranging from 2422 to 546 B.C. The Chinese give three others. *vd.* Foucaux: “*Historie du Bouddha Sakya Mouni*,” Introduction, p. xi. Note Communiqué par M. Stan. Julian. Oldenberg places it about 480 B.C. *vd.* “*Buddha, Sein Leben*,” etc., p. 200.

† If the various sects among Christians were meant by these creeds, we should compare them with the many and widely different sects of Buddhism. *vd.* Müller’s “*Einleitung*,” p. 106.

‡ Douglas: “*Confucianism and Taoism*,” p. 175. Martin: “*China*,” p. 109.

§ They differ in age not more than fifty years in a period of 2400.

¶ Legge, p. 3.

¶¶ “*Confucian Analects*,” vii, 1; “*Douglas*,” p. 147; Müller’s “*Einleitung*” pp. 125, 140.

claimed for him, that he handed down the doctrines of Yâo and Shun, as if they had been his ancestors, and elegantly displayed the regulations of Wan and Woo, taking them as his models.* Now the doctrines of Yâo and Shun, which are contained in the first two parts of the Shoo King, were written as early, probably, as 2000 B.C., and the regulations of Wan and Woo, between 1200 and 1078 B.C.† And so truly are these the foundation of Confucius' doctrine, and so faithfully are they transmitted by him, that Dr. Legge denies that he "made any changes in the ancient religion of China, or modified its records when they passed through his hands." So that, even though Confucius was later than Buddha by half a century, yet the religion of which he was merely the transmitter cannot be called youthful in comparison with that of which the latter was the founder.

To establish the relatively superior age of Buddhism, there are still remaining the four great Monotheistic religions of the world,—Parseeism, Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism. With regard to Parseeism, which in its ultimate analysis may truly be classed as Monotheistic,‡ the inscription of Darius at Behistun shows that it must have been the state religion in Persia before 521 B.C.§ Xenophon says that Cyrus appointed the Magi to read the sacred hymns; and Herodotus, that the Persians after their conquest of the world still revered their national deities as before. It is most probable that Zoroaster lived before the reign of Cyrus (559–529 B.C.); since his name, according to Heeren, is not mentioned in Herodotus, Ctesius, or Xenophon, who would hardly have failed to mention so remarkable a man, had he lived in the period of which they write. The earliest Greek writer who mentions him is Plato,|| who regards him as a sage of remote antiquity. Yet whenever he may have lived, the religion called by his name must have been older; for according to his own statement, he was but the reformer of a religion revealed by Ormuzd to Jemshid long before his day.¶ Many place

* Legge, p. 4, from "Confucian Analects," vii, xix, and "Doctrine of the Mean," xxxi.

† Douglas: "Confucianism and Taoism," pp. 11, 15, 75.

‡ The Parsees say, that "their religion is a simple form of Monotheism, recognizing but one God, the creator, ruler, and preserver of the universe. In the government of the world, he has allowed two principles to prevail: Ormuzd, the principle of all good: and Ahriman, the principle of all evil." A. H. Mounsey: "A Journey through the Caucasus and the Interior of Persia."

§ Major Rawlinson translates the inscription as follows: the rites which Gomates the Magian had introduced, I prohibited. I re-instituted for the state sacred chants and sacrificial worship, and confided them to the families which Gomates the Magian had deprived of these offices. *vd.* Vaux: "Nineveh and Persepolis," p. 374, *sq.*

|| In his "Alcibiades."

¶ Vaux: "Nineveh," etc., p. 98.

him as early as 2500 B.C. ;* and his religious system is claimed as the natural offspring of Sabaeism, or as a more spiritual form of the old Aryan faith, which in revolt against the nature worship of the Vedas caused the separation of the Persian and Hindu branches of the Aryan race.† But even if it were proven, as Hyde and Kleuker maintained, that Zoroaster lived during the reign of Darius Hystaspis,‡ and that the Parsee religion was originated by him, he must have begun his work at the latest but a few years after the death of Gautama, and his system can hardly be called youthful in comparison with any other now existing creed.

Judaism, the author himself allows to be older than Buddhism ; for he speaks of Buddha's time as the “period when Jerusalem was being taken by Nebuchadnezzar.” The creed of Mohammed we admit to be more recent and comparatively youthful ; but, even if we were forced to admit the same with regard to Christianity, we are unable to perceive how the author can establish his statement, that “most other creeds are youthful compared with this venerable religion” of Buddha.

II. THE PREFACE IS FULL OF AMBIGUOUS LANGUAGE, THROUGH WHICH COVERT ASSUMPTIONS ARE MADE WHICH ARE NOT SUPPORTED BY FACTS.§

First, the perfect sinlessness of the Buddha is thus assumed. “Forests of flowers,” it is asserted, “are daily laid upon his stainless shrines”; and “the Buddhist books agree in the one point of recording nothing—no single act or word—which mars the perfect purity and tenderness of this Indian teacher.” Is not this a description of the character of Gautama, which, whether intentionally or not, takes undue advantage of our ignorance of his life and teachings? Is it not a covert claim, does it not in the mind of a Christian reader involve the idea, that the author of Buddhism possessed the attribute of perfect sinlessness? The word purity, to be sure, is ambiguous.

