



McMASTER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

PL 1495 .B72 L4

The notions of the Chinese con C.1



3 9005 0469 0787 3















THE  
NOTIONS OF THE CHINESE  
CONCERNING  
GOD AND SPIRITS.

WITH  
AN EXAMINATION OF THE DEFENSE OF AN ESSAY,  
ON THE PROPER RENDERING OF THE WORDS ELOHIM AND THEOS,  
INTO THE CHINESE LANGUAGE,

BY WILLIAM J. BOONE, D.D.,  
MISSIONARY BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF  
THE UNITED STATES TO CHINA.

BY THE  
REV. JAMES LEGGE, D.D.,  
OF THE LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

HONGKONG:  
PRINTED AT THE "HONGKONG REGISTER" OFFICE.  
1852.



## PREFACE.

---

IN submitting the following pages to the public, the author has nothing to add to what he has stated in the Introduction regarding their leading object. If he could have kept the controversial element out of his attempt to exhibit the Religion of China, he would gladly have done so, conscious how liable the mind is, in the heat of discussion, to present certain aspects of the truth in less or more than their fair proportions. The other branch of his object—the consideration of the terms to be used in the Chinese Scriptures for *God* and *spirit*—could not be handled but in a controversial manner. He has endeavoured to treat it without bitterness.

The view which he has given of the opinions of the Chinese concerning God, will probably appear more than sufficiently favourable, even to some who agree with him on the questions about the translation of the Hebrew and Greek terms. He can only hope that he has presented no conclusions beyond what the evidence adduced will support. It is to his own mind a most encouraging circumstance, that there is a broad standing-ground in their own literature, upon which the Christian missionary can take his position in communicating the truths of Revelation to the Chinese. In the acknowledgments of many of the wisest among themselves, a preparation is made for the unfolding of all that Scripture teaches concerning God and man. Of most of the passages which have been cited the mass of the people are perhaps as ignorant as they are of the Bible, yet they will the more readily admit the latter, when the former can be appealed to, and the author believes, that the more it is sought for, the more will missionaries find among the Chinese that conscieus-

ness of God, of which Tertullian speaks (Note, p. 116), even in the “simple, rude, and uncultivated.”

There are very few passages of Chinese writers referred to, of which the originals have not been given. In translating many of these, great advantage was derived, as in former publications, from the versions of passages in the Chinese classics, upon the subjects discussed, given by Dr. Medhurst, in his “Theology of the Chinese,” but in every case an independent version was made in the first place, and his renderings were only adopted, when they appeared peculiarly appropriate. The versions were for the most part submitted to a Chinese possessing a competent knowledge of English, so that it is hoped no material error will be detected in them. No doubt it would have been possible to give many sentences in as good English and more literally at the same time, and this would have been done, if the work had not been prepared amid the pressure of many other engagements. In some instances the version may have been affected by the general conclusion arrived at. A friend has objected, on this ground, to the word “material” in l. 16, p. 19, and to “creation” in l. 28, p. 52, and the reader is requested to draw his pen through the former, and to substitute the word “system,” in place of the latter.

The help and counsel of friends have been freely enjoyed. The author must specially mention his obligations to T. F. Wade, Esq., Assistant Chinese Secretary to Her Majesty’s Superintendent of Trade, from whom he received the loan of many valuable works, and among them, “The Collected Statutes of the Ming Dynasty,” of which so much use has been made in the first chapter.

May God be pleased to regard with favour this attempt to illustrate the knowledge of Himself possessed by a large portion of His human family, and the terms by which His servants may best express His own name, and the second person in His triune nature, in translating His revealed word!

*Victoria, Hongkong,*  
*8th March, 1852.*

## CONTENTS.

---

	<i>Pages</i>
INTRODUCTION, .....	1-6
<p>The object of the Treatise, p. 1,—Propositions maintained by Bishop Boone, and counter-propositions held by the Author, p. 2,—There is a Chinese term, answering to <i>Elohim</i> and <i>Theos</i>, p. 3,—The views taken by different parties of the word <i>God</i>, pp. 4-6.</p>	
<hr style="width: 10%; margin: auto;"/> <p>CHAPTER I.</p>	
THAT THE CHINESE KNOW THE TRUE GOD, AND THAT THEIR RELIGION IS PROPERLY MONOTHEISTIC, .....	7-64
<p>On ascertaining the meaning of <i>shin</i> and <i>Shang-Te</i> by a process of induction, pp. 7-9,—Requirements of Dr. Boone, before he will admit that <i>Shang-Te</i> is the true God, p. 9,—Statements of Visdelou to show that <i>Shang-Te</i> cannot be the true God, p. 11,—Replies to them, pp. 12-15,—The evidence of Choo He, and other Sung philosophers, upon the question, pp. 16-22,—The State Religion of China—Importance of the appeal to it, pp. 22,23,—A prayer to <i>Shang-Te</i>, p. 24,—To all the <i>shin</i>, as mediators, p. 26,—Prayers to <i>Shang-Te</i>, pp. 28-31,—On the self-existence of <i>Shang-Te</i>, p. 32,—The distinction between <i>Shang-Te</i> and the <i>shin</i>—Prayers to the spirit of the Sun, to the <i>T'een-shin</i>, and the <i>Te-k'e</i>, pp. 33-36,—The Chinese do not worship the material heavens, pp. 36-38,—They do not raise the imperial ancestors to an equality with <i>Shang-Te</i>, pp. 38-42,—The five inferior <i>Shang-Tes</i>, pp. 43-50,—The Chinese serve <i>Shang-Te</i> in both the solstitial sacrifices, pp. 50-53,—The worship of spirits, pp. 53,54,—Of ancestors and the departed great, pp. 54,55,—When religion was first corrupted in China, pp. 55-57,—Analogy between the Religion of China and Popery, pp. 57,58,—Connection between the monotheism and long subsistence of China, p. 59,—Knowledge of God among the people generally, pp. 60,61,—The Taoist <i>Shang-Tes</i>, pp. 61-63,—If we do not use <i>Shang-Te</i> for God, we cut ourselves off from sympathy with the people, pp. 63,64.</p>	

	Pages
APPENDIX.— <i>Note I.</i> THE OPINIONS OF VISDELOU, PREMARE, AND REGIS, . . .	64-70
<i>Note II.</i> TRANSLATION OF A CHINESE COMPOSITION ON THE UNITY AND SUPREMACY OF SHANG-TE, .....	71-73

---

### CHAPTER II.

THAT ELOHIM AND GOD ARE RELATIVE TERMS. FURTHER PROOF THAT THE SHANG-TE PAR EXCELLENCE OF THE CHINESE IS THE TRUE GOD, .....	74-113
The importance of determining whether God be a relative term, p. 74,—	
It is not a generic term p. 75,—It is not an absolute, but a relative term, pp. 76,77,—Its relativeness proved by the analogy of language, and reply to objections of Bishop Boone, pp. 78-82,—That God is a relative term, confirmed by the opinions of the Jews, of Bishop Horsley, of Charnock, of Matthew Henry, of Calvin, of Knapp, of Sir Isaac Newton, pp. 83-88,—Examination of special objections to the view that God is a relative term, pp. 88-92,—The name God cannot be vindicated to Jehovah on the supposition that it is a generic-absolute term, p. 93,—What is meant by God in the absolute, pp. 93-96,—The sources of <i>our</i> idea of God, and the same the sources to the Chinese of their idea of <i>Shang-Te</i> , pp. 96-109,—The agreement in primary signification of the Hebrew, Teutonic, and Chinese names of the Supreme Being, pp. 109-111,—The general application of the word God to other beings besides the true God, pp. 111,112,—The origin of Polytheism, pp. 112,113.	

---

### CHAPTER III.

OF THE GREEK TERM, THEOS. THE TERM USED FOR GOD IN TRANSLATIONS OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THE NORTH OF INDIA. THE TERMS USED FOR GOD IN CHINA BY ROMAN CATHOLICS, MOHAMMEDANS, AND JEWS,.....	114-134
The point that <i>Theos</i> is a relative term is not affected by the question whether the Greeks were monotheists first or polytheists, pp. 114, 115,—Professor Stuart of Andover on the meaning of <i>Theos</i> , p. 116,—The terms used for <i>God</i> and <i>spirit</i> by the missionaries in the North of India, pp. 118-120,—Agreement between <i>Ishwara</i> and <i>Shang-Te</i> , <i>Dehta</i> and <i>Shin</i> , pp. 120-123,—The objection to <i>Shang-Te</i> on the ground of its being a compound term, pp. 123,124,—The agreement between <i>Elohim</i> and <i>Te</i> in their application to kings, pp. 125,126,—Points of agreement between <i>Shang-Te</i> and the Roman Catholic term <i>T'een-choo</i> , pp. 129,130,—Reasons for preferring <i>Shang-Te</i> to <i>T'een-choo</i> , pp. 130-132,—The term used by Mohammedans, p. 132,—The practice of the Jews in China, pp. 132-134.	
APPENDIX.— <i>Note I.</i> EXAMPLES OF THE USE OF TERMS BY THE ROMANISTS IN CHINA,.....	134-138
<i>Note II.</i> ON THE NAME JEHOVAH. IS IT BETTER TO TRANSLATE IT, OR TRANSFER IT? .....	138-139

---

### CHAPTER IV.

ON THE DIFFERENT CHINESE TERMS USED BY PROTESTANT MISSIONARIES FOR THE WORD SPIRIT—NAMES, SHIN, LING AND FUNG, .....	140-162
The different terms used for <i>spirit</i> , p. 140,—Plea for <i>shin</i> on the ground of all admitting that it means <i>spirit</i> , pp. 140,141,—Examination of the reasoning on which it is contended that <i>shin</i> may be translated	

*a god*, pp. 142-144,—Special instances in which it is contended that *shin* should be translated *a god* or *gods*, pp. 144-152,—*Shin* never means *a god*, but only *spirit*, and cannot be made to mean God, pp. 152,153,—The plea for *ling* that it is a synonym of *shin*, pp. 154,155,—The difference between *ling* and *shin*. As applied to the human mind, *shin* denotes its *nature*, and *ling* its intelligence, p. 156,—As applied to *spirits*, *ling* only denotes their *efficaciousness*, pp. 156-159,—*Ling* cannot be used to denote the Holy Spirit. It denies His personality, p. 160,—Report on the Chinese version adopted by the American Bible Society, p. 161,—The plea for *fung*. It denotes *wind*, and *custom*, but cannot be employed in the sense of a conscious spiritual agent, pp. 161,162,—The first step towards avoiding antagonistic versions of the Chinese Scriptures must be the common adoption of *shin* to render *ruach* and *pneuma*, p. 162.

APPENDIX.—Note I. ON THE PROPOSAL TO USE THE COMBINATION T'EEEN-SHIN FOR GOD, .....	163-164
Note II. ON SOME STATEMENTS IN THE REPORT ON THE CHINESE VERSION OF THE SCRIPTURES, PRESENTED TO, AND ADOPTED BY, THE DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY IN DECEMBER, 1850, .....	164-166



THE  
NOTIONS OF THE CHINESE  
CONCERNING  
GOD AND SPIRITS, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

IN the Defense of his Essay advocating the rendering of the words *Elohim* and *Theos* by the Chinese term *Shin*,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Boone takes the field against all comers. Dr. Medhurst, Sir George Staunton, Dr. Bowring, Mr. Doty, and myself, are all met, and, as he hopes, not only foiled, but overthrown. One cannot but admire the boldness of his attacks, the ingenuity of his dispositions, and the earnestness which animates his whole treatise, and well befits the importance of the subjects contested. Notwithstanding these merits, however, the repeated study of his reasonings has only confirmed me in the opinion that the attempt to use *Shin* for God proceeds from false principles, and is attended with the most pernicious effects, and I venture therefore to reargue with him the theses—that the *Shang-Te*<sup>2</sup> *par excellence* of the Chinese is the true God, that *Elohim*, *Theos*, and *God* are relative terms, and that *Shin* means *Spirit*, and, in the translation of the Scriptures, can only be employed to render *ruach* and *pneuma*. I am the less unwilling to enter again upon the discussion, because it seems to me that the notions of the Chinese concerning *God* and *Spirits* can be put in a clearer light than has yet been thrown upon them. If the success of my endeavours shall not be thought equal to my own hopes and wishes, let the desirableness of the objects sought to be accomplished justify me from the charge of unnecessarily obtruding my views upon the public. To set forth with distinctness the opinions entertained by so large a portion of the

<sup>1</sup> 神

<sup>2</sup> 上帝

human race on the important subjects just mentioned, is a matter worth attempting, and when a Missionary believes that the word of God is in danger of being circulated among the Heathen in a version deplorably erroneous, it is his duty to do what he can to avert so great an evil.

Dr. Boone's conclusion that *Shin* must be used to render *Elohim* and *Theos* rests on the following propositions:—

"1st. The Chinese do not know any being who may truly and properly be called God; they have therefore no name for such a being, no word in their language answering to our word God.

"2d. That, this being the state of things, we must seek the general name of their gods, and content ourselves with the use of the word in Chinese that answers to our words a *god*, *gods*, as the best that can be done under the circumstances.

"3d. That *shin* is the general or generic name of the Chinese gods; and therefore it follows,—That this word should be used to render *Elohim* and *Theos* into Chinese."

The position which he thus takes up is certainly a bold one. He admits himself that it is open to attack from five different quarters, and enumerates so many counter propositions, the establishing of any one of which would invalidate his argument. My plan, however, does not require me to enter into a separate detail of all of these, and I shall content myself with an explicit statement of the grounds on which I, for myself, repudiate his conclusion, and the maintenance of which will constitute the subject-matter of the subjoined chapters.

Against his first proposition—I maintain that the Chinese do know the true God, and have a word in their language answering to our word *God*, to the Hebrew *Elohim*, and to the Greek *Theos*.

Against his second proposition—I maintain that no "general or generic name" can be used to render *Elohim*, *Theos*, or *God*, because these are all relative terms. Though I should fail, therefore, in establishing, beyond the possibility of contradiction, the former thesis, it will still be necessary to seek for a relative term in Chinese, to render *Elohim* and *Theos*. We cannot use for that purpose the generic *Shin*, and it *may be* that the name or title of the highest being known by the Chinese will answer sufficiently well.

Against Dr. Boone's third proposition—I maintain that *Shin* does not answer even to our words a *god*, *gods*, but is the generic name in Chinese corresponding to our word *spirit*, to the Hebrew *ruach*, and to the Greek *pneuma*; and that it ought therefore to be employed to render those terms, and those alone.

Thus, Dr. Boone and myself are opposed to each other on every head. I shall endeavour dispassionately to exhibit the reasons which compel me to dissent from him, and adopt the conclusions which I have just stated—remembering always that to establish truth is a much nobler accomplishment than to confute error. I would rather perform the part of a didactician than of a controversialist.

There are two preliminary points on which Dr. Boone lays much stress, and his remarks on which require some criticism. He maintains that all his opponents have erred fatally in the view which they have taken of the word God, and that thus the very spring of their reasonings is vitiated. Going astray at the first step, the more they write, and the longer they dispute, the farther will they be at last from the goal which they wished to reach. And moreover, he says that all parties admit that there is no word in Chinese answering to *Elohim* and *Theos*. No matter, therefore, how they weary themselves to determine the meaning of those terms, their toil will prove "Love's labour lost." Supposing they should be successful, they have to express the result of their investigations in a language which has no characters adequate to the purpose. Their case is as hard as that of the Israelites, whom Pharaoh required to make bricks, without giving them straw to make them with.

Now, as to the second of these points—Dr. Boone ought not to have expressed it so unqualifiedly as he has done. By what he has written, he has done me, for one party, some injustice. The case is this;—In English, we use God properly and improperly, as it is said: we apply it, that is, to Jehovah, the only true God, and we apply it away from Him, to all false gods. Dr. Boone accordingly distinguishes between God, with a capital G, and god with a small g—though the Hebrew knows nothing of such a graphical discrimination. The Chinese have a word, he says, which has the meaning of god with the small g, but not the meaning of it with the large G. They have a word which means a god, but not God, and he proposes to take that word and make a god God. In my opinion, the Chinese have a term which means God, the true God, and they have also applied it away from him, only not so extensively as *Elohim* and *Theos*, were applied away from him. Its meaning is the same as that of *God*, whether written with a large g or a small one. It has been used in the two ways in which *God* has been used, only, while the Chinese have given it the same *kind* of improper signification, they have not done so to the same *degree*. Entertaining this opinion, I can by no means admit that there is no term in Chinese answering to *Elohim* and *Theos*.

As to the first point—the charge brought by Dr. Boone that his opponents have all taken a wrong view of the word *God*—it is stated distinctly enough, in the following paragraph:—

"Of the word *God*, the several parties writing on this question, take widely different views in many respects; but it seems to me there is one error which has chiefly misled Dr. Medhurst, Sir George Staunton, Dr. Bowring, and Dr. Legge, and which we must be careful not to fall into, if we would keep the real point of search clearly before us. The error, to which I allude, is that of regarding the word *God* as the "symbol of an idea," to use Sir George Staunton's expression, instead of regarding it, as it really is, as the name of a *bonâ fide* Being, of whom, after we have exhausted all the *ideas* of which we are capable, we can form but very inadequate conceptions."

Passages are quoted from Dr. Medhurst, Sir George Staunton, and Dr. Bowring, to show how they have laboured under the alleged error, and though no proof is adduced of it, as affecting me, I am content to bear the burden of Dr. Boone's censure along with them. What is their error? That they regard the word *God* as the representative, sign, or symbol, of an idea. I had thought that the notion that words are anything more than the signs of ideas was exploded. It would be a waste of time and space to cite authorities in support of the mode of speech which Dr. Boone so summarily condemns. Most strangely, he imagines that his opponents, when they speak of the word *God* as representing an idea, are regarding it as an abstract term; but there is not one of them who does not hold that the idea suggested, or called up in the mind, by it, is *that of a Being*, possessing various attributes, and sustaining various relations. I have always contended that *God* is a relative term—that it belongs to the same class of words as *Father*, *Emperor*, *Bishop*. I confess I am astonished that Dr. Boone, knowing this, should bring the charge related above against me. No wonder that our final conclusions should be wide as the poles asunder. When one child says to another, "Father is calling you," does he suggest to him nothing but "an abstract idea," a mere mental conception? Does he set him upon answering some vague notion of paternity in his own mind? Surely not—but he gives him to understand that the "*bonâ fide Being*," who is their Father, is calling him. So when I say to a man, "Fear God, and honour the King," I do not mock him with abstractions, but I remind him of two important duties—that he stand in awe of the "*bonâ fide Being*," whom we call God, and that he give honour to the "*bonâ fide Being*," whom we call King.

So much for the accusation, that all the parties, who have written on the subject in hand against Dr. Boone's views, have stumbled *in limine*, and missed the true meaning of the word *God*. It may be that I, as one of them, have not got the true idea of the term;—that is a point to be considered by and by. But certainly, the specific error charged home so boldly by him—that I hold *God* to be an abstract term, like virtue, heaviness, or magnitude—has no existence but in the mistiness of his own mind.

He says—

"If we desire to ascertain whether the Chinese know *God*, we should not inquire, what the leading or principal *idea* conveyed by the word *God* is, that we may see if the Chinese have any word that conveys this principal idea; but rather ask, do they know any *Being*, who, from what they predicate of him, can be known to be the same *Being* we Christians call *God*; then the next question is, by what name do they call this *Being*, and if we can find, in answer to this query, the absolute term, which in the Chinese language designates this being, we shall have found the word in Chinese, that answers to our much sought word *God*, when it is used *propriè*. The first point, however, is to decide, Is the being the *same*? it will be time enough, after this point is settled, to inquire for the name. If the being be not the same, no matter what the

principal idea suggested to us by his name may be, this name will be the name of a false god, and nothing more."

Let us try the doctrine of this passage by one or two illustrations. We shall suppose a company of worshippers, during one of the periods, when the Israelites lapsed into idolatry, gathered round an altar on a high place. They tell us that they are going to offer a sacrifice to their *Elohim*, and they point to a graven image—an image of Baal. Here there are two names—the name *Elohim*, and the name *Baal*, the name *God*, and the proper name of *their* God. We could safely say, "Baal we know not. *He* is not God." But we should not discard the word *Elohim*, because the "Being," who was their God, was not the "Being," who is the true God.

Again, here is the Mahommedan Theologian, Hussain Vaez. We ask him the famous question once put to Mahommed—"Who is the God, whom you worship and teach?" He answers first, in the words of his master—"My God is one God; the eternal God; he begetteth not, neither is he begotten; and there is not any like unto him;" and he paraphrases this declaration, as follows:—"The God whom I adore and who ought to be adored by all, is one only God, simple in His essence, and separated from all other beings by the attributes which belong only to Him. He is of Himself, and has need of nothing whereby to subsist, while all things subsist by Him. He begetteth not (and this the prophet spoke against the Jews who say that Ezra was the son of God); neither is He begotten (and this he spoke against the Christians, who believe that Jesus Christ, the son of the Virgin Mary, was begotten of God); and there is not any like unto Him."<sup>1</sup> Here Mahommed and his follower lay down attributes belonging only to their God, and distinguishing Him from the God of the Jews, and the God of the Christians, as well as from the gods of idolaters. It follows that the "Being" of the Mahommedan *Allah* must, according to Dr. Boone, be different from the "Being" of the Christian God. In many of their attributes they resemble each other closely, but he tells us—"the resemblance is not of the slightest importance; on the contrary being only *resemblance* and not *sameness*, it proves Him to be *another being*." There results the conclusion that we shall do wrong, when we address Mahommedans concerning God, to write or speak of *Allah*, and that Christian authors and teachers have gone "fatally" astray for a thousand years, in their use of this term. Are Dr. Boone and his friends prepared to accept this conclusion? If they are not, they may be assured that they are altogether in error, when they say that in deciding by what term we shall render the word God, we must first ascertain whether, in its common acceptation, it denotes the same Being whom we wish it to denote. A man may be calling another his *Father*, who is not really such. When we

<sup>1</sup> D'Herbelot's *Bibliothèque orientale* art. *Allah*.

make known to him his error, we do not discard the word *Father*. We only tell him that he has been honouring "a Being," as his father, who is not such, and we disclose to him another "Being," who is such. The "Being" may vary, but the "name" remains unchanged.

Here Dr. Boone may say that I am assuming my thesis as proved—that God is a relative term. Let the reader therefore attach, in the meantime, as little weight as he can to this illustration by means of the word *Father*. The previous examples, however, of *Baal Elohim*, and the Mahommedan *Allah*, can hardly fail, I think, to satisfy his mind, that Dr. Boone is labouring under some confusion of ideas, whatever it be, in laying it down, as the first point to be decided, that we are to determine whether the *Being* indicated to the Chinese, by the term which we wish to employ for *Elohim*, be the same with the *Being* indicated to us by our word God. The full exposure of his error must be reserved to a subsequent part of the discussion. I grant to Him, however, that it can only be proved that the Chinese know the true God, by showing that they predicate of the highest Being whom they worship what can be predicated only of Jehovah. Accordingly this I proceed to do in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER I.

THAT THE CHINESE KNOW THE TRUE GOD, AND THAT THEIR  
RELIGION IS PROPERLY MONOTHEISTIC.

Do the Chinese know the true God? Among all the Beings whom they worship, does one stand forth, so pre-eminent in his attributes, so distinguished from all the others, that we cannot but recognize in him the high and lofty One, who doeth according to His will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, the blessed and only Potentate, of whom and through whom and to whom are all things? These questions I answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative. The evidence supplied by Chinese literature and history appears to me so strong, that I find it difficult to conceive how any one, who has studied it, can come to the opposite conclusion.

Dr. Boone, in 1848, when he wrote his Essay on the rendering of *Elohim* and *Theos*, supposed that it was admitted, by all the Protestant Missionaries at least, that the Chinese did not know the true God, nor any Being, who might truly and properly be called God. On this supposition his argument for the use of *Shin* was founded, and it was involved in every step of his reasoning. The "Defense" of his Essay, however, contains all the proof which he could collect to substantiate the assertion that China is indeed a country without God, and it will be necessary that I subject to a careful examination the grounds on which he makes his negation, while I endeavour to adduce the positive evidence that the Chinese know Him who is the Creator, the Preserver, and the Governor of the Universe.

When affirming formerly that the '*Shang-Te*' of the Chinese is "God over all, blessed for ever," I said that the proof of the affirmation was to be sought by making the largest possible collection of examples in which the expression was used, and trying whether God would be an appropriate, or rather the appropriate, rendering of it in every case. But Dr. Boone objects that in proposing such a proof I was contenting myself with a mere "*petitio principii*." The mode of expression which I employed was suggested by the recollection of the following passage in one of Stewart's Philosophical Essays:—

"The meaning of many words of which it is impossible to exhibit any sensible prototypes, is gradually collected by a species of *induction*, which is more or less successfully conducted by different individuals, according to the degree of their attention and judgment. The connection in which an unknown term stands, in relation to the other words combined with it in the same sentence, often affords a key for its explanation in that particular instance, and in proportion as such instances are multiplied in the writings, and conversation of men well acquainted with propriety of speech, the means are afforded of a progressive approximation towards its precise import. A

familiar illustration of this process presents itself in the expedient which a reader naturally employs for decyphering the meaning of an unknown word in a foreign language, when he happens not to have a dictionary at hand. The first sentence where the word occurs affords, it is probable, some foundation for a vague conjecture concerning the notion annexed to it by the author, some idea or other being necessarily substituted in its place, in order to make the passage at all intelligible. The next sentence where it is involved renders this conjecture a little more definite; a third sentence contracts the field of doubt within still narrower limits, till, at length, a more extensive induction fixes completely the signification we are in quest of."<sup>1</sup>

In the process thus exhibited by the learned Professor, I do not see that there is any *petitio principii* involved, nor is there any in the application of it, which I sought to make. I had before me two terms by which it was proposed to render God in Chinese—*Shin* and *Shang-Te*. I adduced a number of examples from Chinese writers, containing the term *Shin*, and showed that to make it stand for God in them turned them into sheer nonsense. Dr. Boone and his friends are fond of quoting the words of Horace;—

*“Si volet usus,  
“Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi.”*<sup>2</sup>

But he quotes them incorrectly, and to serve a purpose altogether different from the intention of their author. “Many words” says Horace, “which have fallen into disuse, will be revived, and many which are now in honour will fall into desuetude, if use will have it so.” Now the use or usage of the Chinese language will not have the term *Shin* to mean *God*. It cries out against such a signification of it, in ten thousand examples, in books and on the lips of the people. Dr. Boone may try to force it to have such a meaning, but he would more easily with his single strength stem the overwhelming rush of mighty waters. On the other hand, a number of examples, containing the expression *Shang-Te*, being adduced, and the other parts translated correctly, it was found that by substituting *God* for *Shang-Te* the whole conveyed a good and natural sense. From such an induction I concluded that *Shang-Te* meant *God*, and might be used, wherever we had to translate *Elohim* and *Theos*. The induction might be incomplete. I begged Dr. Boone to tell us if it was so. The field of Chinese literature was before him. Would he go through the length and breadth of it, and pick up a few examples, that would place *Shang-Te* in the same predicament as *Shin*—examples in which the rendering of *Shang-Te*

<sup>1</sup> Philosophical Essays, by Professor Dugald Stewart. The Essay “On the tendency of some late Philological speculations.”

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Boone gives us—

*“Si volet usus,  
“Quem penes arbitrium, et jus et norma loquendi,”*

—an unscannable line. He quotes the passage to show that “words are the mere creatures of usage,” and that, no matter what meaning a word has *in use*, we may give it another!

by God would make nonsense? He may say, indeed, that he was not to be dictated to, as to the manner in which he should conduct either his attack or defense. Still, I think he might have acceded to my request. Had he produced *one* example, where *Shang-Te* cannot be rendered God, it would have had more weight with me than all the reasonings against its use within the 168 pages of his book. But not a single such expression is forthcoming. His sole reply to my proposal is—Dr. Legge contents himself with a *petitio principii*. At this part of his defense, however, he has one remarkable sentence, to which I wish to call particular attention. “If Dr. Legge,” he says, p. 18, “will prove to us that the Being called *Shang-Te*, in any one of the quotations he gives us, is truly and properly God, we will admit that the *Shang-Te* mentioned in all the other passages is God too, as we have no doubt that they all refer to the same Being.” It is admitted that *one undoubted* instance where *Shang-Te* stands for God—the true, the only God—would to Dr. Boone decide this part of the controversy between him and myself. I hope to produce in the sequel many instances, in which it is impossible that any but the true God can be the subject. In the meantime, I only observe, that if Dr. Boone were Dr. Morrison, whose authority in favour of his views is so earnestly pleaded, then our strife would be ended. The latter, in a passage which has been already quoted in this controversy, in his Dictionary, under the character *Yuen*,<sup>1</sup> says—“*Keang Yuen*, a female, famous in ancient story, and whose name is mentioned in the She-king, in connection with *Te* and *Shang-Te*, as expressive of the MOST HIGH GOD.”

Before he will admit that *Shang-Te* is truly and properly God, Dr. Boone insists that one of two things be clearly shown—namely, that passages be adduced predicating self-existence of him, or at least the creation by him, out of pre-existing matter, of the heavens and the earth, and all things that now exist. On the latter point I am prepared most fully to meet his requisition. Nothing can be more positive and direct than the ascription of creation to *Shang-Te*. At the same time, I must be permitted to enter a protest against his demands, as unjust, if it were to be argued from our not being able to meet them, that *Shang-Te* cannot be God, and that the expression ought not to be used to render *Elohim* and *Theos*. The Apostle says that “God left not himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.” The course of Providence is therefore sufficient to raise the minds of men to the knowledge of God, and Dr. Boone knows well that the Chinese ascribe to *Shang-Te* their fruitful seasons, and recognize him as the Lord and Governor of heaven and earth.

*Creation* and *self-existence* are—the one an act and the other an attribute, to the knowledge of which we attain, certainly, by the lessons of Revelation, possibly and probably, by the exercise of our reason. But they do not give us either the idea of God, or the name *God*. The sources of the idea and the origin of the name will be discussed in the succeeding chapter. My object in the present is, meeting Dr. Boone on his own grounds, to show that *Shang-Te* is the true God, and to supply an accurate view of the Religion of China.

Dr. Boone denies himself that either self-existence or creative acts are ascribed to *Shang-Te*, and he gives without hesitation the grounds of his denial. Two courses are before me—either to disregard these, and submit at once the positive proof that *Shang-Te* is the Creator, or to proceed by an examination of Dr. Boone's objections to a gradual exhibition of the truth. The former method would be the briefer, but the latter, though there is a danger of its being tedious to a general reader, will be more satisfactory to those who are really interested to become acquainted with the opinions of the Chinese.

To support his view of the question, Dr. Boone appeals for evidence to the representations of Visdelou, Bishop of Claudiopolis, who sent to Europe, in 1728, a notice of the classical work, the *Yih-king*; he brings forward certain readings of his own, in the writings of the philosopher Choo He, commonly called Choo-foo-tsze; and he gives two accounts of "the state religion of China," one by Visdelou, and one by Dr. Morrison, appending to them various remarks and comments. I shall take up these evidences in the order in which they are mentioned. In the examination of them it will appear who *Shang-Te* is, and of what sort is the so-called State Religion.

I. To prove that *Shang-Te* is not to be regarded as the true God, there is advanced the authority of M. Visdelou, who, Dr. Boone bids me observe, "distinctly says that Confucius never in the *Yih-king*, nor in any other book, affirms that *Shang-Te* ever generated the heavens and the earth." In a note appended to this chapter, I have offered some remarks on the weight which is to be attached to Visdelou's representations of the opinions of the Chinese. The reader will also find there the translation of a paper by Premarè on the Chinese accounts of the origin of the Universe, and some extracts from the work of Regis on the *Yih-king*. No one would think of putting either Premarè or Regis below Visdelou in the ranks of Chinese scholarship, and their names may fairly be set against his. Authorities, however, will not turn the scale with disputants either one way or the other. Let us see for ourselves how Visdelou banishes *Shang-Te* out of the *Yih-king*.

There are three texts, his glosses on which are cited by Dr. Boone. The first is the famous one about the *T'ae-keih*. In the appendix to the *Yih-*

*king*, commonly attributed to Confucius, occurs the passage, which Visdelou translates as follows—"T'ae-keih generated the two figures, these two figures generated the four forms, and these four forms generated the eight diagrams."<sup>1</sup> He then comments—

"This statement is very enigmatical, and therefore it is necessary to explain it. T'ai-kih signifies the *great summit* (*grand comble*), a metaphorical expression derived from the roof of a house, of which the transverse part, which is at the top, is called *kih*, because it is the highest part of the roof. Now, as all the rafters are supported on the top of the roof, so also are all things supported on this first principle. We must here carefully observed that this first principle is said to generate (*engendrer*), and not to make (*faire*)." \* \* \*

"But the philosophers explain this axiom more clearly. The following is the account of what they, without any allegory say, viz.—The *great summit*, (T'ai-kih) generated the five elements, and the five elements generated all things. This axiom is the abyss, into which those philosophers, called the *Atheo-political*, have plunged themselves; for they pretend that this *great summit* is the primitive Reason (i. e. *T'au*), which, although without understanding or will, is absolutely the first principle of all things. They consider that this Reason, although destitute of understanding and will, nevertheless governs all things, and that the more infallibly, because it acts necessarily. Finally, they pretend that all things emanate from it, as the term generate (*engendrer*) seems to indicate. These philosophers also do not hesitate to give to this reason the title of the ruling power; and as Confucius in the canonical book of changes [the *Yih King*] has, more than once, made mention of *Shángti*, that is to say, the supreme emperor, and of *Ti*, that is, the emperor, and yet we do not see in any part of this book, nor in any other, that *Shángti* generated the matter, that is Heaven and earth, the philosophers conclude from this, that the title *Shángti* is not applicable to the primitive Reason, except when it acts merely in the government of the world. Hence it is that many among them acknowledge besides the primitive Reason, a celestial Genius that belongs to heaven; at least the Interpreters of the emperor *K'ang-hi*, when explaining the diagram of the dispersion, where mention is made of sacrificing to *Shángti*, searching into the cause why, after the troubles of the empire were appeased, they sacrificed to *Shángti*, render the following reason, viz. that during the times of the dispersion, when the sacrifices to *Shángti* were often neglected, the spirits of *Shángti* had been scattered, and it was necessary therefore to recollect them by sacrifices."

On the above representation of Chinese doctrine, Dr. Boone observes—

"If M. Visdelou here gives us a correct account of what is said in the most ancient of the Confucian classics of the 'first cause,' how hopeless is the attempt to make out Dr. Legge's point, that the *Shángti* of the classics is 'God over all, blessed for ever.' So far from regarding him, as a necessary, self-existent, independent being, the learned men of K'anghi's reign fancied, from what they read of him in the *Yih King* that the spirits of *Shángti* had been dispersed because of their neglect to offer sacrifices to him during the troubles of the empire, and that they must be recollected by sacrifices!!!"

