

follow that even this higher Personality and Will would be without its limitations; but they would be at least different from and not so circumscribed as ours.

I do not doubt that it is in this direction that we are to seek for the true *rationale* (if so we may call it) of miracle. The miracles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in pre-eminent degree, and the miracles of His apostles in a lesser degree, were a result of the contact of personalities filled with the Spirit of God with the conditions of the outer world. That is the key to their nature, so far as we can understand it. We may apply that key to the different instances of miracle. It will help us to explain some better than others. We shall be able to understand best those which appear to be a direct extension or heightened illustration of phenomena that come within our cognisance. Such would be more particularly the healing of disease.

Of course any such explanation can be only partial. The lower cannot supply an adequate measure of the higher. And, by the hypothesis, we are dealing with causes which stretch away beyond our ken. We should therefore be prepared to exercise much caution and reserve in judging. It is natural and right that we should dwell most upon those instances which are to us most 'intelligible,' and from which we can draw the most instruction. It is also natural and right that we should read the Gospels critically, that is, with attention to the different degrees of evidence in different parts. But it would be wrong to leap hastily to the conclusion that whatever we fail to understand did not therefore happen. It is probable that our successors will be better equipped and more finely trained than we are:

and just as in the world of nature many things that once seemed incredible are now seen to be both credible and true, so also it may be in the sphere of revelation.

iv. If we thus take the Personality of our Lord Jesus Christ as the clue that we are to follow, many things will be clear to us that would not be clear otherwise. The Old Testament and the New together form a whole; the one prepares the way for, or runs up into, the other. The central point in the Old Testament revelation was that God is a *living God*; that the world is not a dead world, but instinct with life, which is all derived from Him. The New Testament takes up this, and tells us that Christ the Word was the Light and Life of man.

Life is of all forms of energy the most plastic, the most creative. When, therefore, we think of our Lord Jesus Christ as impersonated or incarnate Life, it is no surprise to us to find in Him the creative and formative properties of life reach their culmination.

There is a peculiar fitness in the fact that His career on earth should issue in the Resurrection. All other lesser manifestations are consummated in this. And that is why the early Christians, with St. Paul at their head, clung to the belief in the Resurrection so passionately. The conception of Christ as the Life seems to me central in relation to miracles. In proportion as we get away from it our difficulties increase. But if we keep in mind the broad considerations that I have stated, we shall not trouble much, and I do not think that it is wise to trouble too much about the details of particular miracles that we cannot weave exactly into our own scheme.

---

## Recent Literature in Comparative Religion.

THERE is no branch of study that has made greater progress in popular esteem within recent years than the study of Comparative Religion. One reason for this is the recognition that the propagation of Christianity is to be slower than had been anticipated, especially in countries which cling to an ancient and elaborate religious cult. The missionary must understand the worship

he seeks to supplant. One of the most valuable documents in existence relating to the spread of the gospel among the northern nations of Europe, is a letter written by Bishop Daniel of Winchester about the year 720, and addressed to Boniface, giving him advice regarding his mission work in central Germany. The bishop admonishes Boniface that the preaching should not be at

haphazard, but that the missionary should give evidence that he is acquainted with the cult and legends of the heathen. The wisdom of that advice is now beginning to be recognized. It is even beginning to be suggested, that before missionaries are sent out to their field of labour they should receive some instruction, not only in the language, but also in the religion of the people among whom they are to labour.

But there is another reason, and it is more fundamental. There has taken place within recent years a revolution in men's minds regarding the meaning of religion. It is not very long since the name of religion was grudged, it is not very long since it was passionately denied, to any form of faith or practice outside Christianity. The study of other religions was merely a branch of Christian Apologetic; it had no significance for its own sake. All that is altered. That which used to be denounced as superstition is now dignified with the name of religion. It is admitted that religion is inseparable from mankind, no tribe being without some form of it, no human creature being able to divest himself of the sense of it. The study of religion has thus taken its place among other scientific disciplines relating to man. And although by some it is still denied the august title of science, it has now the independent interest of a most absorbing scientific pursuit.

In the study of Comparative Religion one ought logically to begin with the study of each religion by itself. Not until the religions have been separately examined, is it possible to make a comparison of them. But the logical order is not always the best order for the student, and in any case others have made that separate study for us, and it is now in our power to enter into their labours. The following article touches upon some of the literature of Comparative Religion. Suggestions for the fuller study of the various religions separately may follow after.