* Among them Bunsen.

† Müller : “Einleitung,” p. 97.

‡ This view is ably combated by Windischweann in his “Zoroastrische Studien,” especially in Part v, “Alter des Systems und der Texte” (*i. e.*, of the Bundehesch); and Part x, “Stellen der Alten über Zoroastrisches.”

§ The language of two persons may be the same and yet the meaning they attach to it be very different. Müller says of Christianity and Buddhism, that “in reference to some of the chief points of religion they are as opposite as the two poles”; and yet on the same page he says, that “the similarity between the speech of Buddha and his disciples and that of Christ and His apostles is very surprising.”—“Einleitung,” 226. Prof. Oldenberg also speaks of “die Unmöglichkeit für die Buddhistische Terminologie einen adäquaten Ausdruck in unsre Sprache zu erreichen.” *vid.* “Buddha,” p. 247.

It may denote either chastity or sinlessness. In the former sense Gautama was, indeed, so far as we know, perfectly pure;* at least, he was guilty of no overt breach of the seventh commandment. But is this some great thing for which he should be praised? and made second in character to Christ alone? Have there not been many equally chaste; many, of whom we have no recorded act or word to establish the contrary? But when we look at the motive of Buddha's chastity, we cannot call it pure. He himself taught that a man must be chaste, not because unchastity was a sin against God (for with him there was no God †), nor against the honor of the person injured; but because all desire brought suffering, and for this reason was to be denied. Yet, even in this sense, it cannot be truly said that Gautama was perfectly pure. For according to the poem Gautama was vowed

"Quit of all mortal passion and the touch,
Flower-soft and conquering, of a woman's hands." ‡

In the Dhammika Sutta, section 21, Gautama is represented as saying: "A wise man should avoid married life, as if it were a burning pit of live coals." And the reason that a man should thus avoid married life, was, because a woman was thought to be of an order inferior to man;§ and more especially, because the touch of her created desire, and hence would be pollution, since all desire was in itself sinful. || Now the delights enjoyed by Gautama after his mar-

* It is a question whether Gautama would be chaste, according to 1 Cor. vii. "So far as we know," for it is most likely that we have not the true history of Gautama. Müller says in his "Einleitung in die vergleichende Religionswissenschaft," p. 28: "Zeugen die etwa gewagt hätten, unbewiesene Thatsachen zu bezweifeln oder zu verwerfen, oder gar den heiligen Character des Buddhain irgend eine Weise anzutasten, nicht die geringste Aussicht auf Gehör hatten." Der Maharausa sagt, p. 12, "Nānehi ratha vatthabam," etc., "Andern, *d. h.*, unfreundlichen, Priestern kann nicht erlaubt werden gegenwärtig zu sein," *i. e.*, at the council.

† *vd.* Müller's "Einleitung," etc., p. 226. *vd.* also St. Hilaire: "Le Buddha," especially the "Introduction," and the "Examen Critique du Bouddhisme." Dr. Flinl makes him an agnostic. *vd.* "Antitheism," p. 282, *sq.*

‡ Is not the argument of the Akkhinich ambiguous when it says: La jeunna Sakya Mouni n'est pas un homme puisqu'il abandonne Yasoithara? *vd.* "Turnours and Foucaux," p. 213.

§ In illustration of the supposed inferiority of woman, see "Buddhaghosha's Parable on the Five Commandments" (Rogers' translation, Müller's edition, p. 157); where it is said of a man who, according to the law of Kāme, had to suffer in a hellpot so severe a punishment that only once every sixty thousand years did he come for a breathing-time to the surface; that after a series of revolutions, he became, as the severest punishment of all, a woman.

|| This doctrine of the sinfulness of all desire is the ground of much of the boasted morality of Buddhism. That no essential distinction was made between good and evil desires, we shall endeavor to show at some length; because we think it proves

riage, which are so gorgeously depicted in Bk. ii. of the poem, show that the prince, judged by this Buddhistic standard of chastity formed by himself, was not perfectly pure. And lest it should be said, that this occurred before he became Buddha, and that thereafter the prince was guilty of no such impurity, the author in Bk. vii. has inserted the scene of the meeting between the enlightened hermit and his long-deserted wife, Yasodhara. This shows, that even after he had attained Nirvana, Gautama was polluted by the “touch of a woman’s hand”; and the consequent story of Luksmi, which was invented in order to justify this outrageous breach of the Buddhistic law of chastity in the eyes of his accusing followers, puts an exceedingly severe strain upon either the veracity, or the sanity, of this “noble prince, second in character to Christ alone.”