The three points of exclamation are not misplaced. "If M. Visdelou gives us a correct account"—and so, Dr. Boone's amusement and admiration rest altogether on a peradventure. It is a pity he did not study the classic for himself. The reader will have observed that Visdelou passes very shortly from the consideration of his text to detail the opinions of the Atheo-

<sup>1</sup> 易有太極,是生兩儀,兩儀生四象,四象生八卦

political philosophers about it. Their speculations will come under our notice when we discuss Dr. Boone's readings in Choo He, and particularly what they say about the *T'ae-keih*, concerning which I merely observe, here, that, in the *Yih-king*, that expression indicates "the condition or period, before heaven and earth were separated, when the original matter was formless and one!"<sup>1</sup> When the Bishop of Claudiopolis says—"The philosophers conclude that the title *Shang-Te* is not applicable to the primitive reason, except when it acts in the government of the world," I am not prepared to grant the assertion. In a collection of explanations of the *Yih-king* taken from the philosophers, and first published in the reign of K'ang-he, we read—"When Heaven produces and completes the myriads of things, and rules and governs them, the title given to that Being is *Te*."<sup>2</sup> Here the title of *Te* is given to Heaven, as acting *first* in the *production* of all things, and *thereafter* in their government.

Again, Visdelou says that "many of the philosophers acknowledge, besides the primitive reason, a celestial genius that belongs to Heaven;"—and this genius is *Shang-Te*. Now this is not the case. Towards the conclusion of his notice of the *Yih-king*, he tells us himself that "the Atheo-political philosophers recognize no *Shang-Te* but the primitive reason." The truth is that those scholars, while they try to explain away the declarations about *Shang-Te* in the classics, by substituting for the personal Being a principle of order or primitive reason, often forget themselves, or find the text too simple and express to be played with by their sophist art. Of this nature is the passage to which he refers in the diagram of dispersion. After a careful study, moreover, of K'ang-he's interpreters and many others, I have been unable to find anything about the dissipation and re-collection of the spirits of *Shang-Te*. The expression, even if it did occur, would be innocent enough, but as Dr. Boone finds an occasion for triumph in it, it may be worth while to examine the original at length.

The diagram of Dispersion is so called, because it is composed of the two of the eight *Kwa*, which represent wind and water, the one placed over the other. Wind moving over water is a symbol of dispersion, and the diagram has respect to the empire, when its parts are ruffled and dissipated, like water acted on by wind, and tells how such a state is to be remedied. The first sentence says, "The King must repair to the ancestral temple,"<sup>3</sup> and further on, that step is recommended by the example of the former Kings,

<sup>1</sup> See on the passage the edition of the 13 King, first published under the T'ang dynasty, about A.D. 670. The original is quoted below.

天之生成萬物而主宰之者謂之帝  
王假有廟

who "sacrificed to *Te*, and raised ancestral temples."<sup>1</sup> K'ang-he's interpreters, to illustrate this, quote from the Record of Ching, one of the first and greatest masters of the Sung school, to the following effect—"The former Kings looking at this diagram, in order to save the empire in its state of dispersion, proceeded to sacrifice to *Te*, and erect their ancestral temples. To collect and unite the hearts of men, nothing is so effectual as the grateful returns rendered with the heart in the services of the ancestral temple and in sacrifices. Thus it is that sacrifices to *Te* and the erection of ancestral temples are things in which the hearts of men find their objects of rest. There is no greater way than this to bind the hearts of men, and to remedy a state of dispersion."<sup>2</sup>

The lesson is indeed important, that nothing is so powerful as the services of religion to allay the tumults of anarchy and compose unsettled minds. To the explanation of the Record, the interpreters subjoin an annotation from the same philosopher or his brother—"The philosopher Ching says, In the diagrams of Union and Dispersion, we find sacrificing to *Te*, and the erection of ancestral temples, because the collection of their<sup>3</sup> spirits was manifested in this. Because of their being dispersed, they, therefore, appointed these things in order to collect them."<sup>4</sup> This must be the passage on which Visdelou's remarks are grounded. To understand it, we should bear in mind that the disorganization of the empire was occasioned by the people ceasing to fear the Supreme Ruler and to reverence their ancestors. In consequence, they separated between themselves and Heaven, and the spirits of the former heroic monarchs, which were in heaven. How should they get the Ruler, and those spirits to dwell with them again upon the earth? They must solemnly compose their minds, collect their spirits, and go and worship in the ancestral temples; so would they move the spirits of the departed, who would meet with them, and be with them again to protect them. In a similar manner, with reverent minds and collected spirits, they must worship the Supreme Ruler, and He would hear them, and again regard and bless them. It is nowhere said that *His* spirits had

### <sup>1</sup> 先王以享帝立廟

<sup>2</sup> 先王觀是象，救天下之渙散，至於享帝立廟也，收合人心，無如宗廟祭祀之報出於其心，故享帝立廟，人心之所歸也，繫人心合離散之道，無大於此

<sup>3</sup> To whom does the "their" refer? Most certainly to the people, for the erection of temples could only manifest what was in them.

<sup>4</sup> 程子曰，萃渙皆享帝立廟，因其精神之聚而形於此，爲其渙散，故立此以收之

been dissipated. The diagram of Union does not speak at all of sacrificing to *Shang-Te*, but only of repairing to the ancestral temples. Even if it were said that by such acts the spirits of *Shang-Te* were collected, the expression would only be tantamount, in Chinese phrase, to such Scriptural sayings as—"If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me," "Because ye have forsaken the Lord, he hath also forsaken you," "Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of Hosts."<sup>1</sup>

This examination of the passage in the diagram of Dispersion may dispose Dr. Boone not to trust blindly in the future to the Bishop of Claudiopolis, in his accounts of Chinese texts. And yet there are times when he keeps back a portion of the remarks of his authority, modifying, in a most important manner, the sentiment of those of them which he does quote. This will be seen in the case of the third text of the *Yih-king*, to which Dr. Boone hardly thinks it necessary to do more than advert.

He says, *Defense*, pp. 40, 41,—

"The uniform doctrine of the *Yih-king* is that heaven and earth generated all things. I say uniform doctrine, for in the sentence quoted from the 5th chapter of the 4th section of the Book of Diagrams, 'The *Ti* [Supreme] Ruler [causes things to] issue forth under the *Chin* diagram (See Dr. Medhurst's 'Theology of the Chinese,' p. 234), the words 'Supreme' and 'causes things to' are added by the translator. The text should be translated, 'The Ruler issues forth under the *Chin* diagram, which answers to the commencement of spring. Some interpreters understand the word *Ti* of *Shangti*; but the ancient interpreters, M. Visdelou tell us, understood by it the Emperor Fuh-hi."

Here Dr. Boone has himself discovered that Visdelou does not give "a correct account of the most ancient of the Confucian classics." We found that writer telling us a little ago that the T'ae-keih generated the two figures, "which properly signify heaven and earth." (Def. p. 21) But if heaven and earth be themselves generated, how can they be the producers of all things? As to the translating actively, "*Te* causes things to issue forth," it is what the best Chinese interpreters do. And even according to Visdelou, the Ruler is a *Supreme Ruler*. Dr. Boone, quoting from him, confines himself to one-half the sentence in his original. Visdelou says, "By the term *Te*, the interpreters understand *Shang-Te*, and the ancient interpreters the Emperor Fuh-he, *who, as we have already said, has been elevated to the dignity of a Shang-Te of the second order.*" So then, when the *Te* of the text is said to be referred to Fuh-he, it is to him in his elevated character, as a *Shang-Te* of the second order, "un coadjuteur du grand *Shang-Te*." If the assistants and ministers of *Shang-Te* can do the works that are described in the passage in question, who must He be? "The great *Shang-Te*" can be none other than the great God. \*

<sup>1</sup> On neither of the Diagrams does the T'ang Commentary say a word about collecting the spirits—either of the worshippers, or of the worshipped dead. Is not the style of speech altogether an excrescence of the Sung philosophy?

But the text deserves some farther illustration, and I give it entire, in Dr. Medhurst's translation—

“The (Supreme) Ruler (causes things to) issue forth under the Chin diagram (representing thunder, and corresponding to the commencement of spring;) he equally adjusts them under the Seuën diagram (representing wind, and corresponding to mid-spring;) he (causes them to be) mutually exhibited under the Lê diagram (representing fire, and corresponding to the beginning of summer;) he renders them serviceable (to mankind) under the Kwän diagram (representing earth, and corresponding to mid-summer;) he (makes them to draw forth) pleasing words under the T'huy diagram, representing sea, and corresponding to the beginning of autumn;) he (makes them to) contend under the Këen diagram (representing heaven, and corresponding to mid-autumn;) he renders them soothing and gratifying under the K'han diagram (representing water, and corresponding to the commencement of winter;) while he makes them complete the account under the Kän diagram (representing hills, and corresponding to mid-winter.)”

Premarè says, “The greater part of interpreters agree that the creation of all things is here spoken of.” He gives the commentaries of Choo He, whose authority Dr. Boone acknowledges in other places—“*Te* signifies here the Lord and Sovereign master of heaven.” “All things obey the Lord, and come forth when He calls them.” This language is certainly akin to that of Scripture concerning Him, “who calleth the things that are not, as though they were,” “who spake and it was done, who commanded, and all things stood fast.” Premarè quotes also the comment of Hoo P'ing-wan, “Here the order in which all things have been produced and perfected is spoken of. But who has produced them? Who has perfected them? There must certainly have been a Master, a Sovereign Worker, who is *Te*, the Lord.”

If absolute creation be not spoken of in the passage, we surely have nothing less in it than the upholding of all things—the maintenance of creation from year to year, and season to season. Dr. Boone may have his neuter translation, and we read, “*Te* goes forth in the spring,” with a description of all the phenomena of the year as caused by Him, bringing to our recollection the words of Thomson in his celebrated Hymn—

“The rolling year  
Is full of Thee. Forth in the pleasing spring  
Thy beauty walks, Thy tenderness and love.”

Who is “the Sovereign worker?” There is but *One*. It was with reference to His upholding all things uninterruptedly from the beginning of time, that Jesus said of God, “My Father worketh hitherto.”

I wish Dr. Boone had taken the trouble to find out “the ancient” interpretation. It is a mere figment, and will develop itself in another place. Here is an interpretation older than the birth of our Saviour—the interpretation of K'ung Gan-kwö,<sup>1</sup> a descendant of Confucius in the eighth genera-

<sup>1</sup> Gan-kwö is referred to as a great scholar, in the Kang-keen E-che, under the reign of the Emperor Woo, which closed A. C. 81.

tion—"Te is the Lord, who produces things, the author of prosperity and increase."<sup>1</sup> There is but one being to whom it belongs to produce things, and "promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge; he putteth down one, and setteth up another." In spite of Visdelou's ancient interpreters, and Dr. Boone's summary disposal of it, this text of Confucius supplies irrefragable proof that the *Shang-Te* of the Chinese is the true God. I proceed to consider the second ground of objection taken to that opinion. The reader must decide whether the first ground—the authority of the Bishop of Claudopolis—has not been proved unsafe and untenable.

II. Against the affirmation that *Shang-Te* is the true God, Dr. Boone brings forward certain readings of his own, in the writings principally of Choo He. I was not expecting him to adopt such a line of defense, for, in his Essay, he had disclaimed the authority of that philosopher, and all the other materializing writers of the same sect. At the 18th page of that work, we read—

"What then is the object definitely designated by the word *T'ien*, Heaven, the highest of the objects worshiped in the national rites (of China)?"

"To this question two different answers may be given, according as regard is had to one or the other of two opinions held, by Chinese of different sects, on this point. During the Sung dynasty, (about A. D. 1100,) there sprung up a sect of Philosophers to whom the Romanish Missionaries have given the name of Atheo-politique, and to whose views great prominence has been given in all the editions of the classical works published during the present dynasty. This sect would answer the question, what is meant by *t'ien*,<sup>2</sup> as follows: *t'ien* is *Shángtí*, the Ruler on high; and *Shángtí* is *lí*,<sup>3</sup> the rule of order, destiny, fate.

"There is another class, however, who we conceive represent the polytheists of China, and the old views of the state religion, as presented in the *Chau Li* (Ritual of the Chau dynasty: B. C. 1100,) who answer as follows:—The *t'ien*, worshiped at the winter solstice is, *t'ien chí shin*,<sup>4</sup> the god of Heaven, and this *t'ien chí shin*, god of Heaven, is *Shángtí*, the Ruler on high."

After Dr. Boone had thus declared his belief that the Sung school did not represent the old views of the state religion, there is great inconsistency in his leaning on its authority to make out his point that *Shang-Te* is not God. It is well, however, that he has done so. An opportunity is so afforded to show with what impropriety those writers are appealed to by him. I hope to be able to make this apparent by the following observations:—

1. I agree with Dr. Boone that Choo He, and many other writers of the Sung and subsequent dynasties appear to be endeavouring to explain the creation and government of the universe without the intervention of a per-

<sup>1</sup> 帝者, 生物之主, 興益之宗

<sup>2</sup> 天

<sup>3</sup> 理

<sup>4</sup> 天之神 This account of the State

Religion is very questionable.

sonal, independent, spiritual Being, the Creator and Governor—in other words, without the intervention of God.

2. Those writers, in explaining that creation and government by means of *T'ae-keih*, the great extremity, *Le*, the principle of order, *Taou*,<sup>1</sup> the supreme Reason, and *K'e*,<sup>2</sup> the primordial substance or vapour, are guilty of the same kind of atheism into which many speculators in Europe have fallen and still fall. It is not in China alone that God has been explained away as only another name for reason, or fate, or the order of nature. At the present day we have too many writers and thinkers, such as the author of the *Vestiges of Creation*, in England, and M. Auguste Comte, in France, who would exclude God from His universe, much in the same way that the atheo-political school in China attempted to exclude Him from it, seven centuries ago.

3. The card-like shuffling with the names—"the principle of order," "the great extremity," "the supreme reason," and the leaving one of them in the place of *Te* or *Shang-Te*, as that name stands in the classics, is merely a piece of verbal jugglery, or logical legerdemain, which the mind instantly rejects. For instance, when it is said, "*Shang-Te* conferred their moral nature upon men," or, "Heaven, having created the lower people, raises up for them princes and teachers, to act as agents of *Shang-Te*," these sophists tell us, that the meaning only is, that according to the principle of order—the eternal fitness of things—destiny—fate—it is thus. (Def. p. 34.) Could anything be more inane and ridiculous than such an explanation? The good sense of Choo He himself often gets the better of his philosophy, and in many passages he speaks like a true Theist.

4. The expression *T'ae-keih*, which is made to be synonymous with the principle of order, reason, and *Shang-Te*, is only found once in the classical books. The solitary passage where it occurs, is that text in Confucius' appendix to the *Yih-king*, which has been already quoted. It is never used in any of the Four Books, never in the *She-king*, the *Shoo-king*, the *Le-ke*, the *Chun-tsew*. We have no evidence that the name obtained at all in China till the time of Confucius, about 500 years before Christ, and, according to the chronology given by Dr. Morrison, more than 2,500 years after Fuh-he, the author of the diagrams. Moreover, the sentence of Confucius simply says—"The *Yih* has the *T'ae-keih*, which produced the two figures, which two figures produced the four forms, which four forms produced the eight diagrams." The verb "produced" is not to be taken actively, but only as indicating priority in the order of development. At the head of all the physical changes which have resulted in the Universe as at present constituted, stood the *T'ae-keih*, or the great extremity; out of it came

the two figures, or the different kinds of matter, from which heaven and earth were formed; out of the two figures were developed the four forms, and from the four forms the eight diagrams.

According to this exposition, the *T'ae-keih* would indicate the condition or time preceding the first creating acts;—and this was the sense given to it till the time of the Sung philosophers of the 12th century. In the work of the T'ang dynasty, already mentioned in a note, it is said, under the text in question—“Existence must begin from non-existence, therefore the *T'ae-keih* produced the two figures. *T'ae-keih* is the designation of what cannot be designated. It is impossible to give any name to it. We consider the fact that all existences have a terminus, and call this the grand terminus.”<sup>1</sup> This explanation is by a writer of one of the Tsin dynasties (A. D. 260—416). The T'ang editor subjoins the account quoted at p. 12—“*T'ae-keih* signifies the condition or period before heaven and earth were divided, when the original vapoury matter was formless and one.”<sup>2</sup> It was not till the 12th century that any other meaning was put upon the term, and the founder of the materializing school, Chow Leen-ke, prefixed to the *T'ae-keih* an *Woo-keih*.<sup>3</sup> Before “the grand limit,” that is, he placed “*the illimitable*,” in which phrase, as may be seen in Premare’s Dissertation, Wang Shin-tsze, of the following, or Yuen, dynasty, recognized “an efficacious or inexhaustible Reason, which no image can represent, which no name can designate, which is infinite in all respects, and to which nothing can be added.”

5. While the Sung philosophers confound *Shang-Te* with “the great terminus,” “the principle of order” and “reason,” they make out what I translate *spirit* and Dr. Boone *god*, to be nothing but the action of the *yin* and *yang*—the “active-passive primordial substance”—in harmony with that reason, and subordinate to it. If *Shang-Te* be nothing more than another name for reason, the *shin* are yet the servants of that reason, *under it, inferior to it*. If *Shang-Te* be a mere passionless inactive principle of order, the *shin* are only the *yin* and the *yang* in motion. Dr. Boone lies buried, and not his opponents, beneath the ruin of every thing divine, in which he exults. We sit above them, and have for *God* a presiding reason; he is in the heart of them, and has for *god* expanding and contracting matter.

For the proof of this assertion, I shall not go farther than the digest of comments upon “The Invariable Mean,” contained in the *Pun-e Hwae-*

<sup>1</sup> 夫有必始於無，故太極生兩儀也，太極者無稱之稱，不可得而名，取有之所極，況之，太極者也。

<sup>2</sup> 太極謂天地未分之前，元氣混而爲一。

<sup>3</sup> ○此所謂無極而太極也。

*tsan*, a book, I apprehend, in the possession of most foreign students of Chinese. The sixteenth chapter of the classic is divided into three parts. The first, as rendered by Dr. Medhurst, runs—"Confucius said, How widely extended are the actings out of the *kwei-shin*.<sup>1</sup> In endeavouring to observe them, we cannot see them; in attempting to listen, we cannot hear them; and yet they enter into all things without exception." Who are the *kwei-shin* here spoken of? One of the Chings tells us—"The *kwei-shin* are the energetic operations of heaven and earth, and the traces of production and transformation."<sup>2</sup> Another scholar of note, Chang Tsze-how, says—"The *kwei-shin* are the easily acting powers of the two breaths of nature," that is, the *Yin*, and the *Yang*.<sup>3</sup> Finally, Choo He, the coryphæus of the Sung family, pronounces—"I would say, if we speak of the two breaths (or vapoury matters), that *kwei* is the efficaciousness of the *Yin*, and *shin* is the efficaciousness of the *Yang*. But if we speak only of one breath, then when it advances and expands, it is *shin*, when it recedes and reverts, it is *kwei*. In fact they constitute but one material thing."<sup>4</sup>

But it may be said, the subject in this passage is the physical changes and transformations continually taking place in nature. We advance, therefore, to the other parts of the chapter. "While causing each man in the empire to be properly adjusted, and purified (within), and arranged in suitable apparel (without), in order to offer the accustomed sacrifices, they are expandingly spread abroad, as if over the heads, and as if on each side of the worshippers."<sup>5</sup> Here the *kwei-shin* that are sacrificed to are the subjects of discourse—all the spirits which the Chinese worship, or, as Dr. Boone will have it, all the gods of China. The next part consists of a quotation from the *She-king*, concerning our being overlooked by the *shin*, even in our closets and private dwellings—"The approaches of the *shin* cannot be ascertained; how then can we tolerate negligence?"<sup>6</sup> Thus, in

<sup>1</sup> 子曰，鬼神之爲德，其盛矣乎，視之而弗見，聽之而弗聞，體物而不可遺

<sup>2</sup> 程子曰，鬼神，天地之功用，而造化之迹也

<sup>3</sup> 張子曰，鬼神者，二氣之良能也

<sup>4</sup> 愚謂，以二氣言，則鬼者陰之靈也，神者陽之靈也，以一氣言，則至而伸者爲神，反而歸者爲鬼，其實一物而已

<sup>5</sup> 使天下之人，齊明盛服，以承祭祀，洋洋乎，如在其上，如在其左右

<sup>6</sup> 詩曰，神之格思，不可度思，矧可斲思

the course of the chapter, Confucius speaks of the *kwei-shin* as present in the ever-changing phenomena of nature, as sacrificed to, and as "millions of spiritual beings," which "walk the earth," and observe the conduct of men. He concludes with the exclamations, "How great is the manifestation of their abstruseness! Whilst displaying their sincerity, they are not to be concealed."<sup>1</sup> Now, it has been seen, how the spiritual agency, spoken of in the first part, is explained away by the Sung philosophers as being nothing more than the expanding and contracting of the "primordial substance." That they do not scruple to deal in the same way with the other parts, will appear from the following extract from the Sze-shoo T'ung, "The Perspicuous Explanation of the Four Books." It starts with the word "sincerity" in the conclusion of the chapter.

"Sincerity is the hinge of the entire book of the *Chung-yung*, and we find it for the first time in this chapter. *The scholars of the Han dynasty were all ignorant of its meaning.* Le Pang-chih of the Sung dynasty first explained it as meaning 'freedom from all deception.' Seu Chung-keu explained it by 'ceaselessness.' Afterwards, the philosopher Ching said that it meant 'no falsehood.' Choo He added that it meant 'truth and reality'—and thus the meaning of the word was exhausted. In the six *king*, this word 'sincerity' first occurs in the *Shoo-king* in the book of *Shang*, but it is there only said, *The kwei-shin* enjoy the sincerity of men? *The Chung-yung*, however, speaks of the sincerity of the *kwei-shin*;—the meaning of which is recondite. *The kwei-shin* are the producing and transforming active-passive primordial substance; sincerity is the principle of order, according to which the active-passive primordial substance produces and transforms. Let there really be this principle of order, then there is this primordial substance—of nature very recondite, but action very manifest. *The kwei-shin* have neither form nor sound—how is it that they enter into every thing under heaven? how is it that they cause each man in the empire to be properly adjusted, &c.? Plainly it is, because the impossibility of this one thing—perfect sincerity—to be concealed is so great.

The beginning and ending of all things is invariably caused by the union and dispersion of the active and passive primordial matter, which union and dispersion again are certainly from the principle of order, true and sincere, without falsehood. *After ages did not understand this principle, but took the idea of the kwei-shin from the Buddhists and Taouists, and so proceeded to the practice of superstitious sacrifices in order to solicit happiness.* To such monstrous, strange, and unclassical practices could they come!"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 夫微之顯，誠之不可揜，如此夫

<sup>2</sup> 四書通一誠者，中庸一書之樞紐，而首於此章

This long quotation is important in several respects. It develops the notion of "sincerity," as synonymous with the more frequently mentioned "principle of order." The term, however, occurs in the six classics, only in a simple, natural sense—"the sincerity of men;" but the writer will have it, that, in the *Chung-yung*, Confucius employs it with a "recondite signification." And yet there it lay, unapprehended, through the Han and a dozen other dynasties, extending over a period of about sixteen centuries from Confucius, till the men of Sung rose up. And not only so. We learn also from the passage, that, till those men disturbed it, the common notion of spirits was the same as that of the Buddhists and Taouists—the same, namely, as our own, that spirits are a class of beings, immaterial, active, and powerful. The writer pronounces the notion monstrous and false, but the monstrosity and falsehood all belong to his own idea—that they are only the expanding and contracting of an active passive primordial substance, or vapoury matter. I do not say that the philosophers are always consistent in carrying out this notion of the *kwei-shin* and the *shin*. They are no more consistent than they are in their attempts to explain away the personality of the one Sovereign Spirit, *Shang-Te*. But surely it is wonderful how Dr. Boone and others can rest complacently in the atheism of the school concerning Him, and yet say nothing of its insane lucubrations concerning the *shin*. If we are to look to it at all, for help in our search for the Chinese name corresponding to God, who would not rather adopt the terms meaning Supreme Ruler, though it says they only indicate "the great terminus," "reason," "the principle of order," than the term meaning *spirit*, which it contends

見之漢儒皆不識誠字宋李邦直始謂不欺之  
 謂誠徐仲車謂不息之謂誠至程子則曰無妄六  
 之謂誠朱子又加以真實二字誠之說盡矣而中  
 經言誠自商書之誠其旨微矣鬼神者造化陰陽  
 庸直言鬼神之誠其體甚微其用甚顯夫鬼神無  
 之氣誠有是天下之顯然一至於誠散之後世以  
 則實於其使之莫非陰陽之理祀以邀福者一何  
 無聲何終始莫妄為淫祀以邀福者一何怪誕  
 如凡物之終始莫非陰陽之理祀以邀福者一何怪誕  
 散莫於佛老而競為淫祀以邀福者一何怪誕  
 神於佛老而競為淫祀以邀福者一何怪誕  
 經至此哉

only indicates the union and dispersion, the out-going and in-coming of a couple of vapours? Is *this* to be our God?

6. The speculations of the atheo-political philosophers have never affected either the established religion of China, or its popular belief. By their own admission, their doctrines were innovations on the prevalent modes of thinking, and, since Choo He published his voluminous works, though some learned men may have speculated in their studies over his mystifications both concerning *Shang-Te* and the *shin*, in the cabinet and among the people at large, the former has continued to be "*bond fide*" God, and the latter have continued to be "*bond fide*" spirits. The proof of this has to be adduced in the exhibition of the Religion of China, against the representations of it quoted by Dr. Boone from Visdelou and Dr. Morrison. In leaving the Sung philosophy, I may venture, after the above remarks upon it, to repeat, that the appeal made to it by Dr. Boone was ill-judged. If it make against those who wish to use *Shang-Te* for God, much more does it make against himself who wishes to use *shin*.

III. Against the affirmation that *Shang-Te* is truly and properly God, Dr. Boone pleads two descriptions of the State Religion of China, one by M. Visdelou and one by Dr. Morrison, enlarging upon them with various remarks and comments of his own.

"From their account," he says, "no one can make out that the Chinese are worshippers of the true God; nor, we should think, after reading it, could resist the impression, that his imperial Majesty and those who join with him in this worship, are wholly ignorant of the being we Christians call God."

And certainly, if their accounts be true, I and others must yield this portion of our ground. But they are as incorrect as they well could be. My own obligations to them, however, are not small. Necessitated, in consequence of them, to examine the religion of China at the proper sources, I found an amount of evidence, which I had not anticipated, and which affords me a delightful assurance that this most numerous people are not without the knowledge of God.

This department of our subject is, I think, the most important. Dr. Boone is of the same opinion. He reserves to the last, the two descriptions which he had at hand, and clinches with them his previous conclusions. The advice which he introduces from Visdelou is, indeed, most excellent—

"The Chinese are certainly in advance of other nations in the care and accuracy with which they have written their histories. Besides what we call history in general, they write also particular historical accounts of all things, amongst which religion holds the chief place.

"Each dynasty possesses a history of its religion. Thus it will not be difficult, instead of vainly disputing about their canonical books and about detached portions of passages, to gather from history, a decided opinion concerning the religion of each dynasty, and finally to decide if the religion of the Chinese be the religion of the true God."

The advice, every one must acknowledge, is good, and if evidence is to govern the strife that divides missionaries, the following this counsel must decide it one way or the other. Let me preface what results I have found in trying to do so, with two remarks :—

First, The reader will bear in mind, that the question is not exactly what Visdelou is made by Dr. Boone to say, to determine namely whether the religion of the Chinese be the religion of the true God.<sup>1</sup> That I do not maintain. My thesis is—that the Chinese possess a knowledge of the true God, and that the highest Being whom they worship is indeed the same whom we worship. But they not only worship Him ; they worship a multitude of beings besides, and with their knowledge of God have associated a mass of superstitions and follies. How would Dr. Boone answer the question, Is the religion of the Roman Catholics the religion of the true God ? He would probably say—It is so, only exceedingly corrupted. The same is my reply to a similar question concerning the religion of the Chinese. I am not vindicating *it*, but I am satisfied that in it there is the knowledge and worship of the true God.

Second, It may seem an endless work to set forth the religion of China, as described in the histories of its several dynasties, in number more than twenty, and extending over more than 4000 years. The enquiry, however, need not be so laborious, for any one dynasty will serve as the representative in most respects of all the others.

“Let it not be imagined,” says Visdelou, in the paragraph immediately succeeding that just quoted, “that the present religion of the Chinese is different from the ancient, for though there have been innovations from time to time, in respect to place, time, and form, yet the principal things are practised according to the ancient rites. Now-a-days, as at other times, they sacrifice to heaven, to the earth, to rivers, to ancestors, &c. Now-a-days, the ancient ceremonies are still in use, excepting a small number, which have been changed from no other motive, but that they have been deemed not agreeable to antiquity, only opinions in regard to this are different.” He adds, “It is necessary to except, as we have already said, the sacrifices to the five *Shang-Tes*, which have been suppressed by the Ming dynasty, and by the present called the *Tsing*, which follows step by step the other, to which it succeeded.”

Our way being thus cleared, I shall present, from “The Collected Statutes of the Ming dynasty,”<sup>2</sup> a variety of prayers and hymns, with explanatory notices, which will convey a correct idea of what the religion of China is, and especially of the Being who is the highest object of worship in it. In the sequel, I will consider, among other points, the change which the Ming is said to have made in the worship of previous dynasties.

<sup>1</sup> Visdelou's text is, “. . . de decider enfin si la religion des Chinois est la religion des adorateurs du vrai Dieu.” By an unfortunate fatality which follows him in making quotations, Dr. Boone overlooks the “des adorateurs.” The omission does not do much harm here. In other places, it is more to be regretted.

<sup>2</sup> 大明會典

The public services of religion in China are principally sacrifices. No idea of propitiation appears to be connected with them. They are offerings simply of duty and gratitude, accompanied with supplications and thanksgivings. In the different dynasties, the sacrifices have always been divided into three classes—great, middle, and small. During the early period of the Ming dynasty, under the first class, were comprehended the Border sacrifice, the sacrifices to the Imperial Ancestors, those to the spirits presiding over the land and grain, and that to the inventor of husbandry. This last was subsequently reduced to the second rank, which contained, besides, the sacrifices to the spirits of the hills and rivers, to the distinguished monarchs of former dynasties, to Confucius, and to the standard, and, from the time of Kea-ting, the sacrifices to the spirits of the sun and moon, to the spirits of heaven and the spirits of the earth. All sacrifices to other spirits were of the third or lowest rank. The first of the great services, in the Ming and every other dynasty, is always the Border sacrifice or sacrifices. I speak of it as either singular or plural. For the most part, it may be considered as embracing the sacrifices at the two solstices—that in winter, addressed more particularly to the presiding Power, as ruling in heaven, and that in summer, to the same Power as causing the earth to bring forth and bud. Some times, however, the Border sacrifices have been multiplied to four, and even six; at other times they have been collected into one. It will not be denied that when they are divided into two or more, the greatest is that at the winter solstice, offered to *Shang-Te*, on a round altar, in the southern suburb of the Capital City. We have only to attend to the prayers and praises offered on that occasion to know what the Chinese think of this Being.

The following was the form of prayer, with which the approach of the spirit of *Shang-Te* to the sacrifice was greeted, until the 17th year of Kea-ting, when a change was made, to which I will shortly call attention:—  
 “To Thee, O mysteriously-working Maker, I look up in thought. How imperial is the expansive arch, (where Thou dwellest.) Now is the time when the masculine energies of nature begin to be displayed, and with the great ceremonies I reverently honour Thee. Thy servant, I am but a reed or willow; my heart is but as that of an ant; yet have I received Thy favouring decree, appointing me to the government of the empire. I deeply cherish a sense of my ignorance and blindness, and am afraid lest I prove unworthy of Thy great favours. Therefore will I observe all the rules and statutes, striving, insignificant as I am, to discharge my loyal duty. Far distant here, I look up to Thy heavenly palace. Come in Thy precious chariot to the altar. Thy servant, I bow my head to the earth, reverently expecting Thine abundant grace. All my officers are here arranged along with me, joyfully worshipping before Thee. All the spirits accompany

Thee as guards, (filling the air) from the East to the West. Thy servant, I prostrate myself to meet Thee, and reverently look up for thy coming, O *Te*. Oh that Thou wouldest vouchsafe to accept our offerings, and regard us, while thus we worship Thee, whose goodness is inexhaustible!"<sup>1</sup>

In this prayer, we find the Emperor of China—in his own opinion and that of the many millions subject to him, the greatest of men—prostrate in the dust before *Shang-Te*, acknowledging that from Him he holds as a solemn trust the vast government which he wields, and that He is His servant, though consciously unworthy of His favours. Substitute for *Shang-Te* the name God, and all that is predicated of Him on the one hand is true, and all that the Emperor says of himself on the other is highly praiseworthy. There is a special point, however, in the prayer, to which I wish to call attention—the distinction made between *Shang-Te*, and all the *shin*, or, as I translate the word, spirits. They are His guards or attendants. Just as Jehovah came from Paran with holy myriads, (Deut xxxiii. 2)—as He revealed Himself on Sinai among thousands of angels, (Ps. lxxviii. 17)—so do the Chinese believe that when *Shang-Te* descends to receive their worship offered by the Emperor, He comes attended by ten thousands of spirits. He is not one of *them*, though He is “a spirit.”

This special point is very evident in a remarkable paper, which I proceed to submit. In the seventeenth year of his reign, the emperor Kea-ting introduced a change in the style of address employed to *Shang-Te*. He had been addressed in former reigns with the adjunct of *Haou T'een*—*Haou T'een Shang-Te*, “*Shang-Te*, dwelling in the bright heavens;” Kea-ting altered *Haou T'een* into *Hwang T'een*—*Hwang T'een Shang-Te*, “*Shang-Te* dwelling in the sovereign heavens.” The change of style could hardly be called an innovation. The first description which we have of worship in China—that by Shun—mentions *Shang-Te* without any adjunct. Subsequently, in the classics, we find *Hwang Shang-Te*, *Hwang T'cen*, *Haou T'een Shang-Te*, and other varieties. The form which Kea-ting adopted has been adhered to by the present Tartar dynasty. On occasion of making the alteration, the ceremonies of a regular solstitial sacrifice were performed,

<sup>1</sup> 仰惟立造兮，於皇昊穹，時當肇陽兮，大禮欽崇，  
 臣惟蒲柳兮，螻蟻之衷，伏承眷命兮，職統羣工，  
 深懷愚昧兮，恐負洪德，爰遵彝典兮，勉竭微忠，  
 遙瞻天闕兮，寶輦臨壇，臣當稽首兮，祇迓恩隆，  
 百辟陪列兮，舞拜於前，萬神翌衛兮，而西以東，  
 臣俯伏迎兮，敬瞻帝御，願垂歆鑒兮，拜德曷窮。

and hymns of prayer and praise were sung, in which devotion rose to a very high elevation—as the reader will immediately be able to perceive. Six days before that celebration, the Emperor, with many officers, attended the reading of the paper to which I have referred, at the round altar. It was as follows :—

“A. B., the inheriting Emperor of the Great Illustrious dynasty, has seriously prepared a paper to give information to

The spirit of the Sun (*lit.* the great light) ;

The spirit of the Moon (*lit.* the nightly light),

The spirits of the five planets, the constellations of the zodiac, and of all the stars in all the heaven ;

The spirits of the clouds, the rain, wind, and thunder ;

The spirits which have duties assigned them throughout the whole heavens ;

The spirits of the five hills—the mountains ;

The spirits of the five hills—the guardians ;

The spirits of the five hills, Ke-yun, Tseang-shing, Shin-lëë, T'een-show, Shun-tih ;

The spirits of the four seas ;

The spirits of the four great rivers ;

The intelligences, which have duties assigned to them upon the earth ;

All the celestial spirits under heaven ;

All the terrestrial spirits under heaven ;

The spirit presiding over the present year ;

The spirit ruling the tenth month, and the spirits over every day ;

And the spirit in charge of the ground about the border-altar :—

On the first day of the coming month, We shall reverently lead our officers and people to honour the great name of *Shang-Te*, dwelling in the sovereign heavens, looking up to that nine-storied lofty azure vault. Beforehand, we inform you, all ye celestial and all ye terrestrial spirits, and will trouble you, on our behalf, to exert your spiritual influences, and display your vigorous efficacy, communicating our poor desire to *Shang-Te*, and praying Him mercifully to grant us His acceptance and regard, and to be pleased with the title which we shall reverently present.

