

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

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

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS,
Assistant Editor: T. J. McCORMACK.

Associates: { E. C. HEGELER,
MARY CARUS.

VOL. XI. (NO. 3) MARCH, 1897. NO. 490

CONTENTS:

Professor Tiele on Christianity and Buddhism. Fifth and Seventh Gifford Lectures. Reported by JOHN SANDISON, Glasgow 129

The Next Papal Conclave. PROF. G. FIAMINGO, Rome 135

Mazdaism. The Religion of the Ancient Persians. Illustrated. EDITOR . 141

The Ordeal of Cannon-Fire. DR. FELIX L. OSWALD 150

In Nubibus. The Cogitations of a Smoking Philosopher. Pipes II. and III. RECTOR G. J. LOW, Almonte, Canada 155

Developmental Ethics. ANTONIO LLANO, New York 162

The Religion of Our Ancestors. Norse Mythology. Illustrated. EDITOR . 177

Notes and Book Reviews 186

Correspondence. Science and Universalism. THE REV. H. L. F. GILLISPIE. 191

CHICAGO

The Open Court Publishing Company

LONDON: 17 Johnson's Court, Fleet St., E. C.

Annually, \$1.00. In Foreign Countries in the U. P. U., 5s 6d.

THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

FORMER AND PRESENT CONTRIBUTORS:

PROF. F. MAX MÜLLER,
PROF. ERNST HAECKEL,
PROF. EWALD HERING,
PROF. ERNST MACH,
PROF. AUGUST WEISMANN,
PROF. WILHELM WUNDT,
PROF. JOSEPH LE CONTE,
ELIZABETH CADY STANTON,
PROF. H. OLDENBERG,

JOHN BURROUGHS,
THE LATE GEORGE J. ROMANES,
DR. ALFRED BINET,
WM. M. SALTER,
MONCURE D. CONWAY,
F. M. HOLLAND,
LYMAN J. GAGE,
DR. F. F. ELLINWOOD,
DR. JOHN H. BARROWS,

PROF. E. D. COPE,
TH. RIBOT,
THE LATE GEN. TRUMBULL,
DR. FELIX L. OSWALD,
TH. STANTON,
C. S. PEIRCE,
PROF. H. SCHUBERT,
THE LATE EX-GOV. KOERNER,
COUNT LEO TOLSTOI.

"The message of *The Open Court*, to state it briefly, is that science is a religious revelation; science is the unfolding of the spirit, and its truths (if they be genuine scientific truths, are holy. If God ever speaks to his creatures, he speaks to them in the truths that they have learned from their experience, and when truths are systematised and formulated with exactness, which is the province of science, they do not become less divine, but more divine. Therefore the application of scientific exactness to the various problems of religion is a religious duty, which, if obeyed, may destroy some errors that have become dear to us, but will in the end unfailingly lead to the most important religious reform."

"Considering the religious importance of science, we call a recognition of the stern rigidity of scientific truth and of its indispensableness in all the domains of life, in the workshop as well as in the social relations of man to man, 'The Religion of Science.'"

"In propounding the Religion of Science, *The Open Court* has never identified itself with any party within or without the various churches; it has kept aloof from both the liberals and the conservatives, and has delivered its message independently and fearlessly, neither for the love of nor in spite of any one; but in doing so it has gained friends in all countries of the world, among the ranks of all churches, among the unchurched, and even among the devotees of various non-christian religions."—*Extracts from Editor's Salutory.*

SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE OPEN COURT FOR THE CURRENT YEAR.

1. Symposia of Prominent Religious Teachers, giving impartial expositions of their doctrines and confessions of faith.
2. Pithy sermons and articles by Martin Luther, not heretofore translated into English.
3. Studies in comparative religion. With illustrations.
4. A few biographies of the great thinkers and scientists of the world. With portraits.
5. Articles on scientific subjects, mathematical recreations, etc., and on the history of thought.
6. An Introduction to the Study of Ethnological Jurisprudence. By the late Justice *Albert H. Post*, of Bremen, Germany.
7. On Money. By *Count Leo Tolstoi*.

Annual Subscription, \$1.00; Foreign Countries in the U. P. U., 5s 6d.

Price of Back Volumes: Volume I-II, unbound, \$3.25; bound, \$4.00. Volumes, III-IV-V-VI-VII-VIII-IX-X, unbound, \$2.25; bound, \$3.00. Binding cases for back volumes, in cloth, with gilt side and back lettering, postpaid, 75 cents each. Carriage extra on bound volumes.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY,

324 DEARBORN STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

LONDON: 17 JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET ST., E. C.





ZOROASTER

COPIED FROM A BAS-RELIEF AT PERSEPOLIS. EXAMPLES OF PERSIAN
ICONOGRAPHY IN "EARLY SASSANIAN INSCRIPTIONS," BY EDW. THOMAS, F.R.S.

(REPRODUCED FROM "THE HUNDRED GREATEST MEN," BY PERMISSION OF SAMPSON, LOW, MARSTON & CO.)

THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

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

VOL. XI. (NO. 3.)

MARCH, 1897.

NO. 490

PROFESSOR TIELE ON CHRISTIANITY AND BUDDHISM.

FIFTH AND SEVENTH GIFFORD LECTURES.

REPORTED BY JOHN SANDISON.

AT THE OUTSET of his fifth Gifford Lecture Professor Tiele spoke of the religions which were entitled to be classed as ethical, and in this connexion he discussed the essential difference between Buddhism and Christianity, and the other religions in the group. The latter, he said, were all limited to a single people or nationality, and if they nevertheless spread and were accepted by other nations, that was done along with the whole civilisation to which they belonged. Christianity and Buddhism, however, did not direct themselves to a single people, but to all men, and to all in their own language. In short, Christianity and Buddhism were both universalistic in character, whereas the other ethical religions were, at least in a certain measure, still particularistic. Mohammedanism was so in the least degree. That religion also spread itself out among many peoples, but by its sacred language, its obligatory pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, and its legal prescriptions, which went down into details, it was much more particularistic than either Buddhism or Christianity, and it stood also in many other respects below them.

Professor Tiele acknowledged that there was an essential difference between Buddhism and Christianity, and the religion of Islam, because Mohammedanism had not brought forth the universalistic principle out of itself as a necessary application of its fundamental thought, but had borrowed it from Christianity, and had apprehended it more politically than religiously. In fact, this uni-

versalism of Islam was little different from, and was indeed nothing but an expansion of, the proselytism of Judaism.

Continued study of the subject and further reflexion, had led Professor Tiele to conclusions, even regarding Buddhism and Christianity, that differed in some respects from the prevailing view, and from that which had hitherto been accepted by him. Buddhism and Christianity were, each of them, rather an abstraction, than an actually existing organisation,—not a particular religion, but a group or family of religions, one in origin and in certain general principles, but otherwise often differing world wide and often standing in a hostile attitude towards each other. If we might define religions as “modes of divine worship proper to different tribes, nations, or communities, and based on the belief held in common by the members of them severally,” this definition was certainly applicable to the particular Buddhistic and Christian Churches and sects, but neither to Christianity nor Buddhism, as such, as a whole. Both fell outside of the boundary of their morphological classification. They were powerful revelations of the ethico-religious spirit, which, when spread by preaching, often conquered after long resistance the old religions with which they came into contact, so that they were permeated in more or less measure by the new higher principles, and were thereby wholly reformed. From this preaching, this conflict, and this fusion were born those related, yet, in kind and development, so sharply distinguished religions or churches, which, taken together, were called Buddhism and Christianity.

Inquiring next into the consequences of the specific origin of the ethical religions, the lecturer noted, in the first place, an important modification in the conception of revelation; and, in the second, the forming of more or less independent religious communities, which no longer coincided with the community of the State or the people, but took up over against them a certain standpoint of their own, which, to a certain extent, was independent. With ethical religion there arose the Church; for every ethical religion embodied itself necessarily in a Church. In passing, he remarked that he would not willingly give up the word “Church,”—not meaning the word in its philological sense, but the conception which was now definitely expressed by it.

All ethical religions or churches had proceeded out of small unions, of which, as a rule, one highly endowed spirit was the soul and centre, and these had thereby always a certain independence over against the community of the people and the State. The eth-

ical religions, and even some forms of the highest families of religion, viz., the Buddhistic and Christian, might also become State Churches, but they were so only as privileged Churches, exclusively recognised and supported by the State. They were no longer one with the State, but formed, even as State Churches, independent bodies, and they could only permanently prevent the rise of other independent church associations among the citizens of the State. The rising of such more or less independent Churches was an important factor in the history of the evolution of religion. Called into existence by the religious self-consciousness, they were destined and bound to maintain that consciousness in the first place. With their birth dawned the emancipation of religion. The Church had a right to sovereignty within her own sphere, the domain of the conscience, the life of the soul, religious conviction. But she forfeited that right as soon as she would move upon a domain which was not her own; as soon as, driven by ambition or self-interest, she refused to others the liberty she demanded for herself; as soon as she proceeded to domineer over the State, science, philosophy, or art, and thus disturbed the other expressions of the spiritual life of man in their development. In conclusion, Professor Tiele considered the third consequence of the specific origin of the ethical religions, viz.: that being born of individualism, they could never wholly kill it by the power of the community, and that, conversely, neither would individualism kill its power.