that their moral system springs, not from right, but from selfishness. In the “Dhammapada” we have the following: 273, The best of virtues is passionless. 272 and 187, A Bikshu receives confidence, and a disciple who is fully awakened delights only in the destruction of all desire. 352, He who is without thirst and without affection, has received his last body; he is called the great sage, the great man. 369, He who has cut off passion, goes to Nirvana; and 368, Nirvana itself is the place of the cessation of natural desires, so that, 370, those who have cut off the final fetters of the senses entirely are called Oghatinna, saved from the flood; and those who have escaped all thought of pleasures, 371, escape the punishment of swallowing hot iron balls in hell. Again, 333, we have the direct command: Drive away the desires, O Brahmana; and in 386 the assurance is given, that he who is without passion has attained the highest end, and can in truth be called a Brahmana. More explicit still are the following: 410, He who fosters no desires for this world, or for the next, who has no inclination and is unshackled (*i. e.*, by the senses); and who, 412, is above good and evil, above the bondage of both (notice the bondage of good as well as of evil), and who, 418, has left what gives pleasure and what gives pain, who is cold and free from all germs (of renewed life), whose passions are extinct—him, I call indeed a Brahmana. As to the passion of love in particular, the Dhammapada teaches: 215, From love comes grief, from love comes fear; he who is free from love knows neither grief nor fear. 211, Let, therefore, no man love anything; those who love nothing have no fetters. 284, So long as the love of man to woman, even the smallest, is not destroyed; so long is his mind in bondage, as the calf that drinks milk is to its mother. 218, He whose thoughts are not bewildered by love is called Urdhvaseotas (*i. e.*, one who is free from the vulgar passions of the world, and who has attained the last stage, before he reaches the Arupadhātu, or formless world). [*vid.* Müller’s note to verse 218 of the Dhammapada. Compare also Buddhaghosha’s parable of the Nat king, Nagadatta, and Burnouf’s “Introduction,” p. 614.] Moreover, the vow of total abstinence from all contact with women was a necessary preliminary to an admission to the priestly order. The reason for this was, that the entire forsaking of the world was considered a necessary step toward the attainment of spiritual freedom; for according to the Drammika Sutta, 12, “form, sound, taste, smell, and touch, intoxicate beings; and, therefore, we must cut off the yearning which is inherent in them” (David’s “Buddhism,” p. 63). The anecdote of Oupagoupta also illustrates this selfishness of the Buddhistic morality. He is said to “have resisted the seductions of a rich and beautiful courtesan, not by saying that continence is a duty, and that it is well to battle against culpable desires, but by thinking it is better for those who aspire to freedom and who wish to escape the law of another birth (renaissance) not to go to see this woman.” St. Hilaire: “Le-Buddha,” p. 154. *vid.* also Wuttke: “Die Doctrina,” pp. 24-26; and Oldenberg: “Buddha,” pp. 120, 206, 215, 223.

But if we take the second meaning which may be given to purity—that of sinlessness; yet still we have an ambiguity. What we mean by sinlessness depends upon our idea of sin.* Now, in the first place, Gautama, according to his own teachings, was certainly not free from sin. Sins, he taught, were ten in number, and their essence was desire, or trishna. The last of these ten to be overcome (for they are always overcome in the same order †) is Avidya, or ignorance. When this fetter, or sin, is broken, a man has become Asikha and has thus put an end to all delusion and sorrow.‡ He has come to the fruit of the fourth path, the state of an Arahat, of a man made perfect according to the Buddhist faith—he has attained unto Nirvana.§ But to this state Gautama did not attain until his famous night under the Bo-tree (Bk. vii. of poem). || Hence before this he must have been in ignorance, and hence could not have been sinless according to the Buddhistic notion of sin.

But, in the second place, he was not sinless according to any definition of sin which would make it a transgression of moral law. Let us try him in reference to that commandment most universally recognized of all—the commandment against lying. Buddha himself taught that lying was wrong. The third precept of his law is: One should not lie; or as the poem states it:

“Bear no false witness, slander not, nor lie;
Truth is the speech of inward purity.”

In the 22d verse of the Dhammika Sutta, it is enjoined, that “when one comes to a royal assembly, or gathering, he should not tell lies to any one, nor consent to the acts of those who tell lies; he should avoid any kind of untruth.” Verse 306 of the Dhammapada states, that “he who says what is not goes to hell; he also, who having done a thing says, I have not done it.” Finally, in the 23d of

* “Es ist klar dass dieser Ausdruck (*d. h.*, Sündlosigkeit) erst seine volle Bedeutung erhält durch die Bestimmung seines Gegensatzes, nämlich der Sünde.” *vid.* Ullmann: “Die Sündlosigkeit Jesu,” p. 16.

† *vid.* Childer’s Dict., and Oldenberg: “Buddha,” p. 317; and “Excursus” iii, p. 451, 59.

‡ So Burnouf says in “Le Buddhisme Indien,” p. 474, he is now one “qui apprend omniscience,” “qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas”; or, as the Commentor of Hodgson says (Burnouf, 507), he is now “un esprit qui peut ignorer ou connaitre la vérité touchant les choses.”