For this purpose we have made this paper for your information. All ye spirits should be well aware of it. Ye are seriously informed.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 大明嗣天子御名謹文移告于大明之神,夜明之神,五星列宿周天星辰之神,雲雨風雷之神,周天列職之神,五嶽五山之神,五鎮五山之神,基運翔聖神烈天壽純德五山之神,四海之神,四瀆之神,際地列職祇靈,天下諸神,天下諸祇,

It will be observed, how, in the preceding paper, the Emperor speaks to the *shin*, just as he does to his subjects. In all his addresses to *Shang-Te*, he speaks of himself as *shin*,<sup>1</sup> "servant or subject," but he addresses the *shin* with the authoritative *Chin*,<sup>2</sup> corresponding to our English *Wē*. He is indeed their lord;<sup>3</sup> only to *Shang-Te* does he acknowledge inferiority and subjection. But the document ought to put the question concerning the distinction between *Shang-Te* and the *shin* at rest. We see from it that the Emperor worships one God, and many other spiritual beings, who are under Him and inferior to Him. Language could not be more positive and precise. *Shang-Te* stands out before the worshipper single and alone. A certain change is to be made in the ordinary style of addressing Him. Wherewith shall the Emperor come before Him with the alteration? He prepares for his approach, by calling in the mediation of the *shin*—not of one nor of a few, but of all the spirits of heaven, and all the spirits of the earth. Shall we be told in the face of this that *Shang-Te* is merely one of the *shin*? As broad a line of demarcation is drawn between Him and *shin* and men, as the scriptures draw between God and other beings, pronouncing Him a spirit and yet exalting Him high over all—whether spirits or men.

The songs employed in the service to which the foregoing notification was introductory will now be given. They partake much of the character of psalms, being now of praise and now of prayer. I have thought it well to introduce the whole, with the occasion on which each was sung. The reader will remember, I hope, that to receive a fair impression of the Chinese worship, he must not compare it with the simple forms of Protestantism. He must rather carry his mind back to the temple of Solomon, with its altars of incense and burnt-offering, and its table of shewbread. Let him think also of the dances which sometimes entered into the Jewish worship, the singers and players on instruments, the various kinds of offerings, and the first fruits of the harvest which were presented to the Lord.

戊戌太歲之神,十月神將,直日功曹之神,郊壇  
司土之神,曰朕祇於來月朔旦,躬率臣民上尊  
皇天上帝泰號,仰高玄九重,預告於諸神衆祇,  
煩爲朕運爾神化,昭爾靈顯,通朕微衷於上帝,  
祈賜允鑒之慈,享朕欽薦之號,爲此文告,神宜  
悉知,謹告

<sup>1</sup> 臣<sup>2</sup> 朕<sup>3</sup> 百神之主

Song 1st—To greet the approach of the Spirit of *Shang-Te*.

Of old in the beginning, there was the great chaos, without form and dark. The five elements had not begun to revolve, nor the sun and the moon to shine. In the midst thereof there existed neither form nor sound. Thou, O spiritual Sovereign, camest forth in Thy presidency, and first didst divide the grosser parts from the purer. Thou madest heaven; Thou madest earth; Thou madest man. All things with their re-producing power, got their being.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. On presenting the notice (recording the change of the title).

O *Te*, when Thou hadst separated the *Yin* and the *Yang* (*i. e.* the heavens and the earth), Thy creating work proceeded. Thou didst produce, O Spirit, the sun and the moon and the five planets, and pure and beautiful was their light. The vault of heaven was spread out like a curtain, and the square earth supported all on it, and all things were happy. I, Thy servant, venture reverently to thank Thee, and, while I worship, present the notice to Thee, O *Te*, calling Thee Sovereign.<sup>2</sup>

## 3. On presenting gems and silks.

Thou hast vouchsafed, O *Te*, to hear us, for Thou regardest us as a Father. I, Thy child, dull and unenlightened, am unable to show forth my dutiful feelings. I thank Thee, that Thou hast accepted the intimation. Honourable is Thy great name. With reverence we spread out these gems and silks, and, as swallows rejoicing in the spring, praise Thine abundant love.<sup>3</sup>

## 4. On presenting the vessels with offerings of food.

The great feast has been set forth, and the sound of our joy is like thunder. The Sovereign Spirit vouchsafes to enjoy our offering, and my heart feels within me like a particle of dust. The meat has been boiled in the large caldrons, and the fragrant provisions have been prepared. Enjoy the offering, O *Te*, then shall all the people have happiness. I, Thy servant, receiving Thy favours, am blessed indeed.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 於昔洪荒之初兮，混濛五行未運兮，兩曜未明，  
其中挺立兮，有無容聲，神皇出御兮，始判濁清，  
立天立地人兮，羣物生生

<sup>2</sup> 帝闢陰陽兮，造化張，神生七政兮，精華光圓覆  
方載兮，兆物康，臣敢祇報兮，拜薦帝曰皇

<sup>3</sup> 帝垂聽兮，義若親子，職庸昧兮，無由申，册表荷  
鑒兮，泰號式尊，敬陳玉帛兮，燕賀洪仁

<sup>4</sup> 大筵弘開，權聲如雷，皇神賜享，臣衷涓埃，大鼎

## 5. On first offering wine.

The great and lofty One vouchsafes His favour and regard ; all unworthy are we to receive it. I, His simple servant, while I worship, hold this precious cup, and praise Him, whose years have no end.<sup>1</sup>

## 6. On offering thanks.

When *Te*, the Lord, had so decreed, He called into existence heaven, earth, and man. Between (heaven and earth) He separately disposed men and things, all overspread by the heavens. I, His unworthy servant, beg His (favouring) decree, to enlighten me His minister—so may I for ever appear before Him in the empyrean.<sup>2</sup>

## 7. At the second offering of wine.

All the numerous tribes of animated beings are indebted to Thy favour for their beginning. Men and things are all emparadised in Thy love, O *Te*. All living things are indebted to Thy goodness, but who knows from whom his blessings come to him. It is thou alone, O Lord, who art the true parent of all things.<sup>3</sup>

## 8. At the last offering of wine.

The precious feast is wide displayed ; the gemmeous benches are arranged ; the pearly wine is presented ;—with music and dances. The spirit of harmony is collected ; men and creatures are happy. The breast of His servant is troubled, that he is unable to express his obligations.<sup>4</sup>

## 9. At the removal of the offerings.

The service of song is completed, but our poor sincerity cannot be expressed. Thy sovereign goodness is infinite. As a potter, hast Thou made all living things. Great and small are sheltered (by Thy love). As engraven on the heart of Thy poor servant, is the sense of Thy goodness, so that my

炮烹肴饗馨裁帝歆兮兆民之福臣感恩兮何如幸哉

<sup>1</sup> 大高降恩鑒微情何以承臣愚端拜捧瑤觥堅壽無極并

<sup>2</sup> 帝皇立命兮肇三才中分民物兮惟天徧該小臣請命用光帝陪庶永配於皇穹哉

<sup>3</sup> 羣生總總兮悉蒙始恩人物盡囿兮於帝仁羣生荷德兮誰識所從來於惟皇兮億兆物之祖真

<sup>4</sup> 寶宴弘玉几憑瓊液陞樂舞翮協氣凝民物初臣衷蹇蹇兮報無能

feeling cannot be fully displayed. With great kindness Thou dost bear with us, and, notwithstanding our demerits, dost grant us life and prosperity.<sup>1</sup>

10. To escort the Spirit of *Shang-Te*.

With reverent ceremonies the record has been presented, and Thou, O Sovereign Spirit, has deigned to accept our service. The dances have all been performed, and nine times the music has resounded. Grant, O *Te*, Thy great blessing to increase the happiness of my house. The instruments of metal and precious stones have given out their melody. The jewelled girdles of the officers have emitted their tinklings. Spirits and men rejoice together, praising *Te*, the Lord. While we celebrate His great name, what limit can there be, or what measure? For ever He setteth fast the high heavens, and establisheth the solid earth. His government is everlasting. His unworthy servant, I bow my head, I lay it in the dust, bathed in his grace and glory.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 太奏既成，微誠莫傾，皇德無京，陶此羣生。巨細  
 幪幪，刻小臣之感衷兮，罔罄愚情，實弘涵而容  
 簡甲，𤝵生成。

<sup>2</sup> 禮詆册薦兮，皇神垂享，萬舞畢舉兮，九成已行。

\* As a potter hast Thou made all living things." This seems to be a favourite mode with the Chinese of speaking about God. In the chapter of Choo He's works, from which Dr. Boone makes so many quotations, and midway between two of the longest of them, there occurs a passage, which unfortunately he overlooked. It is said, 可幾間，大鈞播物，還是一去便休，也還有去而復來之理。曰，一去便休耳，豈有散而復來之氣。 "K'o-ke asked, When the great Framer sowed (the seeds of) things, did He go out once and then cease? or did He go and come repeatedly? I answer, He went out once, and then ceased. How should there have been an exhaustion of energy, and then a recollection of it?" Turning to K'ang-he's Dictionary, under the word *Keun*, which I have rendered Framer, we are referred to a passage in the Record of Kea-e, a statesman under the Emperor Wän (A. C. 174—151), with the explanation that by *Ta-keun* or great Framer is meant Heaven. *Kea-e's* record is found in the 27th volume of the Historians. The passage in it which suggested K'o-ke's question is—大鈞播物，塊坳無垠。 "The great Framer sowed the seeds of things, atoms scattered abroad without limit." There is subjoined to it a comment of Gan Sze-koo, one of the early writers of the T'ang dynasty—"Potters call their revolving instrument a *Keun*. The meaning is that the Creator made man as a potter makes an earthen vessel." Such language can hardly fail to suggest to the mind many passages of Scripture, such as that in Isaiah, "O Lord, Thou art our Father; we are the clay and Thou our potter; and we are all the work of Thy hand." There is also the account of the creation of man, how "The Lord God formed him (*yitser, fincit*) of the dust of the ground."

## 11. At the burning of the offerings.

We have worshipped and written the Great Name on this gem-like sheet. Now we display it before *Te*, and place it in the fire. These valuable offerings of silks and fine meats we burn also, with these sincere prayers, that they may ascend in volumes of flames up to the distant azure. All the ends of the earth look up to Him. All human beings, all things on the earth, rejoice together in the Great Name.<sup>1</sup>

“So far,” says Dr. Boone, “from proving *Shang-Te* to be God, (*proprie*), he cannot, judging from all that is predicated of him, (as far as I am informed), be shown to be even a Demiurge. And to this assertion, I beg to call Dr. Legge’s attention particularly.” I venture to say that Dr. Boone will not repeat such an assertion. We see how a little investigation has sufficed to show its baselessness. By seeking knowledge at its proper sources, every other objection to the use of *Shang-Te* for God may be removed.

Let the descriptions which are contained in these sacred songs be considered without prejudice, and I am not apprehensive as to the answer, which will be returned to the question, “Who is He, whom the Chinese thus worship?” We read in Jeremiah, “The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth shall perish from the earth, and from under those heavens;” but *Shang-Te* cannot be among them. *He* made the heavens and the earth and man. *He* is the true parent of all things. *His* love is over all *His* works. *He* is the great and lofty One, whose dominion is everlasting. *His* years are without end. *His* goodness is infinite. Spirits and men are alike under *His* government. They rejoice in *Him*, and praise *His* great name, though they cannot reach to its comprehension, for it is inexhaustible, unmeasurable. This is what China holds, and, in her highest exercises of devotion, declares concerning *Shang-Te*. I am confident the Christian world will agree with me in saying, “This God is our God.”

Are there any predicates of *Shang-Te* inconsistent with what is here said of Him? Let those who have said that myself and others are encouraging idolatry, in proclaiming this, “the Sovereign Ruler and Maker,” to be God,

帝賜洪庥兮，大我家慶，金鳴玉振兮，聲鏗鏗，羣  
僚環佩兮，響玎璫，神人交賀兮，贊帝皇，寶稱泰  
號兮，曷有窮量，永固高厚兮，宰御久常，微臣頓  
首叩首兮，攸沐恩光

<sup>1</sup> 瑤簡拜書兮，泰號成，奉揚帝前兮，資離明，珍幣  
嘉肴兮，與祝誠，均登巨炤兮，達竝清，九垓四表  
兮，莫不昂瞻，庶類品彙兮，悉慶洪名

produce them. "He is but a Chinese Jupiter," they tell us. It is the one cry which it seems hardly possible to silence. I go with them to the Capitoline hill of Rome, and there is the image of Jupiter, sitting in a curule chair, with thunderbolts in one hand, and a sceptre in the other. Have ever the Chinese, during the four thousand years over which their history extends, fashioned an image of *Shang-Te*? They have not. I read with my opponents, in Greek and Latin books, of the birth and reign and wars and lusts and death of Jupiter. Will they produce, out of the tens of thousands of Chinese books, that invite their search, *one sentence* affirming anything similar of *Shang-Te*? They have not yet done so. They cannot, I am not afraid to say, do so.

But it has not been shown that the Chinese declare *Shang-Te* to be self-existent. This may still be urged as a bar to the conclusion, that He is the true God. Be it that a proposition in so many words to that effect has not yet been produced, yet I contend that the natural conclusion from the passages which I have brought forward, is that *Shang-Te* is self-existent. He existed before the heavens and the earth and men. He created these. He rules over them. His years have no end. Dr. Boone tells us that the Chinese hold "eternally existing principles," which are *le* and *k'e*, a principle of order and primordial matter. But we have seen that the substitution of this *le* in the room of *Shang-Te* is nothing but a poor mystification of the Sung scholars. It is a vagary of the philosophy falsely so called of China—a vagary, which her religion, as well as the common sense of the people, disowns. They know nothing of the unwishing, unplanning, nothing-doing *le*; they acknowledge the decreeing, creating, and governing *Shang-Te*. Do the atheists give Dr. Boone a self-existing principle of order? The Emperor and people give me the self-existing God.

It is written, Exodus vi. 2, 3, "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am *Jehovah*; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name *Jehovah* was I not known to them." I take the declaration, as it stands, with implicit faith. To Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, God was not known by the name *Jehovah*—the self-existent Being. Yet they knew the true God. Who will affirm that they did not know his self-existence? That great truth, however, had not come before their minds distinctly, and with an apprehension of it, separate from all other truths about God, and being the basis of them. They had not consciously named Him in accordance with it. Just so it is with the Chinese. It is evident they know the true God. One of the hymns which I have given might be supposed to be composed from the first chapter of Genesis. But, so far as I know, they have not distinctly apprehended His self-existence. Their notions of *Shang-Te* presuppose it. They lie, as it were, in their minds, wrapped round about with it. As the

day-spring visits them from on high, it will reveal it—nothing new, but something unperceived. It is the happiness of missionaries to be the instruments of quickening them to the recognition of it, and to testify—each one—to them, as Moses was commissioned to do to the children of Israel, “I AM—*Shang-Te*, the self-existent—hath sent me unto you.”

I asked that if there be any passages, which speak of *Shang-Te* in a manner inconsistent with those which have been given, they may be produced. I would further ask, that, if there be any passages in which the things ascribed to *Shang-Te* are attributed to any other being or beings, they also may be produced. It is readily granted that passages may be quoted concerning Jupiter, containing expressions as elevated as any we find in Chinese books concerning *Shang-Te*, and little lower than the highest Scriptural descriptions of God. The same is true of many passages concerning their deities, that may be produced from the literature of the Hindoos. But the Chinese stand out distinctly from all other heathen nations in these two points—that their representations of *Shang-Te* are consistent throughout, and that they never raise any other being to an approximation to Him. He is always the same—the Creator and Sovereign Ruler, holy and just and good. And no other is ever made “equal or second” to Him. He has no rival. If the Chinese do not often rise to the same poetical devotion as the Greeks or the Hindoos, it is because to do so is foreign to their practical, unenthusiastic nature. But they do not degrade the Deity. They never make Him out to be like themselves. They have no sects—pitting one “universal Lord” as Vishnu, against another universal Lord as Sheva. Their Religion is now what it was four thousand years ago—I do not say a pure monotheism, but certainly a monotheism, and the God whom they worship, we learn from His attributes, is the same whom we adore, as He has been pleased in much larger measure to reveal Himself to us.

The point on which I have insisted p. 27,—that *Shang-Te* is conceived of by the Chinese as distinct both from spirits and men (these being equally His servants), is of prime importance towards our understanding their religious notions, and bringing to an issue the controversy about the rendering of *Elohim* and *Theos*. Let me recur in further illustration of it to the 10th of the psalms or hymns which have been quoted. In that, *Shang-Te* is addressed as the “Sovereign Spirit,” yet it is subsequently said, “spirits and men rejoice together, praising Thee.” The language might be employed by any Christian in worshipping God; so far from confounding *Shang-Te* with the *shin*, it distinguishes Him as separate and distinct from them. In fact, the Chinese speak continually of the *shin* as a class of beings subject to *Shang-Te*, and doing His service, with much precision. The passage has become trite—“Under *Shang-Te* there are the various spirits, who all receive the orders of Heaven to examine the hearts of men, just as

under the Emperor there are all the various officers, who receive the orders of the Sovereign to rule the bodies of men." The same thing is recognized in the prayers found in the ritual services of all the dynasties. The following address to the spirit of the Sun occurs both in the collected statutes of the Ming dynasty and of the present:—

"A. B., the inheriting Emperor, seriously makes a notification to the spirit of the Sun. Thou, O spirit, art the chief of all the masculine essences; thou art *the head of the various shin*. Thy light shines down (on this lower world), and nothing within the four ends of heaven is hid from it. From ancient days thy meritorious services have been continued to the present; the whole earth looks up and depends on thee. Now, it is the second month of spring; in accordance with the ancient statutes, with gems, silk and animals, I respectfully offer a sacrifice to thee, O spirit, and, bowing, desire thee to regard and accept it, and to give happiness to all the people. Mayest thou enjoy this."<sup>1</sup>

The spirit of the Sun, it will be remembered, was the first of those, which Kea-ting instructed to mediate for him with *Shang-Te*. He occupies indeed the first place among them, and is their "head." Is it possible to mark more definitely the distinction between *Shang-Te* and the various *shin*, which the Chinese worship. He is indeed a *shin*—the sovereign, the infinite; but no more is He confounded by the Chinese with other *shin* than God is confounded by us with other spirits. This topic, I think, can hardly require additional illustration. Some prayers, however, to the *T'een-shin* or spirits of Heaven, and their associates the *Te-k'e*, or spirits of Earth, present themselves which are admirably adapted for the purpose. And as it has been suggested lately, moreover, that the phrase *T'een-shin* may be used for God, those prayers will show its proper application. They are taken from the 51st volume of the Ming statutes. The first is to the *T'een-shin*.

"A. B., the inheriting Emperor, offers a sacrifice to  
The spirit of the Cloud-master;  
The spirit of the Rain-master;  
The spirit of the Baron of the winds;  
And the spirit of the Thunder-master:<sup>2</sup>—it is your office, O spirits, to

<sup>1</sup> 嗣天子御名謹昭告于大明之神惟神陽精之宗列神之首神光下照四極無遺功垂今昔率土仰賴茲當仲春式遵古典以玉帛牲醴之儀恭祀于神伏惟鑒歆錫福黎庶尚享

<sup>2</sup> Let the Chinese phraseology here be remarked—"the *shin* of the Cloud-master, Thunder-master, &c." The Cloud-master, Rain-master, Wind-baron, and Thunder-

superintend the clouds and the rain, and to raise and send abroad the winds and the thunder, as ministers assisting *Shang-Te*. All the people enjoy the advantages of your services. Now the toils of husbandry are reported to be completed, and with animals, wine, fruits, and coarse silks, I have prepared this grateful sacrifice. Regard it, O spirits. May you enjoy this.”<sup>1</sup>

The second is to the *Te-k'e*.

“A. B., the inheriting Emperor, offers a sacrifice to

The spirits of the five mountains ;  
 The spirits of the five guardian-hills ;  
 The spirit of the hill, Ke-yun ;  
 The spirit of the hill, Tseang-shing ;  
 The spirit of the hill, Shin-lëë ;  
 The spirit of the hill, T'een-show ;  
 The spirit of the hill, Shun-tih ;  
 The spirits of the four seas ;  
 The spirits of the four great rivers ;

And the spirits of the Imperial domain, and of all the hills and rivers under heaven :—

It is yours, O spirits, with your heaven-conferred powers, and nurturing influences, each to preside as guardian over one district, as ministers assisting the great Creator, and thus the people enjoy your meritorious services. Now since the business of the husbandman is completed, with animals, silk, and wine, I have prepared this grateful sacrifice. Be pleased with it, O spirits. May you enjoy this.”<sup>2</sup>

master, are the beings worshipped. But if *shin* be rendered “god,” we are sent away from them to other four beings—the gods of the cloud-master and his associates. *Shin* here can only be spirit ;—in these prayers, these acts of worship, it can have no other signification. Surely if it ever mean “god, gods,” it should do so here. But it does not.

<sup>1</sup> 嗣天子御名致祭于雲師之神雨師之神風伯之神雷師之神惟神職司雲雨與布風雷贊輔上帝功施生民今農事告成以牲醴庶品菲帛之儀用修報祀惟神鑒之尚享

<sup>2</sup> 嗣天子御名致祭于五嶽之神五鎮之神基運山之神翔聖山之神神烈山之神天壽山之神純德山之神四海之神四瀆之神京畿天下山川之神惟神鍾靈毓秀主鎮一方參贊大化功

\* Morrison says, “The natural talent conferred by Heaven is called *Chung-ling*.” I have translated accordingly, and not *ad litteram*, to show how the idea of the dependence of the *shin* runs through the language.

The third of these prayers is again to the T'een-shin.

“On this fortunate day, at this good time, the sacrifice has been set forth in accordance with the statutes. O ye spirits of the bright clouds, and the sweet rain, of the wind and the thunder, how vigorous are your efficacious powers, and all people alive are benefited by your services. Ye are ministers assisting Him who is the original Creator, dispensing the love of Him who dwells above the azure vault. Now, I present a grateful sacrifice. Regard these poor offerings (*lit.* water plants.”)<sup>1</sup>

Such are the *T'een-shin*—spirits that are objects of worship by the Emperor. It is vain to think of using the phrase for God. The beings denoted by it are only the servants of *Shang-Te*. He is “the Creator,” “the Source” of all being.

A considerable amount of evidence on which it is contended that *Shang-Te* is the true God is now before the reader. Leaving the ancient classics, and the discussion of individual sentences, we have witnessed what is the actual worship of the Chinese. We have made the appeal to the historical statutes of the empire. The result, it seems to me, is such as ought to make us thankful that God has not left himself without witness, varied and convincing, among this vast portion of His human family. The evidence will be more fully developed by the discussion of several minor grounds of objection, which are taken to the conclusion that has been established. Even if very plausible reasons for questioning it could be advanced—if modes of expression were to be found in Chinese writings, which should seem not to be easily reconcileable with the descriptions of *Shang-Te*, given above—there would be little in that to stumble our faith in the use of the term. It is out of the question to require in a heathen literature the consistency of the Bible, and how often has Infidelity striven to fix on different Scriptural representations of the Deity the charge of incompatibility! But there is very little need to fence an apology for the Chinese religion in this way. It will be seen that we have not to go beyond its own expounders, to find satisfactory answers to the various objections which foreigners have advanced against admitting *Shang-Te* to be the true God.

First, Dr. Boone says—“The Supreme Ruler worshipped is ‘the expansive heavens.’ *Shang-Te* is evidently merely ‘the expansive heavens,’

被於民今農事既成以牲帛醴齊之儀用修報祭神其歆哉尚享

<sup>1</sup> 吉日良辰祀典式陳景雲甘雨風雷之神赫赫其靈功著生民參贊元化宣布蒼仁爰茲報祀鑒茲藻蘋

worshipped under the title of Supreme Ruler." (Def. p. 41.) This objection is stated more at large by Dr. Williams in his *Middle Kingdom*, Vol. II. p. 233—"There are three grades of sacrifice—The objects to which the great sacrifices are offered are only four; viz. *tien*, the heavens or sky called the Imperial concave expanse; *ti*, the earth, likewise dignified with the appellation Imperial; *tai-miau* or the great temple of ancestors, in which the tablets of deceased monarchs are placed; and lastly the *shie-tsih*, or gods of the land and grain, the special patrons of each dynasty. These four objects are placed on an equality by the present monarchs, which is strong presumptive proof that by *tien* is now meant the material heavens."

It is not easy to write seriously in dealing with such an account of the great sacrifices of China. The third object worshipped, Dr. Williams tells us, is "the great temple of ancestors." Does he mean in earnest to say that it is to the temple—the structure of wood and stone and bricks and gilt and tiles—that the Chinese offer sacrifice? And this object, it seems, is put by them on an equality with the other objects—with heaven for instance, supposing that it is really the "Imperial concave expanse," which they adore. A very strange estimate, indeed, and which one would hardly think even the Chinese could make. The Imperial temple of ancestors may be a very fine structure—a structure surpassing the crystal palace and Aladdin's—but to suppose it equal to the overhanging heavens, the glorious firmament, with its greater and lesser lights, and all the host of stars, is a sad perversion of taste; and the Chinese are not guilty of it. They do not sacrifice to the temple, but to the spirits of their ancestors, to whom the temple is built. And the inference is fair, that when they speak in a similar way of sacrificing to heaven, they do not mean "the material heavens," but the great Being, whose throne, according to the Bible, is in the heavens.

But we are not left to inference in the matter. Yang Fuh, a writer of the Sung dynasty, says,—“Heaven and *Te* indicate one Being. The stars and constellations are not Heaven. Heaven must by no means be sought for in what is visible. In what does he who seeks for Heaven in material appearances, differ from a person who knows that a man has a body, colour, and form, but does not recognize the honourable sovereign mind? <sup>1</sup>

Recently, a manuscript work against Christianity was sent in to Dr. Hobson, in Canton, with a challenge to him and his Chinese assistants to reply to it. It is the production of several individuals, and in one place, animad-

<sup>1</sup> 天帝一也,星象非天,天固不可以象求也,以象求天,是何異於知人之有形色貌象,而不知有心君之尊也

verting on a Christian Tract, they observe—"You say, 'The high azure heaven has no ruling governing power.' When we say, 'Thank Heaven,' you require that we should write plainly the surname and name of the Being, or that we say *Shang-Te*, and then you will understand us. But these are the views of a stupid man. No man who has read books would write thus. To explain summarily the word Heaven—it is used just as we speak of the Emperor, calling him His Sacred Highness, and not daring directly to speak out his name."<sup>1</sup>

The above explanation is strikingly accordant with that approved by K'ang-he, and the scholars of his court—"At the border sacrifices, the sacrifice is assuredly not addressed to the material and sensible heaven, which our eyes see, but to the Master of heaven, earth, and all things; only out of reverence and respect, and in consideration of His sublimity, we sometimes do not dare to call Him by His true name, and then we call Him, 'Supreme Heaven,' 'Beneficent Heaven,' 'Illimitable Heaven,' just as in speaking of the Emperor, to avoid saying Emperor, we sometimes use the expressions, 'under the steps,' 'the supreme court,' &c. However these denominations of honour may differ, they only designate one and the same object."<sup>2</sup>

Finally, in refutation of the charge that by *Shang-Te* is only intended the material heavens, I refer to the prayers and hymns of Kea-ting. There, *Shang-Te* is the Sovereign Spirit, the great and lofty One, *the maker* of heaven and earth. The Chinese no more mean the material heavens when they speak of Heaven protecting, ruling, and punishing, than we do, when we use the term in the same way. It is a mode of speech which has the sanction of the Bible—which the blessed Saviour Himself did not disdain to employ.

*Second*, Dr. Boone grounds an objection to the true Deity of *Shang-Te*, on the following account by Dr. Medhurst of the worship of the present dynasty:—

"At the great sacrifice by the rulers of the present dynasty, at the period of the winter solstice, an altar is elevated at the southern side of the Capitol, of a round form, three stories high, the top of which, or the principal place of honour, is intended for the shrine of *Shangti* or *Ti*; having the shrines of the Imperial Ancestors arranged on the right and left hand; while those of the attendant *shin*, such as the spirits presid-

<sup>1</sup> 又說蒼蒼之天,并無主宰之權,謝天者,必要寫明何姓何名,上帝方得知之,此乃愚人之見,非讀書人爲也,夫天之一字總而言之,如今之稱聖上,不敢直呼其名矣

<sup>2</sup> See the Appendix to Remusat's translation of the *Chung-yung*, where the original Manchou of this passage is given.

ing over the sun, moon and stars, clouds, wind, and rain, are placed on the second story, and are honoured with medium sacrifices. When the sacrifice is to take place, the shrine of *Shángtí* is escorted to the high altar; and while the fumes of incense are ascending, the emperor greets the approach of the *shin* or spirit of *Tí*; after which he ascends the steps, and in the presence of *Shángtí* and of the imperial ancestors, offers incense with three kneelings and nine prostrations: this done, he goes towards the shrine of the imperial ancestors, arranged on each side of the high altar, and offers incense with three kneelings and nine prostrations. The same ceremonies are gone through with regard to the offerings, which are first presented before the shrine of *Shángtí*, and then before those dedicated to the Imperial Ancestors. When the service is completed, the spirit of *Tí* is escorted on its departure by music, and the shrine conducted to the temple, where it is deposited as before."

"It will be observed." Dr. Boone subjoins to this statement, "that the respect shown to the imperial ancestors is as great as that shown to *Shángtí*, nothing but precedence being given to him. They are elevated to the same height, and they, as well as *Shángtí*, have incense offered to them, and are saluted with 'three kneelings and nine prostrations.' If the emperor had any, even the slightest knowledge of the self-existent Being who is 'God over all, could he thus elevate his deceased ancestors, the mere-creatures of this Being, to equal rank and honours with Him?"

Against the conclusion, which is thus drawn from the ceremonies at the winter solstice, I observe that *the service is all to Shang-Te*. Three days before the sacrifice, the Emperor repairs to the ancestral temple, and begs his ancestors "to meet *Te*, and entertain His spirit."<sup>1</sup> The imperial ancestors are present, therefore, only as His assessors, and in that capacity take precedence of all the *shin*, showing how inferior is the place *they* occupy.

As to the "three kneelings and nine prostrations"—they are what the living Emperor receives. Could the spirits of the dead have fewer? True, *Shang-Te* receives no more, for the act is the most profound expression of homage, which the Chinese know. I do not defend the performing of it to any human being when alive, or to his spirit when dead;—but that a man bows before another man as he bows before God, will not prove that he confounds God with man—will not prove that he thinks God to be no greater than man. I have seen an assembly of Malays crawling about on their hands and knees before their Rajah, between whom and Allah notwithstanding they made a very considerable distinction. The ceremony

<sup>1</sup> 配帝侑神. Morrison explains the character 侑, "To assist; to accompany; to do the honours of the table." 侑食, "To attend upon guests who are honoured." He explains 配, "A fellow; an equal; to pair; to cause to accompany." 配享, "an equal enjoyment of sacrificial rites with Heaven, Earth, and *Shang-Te*, the Supreme God; the Emperors of China are thus deified after death." Dr. Morrison does not scruple here to call *Shang-Te* the Supreme God, though in his account of the state religion, quoted by Dr. Boone, he is not willing to allow Him to be more than a "thing," but his explanation of the characters 配享 is inaccurate. The deification he refers to, is the imperial appointment that the spirit of the deceased monarch, shall be invited to be present "to do the honours" at the great sacrifice to *Shang-Te*—being of course greatly honoured in so doing.

shows its performer to be destitute of that free and erect spirit which true religion imparts, but it cannot be pushed to prove that he may not have theoretically very proper notions of the Supreme Being.

Further, The real sacrifices to the Imperial ancestors are shown in many ways to be inferior to the great sacrifice to *Shang-Te*. In the matter of offerings, no gems are presented to them. In the ancestral temple, music is played seven times; at the border sacrifice, nine times. The prayers to ancestors are written with common black ink; the prayers to *Shang-Te* with vermillion. These prayers with the incense and offerings of silk are kept for the border sacrifice, in the hall of "Great Harmony;" for the ancestral temple, they are kept with a multitude of the same things for other sacrifices in the hall of "Middle Harmony." Other distinctions of a similar kind may be seen in the chapter on "Sacrifices in general," in the collected statutes of the present dynasty. They may seem to be small matters;—but that such things are not small in a religion of ritual services may be understood from what is said in Exodus, xxx. 22—38, of the anointing oil and the pure frankincense. Both these compositions were holy to the Lord, and whosoever made any like to the one or the other, was to be cut off from his people.

But lastly, as we have listened to the prayers addressed to *Shang-Te*, and learned from them what the Chinese think of Him, let us in the same way hear the language employed in the ancestral temple. We shall thus know of a certainty, whether the Emperor puts his ancestors on an equality with *Shang-Te* or not. The following specimens of it are taken from the 52d and 54th volumes of the Ming statutes.