## I.

### POPULAR INTRODUCTIONS.

1. *The Story of Religions.* By the Rev. E. D. Price, F.G.S. Newnes, 1901. 1s. net.
2. *Studies of Non-Christian Religions.* By Eliot Howard. S.P.C.K., 1900. 2s. 6d.
3. *The Religions of the World.* By G. M. Grant, D.D., LL.D. A. & C. Black, new edition, 1901. 1s. 6d. net.

4. *Four Great Religions.* By Annie Besant. Theos. Pub. Co., 1897. 2s. net.

5. *Studies in Comparative Religion.* By Alfred S. Geden, M.A. Kelly, 1901. 2s. 6d.

Mr. Price's book belongs to Messrs. Newnes' very elementary 'Library of Useful Stories.' No knowledge of Comparative Religion is presupposed in it; nothing is presupposed but a little love of the truth. More than half the space is occupied with Christianity, each branch of which, whether Greek Church, Anglican Church, Wesleyan Methodism, or Swedenborgianism—is treated as entitled to the distinct name of religion, like Taouism or Jainism. There is no theology. That is to say, in the author's words, 'the facts connected with the religions of the world are set forth as clearly as possible, but the inferences to be drawn from such facts are left to the judgment of each reader.'

Mr. Howard's *Studies of Non-Christian Religions* is Mr. Price's book on a slightly enlarged scale, but with the significant difference that all religions are regarded as in contrast to Christianity. This apologetic interest is, however, never very obtrusive and rarely hurtful. It does for us what the other book asks us to do for ourselves, that is all. The greater space makes room for deeper interest, especially biographical interest. The story of Buddha is told in some detail, and with a sympathy that is open and unashamed.

Principal Grant of Canada (whose recent death was a felt loss to scholarship and the cause of education) is the author of the book which has done more than any other to make this study popular. It has appeared in two forms, one for pupils and one for teachers; and between them they have already reached a circulation of thirty thousand. A better elementary guide has not been and perhaps could not be written. No doubt each of the four religions described—Mohammedanism, Confucianism, Hinduism, and Buddhism—is regarded in the light of 'Israel' and 'Jesus' (to use the titles of the last two chapters), but there is none of that fear that casteth out fairness. No nicknames are given. Every form of religion is found to have been a blessing to the people who professed it.

In Mrs. Besant there is no Christian apologetic nor the suspicion of it. She too describes four religions—Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Christianity,—and as she believes that 'each religion has its own mission in the world, is suited

to the nations to whom it is given, and to the type of civilization it is to permeate, bringing it into line with the general evolution of the human family,' there is given to each a free field and no favour whatever. But there is another thing. Each of these four religions is looked at 'in the light of occult knowledge,' both as regards its history and its teachings. And Mrs. Besant knows that thus her book is thrown out of touch with the science of Comparative Religion: she knows it and does not care. She did not hesitate, in preparing her lectures, to fling aside the work of European scholars when it conflicted with occult knowledge, and she does not hesitate now to say that 'touching Hinduism and Zoroastrianism modern scholarship is ludicrously astray.'

This section ends well with Mr. Geden's *Studies*. The title is modest: the book is capable and up to date. But the desire to draw the uninterested and ignorant into the love of this study is so constantly kept in view that one is entitled to place it among the popular introductions. Four religions—the Egyptian, the Babylonian, Zoroastrianism, Mohammedanism—are introduced by a well-ordered chapter on 'Origins.' Mr. Geden has to wrestle with the classification of religions, and rests content at last with a purely external one, 'according to the nations or groups of nationalities by whom they have been accepted.' Such a classification cannot be final. It will come up again.

## II.

### LECTURES AND ESSAYS.

1. *The Faiths of the World*. Blackwood. 5s.
2. *Non-Biblical Systems of Religion*. Nisbet, 1887. 6s.
3. *Great Religions of the World*. Harpers, 1901. 7s. 6d.
4. *Religious Systems of the World*. Sonnenschein, new edition, 1901. 10s. 6d.
5. *The World's Parliament of Religions*. 'Review of Reviews' Office, 1893. Two vols.