§ David’s “Buddhism,” p. 110.

|| Oldenberg: “Buddha,” p. 109, 59.: “Aus dem Asketen Gotama war der Buddha, der Erwachte, Erleuchtete geworden. Jene Nacht, die Buddha unter dem Baum der Erkenntniss, am Ufer des Flusses Neranjara zugebracht hat, ist die heilige Nacht der Buddhistischen Welt.”

Buddhaghosha's parables, it is said that “those who tell falsehoods are swallowed up by the earth, and after death suffer the condition of a hell Preta; and when they are released from that state of suffering and have become men, they will have to bear false witness.”*

Such was the teaching of the Buddha; what was his practice, the Buddhists' own books being witness? Buddha taught that the Rishis were practically omniscient. They could see backward forty Kalpas, and forward the same period, and they know events in each.† A Rahat, more gifted still, was endowed with power to reveal his various former existences for innumerable Kalpas; and according to the Atuwawa, or commentary on the above passage, “to the intelligence of the supreme Buddha there is no limitation.”‡ Again, it is said that the Buddhas are “beings established in the science of supernatural learning, gifted with an infinite view”;§ and Gautama is said to have attained this science under the Bo-tree, when “as the Tibetans say, at the instant when the people struck the tambour, being clothed with a quality of a Buddha perfectly accomplished, and with that of perfectly accomplished intelligence, he attained the triple science,” *i. e.*, a knowledge of the past, present, and future.||

This omniscience of the Buddha is the teaching of the poem also. Thus his teacher, Viswamitra, worshipping him, says:

Thou “comest to my school only to show,
Thou knowest all without the books.”

Again, Gautama is represented as attaining Abhidjña, “insight vast, ranging beyond this sphere to spheres unnamed,” where “he beheld with unsealed vision terms of time which no man grasps.”¶ His omniscience is implied also in the first page of the poem, where the as yet unborn Buddha, long before he entered Nirvana under the Bo-tree, says: “Yea, now I go to help the world this last of many times, for birth and death end hence for me.”**

* *vid.* Roger's translation, p. 158.

† According to Burnouf (“Introduction,” p. 75), a Kalpa signifies the duration of the periods of the world. These periods lasted from 16,800,000 to 1,344,000,000 years. So Rémusat and Deshauterayes, followed by Burnouf in “Le Lotus de la bonne Loi,” p. 324.

‡ *vid.* Turnour's translation of the Patisamvidan. Müller says that he was by his first disciples named Sarvagna, *i. e.*, Omniscient. “Einleitung,” p. 117.

§ “Le Lotus de la bonne Loi,” ch. xx., verse 1.

|| St. Hilaire: “Le Buddha,” p. 29; Foucaux: “L'histoire du Sakya Mouni,” p. 336.

¶ As Burnouf explains this term, it is “a state which is characterized by the perfection of indifference (*upeksha*), where in the complete absence of all pleasure and of all grief, and gifted with an illimitable knowledge, he reposes in perfect indifference in regard to all things.” “Lotus de la Bonne Loi,” p. 819.

** This language is authorized by the prologue to the *Laltairstara*, in which “the Buddha himself recounts that which he did before he was born, and before he became incarnate among men.” St. Hilaire: “Le Buddha,” p. 50.

We believe that our religious natures and the inconsistencies of the philosophy of Gautama contradict his omniscience;* but if this be not allowed, most certainly is it disproved by his false statements in regard to matters of science.† As to geography, he teaches that there are waves in the sea one hundred miles high, that the sea near the Sakwala rock is 820,000 miles deep, that it is agitated by the wind 400,000 miles from the surface, and that under this that is agitated by the wind, there are 40,000 miles of still water. Then there are said to be four continents, one of which, Jampudipa, is 100,000 miles in length and breadth; it has on it the forest of Himalawana, with mountains 2,000 miles high, and seven lakes, each of which is 1,500 miles in length. He speaks, also, of a tree 1,000 miles high.

Again, he pretended to have a perfect insight into past ages; but in none of his numerous references to the past does he tell us that it was different from the present. According to him, there always existed the same kinds of birds, beasts, and reptiles as now exist. How is it, also, that, if omniscient, he never mentions any known creatures except those that are common to India?

Finally, astronomy disproves his omniscience. He taught that the sun was but 400 miles in diameter, and the moon 490; that the planets travel on the two sides of the moon, and that their orbits are horizontal to, and at the height of 420,000 miles from the earth; that there are numberless worlds on a plane level with that in which we live, and that in the centre of each is a mountain, Maha Méru, 1,680,000 miles high, and at the circumference of each a ridge of stone, called the Sakwala rock, 36,000,000 miles in circumference; and that between Maha Méru and Sakwala there are seven circles of rocks with seven seas between them.

Such teachings need no refutation. We have merely mentioned them to disprove the claim of Gautama to omniscience, and to convict him of sin in pretending to teach as truth that of which he knew nothing.