1. I think of you, my Sovereign ancestors, whose glorious souls are in heaven. As from an overflowing fountain run the happy streams, such is the connection between you and your distant descendants. I—a distant descendant—having received the decree (of Heaven), look back to you, and offer this bright sacrifice to you, the honoured ones from age, for hundreds of thousands and myriads of years.<sup>1</sup>

2. Now brightly manifested, now mysteriously hid, the movements of the spirits are without trace; in their Imperial chariots, they wander about, tranquil wherever they go. Their souls are in heaven, their tablets are in the apartment. Their sons and grandsons remember them with filial thoughts untiring.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 思皇先祖，耀靈于天，源衍慶流，繇高逮玄，玄孫受命，追遠其先，明禋世崇，億萬斯年。

<sup>2</sup> 顯兮幽兮，神運無跡，鸞馭逍遙，安其所適，其靈在天，其主在室，子子孫孫，孝思無斁。

3. How Imperial are ye, my ancestors, who ascend and descend in heaven! Truly elegant is the temple; very respectful have been the sacrifices. May your intelligent spirits continue to abide, then will the shrines be profoundly tranquil, and great happiness and prosperity will be given to your descendants uninterruptedly, to bless my family and country for ten thousands of years.<sup>1</sup>

4. To the Founder of the Ming dynasty.

When the middle land was full of distress, and the flock of the people was troubled, Imperial Heaven was displeased with the confusion, and graciously sought for a great prince. He then sent down and conferred His great decree, and caused to be born a man of sage and spiritual endowments. Then, O high ancestor, Thou appearedst above all other men. Thou

<sup>1</sup> 於皇我祖，陟降在天，清廟翼翼，禋祀首虔，明神既留，寢祐靜淵，介福綏綬，錫胤綿綿，以惠我家邦，於萬斯年。

\* "Who ascend and descend in heaven." This language is taken from the Book of Odes. The original passage is remarkable. Chow-kung, a son of the king Wān, and the author of the ritual of Chow, and of the greater portion of the Yih-king, is setting forth to the emperor Shing the example of his grandfather. He says, "Behold the king Wān in the realms above, how brightly does he shine in heaven!—The king Wān is ascending and descending in the presence of *Te*." Such were the notions concerning the dead, eleven centuries before our era; it is interesting to find them reproduced from dynasty to dynasty in the prayers used in the ancestral temple. Commentators say upon the words of the She-king, 文王既沒，其神在上, "When king Wān was dead, his spirit was on high," and again, 以文王之神在天，一升一降，在上帝之左右，是以其子孫蒙其福澤而君有天下, "The spirit of the king Wān being in heaven, and ascending and descending in the presence of *Shang-Te*, therefore, his descendants enjoyed the advantages of his happiness, and ruled over the empire." It is the word so plainly used here for spirit that Dr. Boone will insist on rendering "a god, gods," and contends must be employed by all missionaries for God! We have some singular remarks on the language of the duke of Chow in Choo He. "It is said, 'King Wān is ascending and descending in the presence of *Te*.' If now we say that king Wān is truly in the presence of *Shang-Te*, and that there truly is *Shang-Te*, like the images that are to be met with in the world, we shall certainly be wrong. But since the sage speaks in this way, there is this principle." (Chapter on the Kwei-shin.) What "principle?" Could the philosopher see no intermediate course between believing in an earthen material God, and resorting to an abstract principle? As it was king Wān's spirit which was in heaven, could he not rest in the simple belief that *Shang-Te* was a spirit? Had he done so, he would have saved himself and others the weariness of how much writing and reading about the grand terminus, and the principle of order—chapters equal to any in the world, for darkening counsel by words without knowledge.

donnedst once thine armour, and gottest possession of all within the four seas, becoming the true ruler and king.<sup>1</sup>

5. To the same.

Our Imperial ancestor having received the decree (of Heaven), he opened the empire as out of chaos. Driving away all noxious things, he restored the Middle land. Displaying to the country the constant virtues, he assisted the people. Thus was he able to stand in the presence of Heaven, his merits being so high and honourable. Respectfully has the record been presented. May he regard me, his great grandson.<sup>2</sup>

The above addresses have not been anxiously selected to serve a purpose. They are a fair specimen of the worship offered in the ancestral temple. They may be deemed very foolish, and I have no defense to make for them, but they prove the point for which I have adduced them—that in the worship offered to the Imperial ancestors, *they are not put on an equality with Shang-Te*. On the contrary, it is declared that it was by His favour that they were called to the position of imperial authority. They were raised up by Him in His providence, and having served Him well in their day and generation, their souls are now with Him in heaven. Their spirits move about—ascend and descend—in His presence, and thence they can come to attend the filial services established for them by their descendants. They are even supposed to exercise a guardian care over those descendants, and to be able to bless the empire which they founded or ruled. Notwithstanding, the continuation of the imperial government in their line depends not on them, but on the will of *Shang-Te*, which again will have respect to the conduct of the rulers on the throne.<sup>3</sup> If that be in righteousness, the throne will be established; if they turn to evil, He will take the kingdom from

<sup>1</sup> 繫中夏之邁艱兮，汗羶羣皇天厭亂兮，眷求大君，降錫元命兮，挺生聖神，惟我太祖兮，首出人倫，一戎衣奄四海兮，爲帝王真。

<sup>2</sup> 皇祖受命兮，闢乾坤，驅逐異物兮，復中原，陳常時夏兮，佑元元，克配彼天兮，功高業尊，寅薦冊寶兮，鑒我曾孫。

<sup>3</sup> The Chinese classics and other works abound with assertions of this principle, but I have not seen it declared more plainly than in the "Family Sayings" of Confucius. In the chapter on "Holding the reins," *i. e.* of government, the sage is represented as saying of good rulers—"Their laws being perfect, and their virtue great, the people, when they think of their virtue, praise their persons, and morning and evening bless them. Those blessings ascend and are heard in heaven. *Shang-Te* is pleased, perpetuates their family, and grants them years of abundance." An opposite picture is drawn of bad rulers—"Their laws are not obeyed, their virtue is not great, the people hate their cruel tyranny, and continually sigh and groan. Morning and evening they

them, and give it to men of another family. Then the shrine of the founder will pass into the crowd of those belonging to the sovereigns of former dynasties, and his worship will descend to the third or lowest class. His spirit will be invoked along with those of Fuh-he, Shin-nung, Yaou, Shun, and all the worthies, who, in different ages, "have received the illustrious decree of Heaven, to follow one another as sovereigns, and, on behalf of Heaven, to administer the government, to protect and nourish the people."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Boone's assertion that the emperor elevates his deceased ancestors to equal rank and honours with *Shang-Te*, is like many others hazarded concerning Chinese matters, a too hasty conclusion, and the objection raised upon it against the conclusion that *Shang-Te* is the true God, falls consequently to the ground.

A *Third* objection to that conclusion may be taken from the statement of Visdelou given on p. 23, that prior to the Ming dynasty, there were five other *Shang-Tes* to whom sacrifice was religiously offered, and which practice, he says in another place, was discontinued "only by the advice of the atheo-political philosophers." The statement is, indeed, qualified by him in such a manner that I might dispose of it in very brief space. The five *Shang-Tes* were only "assistants"<sup>2</sup> of the *Shang-Te*. "They presided separately over the five regions of the heavens, the five seasons of the year, and the five elements, sharing thus the burden of the sovereign *Shang-Te*."<sup>3</sup> In these five deities therefore, we have only ministers of *Shang-Te*. Like all the other *shin* or spirits which the Chinese worship, they are subject to and employed by Him. The only difference between them and the others is that they were really deified. The great name of God was given to them. Just as *Elohim* was employed away from Him who alone is *Elohim*, here we have *Shang-Te* employed away from Him who alone is *Shang-Te*. Granting the truth of Visdelou's representation, it does not really affect the evidence which has been adduced to prove that *Shang-Te* is the true God, but rather confirms it, and it shows further, how the name *Shang-Te* may be employed generally to denote others besides the one Being to whom it properly belongs.

The subject of the five *Shang-Tes*, however, deserves a careful handling. The history of the "State Religion" cannot be understood without it, and,

curse them. Those curses ascend and are heard in heaven. *Shang-Te* does not spare them. He sends down on them calamities and punishments. Afflictions and ruin come on them, and exterminate their families."

### <sup>1</sup> 奉天明命相繼爲君代天理物撫育黎黔

<sup>2</sup> Coadjuteurs.

<sup>3</sup> Outre le souverain *Shang-Te*, qui préside à tout le Ciel, il y a encore cinq autres *Shang-Te* qui président séparément aux cinq Régions du Ciel, aux cinq Saisons de l'année, & aux cinq Elémens, partageant ainsi le fardeau du souverain *Shang-Te*.

as I have made so much use of the statutes of the Ming dynasty, it concerns me to free the sovereigns of it from the charge of innovating on the established forms of worship, by the advice of the atheo-political philosophers.

Now, the Ming family did make alterations in the religious services transmitted from several preceding dynasties. Its historians are not loath to avow and defend the fact. They shall tell us for themselves what worship they abolished, and what reasons they had for doing so. Two committees, as we should say, were appointed, at the commencement of the dynasty (A. D. 1366), to investigate all subjects pertaining to rites and music, and by their advice, "all sacrifices to the heavenly sovereign T'ae-yih, the six heavens, and five *Tes*, were entirely abolished."<sup>1</sup> These sacrifices, they maintained, had been foisted in upon the old ritual of the three dynasties, Hea, Shang, and Chow, which knew only two great border sacrifices—those namely to heaven and earth. "It was the family of Tsin," they say, "which erected four altars to offer sacrifices to the White, Green, Yellow, and Red *Tes*. The founder of the Han dynasty adopted the practice, and even added the northern altar for the worship of the Black *Te*, and at length, in the time of the emperor Woo, there were the five altars in Yung, the sacrifices to the five *Tes* in Wei-yang, and to T'ae-yih at Kan-tsuen, and the sacrifice to *Shang-Te* dwelling in the expansive heavens was altogether neglected. In the dynasties of Wei and Tsin and subsequently, they sometimes followed the authority of Ch'ing Heuen, holding that Heaven has six names, and that there are nine annual sacrifices, and sometimes that of Wang Suh, holding that there is but one Heaven, and that it is ridiculous to say there are six, and but two annual sacrifices instead of nine. Thus they now agreed with one another, and now they differed, but generally speaking, they often mixed together the sayings of the two schools."<sup>2</sup> According to this account, the worship of the five *Tes* originated with the house of Tsin, whose fortunes culminated in Che-hwang-te, the burner of the ancient classics and records, and the doating slave of Taoist superstitions, while support was subsequently given to it by the philosopher Ch'ing Heuen, on the ground that "there are six heavens," and that the great spirit dwelling in each is to be

<sup>1</sup> 凡所謂天皇太乙,六天,五帝之類,一切革除

<sup>2</sup> 自秦立四時,以祀白青黃赤四帝,漢高祖因之,增北時以禮黑帝,至武帝,有雍五時,及渭陽五帝,甘泉太乙之祠,而昊天上帝之祭,則未嘗奉行,魏晉以後,宗鄭玄者,以爲天有六名,歲凡九祭,宗王肅者,以爲天體惟一,安得有六,一歲二祭,安得有九,雖因革不同,大抵多參二家之說

reverenced as the ruler (*Te*), and even as "the supreme ruler (*Shang-Te*)."  
The question arises—"Were they the atheo-political philosophers, who devised this account of the worship in question to the Ming rulers, and so procured the discontinuance of it?" So we might infer from Visdelou's account, but nothing could be farther from the truth. I turn to the historians of the T'ang dynasty, anterior to the atheists of Sung full four centuries. Their description of the corruption of the ancient religion of China is more emphatic than that which has been quoted.

"When the Chow dynasty was in its decline, Rites and Music became corrupted amid the contending states, (A. C. 300—240), and perished at last under Tsin. When the Han dynasty arose (A. C. 200), the portions of the six *King* that remained were all full of errors and confusion; scattered about and perishing, false passages were introduced, and all the scholars united to amend and digest them. They explained the sentences with their own ideas, without being able to ascertain the true meaning, and then appeared the books of divination, to increase the confusion. The disciples of Ch'ing Heuen gave him the title of great scholar, and all followed the sayings of their master. In consequence, students were utterly deceived and lost, and the princes that arose, unable to determine the various disputes, allowed what they found established to remain unaltered. From this time the discussions about the border sacrifice on the round altar, and the hall of Intelligence became a chaos, and no one knew where to stop (in his rash assertions). In the Ritual (of Chow), it is said, 'They employed a pure sacrifice to sacrifice to the *Shang-Te* of the glorious heavens'—that is, to Heaven, but Heuen understood that it was the heavenly sovereign, the great ruler, Yaou-pih-paou, dwelling in the north pole star. The Ritual also says, 'They sacrificed to the five *Tes* in the four borders'—that is, to the spirits of the essential breath of the five elements, but Heuen made them to be the Green *Te*, Ling-wei-gang; the Red *Te*, Tseih-p'eaou-noo; the Yellow *Te*, Shay-kew-new; the White *Te*, Pih-chaou-kew; the Black *Te*, Heih-kwang-ke;—five heavens. From this originated the saying that there were six heavens, which after ages were not able to put away."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 自周衰禮樂壞于戰國而廢絕于秦漢興六經在者皆錯亂散亡雜偽而諸儒方共補緝以意解詁未得其真而讖緯之書出以亂經矣自鄭玄之徒號稱大儒皆主其說學者由此牽惑沒溺而時君不能斷決以爲有其舉之莫可廢也由是郊丘明堂之論至於紛然而莫知所止禮曰以禋祀祀昊天上帝此天也玄以爲天皇大

They had not been able, indeed, "to put the saying away," up to the time of the T'ang dynasty, nor did they effect it for five centuries after. Against repeated protests, the corruption continued to prevail, now more now less modified, till at length the family of Ming swept it away, overpast the dark ages of Chinese history, and restored the simplicity and truth of ancient times.

In the "Examination of antiquity,"<sup>1</sup> published in the 4th year of Yung-ching (A. D. 1726), the different steps by which the worship of the five *Tes* advanced, till it took its place among the greatest religious services of the empire, are carefully abridged from the historians of Han. The White, the Green, the Yellow, and the Red, were established one after another by successive dukes of the state Tsin. The Black was added by the founder of the Han dynasty, as the historians of Ming relate above. But the sacrifices to these *Tes* were not great imperial services, till the time of the emperor Wăn. This is distinctly affirmed in the "General Mirror of History," which has been translated by De Mailla, and is known as the "Histoire de la Chine." It was in the fifteenth year of his reign (A. C. 166), that Wăn first offered the border sacrifice to these deities.<sup>2</sup> Immediately after the record of the fact, the history subjoins—"Heaven is only one. To say that there are five *Tes*, is contrary to antiquity. From this time, the border sacrifices on the five altars cannot be enumerated."<sup>3</sup> A little farther on, we find—"The emperor Wăn was a modest and respectful sovereign, who sank into no vicious courses during the former part of his reign, and yet he was the first to offer sacrifice to the five *Tes*. Now there is but one *Te*; how can there be five? Moreover, the sacrifices so confusedly offered in future times, were in fact consequent on this act of his."<sup>4</sup>

These criticisms, it may be alleged, are of modern date, subsequent to the changes introduced by the Ming dynasty. If there were nothing to refer to

帝者，北辰耀魄寶也，又曰，兆五帝于四郊，此五行精氣之神也，立以爲青帝靈威仰，赤帝赤熛怒，黃帝含樞紐，白帝白招拒，黑帝汁光紀者，五天也，由是有六天之說，後世莫能廢焉

<sup>1</sup> 省軒考古類編

<sup>2</sup> 夏四月帝如雍，始郊見五帝，漢興至此，天子方親郊

<sup>3</sup> 天一而已，而曰有五帝焉，非古也，自是郊祀五時不可勝書矣

<sup>4</sup> 文帝謙恭之君，初無所溺，而乃始爲五帝之祀，

but the quotation given from the historians of T'ang, it alone would show the vanity of such an allegation. It is satisfactory, however, to know that the emperor Wăn, in paying to these *Tes* the honours due only to *Shang-Te*, was fully warned of the error of his course. It was at the instigation of Sin Hwan-p'ing, a famous Taouist, that he took the steps he did. Provoked by the insolence of that individual, Wang, the chief of the Censors, accused him of treason, in a memorial, from which Regis extracts the following passage—"I venture to say that nothing is more foolish than this new figment of the spirits *Shang-Te*, of which he says that there are five. It is indeed certain, that from the most ancient times, all who have been wise, and deemed masters of the nation, on account of their reputation for distinguished wisdom, have known but one *Shang-Te*, eminent over all, on whom all things depend, from whom is to be sought whatever is for the advantage of the empire, and to whom it is the duty and custom of the emperors to sacrifice, &c., &c."<sup>1</sup> Not long after the presentation of this memorial, Sin Hwan-p'ing was put to death, but the vicious practice, to which he had obtained the imperial sanction, continued. The emperor Woo, separated from Wăn only by one intervening reign, added to it other idolatrous innovations, and more than twelve centuries elapsed, before the pestilent corruption was entirely removed from the ceremonies of religion.

Thus, by documents of History, it has been shown, that the worship of the five *Tes* as *Shang-Tes* was an innovation dating from the emperor Wăn (A. C. 166), and that a reasonable ground for their elevation was first pretended to be given by Ch'ing Heuen, a scholar of the later Han dynasty, who flourished under the Emperor Hwan (A. D. 152—173). To him is due the discovery of "six heavens," each one requiring a presiding *Te*. But the subject is susceptible of further elucidation. There is evidence to make it exceedingly probable, that prior to the dynasty of Han, neither the religion nor the classical literature of China knew anything at all of five *Tes*. As objects of worship, we saw them coming from a Taouist source; from that also they sprang as objects of speculation.

The reader will have observed, that the historians of T'ang introduce a quotation from the Ritual of Chow, to the effect—"They sacrificed to the five *Tes* at the four borders." This passage, and one or two others in the same work, are the only references of appeal to show that the three dynasties, Hea, Shang, and Chow (A. C. 2142—243), recognized any such beings. The following considerations will suffice, I think, to prove that they are

夫帝一而已,安得有五,况異時紛紛祠祀實昉于此

<sup>1</sup> Regis' Yih-king, vol. II., p. 411.

unsatisfactory, and may be otherwise of use to individuals pursuing the study of Chinese opinions.

1. The ritual of Chow does not rank with the acknowledged classics. The Yih-king, the She-king, and the Shoo-king, are all silent about the five *Tes*. So also are the "Four Books"—the record of the opinions of Confucius and Mencius. No doubt the Ritual of Chow is a very old production, and was digested in its present form under the emperors of Han. Still, it is in some parts inconsistent with the real classics, and wherever it differs from them, or is not supported by them, we cannot attach much authority to its statements.<sup>1</sup>

2. The authority of Confucius is sometimes advanced, to prove that, in his time, the five *Tes* were well-known among the Chinese, but the passage cited in evidence puts in the clearest light the truth—that these beings were nothing but a Taouist invention. It is in the chapter of the "Family Sayings," headed "The five *Tes*." A disciple Ke K'ang-tsze asked Confucius about them, saying, "I have long heard their names, but do not know who they really are." Confucius replied, "Formerly, I heard about them from *Laou-tan*."<sup>2</sup> Here is the acknowledgment of Confucius, that his knowledge of the five *Tes* was not from the ancient classics of China, but from the founder of the Taou sect.

3. In the Chow-le itself, the five *Tes* are sufficiently distinguished from *Shang-Te*. Who they are, it does not say, but they are evidently quite inferior to Him. "The Examination of antiquity," referred to on page 46, gives a decision concerning them in the following terms—"As to the five *Tes* mentioned in the Ritual of Chow as being sacrificed to, they are the beings called *Te*, who preside over the five cardinal points, in accordance with what the Yih-king says, '*Te* causes things to issue forth under the Chin diagram.' The emperor is called Sovereign. The princes of the various states are also called Sovereigns. But though the names are thus the same, the realities (denoted by those names) are different. (Those *Tes*) are not He who is called "Shang-Te of the glorious heavens."<sup>3</sup>

4. In the third chapter of the Le-ke called the Yue-ling, which professes to record the acts of the emperor during the twelve months of the year,

<sup>1</sup> See the prolegomena of Regis and others to their translation of the Yih-king.

<sup>2</sup> 季康子問於孔子曰，舊聞五帝之名，而不知其實，請問何謂五帝，孔子曰，昔丘也聞諸老聃。

<sup>3</sup> 若周禮五帝之祀，此主五方而稱帝，猶易云帝出乎震，天子稱君，諸侯亦稱君，名雖從同，而實異，非即昊天上帝之謂也。

mention is made of five *Tes* who were sacrificed to, namely T'ae-haou *Te*, in the first month of spring, Yen *Te*, in the first month of summer, and Hwang *Te*, in the last, Shaou-haou *Te*, in the first month of autumn, and Chuen-heuh *Te*, in the first month of winter. These *Tes* have five *shins* associated with them, namely Kow-mang, Chuh-yung, How-toe, Juh-show, and Heuen-ming. Who were these *Tes*? Are they the same with those that came in the time of the Han dynasty to occupy so important a place in the religious services of the empire?

This question must be answered in the negative. Their names are different. Here we have T'ae-haou, Yen, Hwang, &c.; there we have Ling-wei-gang, Tseih-peaou-noo, &c. A most mystical refinement has been devised to get rid of this discrepancy. There are five *T'een-Tes*, or Heavenly Rulers, with their associate *shins*, and five *Jin-Tes*, or Human Rulers, with their human associate *shins*.<sup>1</sup> According to the decision of the interpreters of the present dynasty, the heavenly rulers are T'ae-haou, Yen, Hwang, Shaou-haou, and Chuen-heuh; the corresponding human rulers are Fuh-he, Shin-nung, Heen-heuen, Kin-t'een, and Kaou-yang. They say that when the passage in the *Yih-king*, "The ruler causes things to issue forth under the *Chin* diagram," was explained of T'ae-haou, the reference was to the heavenly ruler so called, and not to the human ruler Fuh-he, but that, after Ch'ing Heuen brought in Ling-wei-gang and the other four as the heavenly rulers, then the five *Tes* of the Yue-ling were necessarily degraded to the status of human rulers, and identified with Fuh-he and other emperors.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The human rulers are of course *Tes*; their associate *shins* (神) are only 臣, subjects.

<sup>2</sup> Here at length, "by slow degrees but sure," we have got to the bottom of Visdelou's assertion that the ancient interpreters made the *Te* spoken of in the appendix to the *Yih-king* to be the emperor Fuh-he, one of the human 'adjutant *Shang-Tes*. No ancient interpreter did so. The view was consequent on Ch'ing Heuen's invention of five new heavenly *Tes*, towards the end of the second century of our era. The absurdity of it has been exposed by many Chinese writers. Hung Ying-t'ā, of the T'ang dynasty, asks how any *human* ruler could do the things which the text ascribes to *Te*, and another scholar asks, if the five *Tes* be the five ancient sovereigns, then who managed the seasons before they had any existence?

As to the comment that the *Te* of the *Yih-king* is one of the five Heavenly *Tes*, it likewise is a *dictum* without foundation. The classics tell us as little of five *T'een-Tes*, as of five *Jin-Tes*, and moreover *Te*, in the text in question, is not the manager of one season only, but of all the seasons. He is not one of five, but one and undivided, working all and in all. We must hold, with the most ancient and the greatest modern commentators, that He is "the Lord, the Producer, the Governor of heaven and earth."

Three of the *Tes*, viz., T'ae-haou Fuh-he, Yen-te, Shin-nung, and Hwang-te Heen-heuen, are sacrificed to, as the Fathers of the healing art, both in the spring and winter. The service is conducted by an officer appointed for the purpose. A long prayer for the occasion is given in the 57th volume of the Ming statutes. Their healing art, it is said, is the way by which these spirits "aid the life-giving virtue of *Te* (所以

It is not necessary to pursue at greater length the inquiry about the five *Tes*. The reader will perhaps be able, from what has been said, to judge of the probability of the view which I hold, that they were unknown to the ancient literature of China, and an invention of the Taou sect. Videlou's statements concerning them have been proved quite incorrect. So far from their being worshipped religiously as *Shang-Tes*, by all the dynasties previous to the Ming, they were not worshipped as such at all, before the dynasty of Han. So far from its being reserved for the atheo-political philosophers to protest against them, the historians of T'ang (and I might quote those of other dynasties also) had emphatically condemned the corruption of the ancient worship by the reverence done to them. The review which I have taken makes it still more evident, if possible, than it was before, that *Shang-Te* stands forth in the religion of China, "without equal or second," the only *independent ruler*, whether in heaven or earth.

There remains a *Fourth* and last objection to this view of Him. It is urged by Dr. Boone, in the following manner:—

"Of the ancient sacrifice called *Kiau*, it may be asked, Was it so set apart to the worship of "the expansive heavens," "the Supreme Ruler," that no other being or thing was ever permitted to share it with him? The answer is, that the expansive heavens, the Supreme Ruler, has never enjoyed among the Chinese from the earliest times, of which their histories inform us, any such *preëminent* distinction. Following out the view presented in the Yih King of Earth's participating with Heaven in generating all things, so that they together became "the Father and Mother of all things," this highest sacrifice was always offered to Earth as well to Heaven, the only distinction between them being that this sacrifice was offered to earth, at the summer solstice, and at the Northern border of the country, whereas it was offered to Heaven at the winter solstice, and at the Southern border of the country. Some greater deference to Heaven is no doubt designed in these slight distinguishing circumstances, but not greater than the Chinese would accord to the father over the mother."

In more brief terms, the objection may be stated thus. By sacrificing at the summer solstice to the earth, do not the Chinese raise it—whether we consider it as a symbol or a dwelling-place—to an equal rank with heaven, and do they not lead us away, from one great personal superintending Intelligence, to conceive of two powers, or, at least, of a dual power, to which belongs the government of the universe?

Now, the one decisive answer to this objection is, that *Shang-Te* is the Being contemplated in the one sacrifice as much as in the other. For this we have, among other authorities, the express testimony of Confucius. There is his famous saying in the *Chung-yung*—"The ceremonies of the celes-

贊帝生德)" The emperor "expects" that they will exert their mysterious influences and spirit-services, and keep, says he "our" person in health. They are required by him also to keep the people from sickness, and lead them in "the land of love and longevity,"—"in order to perpetuate the grace of *Shang-Te* (以永上帝之恩.)"

tial and terrestrial sacrifices are those by which men serve *Shang-Te*.<sup>1</sup> This is the translation given by Dr. Medhurst, in harmony with the views of nearly every Chinese commentator. But if any one choose to insist, that by *shay* we are to understand the sacrifice to the spirits presiding over the lands, I will not enter into any controversy on the subject. In such a case, *Keaou* will represent *all* the greatest religious services performed by the emperor, and the conclusion will remain, that *Shang-Te* is the one Being, served by him as the representative of his people, at the summer solstice as well as at the winter.

In "The Four Books with Commentary and Exposition," we have the following expansion of the passage just quoted—"There are the ceremonies of the Keaou and Shay. At the winter solstice, the emperor sacrifices to heaven, on the round mound; at the summer solstice he sacrifices to the earth on the square pool. Thus service is performed to *Shang-Te*, and the emperor takes the sincerity and reverence, wherewith he pays honour to heaven, and respect to the earth, to acknowledge His goodness, in engendering and maturing (the productions of nature)."<sup>2</sup> We are thus led, I conceive, to attach the following meaning to the two ceremonies. The material heaven and earth are the great works of God. They speak to man with different voices, and utter concordant yet various testimony, concerning their Maker. When we consider the heavens, we are filled with awe: we are moved to reverence and honour Him, whose throne they are. When we consider the earth, we are penetrated with a sense of His kindness. Softer feelings enter into the soul, and we are disposed to love Him, who crowneth the year with His goodness. The heavens are to us the representative of the divine majesty; the earth is the representative of the divine care. The former teaches us of God's more than paternal authority; the latter of His more than maternal love. By means of the one and the other, we rise up to Him, as maintaining a sovereign rule, and an ever watchful care—as the Being into our service of whom should enter the elements of fear and love, reverence and gratitude. To such a worship the strong instinctive principles of our nature have impelled the Chinese, and they have sought to attain to it, through the sacrifices at the summer and winter solstices. How far they have at any time been successful, the Searcher of hearts alone knows, but I cannot turn from contemplating their endeavour, without being

<sup>1</sup> 郊社之禮所以事上帝也

<sup>2</sup> 冬至祭天於圜丘,夏至祭地於方澤所以祀上帝,而將其崇天禮地之誠敬,以答其生成之德也

impressed with the sense of that craving and weakness of our nature, which, seeking to go to God, is yet unable directly to draw near to Him, and is ever searching for media of approach. Very poor are all the media of nature. The Chinese have certainly selected the best of them. But may they soon be displaced by Him, who is the *way*, as well as the truth and the life, Immanuel, the God-man, the only Mediator!

The text of Confucius ought to be final in the question before us. Do the Chinese worship two Beings or only one, in the two great religious services of their empire? The greatest of their sages tells us that they worship only one. The definition which we frequently receive of *Shang-Te* is also to the same effect—" *Shang-Te* is the Lord and Governor of heaven and earth." He is the Lord not of heaven only, but also of the earth, in whom therefore, as we saw in the prayers of Kea-tsing, spirits above and men below rejoice, praising His great name. I may observe here, that it is a moot point with Chinese scholars whether there ought to be a sacrifice at the summer solstice at all. The argument against it rests on the earliest account of religious worship which we have in the Shoo-king, when it is said of Shun (A. C. 2230), " He sacrificed to *Shang-Te*;" the argument for two sacrifices rests chiefly on passages in the ritual of Chow, later in date and of inferior authority. Prior to Kea-tsing, the emperors of the Ming dynasty united the sacrifices. By him they were separated, on an appeal to the opinions of the two Chings and Choo He. This is the only influence of the atheo-political school on the religion of that dynasty, which I have been able to trace. Some Sung philosophers, however, had earnestly contended for one sacrifice. Oo Woo-fung objected to the two, because it looked like making " two masters in one family." Wei Chong-keu, a writer of the Ming dynasty, argued that heaven and earth were one material creation, just as the various bones make up the one body of a man; *Shang-Te* was the Lord and Governor of heaven just as the soul is the Lord and Governor of the body, and it was not possible that there should be two Lords and Governors.<sup>1</sup> It is interesting, surely, to find the truth concerning one only God thus expressed, from the pens of Chinese writers, and leading them to signify dissatisfaction with portions of their own worship, which, not denying it, yet make it obscure to minds not caring to investigate their real significance.

It has been shown that the separate sacrifices at the summer and winter solstices neither deny the unity nor the supremacy of *Shang-Te*, and I pass from the subject with a brief account of the two temples where they

<sup>1</sup> 天地一氣如人百骸一體上帝乃天之主宰人心亦身之主宰主宰豈容有二

are celebrated by the present dynasty, taken from Grosier's "Description de la Chine." "Pekin contains at the present day two principal temples—those of heaven and earth—the one and the other situated in the Chinese city. It is in the construction of these edifices that the Chinese have employed all the elegance and all the pomp of their architecture. Etiquette requires that the emperors shall not employ, for any of their palaces, an order of architecture so rich and so magnificent. This law extends to every article of decoration or use—to the vases, the utensils, and even the instruments of music. The flutes, the drums, the *kin* and the *shih*, which are employed in the music of the sacrifices, are not only finished more exquisitely, and of more precious materials, than those of the palace, but they are constructed also of larger dimensions, so that it may be said with truth, that it is only in the temple of heaven that one can hear the grand Chinese music. *The two temples are equally dedicated to Shang-Te*, but under different titles. In the one it is—*The eternal Spirit*, whom they adore; in the other—*The Spirit, the Creator and Preserver of the world.*"

In the above disquisition, I have set before the reader several points of the evidence, on which I hold that the *Shang-Te* of the Chinese—the Being of whom their classical works speak, and whom as a nation they have worshipped for 4000 years—is the true God, and have endeavoured to meet the various objections which have been advanced against such a conclusion. According to the views which have been exhibited, the religion of China cannot be called a polytheism, strictly speaking. It acknowledges one perfect Being, who is above all, the maker and ruler of the universe. It does not confound Him with other beings. It does not give His glory—His great name—to another, nor His praise to graven images. The author of the first article in the "Memoires concernant les Chinois," describes it as "Une Deisme avec quelques superstitions," which certainly is not far from the truth, though the language is softer than I should employ myself. Of those superstitions with which the deism of China is associated, the principal are the worship of many *shin*, and the worship of ancestors.

In regard to the former of these—let us observe the blending of truth and error. The Chinese recognize the existence of spiritual beings, besides men and God; they recognize them as the agents of God, "ministers of His, that do His pleasure." So far they are right, but their belief runs into a multitude of foolish fancies. Undirected by Revelation, they people every spot with its spiritual guardians; they assign to the sun and to the moon and to every star, to all the elements, to every hill and mountain, to every stream and river, their tutelary denizens. And to all this crowd of spirits they offer worship and sacrifice. Now, it is remarkable how the Bible, asserting the existence of spiritual beings, and that they are the ministering servants of Jehovah, yet affords no nourishment to a prurient

curiosity about them, and never allows them to come between men and God. There are in it a very few narratives of a peculiar kind, which to a Chinese will appear most natural. Such is the vision of Micaiah, related 2 Chronicles XVIII. 18-22, where there comes out a spirit, and stands before the Lord, who is sitting upon His throne, with all the host of heaven standing on His right hand and on His left. Such also is the vision, in the 6th chapter of Zechariah, of "the four spirits of the heavens, which go forth from standing before the Lord of the whole earth." But the scriptures bind us up to their own disclosures, and forbid us to add to what they have told us concerning those beings, older and mightier than ourselves. And they never allow our relation to the omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent God, to be obscured by the intervening agency of angels. In the very last chapter of the Apocalypse, one of these refuses to receive the worship of John, tells him that he is only a fellow-servant with himself, and directs him to worship God. In the Bible, angels are the servants of God, executing the special commissions intrusted to them. They are not beings exercising a general function, as mediators between God and men. This they are with the Chinese, and hence they are prayed to, and otherwise worshipped;—and though the worship given to them avows their subordination to God, it is a folly, an error, and a sin.

The second principal superstition of the Chinese is their worship of their ancestors, and the spirits of the departed great. In the former of these aspects, it is represented in the classics as a branch of the great duty of filial piety. "The service," said Confucius, "which a dutiful son renders to his parents is comprised in the following points:—In his ordinary intercourse with them, he must manifest the utmost respect; in nourishing them, he must exhibit the utmost pleasure; when they are sick, he must show the greatest sorrow; in mourning for their death, he must omit no expression of grief; in sacrificing to them, he must display the utmost solemnity. When these five points are all observed, a son fulfills his duty to his parents."<sup>1</sup> But the worship, as actually existing, is more than the manifestation of filial duty and affection. The departed are supposed to be able to help the living. They are prayed and sacrificed to as spiritual powers, from whom protection and favours may be obtained. We saw this in the prayers quoted from the services of the ancestral temple of the Ming dynasty. The worship of ancestors thus becomes a snare and a stumbling-block, bringing them, notwithstanding they are not called Gods, to occupy

<sup>1</sup> 子曰孝子之事親也居則致其敬養則致其樂病則致其憂喪則致其哀祭則致其嚴五者備矣然後能事親

a place in the minds of the Chinese, which ought to be occupied by God alone.

The worship of the departed great is to be condemned on the same grounds. The memory of the just is blessed. Every nation ought to keep its benefactors and ornaments in remembrance, and men everywhere ought to honour the names of all of every nation, who have helped the advance of humanity, and ministered by their example and instructions to the amelioration of our race. But to build temples to the dead—to present offerings to them—to invoke and expect their assistance—are acts founded on no reason, contrary to the lessons of God's word, and full of injurious consequences to those who fall into them.

At what time the religion of the ancient Chinese first admitted these superstitious elements, I am unable to say. It has been asserted by some of the Roman Catholic writers, that the worship of the *shins* commenced in the reign of Hwang-te, placed by Morrison more than 2600 years before Christ; but I have not been able as yet to get any light upon the subject from native sources. Adopting the five *King*, as historical authorities, we find the religion corrupted in the time of Shun, whose reign began A. C. 2230. On ascending the throne, "he offered the corresponding sacrifice to *Shang-Te*, presented a pure offering to the six honoured objects, looked towards and worshipped the hills and rivers, while he universally included the host of *shins*." If we may believe the commentators, those six honoured objects were "the four seasons, heat and cold, the sun, moon, and stars, with the spirit that presided over droughts and inundations. The hills and rivers mean the famous hills and great rivers of the country. The host of *shins* refer to (the genii of) mounds and banks, with (the manes of) the ancient sages, &c." The passage presents us with a religious worship at that early period, essentially the same as that which now prevails. "I do not think," says Dr. Boone, "tradition could have done much for Shun." We may regret, indeed, that it did not do more for him, but in his blending the worship of other beings with that of the supreme God, we only discover the proof that the portion of the Noachic family which migrated to China, was prone to error, like the other portions that remained nearer to their original seats.