*The Faiths of the World* and *Non-Biblical Systems of Religion* were both published some years ago. But even then they were conceived on right lines, and they belong to the modern study of the subject. The former was delivered as a series of lectures in Edinburgh; the latter appeared first as a succession of articles in a magazine. In *The Faiths of the World* there is a deliberate comparison between Christianity and other religions. But it is made by Professor Flint, and every sentence tells in favour both of Chris-

tianity and of science. In other lectures the apologetic does obtrude a little. The lecture on Judaism, though some of its positions would now be disputed, is an original and permanently valuable contribution to its subject.

Some of the writers in the *Non-Biblical Systems* are so closely identified with their special topic, that the book cannot easily be superseded—we refer especially to Sir William Muir who writes on Islam, and Professor Rhys Davids who writes on Buddhism.

The writers for the volume entitled *Great Religions of the World* have all been well chosen. We can scarcely suggest an improvement. Who, for instance, can write on Confucianism like Professor Giles, on Brahminism like Sir Alfred Lyall, on Positivism like Mr. Frederic Harrison? And here also Professor Rhys Davids writes on Buddhism, as if there were no other when he is available.

Far more elaborate than any of the books yet mentioned is the volume entitled *Religious Systems of the World*. There are fifty-eight religions described, and by nearly as many lecturers—for the contents of the volume first appeared as a series of lectures in London. As an instance of its thoroughness, notice that Mithraism occupies twenty-two closely-printed pages: in the 9th edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* it is dismissed in half a page. The book is divided into two parts. The first part describes the Pre-Christian and Non-Christian Religions; the second the Christian, Theistic, and Philosophic Religions. The utmost liberty of speech is granted to each lecturer. The Rev. Charles Voysey argues for Theism as if it were the last word on Religion. Mrs. Besant, however, has a word after him on Theosophy, which also is the latest and fairest flower of religious thought. Even Scepticism itself is treated as a religion, and the Rev. John Owen, M.A., would persuade all men to believe nothing.

Yet bulkier is the work which goes by the name of *The World's Parliament of Religions*. It is elaboration and specialization carried to their furthest bounds. There is no attempt at order, and since among the religions are mixed up all sorts of philosophical addresses, it is hard to find what one wants—perhaps harder when found to find anything in it. The thought in the mind of the promoters of this gigantic scheme seems to

have been that if every form of religion had a free field for its expression, God would take care of His own; and it is a true thought. But why Professor Momerie was called to speak on the Moral Evidence for God, or the Hon. T. J. Semmes on International Arbitration, it is hard to say. If some one would sit down and make a single small volume out of these two immense volumes, we might find what we wanted, or find that it was not there.

### III.

#### STUDENTS' MANUALS.

1. *The Study of Religion.* By Morris Jastrow, jun., Ph.D. Scott, 1901. 6s.
2. *Religions of Primitive Peoples.* By Daniel G. Brinton, A.M., M.D., LL.D., Sc.D. Putnams, 1898. 6s.
3. *History of Religion.* By Allan Menzies, D.D. Murray, 1895. 5s.
4. *Manual of the Science of Religion.* By P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye. Longmans, 1891.
5. *An Introduction to the History of Religion.* By F. B. Jevons, M.A., Litt.D. Methuen, 1896. 10s. 6d.

One of the first questions which we have to face when we pass from the primer in Comparative Religion is, How are the religions of the world to be classified? To that question Professor Morris Jastrow has devoted seventy pages of his book. The old classification was simple if not scientific. There were two kinds of religion, the true and the false, and the false were not religions at all. Professor Jastrow is merciful, and finds some good in all classifications, but he does not adopt that one. Neither does he adopt Hartmann's classification into naturalistic and supranaturalistic, nor Kuenen's into national and universal, nor Tiele's into nature religions and ethical religions, nor Réville's into polytheistic and monotheistic. He works out a classification of his own. What does religion do for life,—how much of life does it cover? The savage is religious only when he is afraid (like the traditional atheist); so we will place his religion lowest: it is available only for the moments of peril in his life. There are religions which cover the whole of life—Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam are such religions,—there is no act but is or may be religious. These are the highest. There are two grades of religion between. It is not a final classification. It shows how difficult a thing classification of religions is. The part of Professor

Jastrow's book which classifies religion is called the general part. It is followed by the special part, which explains how religion stands to ethics, psychology, and the like. The last part is the practical. It encourages the founding of museums and other means for prosecuting the study of religions. The scope of the book is wide. For the whole subject of Comparative Religion it is the latest and best we have.