We shall enlarge upon but one other statement of the preface, *i. e.*, that the "doctrine of transmigration—startling to modern minds—was established and thoroughly accepted by the Hindus of Buddha's time." Notice here the assumption made because of the ambiguity of the word "transmigration." This term has been used to denote

* *Vd.* St. Hilaire's able exposition of this argument in the "Examen Critique du Buddhisme," and "Hardy's Legends," etc., pp. 206-221.

† Here we shall make a liberal use of Mr. Spence Hardy's work, "The Legends and Theories of the Buddhists." More freely do we do this since the author of the poem has used the "Buddhistic citations much as they stand in Spence Hardy's work—referring, however, to the Manual."

very different ideas. The transmigration of the Egyptians was nothing more than a transformation, depending “simply on the pleasure of the deceased or of his genius.”* The Hindus, however, as well as Pythagoras and Origen, meant the transmigration of the soul; for two of the six principles common to all the philosophical creeds are, the eternity of the soul both retrospectively and prospectively, and the transmigration of the soul through an innumerable succession of bodies.† But the transmigration of the Buddhists was not that of the soul; for according to Gautama and his followers, there was no soul.‡ It is only through ignorance that a being indulges the dream that it is a separate or self-existing entity;§ and the existence of any such thing as soul is an impossibility, which the Buddhists take great pains to prove. This is implied in their definition of death, which is called *khandanan Chedo*, the breaking up of the *skandas*, a dissolution of the system.|| In none of Gautama’s many definitions of death has he intimated that it was the departure of a soul from the body to exist in another form. On the contrary, it was one of the heterodox opinions to represent the soul upon death as “flying happily away, like a bird from its cage.” This impossibility is implied, also, in their definition of birth, which is declared to be “*khandanan patubhawo*,” the springing up into existence of the *skandas*.¶ This destroys any previous existence of the soul, and hence any present existence to one who believes in its transmigration; “for the verb *patubhawati* signifies that beginning which had no previous existence.”

But not only is the doctrine of the non-existence of the soul implied, it is expressly taught. The priest Nagasena answers King Milinda’s question as to whether a living soul is received upon transmigration by saying: *Parametthenu* (it is not received), and he goes on to deny the existence of the soul at all.** In the *Sutta Pitaka*, Gautama said: “Mendicants! the unlearned man regards the soul either as identical with, or as possessing, or as containing, or as resid-

* Renouf: “Religion of Ancient Egypt,” p. 189, *sq.*

† Prof. Monier Williams: “Hinduism,” pp. 49, 50, and “Indian Wisdom,” p. 61, *sq.*; *vd.* also, Wheeler’s “History of India,” vol. iii., p. 72, *sq.*

‡ Les textes à la main, je soutiens que le Buddha n’admet pas plus l’âme de l’homme qu’il n’admet Dieu. St. Hilaire: “Le Buddha,” preface; p. vi.

§ Davids: “Buddhism,” p. 83. *Vd.* also Oldenberg’s chapter on “Die Seele,” in his “Buddha,” pp. 258–269.

|| Gogerly in *Ceylon Friend*. *Vd.* Hardy’s “Legends,” etc., appendix, p. 236.

¶ Gogerly, as above.

** Gogerly, and also the *Milinda Prashnaya*, as given by Davids, p. 96. *Cf.* Oldenberg: “Buddha,” p. 260, *sq.*

ing in one of the five skandas. By regarding the soul in one of these ways, he gets the idea, 'I am.' Now the notions 'I am,' 'This I exists,' 'I shall or shall not have material qualities,' 'I shall or shall not have, or shall be neither with nor without ideas'—these notions, the sensual unlearned man derives from sensation, which is produced by contact and ignorance. But, mendicants! the learned disciple, by his conversion has got rid of ignorance and acquired wisdom; and therefore, by reason of the absence of ignorance and the rise of wisdom, the ideas 'I am,' etc., do not occur to him."*

In another place he enumerates sixteen heresies teaching a conscious existence after death, and concludes the sermon by saying: "Mendicants! that which binds the teacher to existence (viz., *tanha*, thirst or the desire to live) is cut off, but his body still remains. While his body shall remain, he will be seen by gods and men; but after the termination of life, upon the dissolution of the body, neither gods nor men will see him."† In a discourse to a person named Sona, he is even more explicit. He declares, that if "there is any organized form of sensation, perception, thought, or consciousness, past, present, or future, internal or external, great or small, remote or proximate—to all it should be clearly and distinctly known: This is not mine. I am not it. It is not to me a soul."‡