It is a commonly received opinion that, before the deluge, idolatry prevailed among "the children of men," the descendants of Cain, and was developed first and chiefly in the form of zebianism, or the worship of the heavenly host.<sup>1</sup> After the deluge, how soon did men fall away from the pure theology which must have been taught them by Noah! Hales says, "Nimrod, that arch-rebel, first subverted the patriarchal government, in-

<sup>1</sup> See Hales' Analysis of Chronology, vol. iv., p. 3.

roduced also the zabanian idolatry, and after his death was deified by his subjects." Now, according to the common chronology, Nimrod was contemporary with Shun. The beginning of the Assyrian monarchy by him is assigned to A. C. 2229. We know also, from the testimony of Scripture that the fathers of Abraham served other gods, and his grandfather Nahor, born A. C. 2151, was only about eighty years later than the Chinese emperor. The individuals who first entered into the north-east of China must have separated at a very early period after the deluge from the rest of the Noachic family;—why should we be stumbled at finding religion corrupted among them, separated from their brethren, contemporaneously with a similar degeneracy, obtaining among the mass, who continued in the vicinity of the land of Shinar, among whom in all probability, Noah and Shem went out and in? Dr. Boone's wonder at the little which tradition did for Shun might be directed with more reason to those patriarchs.<sup>1</sup>

There is another consideration which may be set against the early corruption of religion among the Chinese. How soon did the same elements

<sup>1</sup> One cannot help here being troubled with a most perplexing subject—the credibility of Chinese chronology. The commencement of Shun's reign is placed by De. Mailla, A. C. 2255, and by Dr. Morrison, A. C. 2230. Now, according to the received chronology, the dispersion from Babel took place, A. C. 2230. In the same year, therefore, in which "the earth was divided," we find Shun succeeding in China to the throne of Yaou, who had reigned 100 years—to a kingdom, ruled by an emperor, having under him twelve governors of districts, a host of nobles, ministers of astronomy, music, and public instruction, &c. It is evident that the fathers of the Chinese nation must have separated from the other descendants of Noah long before the time of Peleg. But from the deluge to the dispersion there elapsed only 113 years. There came out from the ark Noah, his wife, his sons and his sons' wives, only eight persons in all. If one son and his wife turned their faces immediately towards the East, it is not easy to conceive of their finding their way from Armenia across the intervening distance of desert to the territory of Shen-se, and there growing within little more than a single century, into a numerous people, with an established government, and some scientific culture. It is impossible I think for such a thing to have occurred. Shall we discredit the records of the early Chinese history? They *will* not be discredited. One might as well deny the existence of the different geological strata and periods. They must be looked in the face. It will not serve the cause of Revelation to neglect them, or to deal with them as if they were only fable.

Dr. Russell, late Bishop of Edinburgh, says in his "Connexion of Sacred and Profane History"—"We are told by Pezron, that the Jesuit missionaries to China were actually obliged to return to Rome to ask leave to use the Septuagint calculation, in order to satisfy the scruples of the better-informed in that country." It is well known that the chronology of the world from the creation up to the birth of Abraham differs very much in the present scriptures, and in the Septuagint version—so much so, that from the creation to the birth of Christ, there were, according to the Hebrew text, 4004 years, but, according to the Septuagint, 5507 years. Supposing that the chronology of the Septuagint may be sustained on other grounds, the reign of Shun will commence A. M. 3277, or 1015 years after the deluge, and he will have been contemporary with Terah, the father of Abraham. The existence of an ordered kingdom at that period in China is not more wonderful than the existence of the same in Egypt. According to the

of superstition, which disfigure it, enter into the Christian Church! The announcement in the New Testament is very express, that there is but one mediator between God and men; the warning is precisely given to beware of the worshipping of angels. And yet four centuries had not elapsed before martyr and saint-worship began extensively to prevail, and Ambrose of Milan proclaims that we ought to pray to our guardian angels, which is soon succeeded by the general worship of the heavenly spiritual host. With this fact before us—the worship of other beings besides God insinuating itself into the Christian Church, within less than three centuries after the apostles, in spite of the tradition of their doctrines, in spite of the more sure written word—however we may deplore the fact, we cannot be surprised at the *modified* spirit and hero-worship among the ancient Chinese. I lay great stress myself upon the qualifying term “modified.” The Chinese have not given the name of God to the spirits of the sun and moon and other heavenly bodies, and of the various parts of nature, nor (excepting in a few questionable instances) to the departed heroes and sages whom they reverence. They have not confounded them with Him who alone is God. They are idolaters as the Roman Catholics are idolaters, but we may not call them polytheists any more than we should apply that name to those others.

Indeed, the analogy between the religion of China and that of the Papal Church is very striking, and we can account for it only by the fact that the great outline of the worship of heathen Rome was adopted by the so-called Christian Church. In his scheme of the Pagan, Papal, and Christian Churches, under the division of the objects of worship, De. Laune says concerning the second—“Besides the Supreme God, Jehovah, the Governor of heaven and earth, whom they pretend to worship, they have divers inferior deities, gods and goddesses, whom they divinely worship; *Diva* or *Sancta Maria*, the Queen of heaven and mother of God; with *Divus Petrus*, St. Paul, St. John, St. Thomas, St. Stephen, St. Andrew, &c.; to whom they, as their numens, or intercessors, build temples, erect altars, and dedicate feasts; paying also so much reverence to the pagan gods as to keep up their names in the days of the week, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednes-

same system, from the deluge to Peleg are 531 years. A large colony might then have started from Babel, and travelled to the north-eastern part of China, and there is nothing improbable in its reaching the adjusted state, in which we find it in the time of Shun, during the intermediate four centuries and a half.

It is a question deserving consideration, which chronology to give in the Chinese version of the Bible. One, who has written well on ancient chronology, says—“Let a man carefully study the history of Egypt, Assyria, or China, or even of astronomy, and he is instantly confronted with facts, bearing the impress of sterling historic truth, which directly contradict the abbreviated Hebrew chronology. Does not his mind naturally deduce the conclusion, that revelation can be sustained only by the abandonment of legitimate research? that revealed truth can only stand by the renunciation of historic truth?”—(Smith’s Sacred Annals, p. 99.)

day, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday; they have also tutelar and ethereal gods and goddesses to be applied to by several vocations, cities, families, orders, sick persons, as *Divus* or St. Nicholas, for the mariner; St. Windoline, for the shepherd; St. John Baptist, for the husbandman; St. Mary Magdalen, for the courtesan; St. Hubert, for the huntsman; St. Crispin, for the shoemaker, &c. The city, country, family, and physic gods are innumerable; St. George, for England; St. Dennis, for France; St. Mark, for Venice, &c.; gods almost for every disease; besides the god-making power, that is in the Pope and cardinals, to canonize what deceased worthies they please, and to appoint them temples, altars, orders, and festivals."

Nearly every point in this description is applicable to the religion of China. The supreme God is the same—"The Governor of heaven and earth;" it acknowledges a Queen of heaven, without adding to that title, however, that she is the mother of God. There are multitudes of saints and worthies, to whom temples are built, altars erected, and feasts dedicated. There are also tutelar or ethereal spirits, applied to by several vocations, cities, families, orders, and sick persons, and with the Emperor rests the power of adding to the number of these, and appointing them temples, altars, and festivals, as he pleases. All these saints or worthies, and spirits, we may, if we please, call the gods or inferior deities of China. But the Chinese themselves have not done so. They call things by their proper names. They have never debased their name for God as *Elohim* was debased. It is strange to deny, because they have not done so, that they have no such name;—as if there could not be monotheism without polytheism. It appears to me equally strange to seek in the fact of their *worshipping* many other beings, whose subordinate position their words of worship continually set forth, a proof that the *One Supreme Being* whom they adore cannot be truly and properly God.

But the positive proof that *Shang-Te*, being the Creator, must be God—God *proprie*—has been largely given. No doubt rests on my own mind as to the fact, and in the assurance, I breathe more freely, while contemplating the moral condition of the Chinese empire. The people is the most numerous of peoples. Though we concede the highest estimate of the population—three hundred and sixty millions—so vast is the territory, that it will not be so densely inhabited as Belgium or England. And then there is its antiquity. From the accession of Shun to that of the present emperor are 4080 years. How very large the proportion of the human race which has lived and died in this empire! The mind recoils shuddering from the thought, that generation after generation has descended to the grave, without one individual ever having had the thought of God in his mind, or the name God on his lips. It is not possible that the nation should have subsisted

so long, without the knowledge of God. It is at the present day essentially the same in its religious notions, maxims of morality, and principles of government, as it was three thousand years ago. Subject to a Tartar tribe for the last two hundred years, it has yet subjected its governors by its moral and intellectual force. The example of *Græcia capta*, which captured its fierce conqueror, is more than realized in this extreme east. Moreover, in receiving Buddhism from India, China has admitted none of its indecencies. Let its moral state be compared with that of the Roman empire. Its temples are not places of abominable lust. Its people crowd to no such shows and games as those of the gladiators. I do not wish to eulogize Chinese virtue, or to exhibit the nation as a model to others. But it occupies a place all its own among the other heathen kingdoms of the globe. The extent of its duration, the numerousness of its inhabitants, its regard to decency, the superiority of its people in strength of character to the other natives of the East—all these are facts, which I cannot reconcile with the assumption that it has been all along, and continues to be, without any knowledge of God. When I recollect how Sodom and Gomorrah were blotted from the face of the earth, because there were not ten righteous in them—how Israel and Judah were scattered from the land of covenant, because they departed from God, and made them molten images, and worshipped the host of heaven, and served Baal—how the Egyptian and Assyrian and Persian and Grecian and Roman monarchies rose, and became vile, and then were smitten and perished—when I recollect these things, and am told to believe in the phenomenon of the Chinese empire, rising, increasing, and still existing, with no word in its language denoting God, I must confess that I am unwilling to admit the phenomenon, and rejoice, when I find on inquiry that it does not have an actual existence, but that, on the contrary, the Chinese know much of God, and have not given His glory to any other. That their religion is monotheistic, is a circumstance which has much to do with their long social subsistence. My own belief is, that it has more to do with it than all the other causes which learned and thinking men have assigned. The peculiarity of its geographical position has contributed to preserve China from powerful neighbours. Its principle of filial piety, and its educational system calling out the best men to fill governmental offices, have done much to preserve its form of government, and repress anarchical movements; but that which has been as salt preserving its parts from corruption and crumbling away, has been its ancient and modern holding to the doctrine of one only God.

The preceding pages have been occupied chiefly with a development of the state religion of China, and its observances, especially as these are practised by the Emperor. But the views which have been set forth concerning *Shang-Te* and the *shin*, and their mutual relations, are those which obtain

among the people generally. This, however, is a matter much controverted among missionaries. It is said by some that *Shang-Te* is merely regarded as one of the *shin*—that, in calling on their hearers to worship *Shang-Te*, they are merely understood as speaking of one of the many beings whom they already venerate. Of course the people venerate *Shang-Te*, but it has been shown that a sufficient distinction is made in their own books between Him and other beings. We may appeal to these in confirmation of much that we teach them concerning Him out of our Scriptures. But I can state it, as the result of my own experience in conversing and reasoning with the Chinese, that they do not confound *Shang-Te* with the *shin*. I might fill twenty pages with accounts of conversations with individuals of different grades upon the subject. They have always to me recognized the *shin*, as a class different from *Shang-Te*, and under Him. As often as I have put the question, “Which is greater, *Shang-Te* or the *shin*?” the reply has been “*Shang-Te* is the greater,” and often with the addition, “How can they be compared? The *shin* are the servants of *Shang-Te*.” This is the belief of all classes from the emperor downwards, and, where it diverges to error, can only be rectified by teaching them right views of the government of God—that His power “spreads undivided and operates unspent”—that He worketh all and in all—and that, however He may employ the ministry of *shin*, that is, of spirits, He does so unknown to us, and that we are not to bow down to them, nor serve them in any way.

To support what I have just stated as the result of my own experience, I will only refer to two testimonies of others. The first is found in the report, published by the Bishop of Victoria, of the interview which he had, in December, 1850, with the Governor of Fuh-keen province. Of the eight positions, “clearly and unequivocally maintained by His Excellency,” the first was—“*Shang-Te* conveys to the Chinese mind the idea not of an idol, or one of their *Shin-ming*, but of one universal Ruler of the world; the same being as *Teen-choo*, the God of Western nations.” The second testimony is in a letter which I received from an American missionary, in January of the present year. He says—“I was visited to-day by a Chinaman, who has resided fifteen years in America, and is just returned. He has been in various parts of America during that time, made four voyages to Liverpool, and acquired considerable English. He seems to be a man of good sense and judgment. The letters which he brings from America speak highly of him as to integrity. He frequently attended church, but as he had not good opportunities for a thorough literary education, was not able to understand all that was said. During our conversation I asked him—“Did you learn about God in America?”

Oh yes; they pray to God, and when I go to church, I pray in my heart too.

Do you know who God is ?

He is up in heaven, and made all things.

I took up a copy of Mark's Gospel, and asked him to tell me what Chinese word meant the same as he learnt God to mean in America. He pointed to *Shang-Te*, saying with much emphasis, "that means God." I then told him that some 60 or 70 good men from England and America had come to China, and learned the Chinese language and letters, but they were not agreed what Chinese characters or term meant God, or was the nearest to mean it. Some said *Shang-Te*, some said *shin*. He replied, "*Shang-Te* means God; he made the sky, ground, and all things. *Shin* all a same good man die, go up to heaven. *Shin* no mean God. *Shang-Te* no father, no mother, live long long time." The remarks of this man confirmed me in the opinion that the Chinese have used *Shang-Te* as the American Indians used "Good Spirit," to express their notion of the Creator gathered from his material works, without the aid of a written revelation."

It is said further, that *Shang-Te* is not worshipped by any of the people of China, but only by the Emperor, and consequently to preach *Shang-Te*, and call on the Chinese to serve Him, is contrary to the laws of the kingdom. But a distinction must be made between *sacrificing to Shang-Te*, and otherwise serving Him. All the people ought to serve Him—obeying Him, venerating Him, praying to Him. The Emperor alone may perform the great solstitial sacrifices. The patriarchal origin of the religion of China here plainly shows itself. Just as Abraham was the Chief of his family and its high priest, so the Emperor of China both rules his people, and sacrifices, for them and for himself, at the great altars. It appears in Mencius, that "the ugliest person, if he fast and bathe, may offer sacrifice," that is, I suppose, in an ordinary way, "to *Shang-Te*," and the commentators say that it was the design of the sage to encourage wicked persons to repent of their wickedness, and seek to do well, for, if they did so, *Shang-Te* would accept them. There is nothing therefore, in the Emperor's acting as the high priest of his people, to prevent our preaching to them by means of the name *Shang-Te*, all the truth about the kingdom of God. We have not to exhort them to go and offer sacrifice. When the Emperor himself receives the gospel, he will cease from his peculiar services. Monarch and subjects will unite in acknowledging the one sacrifice, by which Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

But it is said, once more, that though the state religion of China only acknowledges one *Shang-Te*, the Taouist sect has given the name to several of the beings which they worship, and our preaching is sure to be misunderstood. Dr. Boone mentions instances, in which missionaries, after preaching *Shang-Te*, were astonished to find that their hearers had under-

stood them of *Yuh-hwang*, a chief Taouist deity.<sup>1</sup> Such was very likely to be the case. The missionaries had only to say, "*Yuh-hwang* is not *Shang-Te*. You call him so, but he has no right to the name. We announce to you the true *Shang-Te*, Jehovah." The Jewish prophets had to claim the name *Elohim* in this way from *Baal*, and *Chemosh*, and other false gods, to whom it was given.

The authority of some Roman Catholic priests and converts has likewise been adduced lately, to show the danger of the name *Shang-Te* being mis-

<sup>1</sup> Some very erroneous notions are prevalent about the deities of the Taou sect, and not only erroneous, but contradictory. For instance, in the "Anglo-Chinese Calendar for 1851," under the account of the principal Chinese festivals, it is said—"February 9th.—1st moon, 9th day, *Yuh-hwang Shang-ti's* birth-day; this deity is the highest of the Taou sect." Lower down on the same page, we find—"March 17th.—2d moon, 15th day, *Lau-kiun* born. \* \* The principal deities of the Tau sect are—*San-ting*, three pure ones,—*Shang-ti*, a supreme ruler subordinate to those three, and an infinity of inferior gods, and deified men." In these notices, from a noted Chinese scholar, we expect to find correctness. On the contrary, however, we find, first, contradiction. In the one case, the writer tells us that *Yuh-hwang Shang-ti* is the highest deity of the Taouists, and immediately after, that their principal deities are the "three pure ones," while *Shang-Te*—the same *Yuh-hwang Shang-Te*, I apprehend—is only subordinate to them. We find, secondly, grave error. *Yuh-hwang* is indeed subordinate to the *San-ting*, but *Shang-Te* is not, for the chief of the pure ones is himself a *Shang-Te*. His complete title is given in the *Sow-shin Ke*, one of the commonest works, among the people of this part of China, 妙無上帝自然元始天尊, that is, "The infinitely mysterious *Shang-Te*, the self-existing source and beginning, the Honoured one of heaven." *Shang-Te* cannot be subordinate to *Shang-Te*. In the large temples of the Taou sect, the images of the three pure ones—this infinitely mysterious *Shang-Te* in the centre—are found in the principal hall, while *Yuh-hwang* occupies a small shrine behind them. The work referred to above, appends to the account of *Yuh-hwang's* birth, succession to his father's throne, resignation of it, subsequent sublimation, and apotheosis, two remarkable sentences, the last of which is—

帝臨玉闕統神人悉在鈞陶, "*Te* dwells in the gemmeous palace; all *shin* and men are made by him, as by a potter." How the truth everywhere beams out! *Shin* and men are not related as maker and creatures. But both the *shin* and men, are all of them related to *Te*, as creatures to their Former. That the *Te* here is *Yuh-hwang*, need not be wondered at, for Taouism recognizes the principle of avatars or incarnations of the Supreme Deities, and such incarnations both the *Heuen-teen* and *Yuh-hwang Shang-Te's* are held to have been.

Dr. Boone says, "The Chinese have not anywhere in the classical books, that we are aware of, given any account of the origin of the *Shin* or of *Shang-ti*; and, on the contrary, there are no passages which affirm the self-existence or eternity of either *Shang-ti*, or any other of the beings, who are included in the class called *Shin*."—(Essay, p. 41.) In the words just quoted, we have an account given of the origin of the *shin*. They are creatures like men, made by *Te*. It may be said that the *Sow-shin Ke* is not a classical book, but it details popular notions. That the *shin* as a class are created beings, is the belief of the Chinese, which all who have mingled freely with them—Jews, Mohammedans, and Roman Catholics—readily acknowledge. It is a preposterous undertaking for a few Protestant missionaries to set themselves against such a persuasion, and determine to make a class of creatures into the one Creator.

understood in this way by the Chinese. I can well conceive how the former, having lost the term for their own use, should be glad to bring Protestants to the necessity of adopting that, which has no validity, but what it derives from a Papal constitution. What their converts are quoted as saying, in reality, only proves the appropriateness of the term. One of them writes—“*Heuen Teen Shang-Te*, and *Yuh-hwang Shang-Te* are names of devils. The two characters *Shang-Te*, among the literary sect are regarded as honourable, but it has happened that the devil has stolen them.”<sup>1</sup> The assertion is correct, that the two deities whom he mentions are only devils—i-e—*daimones*. But we have seen that with the literary sect, and in the state religion, the two characters *Shang-Te* are not only honourable, but the name of the true God. Be it that the devils have stolen them, it is ours to reclaim them, and attribute them only to Him, whose they are.

I would say in fine, that if we abandon the use of *Shang-Te* for God, we cut ourselves off from all sympathy with the Chinese people. If we speak to them of *shin*, that term has necessarily connected with it the idea of *inferiority*.

I am surprised that Dr. Boone should have overlooked a sentence in Visdelou, where he has quoted a passage speaking both of the *Shang-Tes* and the *kwei.shin* as formed. Near the close of his “Notice of the Yih-king,” Visdelou says—“Tchu-ven-kong (Choo He) said, according to the witness of his disciple, the famous philosopher *Tchang-van-hien*, (Sing-li-ta-tsuen L. 54.)—‘When it is said that T’ae-keih, that is, the primitive reason, or first principle of all things, produced heaven and earth, and formed the *kwei-shin* and *Shang-Te* or the *Shang-Tes*, this tells us nothing else but what is comprised in this axiom of Tcheou-chun-y—‘T’ae-keih by its movement and repose produced perfect and imperfect matter.’” On reading this, I eagerly turned to the 54th book of the work referred to, and looked it carefully through, but found no such words in it of Choo He, or of Tchang-van-hien. I was fortunate enough to light on his original, however, in the 1st book of the Pandects, at the 74th page. The witnesser, is not Tchang-van-hien, who gives his testimony on another subject in the 73d page, but Too San-yang. The passage is as follows,—又曰生天生地成鬼成帝即太極動靜生陰陽之義 “He (*i. e.* Choo He) also said, The expressions, ‘The producing of heaven, the producing of earth, the completing the *kwei*, the completing the *te*,’ mean the same as this—‘The T’ae-keih moving and resting produced the *yin* and the *yang*.’” Visdelou, it will be seen, is very free in his rendering. The text speaks of the *kwei*, and not of the *kwei-shin*, of the *te*, and not of the *Shang-Tes*, much less of *Shang-Te*, and of the completing the *kwei* and the *te*, whatever that be, and not of the forming them. *Shang-Te cannot be intended by Te*, because, on Choo He’s principles, T’ae-keih and *Shang-Te* are the same. Perhaps the five *Tes* are indicated, but two Chinese teachers, to whom I showed the passage, say that it ought to be read 成鬼成神,—“the completing the *kwei*, the completing the *shin*.” It would, if so read, be in harmony with Choo He’s doctrine of the relation between the T’ae-keih, the *yin* and *yang*, and the *kwei-shin*. As it stands, it is without parallel or analogy.

<sup>1</sup> Letter on the Chinese version of the Holy Scriptures, to the British and Foreign Bible Society, by the Bishop of Victoria. Supplementary Note. See Note 11, in the Appendix to this Chapter.

If we speak to them of *Teen-choo*, distinguishing that name from *Shang-Te*, we are the setters forth of a strange god—a being, of whom their fathers have known nothing, and who has known nothing and cared nothing for them. The same evil consequence will arise from the transference of either of the original terms, *Eloah* and *Theos*. We must have a name which will not make void and of none effect the law of God written in their own hearts—a name that shall witness for Jehovah, in harmony with the witness of their own spirits. Such a name we have in *Shang-Te*, and I believe in no other term. It has been used by them from time immemorial to denote God, as the Maker, Ruler, and Governor of the universe: it is now our privilege and duty still further to unfold to them His character, and especially to make known to them how He was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing into men their trespasses.

APPENDIX.—*Note I.* VISDELOU. PREMARE. REGIS.

VISDELOU was in the habit of writing extravagantly about the Chinese, and caricaturing their sentiments. Another Romish Missionary—Father Bouvet—accused him of flattering the son of the Emperor K'ang-he, by saying that the fundamental principles of the Christian religion were the same as those of the *Yih-king*. His reply was, that he said so, not of religion, but of morals. In none of his writings to which I have had access, does there appear a disposition to judge too favourably of Chinese notions, but the reverse. In his observations appended to D'Herbelot's Notices of China in the *Bibliothèque Orientale*, we find various instances of this, of which the two following may serve as examples.

"The Chinese," he says, "have no other name to express the name of God but Heaven—a sure mark that they do not know him." Now the Chinese, it has been shown, use indifferently the words Heaven and *Shang-Te*, just as we do Heaven and God. They repudiate, as strongly as we could do, the imputation that by Heaven they mean anything else but God who is in heaven.

Visdelou adds, "The Chinese give to their Emperor the title of *T'een-tsze*, which signifies the Son of Heaven. They give him Heaven for his father, the Earth for his mother, the Sun for his elder brother, and the Moon for his elder sister." With this representation, I place, side by side, a sentence from Dr. Williams' *Middle Kingdom*—"The Emperor has been called by many ridiculous titles by foreign writers, as Brother of the Sun and Moon, Grandson of the Stars, King of Kings, &c., but no such epithets are known among the Chinese." If Dr. Williams' statement be correct, as I believe it is, it takes away much from the weight of Visdelou's authority on Chinese matters.

No Roman Catholic Missionary has left a greater monument of his knowledge of the Chinese language than the PERE DE PREMARE. His "*Notitia Linguae Sinicæ*," is an invaluable work, of which it would hardly be possible to speak in too high terms. A friend in Shanghai, has kindly favoured me with the following translation of the first chapter of his preliminary discourse to Gaubil's translation of the *Shoo-king*. It is entitled "*De la Naissance de L'Univers*."

"Lo-peih 羅必 (1) states that he has learned from the *Yih-king* 易經, (2) in the article *Ta-chuen* 大傳, that "the Heavens and the Earth have a beginning,

1. Lo-pl. This writer lived under the Song dynasty. I shall frequently quote from him. The Song dynasty began in the year 954, and concluded in the year 1279, J. C.

2. The *Y-king*, is the name of the most ancient, the most obscure, and the most valuable of all the monuments which China has preserved to us. That which they call the *Ta-tchouen* is a treatise divided into two parts, to be found at the end of the *Y-king*, and which is commonly ascribed to Confucius.

and he adds, that 'if this be said of Earth and Heaven, with much greater reason may it be said of Man.' The chapter Su-kwa 序卦 (1) speaks very clearly of the origin of the world: 'After there was a Heaven and an Earth,' says the text, 'all material things were formed; afterwards male and female, then husband and wife, &c.' This cosmogony is not very different from that of Moses, who says, that God first created the Heaven and the Earth, then all kinds of creatures, and lastly the first man and woman.

"In the Hi-tse 繫辭 (2) are found these words: 'the Y 易 possesses the great extreme 太極; this has produced the couple I, 兩儀; from this couple are derived the four images 四象, and from them, the eight symbols 八卦.' These eight symbols, four images, and this couple, lead the mind to the small lines (3) of which the Y-king 易經 is composed, but since these lines are themselves so many enigmas, we must endeavour to discover their meaning.

"Lo-pi 羅必, explaining this passage of the Hi-tse 繫辭, says that 'the great extreme 太極 is the great unity, and the great Y, that the Y has neither substance nor form, and that all which has substance and form has been made by that which has neither form nor substance.' Tradition relates that 'the great extreme or the great unity comprehends three; that one is three, and that three are one.' Hoai-nan-tse 淮南子 (4) says also that, 'the being which has neither form nor sound, is the source whence have sprung all material beings, and all sensible sounds; that light is his son, and water his grandson.' To return to Lo-pi, he expresses the character I 儀, (5) by Pi 倍, a couple, and adds that they do not say eull 二, two, but leang 兩, because eull 二 would express before and after, while leang 兩 simply expresses mutual conjunction.' The compilers of chronicles have put this passage from the Hi-tse at the head of their compilations, because they believe that the origin of the world is there spoken of, that the great extreme was only matter before any separation, as Kong-gan-koue 孔安國, (6) with several others, says expressly; that the couple I 兩儀 designated matter as distinguished into pure and impure, subtle and gross, celestial and terrestrial: that, these afterwards uniting, there sprang from them four images 四象, or four principal kinds, whence came in the same way eight species of different beings, who, uniting in pairs, produced sixty-four, which represent in general all the beings of which the universe is composed. Without stopping to examine into the truth or justice of this explanation, I inquire whence comes the great Extreme, which is thus restricted to express matter in chaos, and I find, that reason has proved to the most skilful Chinese philosophers, that this matter is not self-produced. The famous Teheou-lien-ki 周濂溪 (7)

1. Su-koua is another small treatise found in the same book, and of which they also make Confucius the author.

2. Hi-tse is Lo-pi's name for the aforesaid Ta-tehouen.

3. These lines are broken or entire; these are what are called Yn and Yang.

4. He is also called Hoai-nan-vang, because he was king of Hoai-nan. His palace was an Academy of Savants, with whom he searched into the most remote antiquity; hence his works are very curious, and his style is very good.

5. This word must not be confounded with Y or Ye, which signifies unity; the character is different.

6. Kong-gan-koue is one of the most celebrated Interpreters, who lived in the Han dynasty. He was a descendant of Confucius in the eighth generation. He found the Chou-king in the hole of a wall, commented upon it, and wrote a learned preface. The Han dynasty lasted from 209 B. C. to 190 J. C.

7. Teheou-lien-ki lived under the Song dynasty. He was the master of the two Tchih-tse, and the majority of the Literati of this dynasty, who were very numerous, professed to follow his doctrine.

commences his plan of the great Extreme with these important words; 'There was a Being without limit, and afterwards there was the great extreme which is *Tai-ki*.' Vang-chin-tse 王申子 (1) affirms with justice that the idea of Tcheou-lien-ki is the same as that of Confucius, in the words just quoted, 'Y or unity, has given existence (2) to the great extreme.' 'The character Y,' says Vang-chin, 'does not here mean a book named Y, but we must know that at the beginning, while as yet there was no great Extreme, even then there existed an efficacious and inexhaustible reason (or cause), which no image could represent, which no name could designate, which was infinite in all respects, and to which nothing could be added.' Tcheou-tse 周子, above this great Extreme, has placed a being without limit and without boundary, and he inserts, between the two, the particle eull 而, which expresses posteriority of existence, to show that the great Extreme was not from the first, but only existed afterwards, for without this, he would never have placed this particle between the illimitable being and the being with limits. So also says Vang-chin-tse. Lou-siang-chan 陸象山 (3) also says, that Tcheou-lien-ki understands by Vou-ki 無極, the illimitable being, the same thing as Confucius means by Y 易, in the passage cited above. Lie-tse 李子 (4) distinguishes what he calls Tai-y 太易, from Tai-tsou 太初, and Tai-chi 太始:—'When these was only Tai-y, the great unity, there was not as yet any matter. Tai-tsou is the first instant and the great beginning of the existence of matter; Tai-chi is a second instant, and the first moment when matter assumed form.' Substance and matter have a beginning, it is only the great Unity which has none.

"In the chapter Choue-koua 說卦 (5) we read these words—'The *Ti* 帝 or the Lord began to go out by the east.' The text makes use of the word Tching 震, which is one of the eight radical symbols of the Y-king, and which designates east and west. It afterwards goes through the seven others, and finishes with Ken 艮, which denotes a mountain. The majority of interpreters agree that the subject here discussed, is the creation of the world, and many in Europe have thought that the universe was created in the spring.

*Haud alios, primâ nascentis origine mundi,  
Illuxisse dies, alium-ve habuisse tenorem  
Crediderim; ver illud erat, ver magnus agebat.  
Orbis, &c.*

"The character, *Ti* 帝, says Tchu-he 朱熹, (6) 'signifies in this place, the Lord and Sovereign Master of Heaven;' and upon what the text says before, the Lord comes forth, and afterwards come all things, the same author says, that 'all things obey the Lord, and come when he calls them.' 'We speak here' says Hon-ping-ven (7), 'of the order, with which all things have been produced and perfected. But

1. Vang-chin-tse lived under the Yuen dynasty between 1279 and 1333. Amongst other works, he has written a very fine commentary on the Y-king.

2. The word *yeou* is commonly taken for the auxiliary verb *to have*, but it properly signifies *being*, and in an active sense, implies *to give being*.

3. Lou-siang-chan lived under the Song dynasty; he had several disputes with Tchu-hi

4. Lie-tse is a very ancient philosopher, a disciple of Kouan-yun-tse; he lived 49 years unknown in a desert.

5. Choue-koua is the name of a short treatise at the end of the Y-king.

6. Tchu-hi is the famous Tchu-ven-kong the greatest of the Chinese atheists, if we may believe some learned men; I will just remark in passing, that what I have seen of this philosopher, is not more atheistical than Socrates or Plato; and he has passed for an atheist without any proof.

7. Hou-ping-ven lived under the Yuen dynasty; he commented upon the Y-king.

who has produced them? Who has given them perfection? It necessarily follows that there has been a master and a sovereign workman; this is why the text calls him 'Ti, the Lord.' The Y-king says, in a similar way, that 'heaven has created' (Tien-tsaο) and in another place, that 'the Ta-gin, or the great one has created' (Ta-gin-tsaο); upon which Tsien-ki-sin (1) says without hesitation, 'that the great one has created the heaven, the earth, men, and all things.' There is then a Heaven which creates, and a heaven which has been created, and since the Great one has created heaven and all things, it follows that the Great one must be the Heaven which has not been created, but which is 'the source and cause of all being:' as says the Li-ki 禮記, (2) 'the material and visible heaven is the symbol of the invisible heaven,' just as the material *Tai-ki* is a rude image of the spiritual *Tai-ki*, which is the same as *Tai-y* or unity.

"Hui-chin 許慎, (3) explaining the character Y, speaks thus, "In the beginning, reason subsisted in unity; it created and divided heaven and earth, formed and perfected all things." This is clear and precise; and since it is Reason which has created heaven and earth, and since it is also true that Heaven has created all things, it necessarily follows that the character Tien 天 has two meanings, and that it denotes sometimes the work, and more frequently the artificer. It is the great Unity that the Choue-ven 說文 calls Tao 道. It is to this Spirit that the ancient Emperors offered sacrifices, which were only due to God the Lord. The Tao-te-king 道德經 (4) says also, that 'Reason (Tao) produced one; that one produced two, that two produced three, and that three produced all things.' (5)

"There is an ancient tradition which relates that 'Heaven was opened at the hour Tse 子, that Earth appeared at the hour Tcheou 丑, and that Man was born at the hour Yn 寅.' These three letters, in relation to a day, comprise the time which passes between 11 o'clock at night and 5 o'clock in the morning; and in relation to a year, Tse 子 begins in December, at the winter solstice, and answers to Capricorn; Tcheou 丑 answers to January and Aquarius; Yn 寅 answers to February and Pisces. The Chinese year has begun at different periods, with one of these three signs; and it is these they call San-tching 三正, that is to say, the three Tching. The Chinese apply the characters, Tse, Tcheou, Yn, &c., not only to hours, but to days and years. If we take the three Chinese hours, which make six of ours, for the six days of creation, each day God would continue his work from where he had left off the pre-

1. Tsien-ki-sin lived under the Ming dynasty, between 1333 and 1628. He has written two excellent works, one entitled *Siang-siang*, and the other *Siang-tchao*.

2. Li-ki is the name of a collection of ceremonies, made by the literati of the Han dynasty; though not regarded by the learned as a *King* or Canonical, it contains many excellent things.

3. Hui-chin lived under the Han dynasty; he wrote a dictionary entitled *Choue-ven*, in which he gives the analysis and proper meaning of each character. He has preserved to us a great number of traditions.

4. The *Tao-te-king* is a very ancient and profound book. It was composed by Lao-tse contemporary of Confucius; he was called the ancient Lao, because he had, they said, remained 81 years in his mother's womb. This work contains 81 short chapters.

5. To understand these words, we must take *Tao* for this sovereign reason, abstracting it from the three which it encloses. The word *Seng* which is four times repeated, signifies to produce, so as to accommodate this generic term to every particular species of production; when they say *tao-seng-y* that is, reason produces one, it must be admitted that reason existed before there were 1, 2, and 3, for it is not 1, 2, and 3, but contains them in its essence. But as 3 come from 2, and 2 from 1, 1 or the first has no other origin than the essence of the supreme reason, it is sufficient to say *Tao* has produced one. The words following, one has produced two, are easy to be understood; two in this place not signifying two, but the second. The phrase which follows, two produced three, does not mean that the second alone produced the third, but means here, the first and second; this all interpreters remark. Tchouang-tse says still better that 'one and the word produced the third;' and the last words, three have produced all things, do not mean that the third alone produced all; but the character San denotes the three who have conjointly created all things.

ceding day; for by Tien-kai 天開 (the heaven was opened) we may understand light and the firmament; by Ti-pi 地闢 (the earth appeared) the earth emerging from the bosom of the waters, and being enlightened by the sun and stars; by Gin-seng 人生 (man was born) all which has life, as well as man. I have read in a Chinese author, that 'at the beginning, when all things were made, they had Tse 子 for their source and origin. Tse 子 is the principle whence all things sprang.'