Professor Brinton of the University of Pennsylvania has so charming a style, that the severity of the study of religion is again forgotten. Yet Dr. Brinton makes no compromise with indolence. He goes to the root; discusses what religion is, and denies favour to any religion on the globe. What is religion? The promoters of the Parliament of Religions accepted all candidates which believed in a god or gods, in an immortal soul, and in a divine government of the world. But Dr. Brinton shows the absurdity of the definition by remarking that Buddhism, which to-day has more adherents than any other religion, rejects every one of these essential things. He himself calls that man religious in whom there is some sense of the supersensuous. And so he easily concludes that there is no tribe or man on the face of the earth, and never has been, without religion. Professor Brinton's book belongs to the series entitled 'American Lectures on the History of Religions.' Its special topic is *Primitive Religions*, but, as the first of its series, it introduces to religion generally.

The best student's book is the *History of Religion* by Professor Menzies. It was written with examinations in the writer's eye. It was written by an examiner and a setter of examination papers. The essentials are in it, all that is requisite for an easy pass, and all in admirable order and lucidity. Yet it is good reading too. Dr. Menzies has the gift of style also. It is wonderful that so many of the writers on Religion should possess this rare gift—Max Müller and Andrew Lang at the head of them. In a comparatively small book Professor Menzies covers the whole ground, for he wastes no space with minute discussion. He even finds time to name the best available literature at every step. His literature can now be added to, and we hope he will produce a new edition soon and add to it.

De la Saussaye's *Manual* is not so useful. It is but a portion of the work he wrote, the rest

has never been translated, and it is out of date in several particulars now, outdated partly by himself. Yet it is a strong, stirring book, not to be overlooked in a survey such as this. Some men owe their interest in the subject to it, their sense of what the comparative study of Religions means.

If Menzies is for the student getting up an examination, Jevons is for the man who has passed it and now would master the subject for its own sake. Again we find the sense of style. There is order also, first things first; and the awe of the most exalted matter for knowledge, the most momentous occupation of life. And more than that, from the very beginning there is the consciousness that the science of religions is not the explanation of religion. One religion is not compared with another in its entirety, but the things that are found in religions throughout their history—taboo, totemism, fetishism, ancestor-worship, and the rest—are described in order of their development, till the Mysteries and Monotheism are reached.

#### IV.

##### FOR FURTHER STUDY.

1. *The Science of Religions*. By Emile Burnouf. Sonnenschein, 1888. 7s. 6d.

2. *Prolegomena of the History of Religions*. By Albert Réville, D.D. Williams & Norgate, 1884. 6s.

3. *The Religion of Philosophy*. By Raymond S. Perrin. Williams & Norgate, 1885. 16s.

As 'introductory' as any are the last three books. They begin by laying down the things that are fundamental. They make their appeal to the natural man—the man unspoiled by bad philosophy and rigid orthodoxy. Yet they must be taken where we have placed them—last. They are none of them milk for babes.

Do they belong to 'recent literature' at all? Not by date of issue perhaps; but by dateless gift of insight, by universal human appeal, they do. And even in the matter of year and month they may claim their place. For there is a dividing line in the history of Comparative Religion, and they are all on this side of it. Beyond the line Comparative Religion is a part of obsolete apologetic; it was Réville, Burnouf, and others who rendered all that apologetic old-fashioned and carried Comparative Religion within at least the possibility of the name of science.

That it is a science indeed is Burnouf's purpose to prove. That is his aim in writing his book, and he boldly calls it *The Science of Religions*. Writing some years later, Brinton considers such a title still 'a little presumptuous, or at least premature,' and says we have no more right to speak of a science of religion yet than we have to speak of a science of jurisprudence, for which the materials are more plentiful. Burnouf knows that he is the first to claim the title, and he defends it. The materials, he says, are abundant; the scientific spirit—the 'liberal mind, free from all prejudice'—is available; and the underlying unity of all religions has been discovered and can be set forth. These are the essentials of science. So his book is no description of individual religions, nor is it much occupied with religious phenomena; it is occupied with the method of studying religions, and the relation of religions to one another and to the religious spirit. Christianity is treated without favour, but it is denied that the strictly scientific attitude is hostile to Christianity; in so far as it is moved by an antagonistic or any other bias, it is not scientific.