They taught the non-existence of the soul by illustration also. Man consisted, as they said, of five properties or skandas.§ As no one of these is permanent, so the collection of them is impermanent. When these five constituents which make up man are separated, he ceases to be, just as the cloud ceases to be when its particles are dissipated in the shower. Man is like a light, to develop which we have the wick, the oil, the lamp, and the flame. When the five skandas are separated, the man ceases to exist, just as the light, when the flame is extinguished. Again, man is like a cart—only a name, nothing in itself but an idea. A collection of things of a certain form and size, we call a cart. But if we ask what the cart is, since it is evident that it is neither the axletree, nor the wheel, nor the shafts, nor any other separate portion, we are unable to tell what it is, except that it is a

* Davids: "Buddhism," p. 97, *sq.* *Vd.* also the *Abhidharma Kisha Vgakhya* of the Northern Buddhists in Burnouf's Introduction, p. 263, *sq.*

† *Brahmajala Sutta.*

‡ Gogerly: *Ceylon Friend.*

§ The first group, the material qualities, are like a mass of foam that gradually forms and then vanishes. The second group, the sensations, are like a bubble dancing on the face of the water. The third, the ideas, are like the uncertain mirage that appears in the sunshine. The fourth, the mental and physical predispositions, are like the plantain stalk, without firmness or solidity. And the fifth, the thoughts, are like a spectre or magical illusion. *vd.* Davids: "Buddhism," 90 *sq.*, and Hardy: "Manual."

name. In like manner, since neither the hair, nor the nose, nor the arm, nor the foot, nor any other separate member is the man, we cannot say that there is more of him than a name. So also, since none of the parts above mentioned is the soul, and as they (*i.e.*, the five skandas) are all of the constituent elements essential to existence, then there is no soul.

Finally, that the Buddhists believed in the non-existence of the soul, is evident from the controversies which raged between them and the Brahmans. The Brahmans, according to Colebrooke, recognize the doctrine of the non-existence of the soul as one of the distinctive features of the tenets of Buddha. Buddhists, on the contrary, call the Brahmans heretics, because they teach that the soul is eternal. They have two separate words by which to designate the heresy of the belief in a soul. These are, “sakkayaditthi,” the heresy of individuality, the name given to the belief as one of the three primary delusions, which must be abandoned at the very first step of the Buddhist path of holiness; and “attavada,” the doctrine of soul or self, which is the name given to it as part of the chain of causes which lead to the origin of evil.*

But what was the Buddhist transmigration, if it were not that of the soul? It was the transmigration of Karma, *i.e.*, of the desert or merit of a being, of the total moral character of a man, at death.† This character is the result of the totality of the moral actions of a being in all previous states of existence. It passes over, as soon as a man dies, to a new being who is entirely distinct in his identity; and yet whose whole life it influences, both in its nature (*i.e.*, as to whether it be beast, or bird, or man, etc.), and in its actions, and in its circumstances, and in its destiny.‡

* Davids: “Buddhism,” pp. 95-109. So in the poem the first sin is called “Attavada,” the sin of self, “who in the universe, as in a mirror, sees her fond face shown,” and crying “I,” would have the world say “I,” and all things perish so if she endure. Here is another instance of the way in which the author throws a Christian halo around terms which have an entirely different meaning in the Buddhistic system. He speaks of the “Attavada,” so as to lead us to the belief that Buddha here enjoins the virtue of unselfishness. But the sin is not selfishness, as we use the term. It is the sin of thinking that I am a separate, distinct entity, a living soul with personal identity and an eternal existence. This sin we have overcome, when we have come to believe that “the things that I see and know are not myself, and that what seems to be myself, in reality neither is myself nor belongs to myself.” *vd.* Bigaudet: “Life of Gaudama.”

† “Buddhism does not teach the transmigration of souls. Its doctrine would be better summarized as the transmigration of character.” Fausböll: “Buddhist Birth Stories,” vol. i., lxxvi.

‡ Davids: “Buddhism,” p. 101, *sq.*; Burnouf: “Lotus de la Bonne Loi,” ch. iii., 109; Hardy: “Legends, etc.,” xlvi., 164, 172, 213; Williams: “Hinduism,” 76-98; Tiele’s “History of Religions,” p. 135; Oldenberg says: “Der Buddhismus lehrt; Meinè That ist mein Besitz, meine That ist mein Erbtheil, meine That der Mutterlieb, der mich gebiert. Meine That ist das Geschlecht, dem ich verwandt bin; meine That ist meine Zuflucht.” *vd.* “Buddha,” p. 248.