"The ancient King 經 (1) do not reason upon the natural philosophy of the world; it is a study too uncertain. The Chinese only began to construct systems of the universe under the family of Song 宋. We ought not to wonder that they were misled; our ancient philosophers were but little more skilful than they, witness the Theogony of Hesiod, the worlds of Democritus, and the principles of Lucretius. It is fortunate for the Chinese, that the same authors who occupy themselves in philosophizing about the machinery of the universe, have almost all commented upon the King 經, all profess to follow the great doctrine which the ancient monuments have preserved, and that they recognize, like these King 經, a Sovereign Lord of all things, to whom they give all the attributes that we ascribe to the true God. I shall not stop to explain the period of Tchao-kang-tsié 邵康節, (2) 'which comprehends a great year, which he calls Yuen 元, and which is composed of twelve parts, as of so many months, which he names Hoi 會, of 10800 years each;' which makes 129,600 years for the entire Yuen 元. When it has been wished to prove, by the exposé of this system, that all the Chinese literati are atheists, it appears to me that it should be demonstrated, that, this system granted, there is no longer a Divinity in the world; and further, that all modern literati are prepossessed with the same hypothesis;—and this has never been done.

"I have read with pleasure in Lo-pi, speaking of Tchao-kang-tsié, 'that his hypothesis will sooner or later be refuted.' Ting-nan-hou 丁南湖 (3) says more, namely, 'that this period brings along with it many doubts;' and on this account, he highly praises Fang-kouen-chan 方觀山, (4) who, after asking 'how they make it necessary to have ten thousand years to form the heaven, &c.,' says without hesitation, 'that all that is absolutely false.'

"Ho-tang (5) maintains also that the calculations of Tchao-kang-tsié 'have no foundation, that the author pretends to have taken them from the Celestial Chart of Fuh-he 伏羲, but that there is nothing less to be depended upon.' In fact it is a mere assumption, that the calculator determines the number of 129,600 years, above

1. They give the title of *King par excellence*, to the best and most ancient Chinese books: to speak of a *King*, is to speak of a work that contains only what is true, good, and great; to say that a doctrine is false or hurtful, is to say that it is not *King* (*pu-king*). The most ancient, and according to the Chinese, the source of all the others is the *Y-king*, the second the *Chi-king*, the Odes, the third is the *Chou-king*, the government of the ancient kings. There are still two others, the *Li-ki*, the rites, and the *Yo-king*, the music. They say they were lost during the time of the civil war.

2. Tchao-kang-tsié lived under the Song dynasty; he is famous for numbers. His periods were published by his son, and are to be found in the collection called *Sing-li-ta-suen*.

3. Ting-nan-hou lived under the Ming dynasty; he wrote history.

4. Fang-kouen-chau, is Fang-fong. He was called Kouen-chan from the name of his country. He was prime minister under the Ming dynasty.

5. Ho-tang a doctor, under the Ming dynasty.

every other, for the duration of the entire period ; it is a mere assumption that he fixes it the middle of the reign of Yao 堯.

“ In short, it is incredible, as says Ting-nan-hou, that it should have required 10,800 years to form heaven, &c. If we find some Chinese Literati who vaunt Tchao-kang-tsié, we ought to make use of the reasoning and testimony of other Chinese authors to refute him.”

REGIS is known as one of the interpreters of the *Yih-king*. His work was edited at Stuttgart, in 1834, by Julius Mohl. One part of the first volume is occupied with *prolegomena*, which contain the most valuable introduction to the Chinese higher classics that has yet been published. On the famous text in the Appendix to the *Yih-king*, “ *Te* causes things to issue forth in spring,” Regis has the following annotation :—

“ *Te*,’ says the Comment, ‘ is the Lord and Governor of Heaven, 天之主宰.’

Wang-fuh says, ‘ *Te* is the Lord of all things, that are produced.’ On this passage, Doctor Chow exclaims, ‘ Who produced these things? who perfected them? Certainly there exists one Lord and Governor, who is here called *Te*, the Supreme Ruler.’ Chang-ko-lao, having set forth and recounted everything which the text has here, thus concludes—‘ all these things are from the supreme ruler, *Shang-Te*.’ But it would be endless to cite here all the interpreters of all ages, and of great name, in whom is found the meaning of the terms *Te* and *Shang-Te*, and at the same time to collect all the texts of the authentic and ancient books about *Shang-Te*, who knows all things, even the most secret, who is omnipotent, perfectly just, who punishes the bad and rewards the good, who is the cause and author of all things, and alone understands their nature, &c. I may say in brief—concerning the proper, obvious, and literal sense of the terms *Shang-Te*, there is no difference among the Chinese. By these words the interpreters understand the Lord and Governor of the world, and the common people do the same, whether they be idolaters, worshippers of the idol *Yuh-hwang Shang-Te*, or whether they be Jews, Christians, or Mohammedans, in all of which cases they do not hesitate to apply the name to the true God (as is certain from the books of their religions, and monuments), calling Him the Supreme Lord of all things, than whom no one is greater, no one more excellent, who is without compeer, without equal. The immediate and proper sense of the terms, therefore, is admitted by all sects and every family ; it is only the dogmatical which is matter of controversy. From which it is plain that the name *Shang-Te*, which always signifies the supreme Ruler, is badly employed by many sects—it may be to denote the greatest idol of the peculiar sect, it may be to denote whatever various philosophers hold as the chief and first principle of things, or even, if some will have it so (let us not dispute about the opinion of the writers of the Sung dynasty), to the notions of *Le* reason, and of *Tae-keih* and *Woo-keih*, the terminus, and what has no terminus. As therefore, from the consent of all sects, about the term *Deus*, the holy apostles and the first Christians concluded that the Being whom they preached, was to be called *Deus*, why (if there is no other obstacle) should not our Christians call Him *Shang-Te*, by which name all other Chinese understand a Being of the highest excellence, according to their various schools and systems of religion.

“ Of the name *Shang-Te*, the expressions, ‘ Lord and Governor of Heaven,’ 天之主宰, ‘ Lord of all things,’ 萬物之主, and ‘ Lord of Heaven,’ 天主, which the Christians use, are only synonyms. If the word *Shang-Te* is now so improper, because of the abuse (as some in Europe have said) of the materializing philosophers of the Sung dynasty, the expressions ‘ Lord and Governor,’ ‘ Lord of heaven,’ are no better. The same objection lies against Shin-ling, 神靈, and any other words, used by all Christians to express *spirit* and *soul* in Chinese. The reason is evident. The same writers in the same books have abused and utterly vitiated the

terms alike—*Chang-ti* (*Shang-Te*) *Tchou-tsai*, *Tien-tchou*, *Chin-ling* (to use their formula). Nor if the Latin names be transferred, *Deus*, *spiritus*, *anima*, will the case be bettered. For necessity always requires that these Latin terms (barbarous to the Chinese) be explained, and by what other terms can this be done but those just mentioned, unapt and improper as they are? There remains, therefore, only one thing to be said, than which nothing can be more absurd—that a Chinese exposition of Christian doctrine is impossible. But the man who arrives at such a conclusion acknowledges that he has erred in his principles, for when we lay our principles badly, all our subsequent reasonings follow from them.”<sup>1</sup>

Note II.—For the following paper, I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Hobson, Canton. He was favoured with the perusal of a manuscript volume of documents compiled by a Roman Catholic gentleman, living about a day's journey from Canton. I purposely refrain from giving the name of the village or town, where he resides. His family have been Romanists for four generations. The documents are some of them memorials to the Emperors in favour of Christianity, and some of them essays by literary men, unfolding Chinese doctrines in harmony with Roman Catholicism. A few pieces of poetry are interspersed. The paper given below purports to be written by 朱宗元, Choo Tsung-yuen, a native of the district of 勸, Kin, in Chê-keang province, who attained the high rank of 會元, or chief of the third literary degree. When some are advancing the authority of Popish priests against the use of *Shang-Te* for God, it is satisfactory to find that Chinese Roman Catholics, of position and character, treasure up such writings as this, as confirmatory of the truths which they have been taught.

<sup>2</sup> “The ceremonies of the celestial and terrestrial sacrifices are those by which men serve *Shang-Te*.”

1 “*Ti*, Imperator (ait glossa) est Coeli dominus et gubernator, *Tien-tchi-tchou-tsai*. Quid significat *Ti* (ait *Ouang-fou*), *Ti* Imperator nempe rerum omnium producturam dominus. Hunc ipsum in locum ita exclamat Doctor *Tchou*, quærens “quisnam has res produxit? quis eas perfecit? Certe existit unus dominus et gubernator, qui hic dicitur *Ti*, Imperator supremus.” Postquam quæ hæbet hic textus exposuit recensitque singula *Tchang-ko-lao*, ita concludit: hæc omnia sunt a Supremo Imperatore *Chang-ti*. Sed actum agam infinitasque vim si omnes eos interpretes omnium ætatum magnique nominis, apud quos legitur *Ti* et *Chang-ti* significatio, appellare velim, simulque hic colligere omnes textus librorum authenticorum veterumque de Supremo imperatore *Chang-ti*, omnia vel intima sciente, omnipotente, summe iusto, puniente malos, remunerante bonos, causa et auctore rerum omnium, soloque earum naturam intelligente etc. Paucis dixerò de sensu proprio obvio litteralique sensu *Chang-ti* nullam esse Sinarum inter se dissensionem, cum et interpretes per has voces intelligant mundum dominum et gubernatorem, et plebei, si idololatras sunt, colentes idolum *Yo-kouang-chang-ti*, aut si Christiani, Judæi, Muhamedani, Deum verum hoc nomine (ut legi in earum religionum libris et monumentis apud Sinas constat) appellantes Supremum rerum omnium Dominum, quo nullus major, nullus præstantior, sine pari, sine æquali, significare non dubitent. Sensus itaque immediatus propriusque ab omnibus sectis totaque gente admittitur, dogmaticus in controversia est. Unde liquet nomen *Chang-ti* significare etiam nunc supremum Imperatorem, sed male adhiberi a multis sectis, puta ad maximum propriæ sectæ idolum; puta ad quod præcipuum habent varii Philosophi primumque rerum principium, aut etiam, si ita placet (ne disputemus de opinione scriptorum sub *Song-tchao*), de *Li*, ratione de *Tai-ki*, *Teou-ki* terminis sine termino commentum. Ut ergo ex omnium sectarum consensu in vocem Deum propriam Sancti Apostoli ipsique primi Christiani concludere latine Deum quem prædicabant, esse appellandum: quidni eum (si nihil aliud obstat) appellare poterunt Christiani nostri *Chang-ti*, quo nomine a caeteris omnibus Sinis Ens summe excellens, juxta propriam unicuique religionem scholamque, intelligitur. Nominis quidem *Chang-ti* voces velut synonymæ sunt *Tien-tchi-tchou-tsai*, *Ouan-ou-tchi-chou*, *Tien-tchou*, coeli Dominus rectorque, omnium rerum dominus, coeli dominus, quibus vulgo fideles utantur. Verum si vox *Chang-ti* ab abusu (ut dixere nonnulli in Europa) philosophantium sub *Song-tchao* omnique materialia scientiam iam indonea est, consequens est non meliores esse voces *Tchou-tsai*, *Tien-chou*, nec quascunque alias *Chin-ling* et ad sinces appellandum spiritum, animam et *Y* ab omnibus Christianis tritas. Ratio evidens est; nam idem qui profertur scriptores et in huiusmodi omnino libris non solum voce *Chang-ti* sed et vocibus *Tchou-tsai*, *Tien-tchou*, *Chin-ling* (ut utar illorum formula) abusi sunt, omninoque depravarunt. Nec si illi ad nomina *Deus*, *spiritus*, *anima* etc. evadent, quidquam efficiant. Urget enim semper necessitas hæc latina (apud Sinas barbara) sinice explicandi, per quas enimvero voces sensu proprio clariore magisque usitates, quam *Tchou-tsai*, *Tchou*, *Chin-ling* ? at ineptæ sunt et illicitæ. Superest itaque unum dicendum, quo nihil absurdius: Sinicam doctrinæ Christianæ expositionem esse impossibilem; eo autem devenire, nihil aliud profecto est quam fateri se in principis errare, nam ut male posuimus initia, sic caetera sequuntur.”

\* An attentive reader will perceive that this annotation has not been edited with perfect correctness, but I have thought it best to print it exactly as it stands in Moh's work.

<sup>2</sup> 郊社之禮所以事上帝也

“There are not two *Tes*. When the text speaks simply of *Te*, in connection with both the celestial and terrestrial sacrifices, there is no elliptical mode of expression. Now, *Shang-Te* is the Lord of heaven. Being the Lord of heaven, He is also the Lord of earth. Therefore, although the celestial and terrestrial sacrifices are different ceremonies, it is said equally of them both, that by them men serve *Shang-Te*. Of all the ceremonies practised in the empire, there are none more important than sacrifices. None, however, have been more perverted and confused by after ages, and of all sacrifices this has happened to none more than to those to heaven and earth. Heaven and earth have been separated, and considered as two. Heaven again has been divided, and considered as five. From this there have arisen many strange, nonsensical and unclassical practices. It has been thought, that so many different beings had the power of causing happiness and misery, and they have been sacrificed to with precious stones (the *kwei* and *peih*), and with animal victims. But heaven and earth are only two material bodies, and not intelligent beings, which could enjoy the sacrifices of men. They have a Producer; they have a Director. That which has form and is material may be divided into two, but Lordship and Governing cannot be divided into two.

“The ancients knew that it was *Shang-Te*, who made all things in the beginning; that it is *Shang-Te*, who daily sustains all nurturing influences; that it is *Shang-Te*, who descends to men in majesty; that it is *Shang-Te*, who visits with calamities and with blessings. Whom should we serve then? We should serve *Shang-Te*, and Him alone. How should we serve *Shang-Te*? We should serve Him with the celestial and terrestrial sacrifices, and with those alone.

“Confucius proceeds from discoursing of the universally acknowledged filial piety (of Woo and Chow-kung) to speak of *Shang-Te*, indicating that men's service of *Te*, is like the service which a son renders to his father. As to the celestial sacrifice, men know that in it *Shang-Te* is served, but how does it appear that He is served also in

帝不有二，則郊社之專言帝者非省文也，夫上帝者天之主也，爲天之主則亦爲地之主，故郊社雖異禮而統之曰事上帝云爾，今夫國家之禮莫重於祭，而後世之悖禮則莫亂於祭，尤莫亂於天地之祭，分天與地而二之，又復分天而五之，於是舉一切怪誕不經之屬，咸以爲禍福之柄，而圭璧牲牲之祭，殊不知天地特兩大形體耳，固靈非覺之體，而能歆人祀也，有生之者，有制之者，形氣可區爲兩，主宰不可區爲兩，古人知始造萬物者惟上帝，日起化育者惟上帝，臨下有赫者惟上帝，降殃降祥者惟上帝，吾何所事哉，事上帝已爾，吾何以事上帝哉，以郊社之禮事之已爾，

夫論達孝而及上帝，蓋謂人之事帝猶子之事親也，然郊之禮夫人而知爲事上帝也，社之禮，

the terrestrial sacrifice? *Shang-Te* is present everywhere, and there is nothing over which He does not rule. Speak of heaven, He is the Lord of heaven. Speak of earth, He is the Lord of earth. Speak of the persons of men, He is the Lord of the persons of men. Speak of all things, He is the Lord of all things. Although the revolutions of the sun and moon, causing heat and cold, and the admixture of earth and water, causing the abundant growth of all the kinds of grain, are occasioned by the moving power and guardianship of spirits, yet these all act as they receive the commands of *Shang-Te*, and for their movements are dependent on His power. Men ought not to give thanks to the spirits; they ought to give thanks to *Shang-Te*.

*Te* is a perfect One. If there be one *Te* contemplated in the celestial sacrifice, and another contemplated in the terrestrial, this makes two *Tes*. I would ask, are there two *Tes*, equal in knowledge, strength and ability, without any difference? or, Are they unequal, the one great and the other small? In all the changes and transformations taking place of the *Yin* and *Yang*, must they first consult between themselves? or, Does each of them issue his own orders? Heaven and earth are the workmanship of one *Te*, and therefore every forth-putting of His power, and every consequent production, happen in perfect obedience to His energy. If there were two *Tes*, it would be like two sovereigns occupying a divided territory. Their government, instructions, and orders, being different, how could there be the seasons of the year, and the regular production of all things?

“Moreover, *Te* is supremely honourable. But only *One* can be supremely honourable. A second is honourable only in a secondary degree. How can there be this comparison of degrees, which would take away from the honour? The difference between *Shang-Te* and the various spirits, is more than a thousand, yea than ten thousand times the difference between a Sovereign and his great ministers.

而亦爲事上帝何，上帝者無所不在，亦無所不  
主，在天則爲天之主，在地則爲地之主，在人身  
則爲人身之主，在萬物則爲萬物之主，雖日月  
運行，而一寒一暑，水土交成，百穀蕃植，各有鬼  
神爲運動護守，然皆受上帝之命而行者也，亦  
倚上帝之能而動者也，則不必當爲鬼神報，而  
應當爲上帝報也。

至一之爲帝，使郊有一帝，而社又復有一帝，是  
二之也，試問此二帝者，其智勇才能均敵而無  
差乎，抑或大小不齊乎，其間凡爲陰陽變化之  
事，必相咨度而後行乎，抑各出其號令乎，夫天  
地爲屬一帝，搏捩故一施一生，莫不順氣而應，  
若各自爲帝，則如兩君分域而處，其政教號令，  
亦不相屬，何以歲序功成百物哉。

且至尊之爲帝，卽一爲至尊，二卽爲次尊，可以  
序進而較，猶爲失尊，夫上帝之懸乎百神，其視  
大臣相去人主，尙不啻千萬也。

“The things used at the two sacrifices are different; the places where they are performed are also different; but the service is not different. How is it then that the service is performed on the two occasions? The ceremonies are regulated by the different services rendered by the two objects, and thanks given accordingly. The high and bright heaven covers us above; we receive its light and shelter;—this is the manifestation of what *Shang-Te* does for us, given by the heavens. The deep and broad earth supports all on it; we enjoy the beautiful advantages which it yields;—this is the manifestation of what *Shang-Te* does for us, given by the earth. Thus, in the celestial sacrifice, thanks are given to *Shang-Te* for His creation of heaven, and in the terrestrial sacrifice, thanks are given for the creation of the earth.

“Grain is the production of the earth. Now, the former kings prayed for grain at the celestial sacrifice, and not from the Empress earth, which makes it clear that in the celestial and terrestrial sacrifices the service is equally to *Shang-Te*. Therefore all living men ought to serve *Shang-Te*, and the Emperor on their behalf serves Him by these two sacrifices. No one below the highest can serve *Te* with these ceremonies, but every man can serve Him with his body and his heart, as he sacrifices to his parents. If it be doubted, that because the celestial and terrestrial sacrifices are different, there are different beings served by them, then, because the seasonal sacrifices of the ancestral temple are different, it may be doubted whether there are not different sets of parents.”

則郊社之禮所用之物異所行之地異而所以事之則不異也然既郊事之而又於社事之何也蓋各就其功用昭明之處而加禮以報焉高明上覆我得以蒙其光焯者上帝功用之著於天者也沉厚下載我得以享其美利者上帝功用之著於地者也則郊以答生天之德而社以答生地之德也

今夫穀者地之產也而先王祈穀於郊不祈於后土則郊社之統爲事上帝也明矣是故生人皆當事帝而天子則以郊社之禮代人事帝太上而降不得用享之禮以事帝而各得以其身心事帝猶祀親也若因郊社不同而疑所事有異亦可因禴祀蒸嘗其禮不同而疑所事有二親哉

## CHAPTER II.

THAT ELOHIM AND GOD ARE RELATIVE TERMS. FURTHER PROOF THAT THE SHANG-TE PAR EXCELLENCE OF THE CHINESE IS THE TRUE GOD.

In the preceding chapter, I have endeavoured to show that the question, "Do the Chinese know the true God?" should be answered in the affirmative. If it shall be thought that I have made good my point, most people will be inclined to say, that in speaking to the Chinese of God, and in translating the Scriptures into their language, we ought to use that term for the Divine name, by which they themselves speak and write of Him. There are some, however, who object to such a conclusion, and among them Dr. Boone. He requires that the name *God* be rendered by "an absolute"—"an absolute generic appellative"—term, and though I may have proved to his satisfaction, that the Being whom the Chinese designate by the name *Shang-Te* is to be regarded as truly and properly God, he will still object to the use of it to translate *Elohim* and *Theos*.

On the other hand, if the evidence that has been adduced shall make a much slighter impression upon him and others than it does upon myself, and they continue to deny that *Shang-Te* is the true God, I will still maintain that the phrase is the best which the Chinese language affords, whereby to render *Elohim* and *Theos*, and that, for the very reason advanced against it—because, namely, it is a relative, and not an "absolute generic appellative" term, and it denotes a relation the very same that is denoted by the Hebrew *Elohim*, and by our word *God*.

Dr. Boone allows, that if my view of the original terms be correct, then his conclusion in favour of rendering them by *shin* is invalidated. I allow, that if his view of them be correct, then my conclusion in favour of rendering them by *Shang-Te* is invalidated. The discussion, therefore, to which I now proceed is of peculiar importance. No knowledge of Chinese is required to pronounce upon its merits. It is granted on the one side, that *shin* is an absolute generic term. It is granted on the other, that the name *Shang-Te* is relative. In order to give judgment *against* the one term or the other, it is only necessary to decide concerning *Elohim* and *Theos*, or our English word, *God*. Are they absolute generic terms? Then, though it may not be right to render them by *shin*, *it must be wrong to do so by Shang-Te*. Are they relative terms? Then, though there may be a better expression for them in Chinese than *Shang-Te*, *it must be wrong to employ shin*.

Dr. Boone holds that *God* (for I need not encumber the style by always enumerating *Elohim* and *Theos*) is a "generic absolute appellative" term. (Def. p. 66.) I hold that it is a relative term;—and hereupon issue is joined.

It will simplify the question to omit the word appellative from Dr. Boone's statement. A relative may be called appellative as much as a generic term. We are agreed on this point. An appellative term is only another name for a common term. Whately says—"When any one object is considered as to its nature and character only, as being *of such a description* as might equally apply to other single objects, the inadequate or incomplete view thus taken of an individual is expressed by a common term; as 'tree,' 'city,' 'minister-of-state.'"<sup>1</sup> Of the examples here given, it will not be denied that "tree" is a generic term, and "minister-of-state" a relative; but they are both adduced as instances of common or appellative terms.

Throwing away, then, the word appellative, there remains the description of the term in dispute as being "generic absolute," opposed to the assertion that it is "relative." I shall take, first, the former element in Dr. Boone's account of it, and state why I deny that *God* is a generic term.

By generic terms are understood the names of genera or classes. They comprise many individuals—it may be, many different species—under them. The common name may be given to every individual. No one has more or less a right to it than every other. There is the word "dog." There are hundreds of thousands of the animal commonly known by that name, and in Natural History, it includes also the Wolf, the Jackal, the Fox, &c. Every individual of all the different kinds of dogs, and of all the animals contained in those various tribes, may be designated, *with the same truth and propriety*, by the generic term. There is again the word "Tree." To what an immense variety of species, and to what an incalculable number of individuals, may it be applied! It is impossible to single out any one—let it be the noblest oak of England, or the oldest cedar of Lebanon—and say that to it alone the name *tree* belongs. The word, being generic, necessarily implies the existence of many individuals, *equally contemplated by the mind* as partaking of the nature or attributes which it indicates or connotes. I ask, is the name *God* such a generic term? Is there a multitude of beings participating the same nature and attributes, to all of whom it equally belongs? Reason and religion, with concurrent voice, reply in the negative—"There is but one only, the living and true God."

But, since this is the case, how is it that we speak of gods as a class—that we have the gods of Greece, the gods of Rome, &c.? Dr. Boone, in order to clear this up, dwells on the distinction of the word as used *properly* and *improperly*. "There is *in nature*," he observes, "but one God, and the plurality exists only in the *imagination* of polytheists; the word *God*, when employed in a *proper* sense, designates Jehovah alone, and the genus is an improper one, whose existence is entirely owing to the false views of

<sup>1</sup> Elements of Logic, Book II., chap. v., § I.

polytheists." (Def. p. 45.) I will not stop to offer any objection to this representation, but in the sentence which follows it, there is an assumption which I must regard as greatly misleading, and I beg to call attention to it, because an issue upon it will go far to determine the issue on the whole subject in hand. Dr. Boone says—"Whether the beings designated be real or imaginary, cannot, I conceive, alter the *character* of the word, which is the common name of the class." Now, the case is by no means what it is here assumed to be. If *all* the beings were real, or *all* imaginary, I grant that the difference of existence and non-existence would not affect the character of the common name. But the fact is that *one* God is real, and all the others are imaginary. If they were all real, the name God would be like the generic term "tree," belonging with the same propriety to every individual in the genus. If they were all imaginary, the word would be like the generic term "fairy," belonging with the same propriety to every individual in that class of fancy's creation. But as the case actually is, the term is not generic. Properly belonging only to one Being, how can the applying it to others alter its real character, its essential nature? How can we with a generic term—a "generic absolute" term—deny the existence of the genus which it denotes? As well, and as truly, it appears to me, we might say that six and five are nine.

How, then, do I account myself for the fact of the general application of the word? This question will require that I state, in the first place, the ground on which I maintain that it is a relative term, and not an absolute. Now, on the question whether *God* be absolute or relative, Dr. Boone quotes against me the account of such terms given by Archbishop Whately, and by that account I am willing to abide. Whately says—"When any object is considered as a part of a whole, viewed in reference to the whole, or to another part, of a more complex object of thought, the name expressing this view is called *Relative*: and to Relative-term is opposed *Absolute*; as denoting an object considered as a whole, and without reference to anything of which it is a part, or to any other part distinguished from it. Thus 'Father,' and 'Son,' 'Rider,' 'Commander,' &c., are Relatives; being regarded, each as a part of the complex object, Father-and-Son, &c.; the same object designated *absolutely*, would be termed a Man, Living-Being, &c."<sup>1</sup> To illustrate further the distinction thus laid down—When I speak of "a tree," I have in my mind the idea of an object *independent*—a being existing by itself as a whole, without reference to any other being. On the contrary, the word "Father" calls up the idea of an object *related*—a being connected with other beings, and receiving the particular designation in consequence of that connection. Let the word into which we are in-

<sup>1</sup> Elements of Logic, Book II., chap. v., § I.

quiring he subjected to the test of this definition. I question my own consciousness about it. It tells me that when I think of the Supreme Being as *JEHOVAH*, then He is present to my mind as *absolute*, as He is in Himself, considered as a whole, without reference to anything of which He is a part, but when I think of Him as *GOD*, then He is before my mind, as *related* to all other beings—the one Being in whom they live and move and have their being—with whom they (myself among them) have to do. Such to me is the result of the appeal to consciousness, and I shall only show further that my judgment is supported by the analogy of language in general, and by the concurrence of very high authorities. Its truth will thus be guaranteed by the tacit—yet certain—witness of all men, and by the explicit witness of many of the first of men.

I. I maintain that the view of *God* as a relative term is supported by the analogy of language. The usage of *God* is according to the usage of relative terms; it is opposed to the usage of absolute and generic terms.

Whately observes—"When any object is considered according to its *actual existence*, as numerically *one*, the name denoting it is called *singular*; as, 'this tree,' 'the city of London, &c.'"<sup>1</sup> The expressions, "this tree," and "the city of London," are singular terms; they denote objects, numerically *one*. But "tree" and "city" are themselves generic nouns. To make them denote individuals—to single out *one* tree, and *one* city from their respective classes—there are required—in the one case, the demonstrative pronoun, "this," and in the other, the definitive description, "of London." No generic term, without being circumscribed in this way, can be used as a singular term—to denote, that is, *one* being. A relative term need not be limited by any such contrivance. It may stand absolutely, or in apposition with another noun, as the representative of a single individual. We may say for instance, "Father is calling you," "Master orders you to come," "Queen Victoria is beloved," "King John signed the Great Charter," "General Washington obliged Lord Cornwallis to surrender at York-town." Absolute generic terms cannot be employed in the same manner. Language will not admit of such expressions as, "Tree waves its branches," "River rolls its waters to the sea," "Man John was base," "Horse Bucephalus was subdued by Alexander." It is not difficult to account for this difference of construction. It springs from the essentially different nature of the two classes of words. A generic noun belongs to many. It cannot be given to one without the help of a restrictive term or phrase. But a relative term may have in itself a definitive restrictive force. There can be but one father in a family, one master in a household, one sovereign in a nation. The relation which those terms denote, sufficiently limits them of itself. One son

<sup>1</sup> Elements of Logic, Book II., chap. v., § 1.

does not need to point out his father to another by means of "my," or "our," or "this," or "that," or "the." The name alone designates the one individual. Now *Elohim*, and *God*, agree with this usage of relative terms. We open our English and Hebrew Bibles, and the first verse declares to us, "*Elohim—God—made the heavens and the earth.*" The word reclaims against being classed among generic terms, and demands that we regard it as relative.

Nothing could be plainer to my own mind than this point of grammar, and nothing more conclusive than the application of it to the question, which so painfully divides missionaries on the translation of the Scriptures into Chinese. It is necessary, however, to dwell upon it at length, for Dr. Boone has endeavoured to contest both the facts and their bearing on the controversy between us, with an earnestness which shows how truly he avows that it is incompatible with his own opposite opinion.

First, He fails to see clearly the *facts*—the actual usage—on the ground of which I contend for the relative classification of the term. Quoting from some writer on Grammar, he says—"Proper nouns designate beings in a definite manner, so that there is no need of any sign to point out the particular individuals to which they are applied. *Appellative nouns*" (relative or absolute) "on the contrary, being common to all the individuals of the same species, when we wish to apply them to a single individual, or a certain number of individuals of this species, or lastly, to the whole species, it is of use to employ particular signs to indicate these various applications." (Def. p. 54.) The words "relative or absolute" in this last sentence are Dr. Boone's own, introduced by him to mark the applicability of the quotation to the subject in hand. His authority says that *appellative nouns* when applied to a single individual must have a particular sign attached to them. Now this is true—necessarily true—in the case of generic nouns. But it is *not necessarily true* in the case of relative nouns. The Grammarian probably had only generic nouns, properly so called, in view. Dr. Boone would make him be writing of relatives as well. Thus he misses the special point in debate, and overlooks the fact, that obliges us, I contend, to seek for a relative term by which to render the word *God*.

The same thing is very evident in his treatment of the peculiarity in the use of the word *man*. It is the grammatical rule, that "The definite article is used before a noun when it stands for a whole species made up of distinct individuals, as, The lion is the strongest of all animals."<sup>1</sup> The only exception to this rule is in the usage of the word *man*, which may be employed in a general sense without the article before it, as, "Man is born to trouble." It thus admits the same variety of use, *as to grammatical form*, that a rela-

<sup>1</sup> Allen and Cornwell's Grammar, p. 135.

tive noun admits—that is, it may stand, as the subject of a proposition, both in the singular and the plural, without the article, and also with either of the articles, the definite or the indefinite. Dr. Boone is surprised that this should not cause me “the slightest distrust of the value of my test.” I said—“It does not belong to our subject to explain how *man* if it be rightly called a generic term, differs from other similar terms in this grammatical use.” On this Dr. Boone observes—“With all deference to Dr. L., this is the very thing the subject did require him to explain, if he wished his readers to have any confidence in his proposed test, to ascertain whether a noun be appellative relative, or appellative absolute, *i. e.* generic.” (Def. p. 53.) Now, what is my proposed test? It is this—that a generic term cannot be made singular—cannot be applied, that is, to an object numerically one—without an article, or some other restrictive word or phrase. Here is *man*, used without any such word, in the singular, as the subject of a proposition—“*man is mortal.*”<sup>1</sup> If *man*, in this sentence, denoted an object numerically one—if it were a singular term—then I should be bound to explain the phenomenon, and if I could not do so, the value of my test would be destroyed. But as the case is, the peculiar usage of *man* does not clash at all with the test. If Dr. Boone will produce a *single example* in which a generic term, without definitive word or phrase, stands as a singular term, then he will have met my argument, and overthrown it. Until he does this, I must hold the fact of the grammatical usage of *Elohim* and *God* as singular terms to be demonstrative of their relative nature.

The same absence of discrimination is displayed by Dr. Boone, where he attempts to set aside the inference which I drew from an analysis and enumeration of all the cases in which *Elohim* is used in the Old Testament. By such a process it was found that the word is used altogether 2,555 times.

<sup>1</sup> My saying in regard to *man*—“if it be rightly called a generic term,” seems so outrageous to Dr. Boone, that he indicates his astonishment by three points of admiration. I was certainly wrong in allowing the peculiarity of its grammatical use to raise a question in my mind of its being a proper generic term. But what is the solution of that peculiarity? There must be a solution of it. It is no solution to say—“use wills it so.” Why does use so will? The phenomena of language have their causes as truly as the phenomena of light.

There is the class of what Nordheimer calls *material* nouns—“The names of existences taken in their most extended sense, without respect to the form or organization, which confers individuality, as *corn, gold, water.*” These are used as the subject of a proposition, without the article—“*gold is heavy.*” When we say—“*man is mortal,*” we are thinking of the race in its most extended sense, and have no reference to the attributes which confer individuality on its component members. There is an analogous use of some names of the vegetable kingdom. We speak for instance of grasses, and yet may say—“*grass clothes the valleys,*” having in the mind the general idea of herbage. It appears to me that the usage of *man*, in the extended sense, without the article, is connected with an intuitive apprehension of the unity of the race—a conviction of the truth that God hath made of one blood all nations of men.

More than one-half these times it has a relative signification, apparent and undeniable. It is used 357 times with the definite article, and 722 times it occurs simply, as the subject or object of a proposition, without definitiveness of any sort. Dr. Boone observes :—

“ Before Dr. Legge expects us to lay any stress upon these numbers, he should have shown that the absolute name of a Being, or the absolute appellative name of a class of beings, can not be used ‘ with relative force apparent,’ as the word *Elohim* is in the O. T.; or else his numbers all go for nothing. In some languages, the phrases ‘ *my man*’ and ‘ *my woman*’ are used to designate the relationship of husband and wife (or, as it is commonly said in English, man and wife), and yet no one would question the fact that the word *man* in these languages was an absolute appellative noun.

“ Take another instance: Suppose a lady called her husband, or her son, ‘ *my Charles* ;’ and that upon reading a memoir of her, we should find that the phrase, ‘ *my Charles*,’ occurred 1,476 times, whereas the word *Charles* stood absolutely only 722 times: what would be thought of the inference that this word ‘ *Charles*’ was a mere relative term, which signified husband or son, the reader being left in doubt which was the definite relation indicated, as Dr. L. is with respect to the relation designated by the word *God*. Those who consider the word *God* as an absolute appellative noun, find no difficulty at all in accounting for the use of the word *God* in these 1,476 cases, where Dr. L. says it ‘ is used with relative force apparent ;’ for the Being whose absolute name it is, stands in many relationships to us, several of which relationships (it is worthy of remark) and not *one* only, this word is used to designate.” (Def. pp. 159, 160.)