* * *

Continuing an inquiry into the directions of development in particular religions and in groups of closely related religions, Professor Tiele said in his seventh lecture that what held true of the great families of religion was also applicable to the individual members of which they were composed, to single religions as well as to groups of mutually related religions. After quoting examples to show that evolution was a very complicated phenomenon, that it did not proceed in a straight line, nor was perfectly harmonious, but that here the one side and there the other side of the religious thinking and life was specially cultivated, and that thus every religion, every school, every sect, every direction, furnished its own contribution to the general development, he said that that, however, they could only do, and they could only bear fruit for this end, if they did not remain isolated, nor shoot past the goal in more and more sharply marked one-sidedness. In such cases, indeed, there commonly sprang up a reaction. But this reaction was, as a rule, a violent subversion, a falling into the op-

posite extreme. The cure could only be brought about by reconciliation, whereby the equilibrium was restored, or rather by which the tendencies which, on account of their one-sidedness appeared to be antagonistic and irreconcilable, were resolved into harmonious co-operation. That co-operation, as was evident, would also be still always incomplete, just as all that was human was incomplete—at least at the beginning it would be rather a striving, an ideal, which was only slowly realised; but it would yet be a step forward and in the right direction. That which combined what was formerly separated, stood, on that account, higher, because it taught men to appreciate what was not esteemed, or was misunderstood, by one direction as well as by the other, as equally legitimate, nay, as even necessary elements of the religious thinking and life; and in so doing it let nothing be lost of the good in either direction, but made it conducive to the higher development of religion. The whole history of the Roman religion was the history of a constant and systematic reception of Greek ideas and observances into the firmly founded structure of the Roman forms of worship. In Christianity that confluence of the two great streams of development reached its completion. While Buddhism reached the extreme limit in the direction of the one-sided theanthropism, and embraced all the divine in the Enlightened One, but soon again fell away into a composite mythology and an abject superstition; and while Islam in its own almost fatalistic monotheism embraced the most one-sided form of a theocracy, and thereby to a considerable extent relapsed into the old particularism, Christianity brought the two antagonistic positions, transcendence and immanence, to unity by its ethical apprehension of the Fatherhood of God, in which both God's exaltation above man and man's affinity with God were comprehended.

X ✓ Christianity was the most many-sided of all religions and families of religion, and it possessed thereby a capacity of adaptation that had been called its elasticity which explained the great wealth of its many and multifarious forms. It was in more than one respect, and more than any other religious communion, the religion of reconciliation; and in this sense that it reconciled in itself with each other the apparently irreconcilable elements of the religious life, separately represented and one-sidedly developed in other religions and in earlier periods of shorter or longer duration. For it brought to unity, not only the antithesis referred to, of theocracy and theanthropism, but others as well. In its preaching of the kingdom of God, which was not future only nor exclusively heav-

enly, but existed here already among us, and must also be realised on earth; in its beautiful doctrines of the communion of saints, the brotherhood of all mankind, and the equality of all before God, it strove after the most intimate union of all men, whatever be their descent, language, or color. But along with all that, it left full freedom to the individual, by proclaiming that the unity of the spirit was the only bond of this communion, and that each individual was alone responsible for his own conscience—not like Buddhism which extinguished all individuality, because it annulled personality and imposed on every confessor passive obedience to the power placed above it. Christianity did not take up a hostile attitude to the world, nor did it mix itself with it; it neither hated nor defied it, and was therefore neither one-sidedly optimistic nor one-sidedly pessimistic. It appreciated and glorified the greatest self-denial and surrender of everything for a sacred end, but aimless self-renouncement, fasting and abstinence for their own sakes, as meritorious works it rejected. It did not assert that the reconciliation of these antinomies, the confluence of these divergent directions, was already completed in the historical Christianity. They found them still frequently side by side and in conflict with each other; they were confronted here and now by the one, and then and there by the other religious thought cultivated with special preference, embodied in diverse churches and sects, and maintained by one-sided parties. But it was distinguished by this form from all other ethical religious communions, of which even the most universalistic really knew only one form of religious life,—that they found in the bosom of Christianity all directions, and all of them appealing with some right, to the same authority. Hence, he by no means said that the reconciliation of what hitherto divided mankind in matters of religion had already come about. It was the work which for nearly nineteen centuries had been carried on in the Christian world, partly unconsciously and partly with full consciousness, but which, although not without fruit, was still far from being completed.

✧ The whole history of religion viewed outwardly was the history of a succession of all sorts of one-sided forms of religion, in which the religious elements were variously mixed, and which in rivalry with each other arose, flourished, and perished, or at least ceased to grow. The history of Christianity was the continuation of the earlier history, but more complete, many-sided, all-embracing. What he meant was only this, that when they took the trouble to penetrate to the kernel of the Gospel in which all the varieties of

Christian life took their origin, they should find there the solution of the contradictions in germ or in principle. He did not say that from partiality for the religion which he accepted as his. If he had to give expression to his religious conviction, he should confess that in the Christ, the true religion, the religion of humanity, was revealed to man. It was the religion which constantly created new forms that were higher and higher, but because they were human, were also always still defective, and which thus developed itself more and more in and through humanity. But that was a matter of belief, and he put himself here upon a purely impartial, scientific standpoint. Yet ever upon that standpoint, and as a result of historical and philosophical investigation, he did maintain that with the appearing of Christianity a wholly new period in the evolution of religion had begun; that all the currents of the religious life of humanity previously flowed together in it; and that to develop religion was now and henceforth the same as to realise more and more the principles of that religion.