The Buddhists, then, did not believe in the existence of the soul. Their transmigration was not, as that of the Hindus, one of the soul, but of character. It is, therefore, making a statement founded on the sound and not on the sense of a word, to say that their "doctrine of transmigration was established and thoroughly accepted by the Hindus of Buddha's time."*

There are other inaccuracies and assumptions in "The Light of Asia," to which we shall merely call attention. Notice, for example, the use of the formula, "I take refuge in Buddha." How senseless and illogical it is to speak of taking refuge in one who, at death, according to his own teaching, ceased to be; † to take refuge in one who taught that each man must gain salvation for himself. ‡ How groundless, too, is the praise which he gives to this religion, for having in it the "eternity of a universal hope, the immortality of a boundless love, an indestructible element of faith in final good, and the proudest assertion ever made of human freedom." "The eternity of a universal hope?" Rather the universality of an eternal hope; for, according to the books of the Buddhists themselves only three or four besides Gautama have ever attained to the Nirvana of which he speaks in such glowing terms. § "And an indestructible element of faith in final good?" Yes, a final good which consists in annihilation of all desire, in cessation of all existence, in blank, thoughtless, passionless nothingness. || "And the proudest assertion

* We could just as well say that the doctrine of justification was thoroughly accepted by the Galatians to whom Paul wrote, or by the Papists in the time of the Reformation. A doctrine of justification they had; but not *the* doctrine of justification by faith alone. So the Hindus had a doctrine of transmigration, but not *the* doctrine of the Buddhists.

† Buddha himself said, according to the poem: "Yea, now I come, this last of many times; for birth and death end hence for me." In the "Histoire du Bouddha Lakya Mouni, Traduite du Tibétain par Ph. Ed. Foucaux," Bouddha says: "L'être n'existant pas, la naissance n'existe; par l'anéantissement de l'être la naissance est anéantie." *vd.* chap. xxii., p. 333. *Cf.* also "The Dhammapada," vv. 114, 374, 238, 327, and the last, with the fact of Buddha's attainment of Nirvana. Foucaux, ch. xxi. Poem, Book VII.

‡ Among his last words to his beloved disciple, Ananda, were: "Thou hast done good, Ananda; only strive, from sin thou wilt soon be free." His last words were: "Strive without ceasing." *vd.* Oldenberg: "Buddha," p. 206. So the poem says: "Within yourself deliverance must be sought."

§ So Davids: "Buddhism," p. 125.

|| A final good which says that "The greatest happiness is, not to be born; and the next greatest is for those who have been born to die soon." Bunsen: "God in History," vol. i., p. 375. "Finis Buddhaistarum verus non est summa omnium perfectis sed interitus." "Is verus vitæ finis est, ut homo redeat eo, ex quo exortus est, in nihilum." Wuttke: "De Doctrina Budd.," pp. 30, 32. "Das Dasein ist unser Unglück. Dies ist unsere tragische Schuld, dass wir sein wollen, das wir wir sein wollen." Oldenberg's "Buddha," p. 229. *Cf.* also the 2d and 3d of Buddha's "Four Verities."

ever made of human freedom.” Proud, indeed, since it ignores or denies a God,* disdains all responsibility to any one but self (or Karma), refuses to think of sin as immoral,† and makes self the ground and the aim of all moral actions. But how absurd to speak of freedom, when a man’s whole moral character has been determined for him by another and distinct individual in a previous and to him (who is not a Buddha!) unknown and unknowable state of existence; when the form of his existence, as deva or beast, as insect or man, has been determined by a Karma worse than the fate of the Grecian mythology—a Karma of which he is utterly unconscious and from which he cannot escape, unless, perchance, in annihilation, and this to be attained only after immeasurable degrees of suffering and almost endless generations of births.‡

Finally, notice the quiet assumption as to the “miracles which consecrate this record.” Absurd and impossible as they are in themselves, even if true, they would fail to consecrate the record of Gautama; since equally great and absurd miracles are said to have been wrought by countless others as well accredited as he.§

These are the most important inaccuracies of the preface to the “Light of Asia.” They are mostly of those subtle kinds of assumption which arise from careless statement of facts, or the use of ambiguous words. Enough, we believe, have been proven to have been made in the preface of this work, to put all upon their guard against the hasty acceptance of statements made in the poem itself as to the life and doctrines of Gautama.

But before we close, let us state in his own words the aim, sources, and principles of criticism which have guided the author in the construction of his poem; and let us state an example illustrating the application of these principles.

*“Der Buddhismus ignorirt jede Spur des Gefühls der Abhängigkeit von einer höhern Macht und leugnet daher die Existenz einer höchsten Gottheit.” Müller: “Einleitung,” p. 226.

† *Tamenquæ Buddhaistæ de moribus docent, non vere moralia, sed potius naturalia, esse videntur.* The five commands are all negative: “Homo enim debet animam revocare ab omnibus rebus quibus sensus incitantur et cupiditates.” *vd.* Wuttke: “De Doctrina Budd.,” pp. 24-26.

‡ *vd.* St. Hilaire’s criticism of such a freedom in his book, “Le Bouddha.”

§ “Die Bhuddistischen Legenden fliessen von erbärmlichen Wundern über, welche Buddha und seine Jünger vollbracht haben sollen, Wunder, die an Wunderlichkeith die Wunder aller andern Religionen weit überbreiten während in ihren eigenen kanonischen Schriften die Worte Buddha’s aufbewahrt sind, mit denen er seinen Jüngern wehrt Wunder zu thun.” Müller: “Einleitung,” p. 25. Wuttke says: “Miracula quidem edidit magna et multa, sed quicumque homo sanctus est eadem edere potest.” “De Doct. Budd.,” p. 11. Oldenberg says that it was “later centuries which first endowed his history with miracle upon miracle.” See “Buddha, etc.” p. 83.