Let me beg the reader to mark carefully the manner in which Dr. Boone here deals with the argument before him. We are inquiring into the grammatical class of a noun. Out of 2,555 instances of its occurrence 1,476 are produced, where it cannot have any other but a relative signification. May we infer from these instances that it is a relative term? He says—“ No; it must first be shown that a generic term cannot be so used,” and to show that a generic term is susceptible of such a usage, he adduces from “ some languages ”—he does not say what—a solitary example, “ *my man*,” and “ *my woman*,” used for husband and wife. Those phrases in English are slang. What are the languages where they are anything else? But Dr. Boone adduces a different instance to set aside the inference. He travels into the region of proper names, and says, “ A lady may call her son or her husband *my Charles*. Is *Charles* therefore a relative noun?” No;—because “ *my Charles* ” is an elliptical expression, the relative word son or husband, as the case may be, being understood, and moreover the history of a lady which contained 1,476 appellations, whether of her son or husband, as “ *my Charles*,” would be a very tiresome book. Dr. Boone does not believe himself that “ *my Charles* ” and “ *my God* ” are grammatically analogous expressions;—why then distract the attention by the comparison of them? And why does he say nothing of the other cases. There are 722 instances in which *Elohim* is used absolutely as in the first verse of Genesis. Could he not find any example of a generic noun so used? When he can do so, let it be produced. Even his “ *man* ” and “ *woman* ” have the restrictive “ *my* ” before them, to make them singular terms. There remain 357

cases in which *Elohim* is used with the definite article, and conveys the same meaning as when it stands simply alone. In this usage likewise, there is an accordance with the analogy of acknowledged relative nouns, while neither generic words nor proper names can be so employed. Dr. Boone, indeed, takes no notice of them. They are there, however, in the Bible. He says that "those who consider the word God as an absolute appellative noun find no difficulty at all in accounting for the 1,476 cases," where it is used with relative force apparent. I am not surprised at his finding the solution of them so easy, when he is satisfied with such analogies as "my man," "my woman," "my Charles." It would have been gratifying had he illustrated the other 1,079 cases, *even by examples of a similar nature*. After all that he has said, and all that he has *not* said, I must profess my deepened conviction, that the grammatical usage of *Elohim* and *God* proves them to be relative nouns.

But Secondly, Dr. Boone endeavours to disprove the bearing of the facts concerning the usage of *Elohim* and *God* on the controversy in hand. He observes:—

"If Dr. L. replies, 'Some relative terms are similarly construed,' *i. e.* either with or without the article; that is the reason why we must have a relative appellative: our answer is, In Chinese there is no article; in this respect there is no difference between *Shángtí* and *Shin*; and in English, his favourite phrase and the word *God*, tried by this test, can not be reconciled: he can not with 'grammatical propriety' say, 'Supremé Ruler made the world.'"—(Def. p. 165.)

In this passage, the objection to my demand for a relative term to translate *Elohim* and *Theos* is rested on two grounds. It is said first, that in Chinese there is no article, from which circumstance Dr. Boone infers that a generic term will do as well to render them as a relative. The argument thrown into a syllogistic form is this—Generic terms require an article or some other definitive word in order that they may designate one individual, or become singular terms. But the Chinese language has no article. Therefore in the Chinese language there is no difference between a generic term and a relative. The fact, however, is, that between these two classes of nouns there is the same difference in Chinese that there is in every other language. The value of Dr. Boone's assertion may be tested in another way. The Latin language is in the same predicament as the Chinese with regard to articles. Can a generic name in Latin be used absolutely as a singular term? Can it be employed to deny the genus which it denotes? It cannot, but a relative noun in Latin may stand just as in Hebrew or English, without any restrictive particle or description, as a singular term, denoting one individual.

The other ground on which Dr. Boone objects to my demand is, that in English, my favourite phrase and the word *God*, tried by the test which I propose, cannot be reconciled. "*Shang-Te*," when rendered into English, is

“the Supreme Ruler” and not “Supreme Ruler.” My reply to this is that *Shang-Te* is a singular term. If I translate it *ad sensum*, I render it *God*, and when I translate it *ad literam*, I render it “The Supreme Ruler.” The idea is the same, in which ever way the phrase is translated, just as *Elohim* and *Ha-Elohim* convey the same idea, and our English translators, in rendering them, almost always neglected to mark the article in the second form. I submit that neither of Dr. Boone’s objections are of avail to disprove the bearing of the facts concerning the usage of *Elohim* and *God* on the question before us. Those facts show that they are relative terms, and when Dr. Boone and others by means of the generic *shin* would teach the Chinese that there is only one God, they labour as men, “beating the air.” They might as well preach to them that there is only one man, or that a part is greater than the whole—yea, that a part implies the non-existence of the whole to which it belongs.

II. In my judgment that *God* is a relative term, I am supported by very high authorities. This circumstance cannot of course, settle the point that it is really such a term, but it is of importance to exhibit it, and the more so because Dr. Boone has represented the view which I hold as contrary to orthodox doctrine. The fact is, that Athanasius, Calvin, and a thousand others, pillars of the truth, are much more with me than with him.

A considerable portion of his Defense is occupied with quotations from Creeds and Confessions to the effect that there is “one certain nature, and Divine power, which we call God”—with all of which I cordially agree. I stated, in the Introduction, that a relative word implies the existence of a being sustaining the relation which it denotes. Relative nouns are concrete no less than generic nouns. Whately says, “When the notion derived from the view taken of any object is expressed with a reference to, or as in conjunction with, the object that furnished the notion, it is expressed by a concrete term.” All Dr. Boone’s citations, therefore, to show that orthodox men hold that there is a Divine essence are nothing to the purpose, and when he speaks again and again of “a mere relative term,” he has recourse to a *ruse de guerre*, of the same kind as the assumption that he has all orthodoxy on his side. “A mere relative term” would be—I know not what; a house without a foundation, a tree without a root, a stream without a fountain, a child without a parent. If I were to speak of a “mere generic term,” I might do so with reason, for the notion expressed by it is only a very inadequate notion of every individual comprehended in the class. Moreover, there is no *essence* corresponding to a generic term. It was the foolish fancy of the Realists to hold that universals are realities. Only individual terms have really existing *things* corresponding to them. As many individuals as there are in a class, so many essences are there, so that if *God* be a generic term, then every being so called really exists, and Jehovah

is merely one of many, whereas He has said, "I am God alone, and besides Me, there is none else." I have said, indeed, that "God does not indicate the essence, nor express anything about the being of Jehovah," and I adhere to the assertion. Of what nature the Being God is; what are the peculiarities of His essence; what is the mode of His being; *qualis est in se*;—if we would learn these things, we shall in vain interrogate the trigram itself. Our search must be among the treasures of knowledge concerning God, that are deposited in His word and works. To use the language of the late Dr. Chalmers—"By a fundamental law of the human understanding, we believe in a substratum for the Deity, a substratum for man, a substratum for the universe, but we cannot for our lives imagine, what more we know of them than that they barely exist, nor how it is that these three bare entities can be turned like geometrical definitions into the germs of reasoning."<sup>1</sup>

Among the authorities who support the view that God is a relative term, a chief place is due to the Jews, who, with unanimous voice, I may venture to say, testify that *Elohim* is spoken of God as a Judge and powerful Ruler. "They tell us of their own accord," says Calvin, "that the other names of God are nothing more than epithets, and that Jehovah alone is a name of substance, to express His essence."<sup>2</sup> Dr. Boone, however, may say that the Jews are prevented by their view of *Elohim* from coming over to the orthodox Christian faith. I shall therefore put forward on my behalf a few theologians of note.

Bishop HORSLEY did good service to the cause of truth, during the latter part of the last century, by his various critical labours, and especially by his controversy with the Socinian, Dr. Priestley. He says—"In general, it is very obvious that the word *Elohim* is expressive of relation. Another, but only one other of the divine names, namely, *El*, occasionally expresses relation. But it is only occasionally and rarely that *El* is so used. Whereas *Elohim*, as a name of the true God, is so constantly used as a term of relation, that it is reasonable to think the idea is involved in the very meaning of the word. It is not, however, expressive of a relation between equals; nor is it an appellation for both parties in common, in the relation it denotes. It is the name of the superior party. The superiority is evidently the most absolute; the dependence on the side of the other party the most complete and entire." Having unfolded his own view—that the relation denoted by *Elohim* is "that in which the donation of life and well-being is implied, and the perpetuity of that donation," he subjoins—"It should seem that Abarbanel, however absurd his etymology of the word may

<sup>1</sup> Article on Morell's History of Philosophy, in the North British Review.

<sup>2</sup> Institut. Lib. I., cap. XIII., § IX.

be, has given the true sense of the word, when he says that as the word 'Jehovah' is to be expounded of the Divine essence in itself, Elohim on the other hand is to be understood in relation to external things; that it is a name of God with respect to effect, production, creation, and influence upon all things in the universe, which receive from God their being, are maintained by Him in a state of well-being, and in the vigour of their respective natures."<sup>1</sup>

No English author has written better, theologically, upon the Attributes of God, than Dr. CHARNOCK. The original editors of his elaborate work upon the subject, say that it contains "no one material thing in which he may justly be called heterodox," and that "he sets himself industriously against some errors, especially the Socinian, and cuts the very sinews of them." His first discourse is "Upon the existence of God," from the text, Psalms xiv. 1, "The fool hath said in his heart, 'There is no God,' &c." On this expression of the fool, he gives the Chaldee version, "*non potestas Domini*," adding—" 'Tis not *Jehovah*, which name signifies the essence of God, as the Prime and Supreme Being, but *Eloahia*, which name signifies the Providence of God, God as a Rector and Judge."

Dr. Boone quotes MATTHEW HENRY against me, but on this verse of the 14th Psalm, that happy commentator observes—" *There is no God*; he is an atheist. There is no *Elohim*, no Judge or Governor of the world, no Providence presiding over the affairs of men. They cannot doubt of the being of God, but will question his dominion."

I quoted CALVIN as agreeing with me about the character of the word, but Dr. Boone says that I am mistaken in attributing such a view to the great Reformer. I have in consequence examined several of Calvin's writings with care, and must reiterate the statement, that his view of the term *Elohim* is entirely according with that which I advocate. No language can be more explicit than the following observations upon the description of God, in Exodus xxxiv. 6, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, &c.:"—

<sup>1</sup> Biblical Criticism, vol. i., pp. 24, 26. The passage by which Bishop Horsley is led to conclude that the exact relation denoted by Elohim implies the gift and perpetuating of life and well-being, is that where our Saviour reasons with the Sadducees to prove the continued existence and future resurrection of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He said, "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." I am not concerned with Bishop Horsley's interpretation of the relation, but the argument of our Saviour is built on the relative nature of the name God. There are two parties in a relation. Wherever it actually exists, *the existence of the two parties is implied*. The Sadducees allowed the existence of God: how then could they deny the continued existence of the patriarchs? I speak it with reverence, but it seems to me, that in the *argument* of Christ, there is the highest possible confirmation of the view that Elohim, Theos, and God are relative terms.

“ Let us observe that His eternity and self-existence are predicated, in that magnificent name twice repeated (*Jehovah*, the LORD), and thereafter there are enumerated His *virtues*, by which He is described to us, *not as He is in Himself*, but as He is *towards us*, so that our knowing of Him may be with a lively sense rather than with an empty and dazzling speculation. We hear, however, the same virtues enumerated here, which we have observed to shine forth in heaven and earth ; clemency, goodness, compassion, justice, judgment, and truth. For *virtue and power are contained in the title Elohim.*”<sup>1</sup> Dr. Boone quotes two passages from Calvin to support his assertion, one from his commentary on John I. 1, to the effect that since the Word is called God, we have no right to question *his divine essence*, but I see nothing in that inconsistent with his view of *Elohim* as expressed above. The other passage is from the 13th chapter of the 1st book of the Institutes, where Calvin says that, “ the word was always God, and afterwards the maker of the world.” His argument is that the word always was partaker of the nature of *Jehovah*, and if Dr. Boone had only read on, half a page farther, to the middle of the next paragraph, he would have found the words which I have quoted on the 83d page, about the distinction which the Jews themselves make between *Jehovah* and the other names applied to the Supreme Being. On the expression, “ that which may be known of God,” in the first chapter of the Romans, Calvin says, “ They are mad, who desire to know what God is,” and proceeds to show that it is only a relative knowledge which we can have of Him, by means of His works. If Dr. Boone had been careful to collate different portions of the Reformer’s writings, he would not have charged me with mistaking his views on the question in dispute between us.

The same precaution would have prevented him from appealing in confirmation of his own sentiments to the more modern Theologian, KNAPP. That writer says, “ The best definition of God—the one, in which all the others are comprehended is the following. God is the most perfect being, and is the cause of all other beings.” Now, this is a definition of the Supreme Being intended to comprehend the results of *all* inquiries con-

<sup>1</sup> Instit. Lib. I., cap. x., § II. In the Hebrew, the text runs, *Yehova, Yehova El*, not *Elohim*. Calvin, no doubt, regarded *El* and *Elohim* as synonymous. I beg the indulgence of the reader for quoting the two following sentences from a sermon, written on the above text, as a College exercise, in 1837 or 1838. “ By the name *Jehovah*, we are led to think of the Divine Being as the self-existent One, of whom and through whom and to whom are all things—as He who is, and who was, and who is to come—eternal, having no beginning, everlasting, having no end. By the name God, we are led to think of the Divine Being, as a ruler and governor, sustaining the creatures which He has made, and dealing with them according to rule and law.” It was impossible, that holding this view of *El* and *Elohim*, I should long abide by the first lessons which I received in Chinese, that their proper representative in that language was the term *shin*.

cerning His nature and attributes, but the explanations subjoined to it show clearly that our first knowledge of God is relative, and the account subsequently given by him of *Elohim*, shows that he regarded that term as relative. "The first clause of this definition," we read, "is comprehensive of all the particular attributes by which God is distinguished from other beings, such as eternity, necessity, independence, freedom and perfection of will, &c. The second clause of the definition is added, because the contemplation of all other beings, the aggregate of which is the world, facilitates the knowledge of the most perfect being, by rendering it obvious that no other beings possess all the perfections, which are united in him. In this view, God is regarded not only as he is in himself, but *also in relation to other existing things*.—The first clause of the definition, however intelligible it may be to the learned, who are accustomed to abstract ideas, is too transcendental and metaphysical for uneducated people. And as the principal part of our knowledge of God is derived from the contemplation of the natural world, and the conclusions to which we arrive from this contemplation, the second clause of this definition will be far more generally intelligible than the first. In popular instruction, we should therefore define God to be the creator, preserver, and governor of all things; *for we always conceive of God principally in relation to ourselves, and the world around us, and without the contemplation of the world, we should never have come to the knowledge of God, as the most perfect being; so that the first part of the definition is a consequence of the last.*" When Knapp comes to treat of the Scriptural names of God, the most perfect being, he gives first *Eloah* as signifying "*Augustus*, the one to be revered." From the etymology on which he founds that signification, I am compelled to dissent, but certainly the being revered implies reverers, and *Eloah* and *Elohim* would denote the Supreme Being in that relation to his creatures which demands their worship. *Eloah* and *Elohim* by their intrinsic meaning call up the Being of God in connection with the world, and not absolutely. This was Knapp's belief, and it is mine, but it is not Dr. Boone's, and why he should adduce such a writer to support his side of the question, I feel quite at a loss to understand.

I had endeavoured to fortify my own opinion as to the relative nature of the term *God* by the authority of SIR ISAAC NEWTON. He has stated expressly that "God is a relative term," and that "the word God everywhere means Lord." He has stated too, that by the word God he understood also a Being, Infinite, Almighty, Eternal, and the Creator. But what inconsistency is there between the two averments? Dr. Boone says that, "Newton does not say that this Infinite, Eternal, Being without this relation (of mastership) would not be God" (Def. p. 150);—it did not lie in Newton's way to say so in express terms, but Dr. Boone allows that it is "a just

consequence" of the view that God is a relative term, and it is chargeable on Newton, therefore, as truly as on myself.<sup>1</sup>

That Dr. Boone should adopt the following passage, in treating of the opinions of Newton, I confess occasions me some astonishment. He says:—

"In answer to the simple authority on which he relies—that of Sir Isaac Newton—I will take the liberty to quote a paragraph or two from a very clever and excellent review of the Doctor's "Argument," which was published in the *China Mail* of the 23d May, 1850. The Reviewer says, "The third fortification is 'the great authority of Newton.' The quotation from the Scholium of the Principia is in point, and seems to agree with the Doctor's view, but can not corroborate it. Newton, beyond the limits of abstract and natural science, becomes as another man. Does not the Doctor feel this in reading his conjectures respecting prophecy, and his tracts on 'those two noted corruptions of Scripture?' If he adhere to Newton in all these things, from the convictions of reason, will he not bring the great author to the same test here, according to the maxim quoted by himself, *non enim tam auctoritatis in disputando, quam rationis momenta querenda sunt?*"

"But is it not this philosopher's sole object to refute the doctrines of the Epicureans, who believed in the existence of inactive deities, and the Stoics and others who held to *anima mundi*? Newton is maintaining, we apprehend, a question of *facts*, and not of the *application of words*. He does not wish to prove that the term *God* is equivalent to the term *Lord*, but that *God* is the *Lord*, the universal Ruler over a dominion distinct from himself, which the ancient philosophers denied.

"Again; in the Scholium on his profound contemplations on the works of God, Sir Isaac naturally views the Infinite One as the God of nature, and not as the self-existent, prior to all secondary beings. A plurality of objects is necessary to constitute relation, but when God dwelt alone, He sustained no relations, and the term applied to Him in that state is not a relative. Newton says, 'a being without dominion however perfect, is not the Lord God;' but God he surely was without a creature and without a subject. If Newton had been writing a book of synonyms, he would not have defined the word *God* merely by *Lord*, and made the term relative because another title of the same being necessarily implies relation."

As to all that is advanced in the above remarks about Newton's refuting the doctrines of the Epicureans, and what *he would have done*, if he had been writing a book of synonyms, I have nothing to say. What Newton has done is what we have to do with. But surely it was unworthy of Bishop Boone to refer to his "conjectures respecting prophecy, and his tracts on these two noted corruptions of scripture." If either he or the original writer had looked into Newton's works, they would have found no *tracts* about "two noted corruptions," but a letter to a Friend, giving "an Historical Account of two notable corruptions of scripture." Let me inform Dr. Boone, that Newton's "observations on the Prophecies of Holy Writ" are

<sup>1</sup> There is an able account of Newton's views, and a carrying them out to their consequences, in Chambers' Universal Dictionary, article *God*. The writer remarks well, that "a distinction ought to be made between the name *God*, and the name of *God*. The name or word *God* in the Hebrew is *Eloah*, or in the plural *Elohim*. The name of *God* is *Jehovah*, but it is not this name that answers to the Greek *Theos*, Latin *Deus*, English *God*, &c. In reality, none of these languages have any proper name of God, as *Jehovah* is in the Hebrew."

less entitled to be called “ conjectures ” than nine-tenths of those which have been written on the same subject, and that the two notable corruptions of Scripture are I. John v. and part of the 7th and 8th verses, and the word *God* in I. Tim. III. 16. He knows very well that subsequent inquiries have confirmed Newton’s judgment on the former passage, so that it is now rejected as spurious from the best critical editions of the New Testament, and that authorities are about equally balanced as to the second passage.

I may be doing him an injustice, but I cannot help thinking that the paragraph found a place in the Defense, because it might be inferred from it that the cloven foot of heterodoxy was somehow hid under the notion that God was a relative term. He does me, however, the justice to admit—and really I feel grateful for the happiness which he expresses at the knowledge—that I stand out from all who have maintained that view, in making the unity of the Godhead to consist in oneness of substance. (Def. p. 152.) His acquaintance with theological writers where they had touched on the point was too limited. Calvin, Charnock, Horsley, all were sound in the faith—as sound as Dr. Boone could desire. It would be a very easy matter to make a large volume filled with authorities as to the relative nature of the word God—the authorities of individuals whose theological name is without reproach. Of all whom Dr. Boone has quoted as on his side, the only parties I am prepared to concede to him are Tertullian and Waterland. It does not appear from anything they say, that he has a better right to any of the others than to Henry, Calvin, and Knapp—not even to him whom he calls “ the noble defender of the orthodox faith,” Athanasius. But I leave this portion of the subject. Names good and great enough have been adduced to show at least, that we may safely maintain that God is a relative term, without exposing ourselves to the charge either of heresy or weakness. It is not on names, however, that I rest my case. The grounds for the conclusion have been distinctly stated, and it now only remains for me, before advancing another step in the general discussion, to collect together various special objections, which Dr. Boone has urged against its adoption.

*First*, He observes :—

“ Dr. Legge tells us very correctly, from Rees’ Cyclopædia, that relative words ‘ include a kind of opposition between them ; yet so as that *one* cannot be without the *other*.’ —Will Dr. Legge tell us then, what *that* is without which Jehovah could not be God? He answers on p. 5, its correlative is ‘ creatures.’ ‘ As soon as the first man was called into existence, Jehovah stood to him in the *relation* of God.’ Is the eternity of God one of the articles of Dr. Legge’s creed? If so, to be consistent with the view above expressed, he must maintain the eternity of the creation also. On p. 11, Dr. Legge quotes the principle of the Grecian philosophers, ‘ *ex nihilo nihilo fit.*’ However true this doctrine may be when applied to every ‘ material cause,’ does Dr. Legge regard it as true when applied to the efficient cause—to God? Does he deny a creation from nothing (*ex ovuk ontion*), so that there never was a time when God existed alone, before He had created anything?”

Now, the eternity of God is an article in my creed, and I am conscious of no necessity laid on me, by my view of the grammatical character of the name, to believe that matter was eternal also. The absolute name of God is Jehovah. He always was. He determined to create. He did create. He was then Creator and He was *Elohim* or *God*. *Jehovah* and *Elohim* denote the same Being, the one name leading our thoughts to Him, as He is in Himself, the other leading our thoughts to Him, as He is in relation to the universe, which He has made. By the one term and the other, you may predicate of Him eternity, omnipotence, and all His other attributes.

*Second*, Dr. Boone observes :—

“Dr. Legge confounds the *name* with the *being*. The Being we call *God* sustains numerous relations to us and to other beings, and when we wish to refer to these relations, we call him Creator, Ruler, Father, &c. ; but these relations are not implied in the name *God*, as he was God before these relations had any existence. And from this fact, that God sustains to us not one, but many relations, we derive an additional argument against the use of any relative term to render this word. Relative terms can *strictly* and *properly* be used to designate only a single relationship. Dr. Whately defines them as follows : ‘When any object is considered as a part of a whole, viewed in reference to the whole or to another part, of a more complex object of thought, the noun expressing this view is called *relative* ; and to *relative* noun is opposed *absolute*, as denoting an object considered as a whole : Thus ‘father’ and ‘son’ are relatives, being regarded each as a part of the *complex object* father-and-son ; the same object designated absolutely would be termed a *man*, &c.’

“This complex object of thought is changed in every new relation, so that if we have occasion to speak of several relations sustained by the same object, we must designate the subject of which we would predicate these relations, by its absolute name, the name by which we call ‘an object when considered *as a whole*,’ and not by the name of any of these relations. For instance, we may say, This man is my father, her husband, his uncle, &c., &c. ; he is a lawyer, merchant, European, Englishman, &c., &c. ; but we could not predicate all these several relationships of this same subject, if we designated him by the name of any one of these relations. We could not say, This father is a husband, uncle, lawyer, Englishman, &c. So here, I contend, we can not, as the rendering of the word *God*, use the name of any one of the relations he sustains to us (*e. g.* Supreme Ruler), because no relative term can be used to express all the various relations that God sustains to us and to his other creatures, as I have illustrated in the case of the word *man*. If Dr. L. should, therefore, succeed in proving to our satisfaction that the Being, whom the Chinese designate by the term *Shángtí*, is to be regarded as truly and properly God, I would still object, as I said above, to the use of this phrase to render *Elohim* and *Theos*, on the ground that *Shángtí* is a relative term, and not the absolute name of this Being.” (Def. pp. 67, 68.)

The argument here is, that by means of an absolute term many relations may be predicated of an individual, which cannot be done strictly and properly by means of a relative term. The reply to it is, that the assumption is quite wrong. Of course, only one relation is in any term, so to speak ;—that is, analyzing it etymologically, it will be found to express but one idea ; but it may be adopted as the basis of all other predicates concerning the individual denoted by it, and that in many cases *with much more propriety than his absolute name*. I do not see why we should not say—“This father

is a lawyer and an Englishman, and that father is a colonel and an American," as properly as—"This man is a lawyer, and that man is a Chinese." Any hardness in the former expressions arises from the nature of the sentences. It is not likely that two men could come before us as Fathers, to be distinguished by such predicates. Change the relative term; say "convict" instead of "father," and the expressions, "This convict was a house breaker; that convict was a lawyer and a forger," will not sound unnatural to the ear. Or change the restrictive word that makes the singular term, and instead of "This Father," say "My father," and may not a son say with the strictest propriety, "My father is an Englishman—my father is his uncle—my father was a merchant?" Not only are such expressions strictly proper, but it would be improper to employ in them the absolute term instead of the relative. What son would think of prefacing an account of his father with the statement, "The human being, who is my father?" Or let us suppose the case of two Frenchmen, discoursing of the glories of Buonaparte. They would not indicate him by his absolute name. They might make "*Napoleon*" the basis of their discourse, but with as much propriety, and I think more naturally, they would talk of "*The Emperor*."

The error which Dr. Boone charges on me, is the one rather into which, it appears to me, he falls himself. I confound, he says, "the *name* with the *being*." The reader must determine whether I do so. The name *Elohim* or *God* is, I have said, etymologically significant of one idea. It denotes the supreme ruler. Of Him Creation testifies, and the Scriptures utter their oracles. We are taught in this way, both what He is in Himself, and all the relations which He sustains to us, and the term, by the necessary association of ideas, becomes the representative of all this acquired knowledge. What the absolute name denotes, is in reality a very small matter. Dr. Boone imposes upon himself in this point by the loose manner in which he has been accustomed to refer to the opinions of other people. In the above paragraph, he speaks of the absolute name as that by which we call "an object considered *as a whole*,"—quoting from Whately, and italicizing the three last words to show the importance which he attaches to them. He holds evidently, that the absolute name expresses the Supreme Being, in the totality of his attributes,

"Full-orbed, with all his round of rays complete."

What is this but to confound the *being* with the *name*. *He barely gives one-half of Whately's account of absolute terms*. The whole is quoted on p. 76, above. "An object considered as a whole," is with the writer on Logic an object considered by itself, without a single relation, or reference to anything else. The words "as a whole" are not indicative of its comprehensiveness, but of its limitedness. They do not enlarge our view of the object, but they confine it.

Thirdly, Dr. Boone adduces against my view of *Elohim* some passages of Scripture, which he holds to be irreconcilable with it. He observes:—

“The Psalmist says, ‘O LORD, *before* the mountains were brought forth, or *ever* thou hadst formed the earth and the world; even *from* everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.’ Ps. xc. 2.—‘I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations; of old thou hast laid the foundation of the earth’ &c., &c. Ps. cii. 24. ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’ When the Evangelist tells us here that the Word ‘was God,’ does Dr. Legge understand him to say that the Word merely sustains a relationship to God the Father or to men?” (Def. p. 47.)

I cannot conceive for what purpose Dr. Boone capitalizes the words with which he makes the second verse of the 90th Psalm commence. The words *do not form a part of the verse in the Bible*. They belong to the first verse, which, rendered as literally as I can do it, is, “O Lord, a dwelling-place art Thou to us in generation and generation,” *i. e.* for ever and ever. The second verse is—“Before the mountains were brought forth, and Thou hadst formed the earth and the land, and from everlasting to everlasting, Thou God (*El*).” By connecting the two verses into one, Dr. Boone probably intended to indicate that the Psalmist was carrying on from the first to the second the same conception which was expressed in the commencing word, *O Lord*, and in writing that in capitals, he supposed it was *Yehova*, which is for the most part so rendered in our Bible. He falls into the same error of quotation, which I have had occasion already so frequently to point out. *The Hebrew word is not Yehova; it is Adon, a confessedly relative term, meaning Lord or Master.* By Dr. Boone’s own showing and selection of the example, we have the case of a *relative name*, adopted as a basis, on which to raise the highest predicates of the Supreme Being. With regard to the last words of the second verse, “Thou God,” it is to be observed that the original word is *El, meaning, confessedly, “the powerful,”* and as applied to God, a designation of Him, not as to His essence. We may translate the Hebrew—“Thou art God,” or “Thou art, O God.” This last is the rendering of Hengstenberg, whom I am sure Dr. Boone loves, as I hope I do, for the noble stand he has made against the heterodox and rationalists of the continent. He says, “If we take *El* as the predicate, the whole train of thought is destroyed.”<sup>1</sup>

The verse quoted from the 102d Psalm, has nothing, which I can see, to do with the subject in hand. Why might not *Eloah* stand in such a case as well as *Adon* in the 90th Psalm? But here again, we have in the Hebrew not *Eloah* or *Elohim*, but *El*.

The first verse of the Gospel of John is one to which Dr. Boone makes repeated appeal, and which he considers to be demonstrative of the incorrectness of the view that God is a relative term. “In the beginning,” says

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg on the Psalms, vol. iii. p. 124.

the Evangelist, "was the Word; and the Word was with God; and the Word was God." Now, I agree with Dr. Boone that this passage furnishes irrefragable proof of the Divinity of the Saviour;—and the clearness and force with which that all-important truth is evidenced by it, is not lessened by the relative signification which belongs to the term *Theos* or *God*. "The Word was in the beginning;"—respect is evidently had in the phraseology to the first verse of Genesis. When the world began, then the Word was. "And the Word was with God;"—in a union the most intimate and complete, in-so-much that "He was God"—no other being, but God himself, even He of whom it is said in the first verse of Genesis, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." The second verse of the Gospel tells us that "all things were created by Him"—*i. e.* the Word, making it still more plain that the Evangelist, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, had in his mind the account in Genesis, and that it was his design to teach, that the Word of whose incarnation and discourses and death upon earth he was about to write, was the same Being, with the account of whose creation of the heavens and the earth the Old Testament Scriptures commenced. He does not say, "The word was possessed of the Divine nature." He says with majesty and sublimity equal to that which Longinus saw in the narrative of Moses—"The word was God." Being God, what nature could he have but that of God?

In connection with this text, Dr. Boone quotes a long array of names to prove that it predicates a Divine nature as belonging to the Word, and among them Calvin and Henry, whose view of *Elohim* has been presented above on the 84th and 85th pages. If it were worth while, it could be shown that others of his authorities held a similar opinion concerning its relative character. Between their doing so, and yet speaking *dogmatically* in the way they do, there is no contradiction, but an entire compatibility.

I have thus considered the three passages of Scripture, which Dr. Boone has adduced as subversive of my view of the term in dispute, and trust that it has been made to appear that instead of subverting it, they confirm it rather. Of the scriptural usage of *Elohim* and *Theos* I have said so much already in this chapter, that I will not detain the reader much longer on this part of our subject. In the few additional remarks which I have to make, I shall take for my ground-work, the following sentence;—"I wish," says Dr. Boone, "Dr. L. had mentioned the difficulties which he saw in the way of vindicating the name *God* to *Jehovah*, on the supposition that it is an absolute term, *i. e.* a word, indicating the essence, the being of *Jehovah*, (to use his own words,) for my mind cannot conceive any."

Now, I have given my reasons why I consider *Jehovah* as the absolute name of the Supreme Being, rather than *Elohim* or *God*. I cannot entertain, therefore, the supposition which Dr. Boone proposes.

Moreover, he contends that *God* is an absolute *generic* term. The term by which he renders it in Chinese—*shin*—is so. It belongs to God, and it belongs to every spiritual being in the universe. I have shown how it can never convey a singular declaration of God as numerically one, in any of the thousand cases where God (*proprie*) stands as the subject or object in a sentence. And when Jehovah says—“I am God alone,” and *God* in such a case is rendered by a generic absolute term, *the proposition is untrue*. He is a spirit, but He is not the only spirit. Dr. Boone and some of his friends have reclaimed against a charge advanced by some missionaries, that their rendering of *Elohim* and *Theos* by *shin* would make their version of the word of God “contemptible.” I do not use that term, but I must ask them to bear with me, when I tell them my solemn conviction, that *their rendering will make the word of God a book of untruth*. Do not let us talk or write about versions being “contemptible” as to style, or otherwise. The Bible ought to be well translated, but God may bless a version that has no pretensions to elegance of style or force of expression, provided that it convey the truth, just as He has often chosen “base things of the world, and things which are despised, to bring to nought things that are.” But if a version be against the truth—if it put words into Jehovah’s lips, which are not according to fact—what shall we say? It is in this point above all others that I feel straitened and distressed by the difference of opinion that separates me from Dr. Boone and others. This constitutes “a great gulf” between us. I dare not ask a Chinese to read a version of the scriptures where an absolute generic term is used for God. I could not listen to the teaching of missionaries, who were telling the heathen, as the words of Jehovah, what every intelligent man among them would instantly and rightly reject as false, unless he sat still in bewildered astonishment at the ignorance of the foreigners.

Lastly, I cannot conceive why Dr. Boone should be so anxious to have, as the representative of our word *God*, an absolute term. I had said:—

“Dr. Boone believes that the idea of a Divine nature lies in the word *God*. Now the nature of God is spiritual; ‘God is a Spirit,’ was the account given by God himself manifest in the flesh. *The peculiarity* by which God, as he is revealed to us in the Scriptures, is *distinguished from all other spiritual Beings* as to nature, is, that in his infinite and incomprehensible spiritual essence there exists a Trinity of Hypostases, or, as we term them in English, Persons. *Thus is the only divine nature*. And the idea does not lie in the word *God*.”

Dr. Boone represents this as “a very peculiar notion of what is meant by the divine nature,” and says, I might have mentioned Self-existence, Omnipotence, Omniscience, &c., as all entering into the constitution of it. He did not bear in mind that *I was speaking of God in the absolute*—of God, that is, according to Whately’s account, to which Dr. Boone makes his appeal, *considered in Himself*, as a whole, independent of all other beings,—

of God, prior to Creation, or by a mental effort, considered in abstraction from it. As such, prolonged reflection satisfies me that my account was correct. A similar idea is much more fully developed in an American work published in 1849, which I did not have the pleasure of perusing till the present year. The view which the writer gives of "God in the absolute," is so distinct and powerful, that I am happy to transfer it to my pages.

"Let us endeavour," says he, "to form the distinctest notion possible of God, as existing in Himself, and unrevealed. Then we shall understand the better what is necessary to reveal Him. Of course we mean, when we speak of God as unrevealed, to speak of Him anterior to His act of creation; for the worlds created are all outgoings from Himself, and in that view, revealments of Him. God unrevealed is God simply existing, as spirit, in Himself.

"Who, now, is God thus existing in Himself? Has He any external form, by which He may be figured or conceived? No. Is He a point without space—is He space without limit? Neither. Is His activity connected with any sort of motion? Certainly not; motion belongs to a finite creature ranging in the infinite. Is there any color, sound, sign, measure, by which He may be known? No. He dwells in eternal silence, without parts, above time. If, then, we can apprehend Him by nothing outward, let us consider, as we may without irreverence, things of a more interior quality in His being. Does He, then, act under the law of action and reaction, as we do? Never. This, in fact, is the very notion of absolute being and power, that it acts without reaction, requiring no supports, living between no contrasts or antagonisms. He simply is, which contains everything. Does He, then, reason? No; for to reason in the active sense, as deducing one thing from another, implies a want of knowledge. Does He, then, deliberate? No; for He sees all conclusions without deliberation, intuitively. Does He inquire? No; for He knows all things already. Does He remember? Never; for to remember is to call up what was out of mind, and nothing is out of mind. Does He believe? No; the virtue that He exercises is a virtue without faith, and radically distinct, in that view, from anything called virtue in us. Where, then, is God? by what searching shall we find Him out? by what sign is He to be known or conceived? Does He think? No, never, in any human sense of the term; for thought, with us, is only a finite activity under the law of succession and time; and besides this, we have no other conception of it. Has He new emotions rising up, which, if we could see them rise, would show us that He is? No; emotion, according to our human sense, is a mere jet of feeling—one feeling moving out just now into the foreground before others; and this can be true only of a finite nature. God, in such a sense, certainly has no emotions.