Réville is historical. Religion may be a science and it may not; it is a most interesting product of the human mind, and a most potent influence in human life. He defines it; discovers its origin; traces its development; describes its most outstanding manifestations, as the Myth, the Symbol, the Sacrifice, the Priest, the Prophet; and finally estimates its influence on morality and its contribution to the civilization of the world. In the course of this history of religion and religious phenomena, Réville classifies religions into polytheistic and monotheistic: the monotheistic religions being Judaism, Islamism, and Christianity. And although the classification is open to the criticism that Buddhism, which recognizes no god at all, is called a polytheistic religion, yet there is none that is simpler or freer from scientific offence.

It is only the third part of Mr. Perrin's book that immediately concerns us. The first two parts are philosophical. The title of the third part is the 'Religion of Philosophy,' but it is occupied with an examination of the chief religions of the world from the standpoint of an ethical writer and reformer. Mr. Perrin allows himself the utmost liberty of expression in criticizing both Judaism

and Christianity, and sometimes it would have been well had he used more endeavour to make his statements good. Thus: 'In order to distinguish Jesus from others of the same name, he was called the son of Mary. His widowed mother, soon after her husband's death, moved to Cana, a small town about eight miles from Nazareth. Here Jesus plied the trade of carpenter during his youth, and gradually developed that character which afterwards made him one of the greatest of moral reformers; great because his teachings have influenced a vast civilization, although they contain nothing either purer or higher than had been taught before.' The statements that may be

challenged are not a few. But the value of the book lies in its earnestness of ethical purpose. Mr. Perrin does not care about a science of religions; it is the practice of religion that he wants. And he is bold enough to pass all the great religions of the world before him, while he criticizes them in respect of the gulf that lies between their profession and their practice. His book closes this survey fitly. Science that deals with religions as mere natural phenomena, classifying them but pronouncing no judgment on them, is not the last word we must listen to. The last word is, 'This do, and thou shalt live.' Mr. Perrin brings us back to that.

## Jeremy Taylor and Richard Baxter: A Comparison and a Contrast.

BY THE REV. MARTIN LEWIS, B.A., FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

### II.

IN natural disposition the Anglican possessed a sweetness of blood and a happiness of temper denied to the Puritan. Dean Rust said most truly, in his funeral panegyric, 'Nature had befriended him much in constitution; his soul was made up of harmony; he was a person of a most sweet and obliging humour; his cadences were musical.'

Baxter's temperament was not thus finely balanced and tuned. His figure was indeed tall and slender; his voice rich and full; he could smile with dignity and sweetness; but there were in his nature discordant elements of peevishness, asperity, and disputatious stubbornness. And yet beneath a rugged and thorny surface there were fountains of passionate tenderness, courageous cheerfulness, and large-hearted charity, deeper than the streams which sparkled through the flowery meads of the more winsome nature.

The tender humanity of Baxter's heart of hearts wells up in the almost ideal love which united him to his noble wife.

Jeremy Taylor was twice married, but from his writings we should scarcely guess that either of his wives had ever existed. His flowing periods and delicate compliments were reserved for his

lady friends of high rank, the matchless Orinda and the rest. Baxter's wedded life was a romance from first to last. After he had become homeless and almost penniless, on black St. Bartholomew's Day, for conscience' sake; when he was beginning a life of perpetual martyrdom, — 'in prisons frequent, in deaths oft, in labours more abundant,' an exile and a wanderer in his own dear native land, then it was that a noble woman took that sad, brave heart to her tender bosom. Margaret Charlton was a lady of gentle birth and breeding. She was young, only twenty-three, and he was growing old, nearing fifty. She was rich, and he was poor. But true love laughs at all barriers and overleaps all gulfs. The two lives flowed into one, and were joined in perfect unity.

When they were first engaged, Baxter, with the absolute disinterestedness of his character, stipulated two things: that he should have none of her money, and that she should not ask from him any of the time which belonged to the duties of his sacred calling. The compact was faithfully kept. Baxter's helpmeet became his second-self, and for nineteen years her heroic and gracious figure stood like a good angel by her husband's side, befriending him in prison and in sickness;