"In the following poem," says he, "I have sought to depict the life and character and indicate the philosophy of Prince Gautama of India, the founder of Buddhism." My work has been "inspired by an abiding desire to aid in the mutual understanding of East and West." My sources have been "the imperfect Buddhistic citations, much as they stand in Spence Hardy's work." These citations I have accepted; and "I have also modified more than one passage in the received narratives." My views, however, are "the fruits of considerable study, and also of a firm conviction that a third of mankind would never have been brought to believe in blank abstractions or in nothingness as the issue and crown of being." Imperfect citations, accepted! Received narratives, modified! Fruits of a firm conviction! Of the working of such principles, the first half of the poem is an excellent example. These four books cover twenty-nine years of the life of Gautama, and reach merely to the time of his flight.* All that we know of the history of Gautama up to this period of his life, is: He was the son of a rich nobleman, whom later legends first transformed into a great king; he was reared at Kapilarastro, probably by his aunt, who was also his step-mother. In addition to this, we hear of a step-brother and step-sister, and that he was married and had a son.† Upon this slender basis of historical fact, aided by his firm convictions, imperfect citations, and wilful modifications, has the author built the beautiful fabric of the former and more delightful portion of his poem. Its miracles and prophecies, its pleasure-grounds and palaces, its sleeping beauties and royal gala days, centering around the person of an all-knowing and heaven-descended prince, are charming portraits from the galleries of legend and imagination; but not even the genius of an Edwin Arnold can transform them into the vitality of history and truth.‡

* Oldenberg: "Buddha sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde," p. 105. St. Hilaire: "Le Buddha et sa Religion," v. "Il abandonne à 29 ans la cour du roi son père pour se faire religieux et mendiant."

† *vid.* David's "Buddhism," *in loc.*, and Oldenberg's "Leben Buddha's," pp. 101-104. The latter says: "Eine weit verbreitete Tradition lässt Buddha einen Königssohn sein. Diese Vorstellung aber ist der ältesten Gestalt in welcher die Traditionen über die Familie uns vorliegen durchaus fremd; vielmehr haben wir uns in Buddhodana nicht mehr zu denken als einen der grossen und reichen adligen Grundbesitzer vom Sakkyastamm. Von der Kindheit Buddha's wissen wir kaum etwas. Die traditionelle Erzählung lässt den jungen Adligen seine Jugend in Kapilaratthu verleben. Wir hören von einem Stiefbruder und Stiefschwester, und dass der künftige Buddha vermählt war und dass er einen Sohn hatte. Mit diesen spärlichen Zügen ist Alles erschöpft, was von Buddha's Jugendleben uns glautlich überliefert ist."

‡ Perhaps the next essay of the gifted author will be: "The Light of the World," an attempt to depict the life and character of Jesus of Nazareth, founded on the Gospel of the Infancy and various imperfect citations from legendary lore, aided by the

We close with a few questions. Why does the author eliminate from his narrative the scientific teachings, recorded in Hardy's "Legends," which seem to militate against the omniscience or the truthfulness of the Buddha? *

If the author believed that the sources of the first four books were legends, what excuse has he for having introduced into his poem so many misleading parallelisms with the life of Christ? †

If he did not believe this, is he who depends upon Spence Hardy's "Manual" able to stamp as reliable history that which has been condemned by Professors Rhys Davids and Oldenberg?

Are not the inaccuracies of the preface, the legendary sources of the poem, the critical principles of the author, together with one such astounding example of their application as is above mentioned, sufficient to condemn the whole production—not as a consummate work of art and masterpiece of poetic genius, but as an attempt to give us a "just conception of the lofty character of this noble prince and of the general purport of his doctrines"? ROBT. D. WILSON.

author's firm convictions and useful modifications of received narratives. He might also find material for a life of Mohammed or Lao Tse. *vid.* Irving's "Successors of Mahomet," p. 93, and Plaenkner's "Der Weg zur Tugend," Einleitung, p. 1.

* See above.

† *Cf.* "I go to help the world" with "Lo! I come to do thy will"; the announcement to the Virgin with the dream of Maya; the conception and bliss of Maya with those of Mary; the dreams, the joy in heaven, the songs of the Devas, the coming of merchantmen, the prophecies of Asita, the worshipping of the babe, the piercing of the sword, etc., etc., with similar incidents and statements in the Gospels. Whether all, or most, of these incidents and turns of thought are actually found in the 84,000 canonical books of the Buddhists, is a question which in our present knowledge of these books no one is in a position to deny. We think, however, that it would be impossible for the author to prove that all of them were found in the materials at his command—unless in his firm conviction that they should be found there. But even if they were so found, their legendary character would preclude their use in a work which, as the author's, purposes to give us "a just conception of the character" of the Buddha.