

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### BUDDHIST OMISSIONS IN HASTINGS'S DICTIONARY OF RELIGION AND ETHICS.

BY ALBERT J. EDMUNDS.

#### *Second Paper.*

These omissions, first noted in *The Open Court* for July, 1912, still continue. But we must not forget that the gigantic work is a pioneer one, and big with promise for the future. Furthermore we cannot expect professional Christians to accord the same full treatment to a great rival religion which they accord to their own. With these reservations, and expressing the warmest appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Hastings for his great work, I wish to point out a few more gaps in the record.

Under the article "Fiction," the Jātakas are hardly more than mentioned. Under "Grail" no mention is made of the wanderings of Buddha's alms-bowl, as testified to by Fā-hien in the fifth century. Under "Gospels, Apocryphal," no mention is made of the demonstrable Buddhist influence in these. We will not register a like complaint about the canonical Gospels, because the work which deals with this subject is hardly known to British and Americans, but to Japanese, Italians, Germans and Frenchmen. Therefore we cannot expect the full treatment in an English cyclopedia which we look for in a foreign one.

Under "Faith," no Buddhist faith is mentioned, though Buddha said, even in the Hīnayāna texts: "All those who have merely faith and love toward me are sure of Paradise hereafter." Likewise under "Faith-healing" there is no mention of the mental cures wrought by Buddha and his disciples in so respectable a scripture as the Classified Collection. Neither do such appear under "Disease and Medicine" nor "Health and Healing."

Under "Fire" there is no mention of the Buddhist fire-meditation, wherein the ascetic sees himself burst into flame, as is recorded of St. Francis, and which the late Canadian alienist, Dr. Richard M. Bucke, testified as having happened to himself.

Under "Euthanasia" there is no mention of the Buddhist Pārājika which forbids the practise under pain of excommunication.

There is no article on the "Beloved Disciple," though both Christianity and Buddhism possess such a character—Christianity in its latest Gospel, under suspicion of fiction; Buddhism, as one of the salient features of its most authentic texts. Let us hope that the "Penitent Thief" will not suffer from a like omission, though he ought already to have appeared under

"Angulimālo," who is passed over in silence. Like the "beloved disciple," this character is a late fiction in the Gospel, but an historical personage in the Sūtras.

Under the forthcoming articles "Missions" and "Parthia" it is to be hoped that an account will be given of the great Buddhist propaganda in Central Asia and the eastern parts of the Parthian empire at the time of Christ. The translation of a sacred canon is one of the greatest phenomena in history, and it would be as proper to ignore the Septuagint in an article on the Old Testament as to ignore the missionary versions of the Buddhist scriptures in Sogdian, Tokharish and other forgotten languages which were current between Christendom and Buddhodom at the time when our Gospels were composed. The article "Translations" might appropriately deal with such, or "Propaganda," which ought also to include a mention of the numerous sculptures of Buddhist scriptural incidents known to have existed at the time of Christ, both in and out of India.

Speaking of translations, it is a grave omission in the article "Anguttara Nikāya" (which would better have been placed under its English title of "Numerical Collection") that no mention is made of the fact that this great scripture was translated into Chinese in the fourth century A. D. Before we can deal fully with any ancient text we must inform ourselves about its early translations, and here it is peremptorily necessary for Dr. Hastings to employ a Buddhist scholar who knows Chinese. Thus, under the brief article "Agama," there is no mention of the vast labor of Professor Anesaki of Harvard in collating the Chinese Agamas with the Pāli Nikāyas and finding them identical in basis, but differing in sectarian recension. The laborious work was published in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* for 1908 in the English language, and all Pāli scholars ought to read it. However, Nanjio, in 1883, had shown the identity of the Long Agama in Chinese (from a lost Hindu original) with the Long Collection in Pāli, translated by Rhys Davids without any mention of the fact.

We could never have a scientific text of the New Testament if we relied upon Greek scholars alone, for many of our most ancient readings are betrayed by early versions: Old Latin, Old Syriac, Old Armenian. The days of one-man scholarship have for ever gone by in our own religion, and ought not to be perpetuated in studies of our neighbor's religion.

Under "Discipline, Buddhist," we find the English version of some Sūtras quoted among the authorities, while the Chinese translations of five sectarian recensions of the Discipline itself are ignored. These translations were made some fifteen hundred years ago, and included a Chinese version of the Pāli Book of Discipline.

A valuable article on Chinese Buddhism draws a picture of present monastic life. But no account is given of the Hīnayāna sects in China, with the five recensions of the Discipline aforesaid. The great missionary movement of the pilgrims and translators is mentioned, but not with sufficient fulness. Chinese Buddhism is treated as if mainly Mahāyāna (which of course it is to-day) though the author frequently quotes the Sūtra of "Brahmā's Net" without ever locating it in the Hīnayāna Long Collection. Credit ought to have been given to Gogerly and Rhys Davids for former translations of it from the Pāli.

The old-fashioned cyclopedia was impersonal, and the reader looked upon

its utterances as final, i. e., as the authoritative expression of what was agreed upon as known. But the modern method of signed articles has the advantage of laying bare the fragmentary character of knowledge, by breaking it up into personal statements wherein a scholar advertises his own books and slays his enemies, living or dead. I can quote a case where a splendid scholar, recently the ornament of a great university, is thus chastised over his grave, when he was entirely right,—his only misfortunes being that he knew more than his adversary and died first. But all this helps to destroy the old cocksurenness about everything and enables people to realize how incomplete our knowledge is. For this reason some sort of correlation articles are necessary to give coherence to the whole.

---

#### WE HAVE FORGOTTEN WHAT WE VOWED TO REMEMBER.

During the war of secession Great Britain remained neutral in name, but favored the southern states and supplied them with arms and ammunition. Great Britain would have been pleased if the rebels had come out victorious, and if the United States had been divided into two countries. At that time an anonymous poem appeared in *Harper's Weekly*, May 18, 1863, under the title "A Warning," which reads thus:

"We will remember it—England's "neutrality"—  
We who have witnessed her cowardly craft;  
Friendly in seeming, a foe in reality,  
Wiping her eyes while she inwardly laughed.

"We will remember when round us were lying  
Thousands of gallant men, wounded and dead,  
Rebels on all sides our pathway defying—  
'Down with our rival!' was all England said.

"We will remember with lasting emotion,  
When her starved workmen were gasping for breath,  
While stores of grain we sent over the ocean,  
Her ships came laden with weapons of death!

"We will remember her sham aristocracy,  
Cheerful and jubilant over our fall,  
Helping when treason would stifle democracy,  
Turning a deaf ear to Liberty's call.

"We will remember the Keokuk sinking,  
Riddled with balls 'neutral England' had sent;  
We will remember her laughing and winking,  
Feasting arch-traitors on board of the Trent.

"We will remember it when we are stronger,  
When once again we stand saved and erect;  
Her neutral mask shall shield England no longer;  
By her foul deeds she'll know what to expect!"

In these fifty-two years since 1863 the national character of the United States seems to have changed; our Yankee type has been anglicized. At