“What, then, shall we say; what conception form of God as simply existing in Himself, and as yet unrevealed? Only that He is the Absolute Being—the Infinite—the I Am that I am, giving no sign that He is, other than that He is.

‘A very unsatisfactory, unpleasant, insignificant, and practically untrue representation of God,’ you will say. Exactly so! that is the point I wish to be discovered.”<sup>1</sup>

“Exactly so”—and it is a word having this signification, or rather thus wanting signification, which Dr. Boone would be glad to introduce into the Chinese scriptures in the room of *Elohim* and *Theos*. If his wishes could be realized, his version of the Bible would be a phenomenon so wonderful, that the language of Grattan, extravagant and licentious in its original application, would barely be sufficient to characterize it—“an experiment, to set heaven and earth adrift from one another, and make God Almighty a tolerated alien in his own Creation,” yea, in his own Word.

Of God in the absolute we know nothing, but that He exists. He is, according to the view of Dr. Chalmers, that substratum for the Deity of Revelation and Creation, in which we believe by a fundamental law of our constitution. And Revelation assumes the acknowledgement of the existence of God by its readers. It does so, even where it is teaching its highest lessons concerning His nature, as in the declaration, “God is a spirit.” Thus it does not profess to give to men the idea of God, but to give fuller information concerning that idea, to correct the many perversions of it, into which men are prone to fall, to assert its grandeur and practical importance, and to make known especially “the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.” Reference is made in many places to the manner in which the idea of God is produced in the human mind, always implying that our knowledge of Him is relative, gained, that is, by the contemplation of His works, and reflection on the phenomena of nature and providence. One passage of this nature was quoted on p. 9,—a part of the address of Paul to the people of Lycaonia, to the effect that “God left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling

<sup>1</sup> The writer of this passage is Dr. Horace Bushnell. It will be found in his work entitled “God in Christ,” which led, I have been informed, to his being tried or examined by his ministerial peers, on a charge of heresy or something approaching to it. He was acquitted. His book must be very distasteful to all who would brand, or put to the sword, every one who cannot get round the h in pronouncing shibboleth. It is nevertheless a truly interesting work, though some of the writer’s conclusions appear to me unsatisfactory. His mind seems to have more subtilty than strength, and his habits of thinking to be speculative rather than logical. With his view of God in the absolute, unrevealed, as given above, I entirely agree. But does not Revelation teach us the Trinity of Hypostases, as in Jehovah, independent of all relation to His creatures? This Dr. Bushnell would deny.

our hearts with food and gladness." But a more remarkable passage is that in the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans, where the apostle argues the *guilt* of "the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it to them." How has God shown it to them? By a revelation of Himself in the absolute? No—but "the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and God-head." The knowledge of Him is gained relatively. Men's cognizance of Him is not direct and independent: it is by means of "the things that are made." Dr. Boone differs from me as to the interpretation of the 21st verse of this chapter—"When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God." But it cannot be explained so as to be inconsistent with the general argument of the apostle, which it would be, if after the reasoning which has been pointed out, he were to go on to speak of God in the absolute.

Believing now that it has been shown that our knowledge of God is relative, and, in harmony with that fact, that the name itself is a relative term, I proceed to set forth further proof that the *Shang-Te* of the Chinese is the true God. There are the sources of *our* idea of God. I propose to show that the same sources have led the Chinese to the idea and acknowledgment of *Shang-Te*. And to avoid unnecessary disputes, instead of presenting these in the first place in my own language, and according to my own conception of them, I shall avail myself of the account of them given in a recent work, "The Method of the Divine Government, by the Rev. James M'Cosh," which has been acknowledged by the most competent judges to be "distinguished for originality and soundness of thought."

"Though God," says this author, "is invisible to the bodily eye—though he is, as it were, behind a veil—yet the idea of his existence is pressed on the mind from a variety of quarters. Were it not so, the apprehension of, and belief in, a supernatural power or being would not be so universally entertained. The mind which refuses the light that comes from one region, is obliged to receive the light that comes from another quarter of the heaven and earth. It may be interesting to trace to its sources the most important conception, which the human mind can form.

"FIRST, THERE IS THE DESIGN EXHIBITED IN THE SEPARATE WORKS OF GOD.

"SECONDLY, THERE ARE THE RELATIONS WHICH THE PHYSICAL WORLD BEARS TO MAN, WHICH WE CALL THE PROVIDENTIAL ARRANGEMENTS OF THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT.

"THIRDLY, THERE IS THE HUMAN SOUL, WITH ITS CONSCIOUSNESS, ITS INTELLIGENCE, AND ITS BENIGN FEELINGS.

"FOURTHLY, THERE ARE THE MORAL QUALITIES OF MAN.

“Such seem to be the four natural sources from which the human mind derives its ideas of the Divine Being. Viewed separately, the arguments drawn from these sources are not all conclusive, or equally conclusive; one may be considered, perhaps, merely as suggestive, and another as confirmatory; one as a proof of the existence of God, and another as an illustration of the existence of certain attributes.

“Each class of objects furnishes its quota of evidence. The physical works of God give indications of power and skill. The providence of God exhibits a governing and controlling energy. Our spiritual natures lift us to the conception of a living, a personal, and spiritual God.”

The preceding arrangement of the sources of our idea of God cannot fail to approve itself to the reader, as exceedingly beautiful and complete. I shall now take the different parts in detail, and exhibit how akin to the reasonings of the writer have been the mental exercises of Chinese thinkers, and of the people in general.

The first source of our idea of God is the evidence of design in His separate material works. “An acquaintance,” the author writes, “with the depths or minutiae of science is not needful to enable mankind to appreciate this argument. Every person who has observed the springing of the grass and grain, and the budding of flowers, or who has taken but a passing survey of his own bodily frame, or of the motion of the heavenly bodies, has had the idea impressed upon his mind of reigning order and wisdom. There is nothing abstruse, complicated, or mysterious in the chain of reasoning, which leads us to believe in a supernatural intelligence, or rather in the single link which connects the works of God, and the worker. It is represented by Dr. Thomas Reid, as containing in its logical form two propositions—the major, that design may be traced from its effects, and the minor, that there are appearances of design in the universe.”<sup>1</sup>

Now, in the preceding chapter, many instances were adduced, in which the phenomena of nature are viewed by the Chinese in their connection with *Shang-Te* as their Cause. All existing things are regarded as His workmanship; all the series of causes and effects which nature continually exhibits are considered to be from Him, and under His control. There is the text from the Appendix to the *Yih-king*, about the goings forth of *Te*, which has been so often referred to, and is given at length on p. 15. The very lowest view that can be taken of it, is that it speaks of the upholding of all things, and in the following exposition of it by a writer who adopts that view, we have a fine example of the “rising from nature up to nature’s God.” “Heaven,” says he, “in producing and perfecting all things, and ruling and governing them, is called *Te*. All His movements—whether

<sup>1</sup> The Method of the Divine Government. Introduction, chap. I.

active or more silent—find a place in the arrangement of the diagrams. The first of these is the *Chin*, which embraces the goings forth of *Te*, when the energies of nature bud forth and are moved. To the *Chin* succeeds the *Seuen*, which embraces the adjustments of *Te*, when the energies of nature are equally diffused. The next diagram is the *Le*, where we see the manifestations of *Te*, when the energies of nature are active and vigorous. The next is the *Kwan*, where *Te* makes all things serviceable, and the energies of nature are employed in the growth and nurture of all productions. From *Kwan* we come to *T'uy*, in which *Te* has complacency and delight, and the energies of nature have a joyous harmony. Next is the *Keen*, embracing the strivings of *Te*, when the energies of nature seem to be contending together. Next is the *K'an*, when *Te* withdraws his power, and the energies of nature rest from their labours. Finally, there is the *Kan*, when there is no voice of *Te*, and yet He is very influential for the good (of men). At this point, the energies of nature have completed their productions, and they are re-collected to commence their work afresh. Thus from *Chin* to *Kan*, all the phenomena of the round year are embraced within the diagram arrangement.”<sup>1</sup>

All the phenomena of the year are indeed embraced in the arrangement, but they are exhibited in their connection with Him, of whom and through whom are all things. In the *Te-choo* edition of the *Yih-king*,<sup>2</sup> upon the same text, there are some expressions, more striking, perhaps, than any of the above:—“The spirit of *Te*, pervades all things, without being limited by space, and the transformation and production of things proceed according to a regular order, so that, by their issuings and revertings, we may

天之生成萬物而主宰之者謂之帝其出其入  
無不寓於卦位間彼位起於震其即帝之出氣  
機于此萌動乎繼以巽也其即帝之齊氣機于  
此均布乎次巽而離乃帝之相見于斯氣機之  
所宣著也次離而坤乃帝之致役于斯氣機之  
所長養也坤之後而兌是帝所悅之方氣機之  
交暢在茲矣兌之後爲乾是帝所戰之處氣機  
之搏擊在茲矣以至次坎于乾斯帝之歸藏于  
內氣機于是慰勞休息焉次艮于坎斯帝之不  
言所利氣機于是生克嗣續焉則起震迄艮而  
一歲之周不循環于卦之中乎

illustrate the issuings forth and revertings of *Te*. When we see things completing their termination, we know that it is *Te* who has managed that termination. When we see them effecting their commencement, we know that it is *Te* who has brought that commencement to pass."<sup>1</sup>

We saw that the Chinese believe in the agency of spiritual beings in the different departments of nature, but we saw also how those beings are recognized as the servants of *Shang-Te*. "The powers that be" are all ordained by Him. Another thing is deserving of remark—that, while recognizing the agency of inferior beings, in cases of importance and emergency, the Chinese rise away from them up to the Supreme Ruler Himself. There are spirits which preside over the grain, but the Emperor, every spring, at the great round altar, offers sacrifice to *Shang-Te*, as "the great Maker," and prays "that He will give happiness to the multitudinous people, by causing the five kinds of grain to grow, and conferring that which is the staff of all lands."<sup>2</sup> There are again spirits who preside over "the bright clouds, and the sweet rain," but in a time of drought, Emperor and people, feeling that vain is their help, raise their cry to heaven—to "*Te*, who alone can grant prosperity, sending the rain and the clouds, to cause the various grains to grow."<sup>3</sup>

But the argument from design is sometimes put very plainly and expressively. Dr. Medhurst has pointed out the following passage in the "General Mirror of Spirits and Genii:"—"The great Shun, observing the equable adjustment of the sun, moon, and planets, knew that there must be a Heavenly decree. Accordingly, having undertaken to perform the duties of the Emperor, and to take charge of all affairs, he sacrificed to heaven and earth at the round hillock, and announced the circumstances in which he had

<sup>1</sup> 帝之神運無方,物之化成有序,故以物之出入  
明帝之出入,即物之成終,而知帝之宰其終,即  
物之成始,而知帝之肇其始矣

<sup>2</sup> 嗣天子臣御名祇奏于皇天上帝,曰,候維啟蟄,  
農事將舉,爰以茲辰,敬祈洪造,謹率臣僚,以玉  
帛犧齊粢盛庶品,備斯明潔,恭祀上帝園丘,仰  
希垂鑒,錫福烝民,俾五穀以皆登,普萬方之咸  
賴

<sup>3</sup> 維帝降康雨,施雲行,登我黍稌

These characters may recall to the memory of some those lines in Watts' version of the 65th Psalm—

"When clouds distil in fruitful showers,

"The Author is divine."

undertaken the government. On that occasion, he looked above, and reflected—‘In this azure expanse of heaven, where the great ether is so bright and vast, how is it possible that there should be no Lord and Ruler, who presides over all decrees.’<sup>1</sup> He therefore thought of an exalted designation for this Being, and called Him ‘*Shang-Te*, dwelling in the bright heavens,’ and ‘The great *Te*, the Lord of heaven’—designations corresponding to that of ‘The Supreme Heaven!’” The same logical exercise of thought appears in the many passages where *Shang-Te* is called “The Former or Framer of all things,” and where it is said that “He made man as a potter makes an earthen vessel.” (See p. 30.) Sometimes we find the converse of such statements, and the necessity of design and ability in works of man is argued from the design and skill apparent in the works of nature. Yuen-mei, a writer of the present dynasty, says—“The making of poems is like the making of history. Three things are necessary to it—ability, learning, and discrimination, but of the three ability is the chief. *The Creator without ability could not have made all things.*”<sup>2</sup>

Thus much on the first source of our idea of God. The everchanging appearances of nature, we perceive, have led the Chinese to seek for the cause of them in a Being of power and wisdom, out of nature, and beyond it, its Author and Upholder. The equable adjustment of the heavenly bodies has led them to conceive of a Supreme Ruler, whose workmanship they are, and by whose decree they are sustained. All other beings are made by Him, and serve Him. Throughout the universe, there is not a living thing, and no single event, whose beginning and ending are not to be referred to His will.

The second source of our idea of God is “the relations which the physical world bears to man, which we call the providential arrangements of the Divine government.” “In observing these,” says Mr. McCosh, “the mind rises beyond mere isolated material objects and laws, and even beyond the relations between them, to contemplate the grand results in the dealings of God towards his creatures. *It is to this latter class of facts that the majority of mankind look rather than to the other.* An extended observation of

<sup>1</sup> 大舜見七政齊平，知天命攸在，遂攝行天子之事，整理庶務，祭天地於圜丘，類告攝政之由，因仰思蒼蒼者天，元氣昊然廣大，豈無主宰司命，擬上尊號曰昊天上帝，又曰天主大帝，適符上天之號。

<sup>2</sup> 作詩如作史也，才學識三者宜兼，而才爲尤先，造化無才，不能造萬物。

the nice adjustments in material objects requires a kind of microscopic eye and a habit of fixed attention, such as are not possessed by the great body of mankind, who look not so much to these as to prominent events cognizable by the senses, without any minute inspection, and which indeed force themselves upon the attention; the providential care of God, and the restraints of his government, being not so much isolated adaptations, as the grand results in their bearings upon mankind, to which these adaptations lead. The common mind, unaccustomed to dissection, can pursue the scientific argument and the observation on which it proceeds, but a very little way, but this other it can prosecute to a great length. Inquire into the ground of the belief in the existence of God, entertained by the working man or man of business, and you will probably find it not an ingenious inspection of his own frame, or of any material object, but an observation of the care which God takes of him, and of the judgments with which from time to time He visits the world. It is this more obvious observation, which falls in more readily with his habitual train of thought and feeling, and which comes home most powerfully to his heart and experience."

I have marked one of the sentences in the above paragraph with italics, because it seems to me to contain an important truth, in connection with the arguments of Natural Theology for the existence and attributes of God, and a truth which is strongly attested by the literature of the Chinese. The providential arrangements of the Divine government are one of its principal themes. God appears in it as the Ruler and Governor much more frequently than as the Artificer and wise Contriver. This is in interesting harmony with the reasoning of the philosophical writer. Were I to quote all the passages, asserting the rule of *Shang-Te*, which are to be found in the Classics, I should have to transfer to my pages a considerable portion both of the *Shoo-king* and the *She-king*. A very few examples will suffice, especially as many quotations introduced in the preceding chapter, directly assert a moral government of the world, administered by Him.

In the chapter of the *Shoo-king*, headed "Many Regions (*To Fang*)," we read:—"Te sent down calamities on the Hea dynasty. The ruler of Hea increased his luxury. He would not speak kindly to the people, and became utterly dissolute, and lost to all intelligence. He was unable for a single day to rouse himself to follow the path marked out by Te."<sup>1</sup> Illustrating this passage, a commentator, Wang Tseou, says,—“In the daily business of life, and the most common actions, we feel as it were an influence exerted on the intelligence and emotions of our hearts. Even the most

<sup>1</sup> 惟帝降格于夏,有夏誕厥逸,不言肯感于民,乃大淫昏,不克終日,勸于帝之迪

stupid are not without their gleams of light. This is the leading of *Te*, and there is no place, where it is not felt.”<sup>1</sup> The text and the comment set forth the wrath of God revealed from heaven against the unrighteousness of men, and yet only then revealed, when His spirit has striven long to lead them right.

In the section of the *She-king*, headed “The first month (*Ching Yue*),” we read:—“The people now feeling their jeopardy, look up to Heaven, as if it were regardless of them. But when the time of its determinations has arrived, no man will be able to overcome them. There is the Sovereign *Shang-Te!* Does He hate any one?”<sup>2</sup> This question of the writer may bring to our minds the one of Abraham, “Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” The commentator expounds the sentiment in the following way:—“The people feeling their jeopardy, bitterly cry out and tell their state to Heaven, and yet Heaven appears regardless, as if it would make no distinction between the good and the evil. But this happens only while the time of its determined action has not yet arrived. When that has arrived, there will not be one whom Heaven will not overcome. Is there any one whom Heaven hates that it should afflict him? Happiness to the good, misery to the bad—are settled essential principles.”<sup>3</sup> Let the reader observe the trust in the Divine government which this passage displays. Iniquity abounds. The innocent are suffering. The bad are exalted. Such are the phenomena that for a time disturb the mind. But “there is the Lord, *Shang-Te!*” In that assurance the mind may rest. *He* will arise, and vindicate the just.

In the section entitled “Great Brightness (*Tae Ming*),” we read the following address to king Woo, on the eve of his engaging the forces that were supporting the tyrannical rule of the last emperor of the Yin dynasty—“The multitudes of Yin are gathered like the leaves of a forest, as they are spread out there in Mō-yay. But we are full of spirits. *Shang-Te* is,

<sup>1</sup> 王氏樵曰，夫日用之間，常行之理，此心之靈，若或啟之，雖至愚之人，未嘗無一念之明，是帝之迪人，無往而不在也。

<sup>2</sup> 民今方殆，視天夢夢，既克有定，靡人弗勝，有皇上帝，伊誰云憎。

<sup>3</sup> 民今方危，殆疾痛號訴於天，而視天反夢夢然，若無意於分別善惡者，然此特值其未定之時。爾及其既定，則未有不為天所勝者也，夫天豈有所憎而禍之乎？福善禍淫，亦自然之理而已。

with you. Banish all doubt from your mind.”<sup>1</sup> This address is thus expanded in the commentary—“When king Woo was attacking Chow, the forces of the latter were collected, numerous as the leaves of a forest, to withstand him, and pitched in Mō-yay. Though Woo’s forces were all in high spirits with their enterprise, they were yet afraid lest his mind should be in anxiety on account of the comparative smallness of his army; therefore they animated him, saying, ‘*Shang-Te* is with you. Banish all hesitation from your mind.’”<sup>2</sup> This passage has always called up to my thoughts the words of the 20th Psalm—“Some trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will remember the name of the Lord our God.” The prayer of king Asa may also be compared with it—“LORD, it is nothing with thee to help, whether with many, or with them that have no power; help us, O LORD our God; for we rest on thee, and in thy name we go against this multitude. O LORD, thou art our God; let not man prevail against thee.” (2 Chron. xiv., 11.)

It is needless to quote additional passages. The declaration of the Governor of Fuh-keen, quoted on the 60th page, is borne out by all the literature, ancient and modern, of the empire—that “*Shang-Te* conveys to the Chinese mind, the idea of one Universal Ruler of the world.” What could be more akin to western modes of thinking—what could be more just—than the following reasoning as to His existence, quoted by Dr. Medhurst from the Dictionary called *Heae shing pin tsze tseen*?<sup>3</sup> “According to the Shoo-king, Heaven is without any private partialities, but favours the respectful; again, the decree of Heaven constituting any one Emperor is hardly to be relied upon, because it is not invariably secured to one family. Further, on those who do good, Heaven sends down a hundred blessings, and on those who do evil, it sends down a hundred calamities. Now, if in the midst of all, there was only this undistinguishing principle of order, and breath of nature, revolving round and round; and if there were no such thing as a perfectly spiritual and efficacious true Ruler,<sup>4</sup> then

<sup>1</sup> 殷商之旋其會如林矢於牧野維予侯興上帝  
臨女無貳爾心

<sup>2</sup> 此章言武王伐紂之時紂衆會集如林以拒武  
王而皆陳于牧野則維我之師爲有興起之勢  
耳然衆心猶恐武王以衆寡之不敵而有所疑  
也故勉之曰上帝臨女無貳爾心

<sup>3</sup> 諧聲品字箋

<sup>4</sup> 至靈之真宰

who is there to display these partialities and impartialities? And who is there respecting whom it can be said that His decree is hardly to be relied upon, and is not secured to any family, while he sends down blessings or calamities upon people? Is it not He, whom we call the great and majestic *Shang-Te*?<sup>1</sup> But we people, living daily under the Divine inspection, do not know how to cultivate our fear and caution, so as to dread the Majesty of Heaven. Whilst we dare, with our little cunning and selfish feelings, to contend against the Heaven of *Te*, are we not unreflecting in the extreme?"<sup>2</sup>

I know not in what more skilful manner a missionary could expose the erroneousness of the principles of Choo He, and his followers, or how he could better set aside the assumptions of "an undistinguishing principle of order"—"the *le* that neither wishes nor plans," and of "an active-passive primordial matter." What can we say of those assumptions but that they are absurd, and will not avail to explain the acknowledged phenomena and facts? This is what the Chinese writer says. No western theist ever rose more firmly and directly to the recognition of God.

I have only to repeat here the two observations with which I concluded the illustration of the first source of our idea of God—that, while the Chinese acknowledge the agency of other spiritual beings in the moral government of the world, they are careful to discriminate between their *subordinate ministry*, and the Sovereign rule of *Shang-Te*; and in cases of emergency, they for the most part make their appeal direct to Heaven. I have before me "The Book of Actions and their Recompenses,"<sup>3</sup> in the Imperial edition, with a preface from the vermilion pencil of Shun-che, the first Tartar emperor. Though it is properly a work of the Taou sect, its general principles are recognized as in harmony with the classical doctrine. Passages are adduced from the different *king* to illustrate them, and the reader is taught to extract the essential truth from the peculiar dress in which it is presented. The work says:—"Their recompenses follow good and evil, as surely as the shadow attends the substance. Therefore in heaven and on earth, there are spirits who are set over the faults of men, and who shorten their lease of life, according to the lightness and gravity of those faults. There are also the spirit-princes of the stars called the three *T'ae*, and of the Bushel of the North (*Ursa Major*), which are over men's heads, and record their crimes. There are also the three Body-spirits, which reside within men's bodies, and, on every fifty-seventh day, go up to the palace

## <sup>1</sup> 皇皇之上帝

<sup>2</sup> Medhurst's Inquiry into the proper mode of rendering the word God, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> 感應篇

of heaven, to report men's crimes and faults. On the last day of every month, the spirit of the furnace does the same,"<sup>1</sup> In these sentences, the subordination of those various *shin* is sufficiently declared. The classical commentator, however, leads the mind, away from the spirits of heaven and earth, directly to *Shang-Te*, quoting from the *She-king*—" *Shang-Te* is near you, and daily surveys your conduct."<sup>2</sup> In reference to the three Body-spirits, he says:—" There is a saying of the Taou sect, ' Be on your guard on the fifty-seventh day, and you will escape the three Body-spirits,' but I think we ought in everything to do good. Then they will go up and report our good-doing. Though we should not escape from them, they can do us no harm. But if our conduct be bad, although we may escape from them, how shall we evade the inspection of Heaven?"<sup>3</sup>

The third source of our idea of God is the human soul, with its consciousness, its intelligence, and its benign feelings. " A reference," says the writer, " is made to these, not as the agents by which the process of proof is conducted, but as the objects contemplated, and on which the proof rests. It is never to be forgotten, that apart from a reflex contemplation of the human soul, it is impossible to rise to the contemplation of a living and intelligent God. It is in the human soul, small though it be when compared with the object reflected, that we are to discover, most strikingly represented, the image of a spiritual God. Without taking human consciousness and feeling and intelligence into view, God would be conceived of as a mere principle of mechanism or order in nature, as a power of fate or law of development above nature (as with Schelling), rather than a real and living agent. It is the possession of consciousness and intelligent purpose by man, that suggests the idea of a personal God."

I have a profound conviction of the truth of these observations, and nothing has interested me more, in investigating the notions of the Chinese concerning God, than to find writers reasoning in the way they do, from the

<sup>1</sup> 善惡之報如影隨形,是以天地有司過之神,依人所犯輕重,以奪人算,又有三台北斗神君,在人頭上,錄人罪惡,奪其紀算,又有三尸神,在人身中,每到庚申日,輒上詣天曹,言人罪過,月晦之日,竈神亦然

<sup>2</sup> 上帝臨汝,日鑒在茲

<sup>3</sup> 守庚申而絕三尸,語出道家,然吾以爲事事行善,三尸亦必以其善上奏,雖不絕,何害,若所行不善,雖絕三尸,豈能逃于天鑒乎

soul or mind of man to the intelligent personality of *Shang-Te*. In illustration of this, let me refer the reader to the words of Yang Fuh, quoted on p. 37, and those of Wei Chwang-keu, quoted on p. 52. The former says that "by Heaven and *Te* are indicated one Being—that Heaven must not be sought for in what is visible—that he who seeks for Heaven in material appearances, does not differ from a person who knows that a man has a body, colour, and form, but does not recognize the honourable sovereign mind." The latter says that "*Shang-Te* is the Lord and Governor of heaven just as the soul is the Lord and Governor of the body, and that it is not possible that there should be two Lords and Governors." In the Dictionary from which I quoted the admirable reasoning in p. 103, for the personality of *Shang-Te*, we read,—"*Te* is the Governor of heaven; the Lord and Governor of heaven is called *Te*, as the lord and governor of the body is called the mind."<sup>1</sup>

Intimately connected with this part of the subject are the many passages in which the mind, will, decrees, and spirit, of *Shang-Te* are spoken of. Such expressions are evidently formed upon the conception of Him according to the consciousness that we have of our own free, intelligent, personality. In the section of the Shoo-king, called—"The announcement of T'ang," that monarch says to the people of all his states—"If you be good, I will not dare to conceal it. If guilt rest on my own person, I will not dare to excuse myself. The inspection of those things rests with the mind of *Shang-Te*."<sup>2</sup> Several instances have already been given where the decree or decrees of *Shang-Te* are mentioned. There is, indeed, hardly a phrase of more common occurrence in the Shoo-king. The expression—"spirit of *Te* or of *Shang-Te*" is a very important one. His personality is involved in it, for wherein lies our conviction of our identity, our continuous personality, but in our spiritual self-consciousness? In this point, Chinese phraseology concerning *Shang-Te* coincides remarkably with the language of Scripture concerning God. *Shang-Te* is a spirit; God is a spirit. There is "the spirit of *Shang-Te*," as there is "the spirit of God." "By His spirit God hath garnished the heavens;" "by His spirit *Shang-Te* beautifies all things."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 帝者天之宰也,天之主宰曰帝,身之主宰曰心

<sup>2</sup> 爾有善,朕弗敢蔽,罪當朕躬,弗敢自赦,惟簡在上帝之心

<sup>3</sup> 神也者妙萬物而爲言者也. It is with these characters that the paragraph of the Appendix to the Yih-king, following the account of the issuings forth of *Te*, commences. In giving to the term 妙 an active signification, I cannot advance the support of many commentators. In harmony with most of them, Regis

The fourth and last source of our idea of God, as stated by McCosh, is the moral qualities of man. By these qualities he understands more particularly the conscience. "This conscience," he says "is in all men. Man has not only powers of understanding, such as the memory, the imagination, and the judgment; not only feelings and emotions, such as love, hope, fear; he has likewise a higher faculty or sense, which judges by its own law of every other principle of the mind, and claims authority over it. Now, the conscience is a ready and powerful means of suggesting the idea of God to the mind. We believe that it is by it, rather than by any careful observation of nature, material or spiritual, that mankind have their thoughts directed to God. It is not so much by what he sees around him, as by what he feels within, that man is led to believe in a ruler of the world. A conscience speaking as one having authority, and in behalf of God, is the monitor by which he is reminded most frequently and emphatically of his Governor and his Judge."

This source of our idea of God is intimately connected with what has been given, under the second head, as the providential arrangements of the Divine government. Among those the writer included the judgments with which God from time to time visits the world, but what is such a judgment, but a forth-putting of the power of God in harmony with a rule of right, and in support of it? To recognize a providential judgment there must be in the first place a judgment of conscience. Still I think with Mr. McCosh, that "it is possible to build upon the very fact of the existence of the conscience an independent argument in favour of the being of God," and what is more to the point in hand, the Chinese reason from the one to the other, just as we do.

A striking instance of this was adduced on the 101st page, in the observations of Wang Tseaou, upon the punishment of the emperor Kēē, for his irreclaimable dissoluteness. He speaks of an influence exerted upon our

translates—"That which in this universe of things is most wonderful and exceeding apprehension, is spirit." But it is not spirit in general that is the subject of discourse. It is the spirit of *Te*, whose workings are illustrated. Leang Yin, one of the earliest commentators under the Ming dynasty, says—神即帝也,帝者神之體,神者帝之用,故主宰萬物者帝也,所以妙萬物者帝之神也, "*Shin* here refer to *Te*. *Te* is the body (the *substans*) of the *shin*; the *shin* is the acting out of *Te*. Therefore He who rules and governs all things is *Te*. That whereby he beautifies all things is His *shin*," *i. e.* His spirit. Here the two characters *Te* and *shin* are brought together—I would ask which of them meets Dr. Boone's requisition of an absolute name. He will use *shin* for God: but, according to the Chinese philosopher, *Te* is the body, substance or essence, of *shin*. The mind may rest in *Te* as "*a being*:" it cannot do so in *shin*, when thus in conjunction with *Te*.

minds, in regard to the nature of our daily conduct, which influence is "the leading of *Te*." The expression is altogether tantamount to the description of conscience, which I think is not uncommon, as "the voice of God" within us. Our moral nature is, indeed, ascribed in express terms to *Shang-Te*, as His gift. We read in the *Shoo-king*, in "The announcement of T'ang"—"The Sovereign *Shang-Te* conferred the principles of rectitude on the lower people, by obeying which they will possess an invariably virtuous nature."<sup>1</sup> Those principles of rectitude are benevolence, righteousness, propriety, knowledge, and faith, and they are manifested chiefly in regulating the five great relations of life—those, namely, of parent and child, monarch and subject, husband and wife, elders and youngers, and of friendship. The moral philosophy of the Chinese, therefore, accords with that of those western writers, who have questioned the propriety of regarding conscience as a distinct faculty, but view it rather as a general principle of moral approbation or disapprobation applied to the conduct and affections. This, however, does not affect the question of its supremacy in the soul, nor of the recognition to which it leads of the supreme authority of its Author. Mencius declared that "it was by the preservation and nourishment of the heart and nature thus endowed that man served Heaven."<sup>2</sup> On one occasion, he gave utterance to the following noble sentiments—"The delight of the superior man lies in three things, and to be ruler over the empire is not one of them. If his parents be preserved in life, and his brothers give him no occasion for sorrow—this is one element of his delight. If he can look up to Heaven without shame, and look down upon other men, without being abashed—this is the second element of his delight. If he can get the most talented

<sup>1</sup> 惟皇上帝降衷于下民若有恒性。 In the Pe-che (備旨) edition of the five *king*, there is so remarkable an exposition of this passage, that it cannot fail to interest students of Chinese ideas—夫人所以有仁義禮智信之性者，從何得之，乃惟皇上帝，化生萬物之初，本其太極陰陽之至中者，降之民，渾然在中，不偏不倚，所謂衷也。 "Whence did man get his nature, endowed with the principles of benevolence, righteousness, propriety, knowledge, and faith? It was from the Sovereign *Shang-Te*, who, in the beginning, when He produced all things, conferred upon man that which was most perfect of the *T'ae-keih*, and the *yin* and *yang*, blended together in him, without deflection, without perverse inclination. This is what is called the moral nature." What is meant here by the *T'ae-keih*, I will not undertake to say, but the writer makes a very evident distinction between it and *Shang-Te*. He is the author of all things, and specially of the moral nature of man. The *T'ae-keih*, the *yin* and the *yang*, are instruments, or *materiel* rather, in His hand.

<sup>2</sup> 存其心養其性，所以事天也。

men in the empire under his influence, and teach them—this is the third element of his delight.”<sup>1</sup> The second of these sources of delight appears to be that in which Paul says he always exercised himself—“To have a conscience void of offence towards God and towards men.” The whole three are summed up by Chang Nan-heen in the words—“The delight of the superior man is to delight in his Heaven”<sup>2</sup>—this last word evidently denoting the Heaven-given and gifted nature.

I have thus gone over the different sources of our idea of God, and exhibited how the same facts in nature and providence have led the Chinese to the idea of *Shang-Te*. The notions of creation and self-existence cannot enter into the origin of our idea of God; they constitute rather its completion. That the Chinese have ascended to the former at least, has been shown abundantly in the preceding chapter, but if they had not done so, I should still have contended on the ground of this other evidence, that *Shang-Te* must be the true God. This is the only evidence which I could philosophically seek for myself.

It is a just remark also of the author from whom I have so largely quoted, that the arguments drawn from the different sources of the idea of God which he enumerates, are not all conclusive or equally conclusive. If only one of them were found clearly developed among the Chinese, we should be able, I conceive, by means of it to lead them on to all the rest. But there is not one that fails us. *Shang-Te* is the Designer and Producer, the Ruler and Governor. He is a spirit, a personal intelligence, and the Lord of the conscience. Still, I readily admit that they are “The Providential arrangements of the Divine Government,” which have most affected the minds of the Chinese, and are most closely connected with their idea of *Shang-Te*. But in this they agree with the “majority of mankind,” and in the embodiment of this fact, which we have in the NAME by which they designate the Supreme Being, we have a strong corroboration of both of the theses which I have thus far been arguing, and an interesting illustration, of the unity of *mind* that lies under all the apparent diversity of human languages and customs.

That *Shang-Te* means the Supreme Ruler is admitted on every hand. The Jews on their part tell us that their name for the Supreme Being—*Elohim*—means “the Governor or Judge.” There is the name *God*, which, slightly varied, runs through the languages of all the Teutonic races in

<sup>1</sup> 孟子曰，君子有三樂，而王天下不與存焉，父母俱存，兄弟無故，一樂也，仰不愧于天，俯不忤于人，二樂也，得天下英才而教育之，三樂也

<sup>2</sup> 君子之樂，樂其天也

Europe, and is found in Asia, the name of the Supreme Being among the Persians. Its radical signification also is the same. This has already been insisted on, both by Dr. Medhurst and myself, and I am happy to have met with the following confirmation of it in Webster's "American Dictionary of the English language." He says under the word:—"GOD. Sax. *god*; G. *gutt*; D. *god*; Sw. and Dan. *god*; Goth. *goth* or *guth*; Pers. *godā* or *choda*; Hindoo, *khoda*, *codam*.<sup>1</sup> As this word and good are written exactly alike in Saxon, it has been inferred that *God* was named from his *goodness*. But the corresponding words in most of the other languages are not the same, and I believe no instance can be found of a name given to the Supreme Being from the attribute of his goodness. It is probably an idea too remote from the rude conceptions of men in early ages. Except the word Jehovah, I have found the name of the Supreme Being to be usually taken from his supremacy or power, and to be equivalent to lord or ruler, from some root signifying to press or exert force. Now in the present case, we have evidence that this is the sense of this word, for in Persic, *godā* is rendered *dominus*, *possessor*, *princeps*, as is a derivative of the same word. See Cast. Lex. 241." Dr. Boone says that "Etymology is a very uncertain guide to the character and meaning of words—that every work on logic is full of warnings against our being misled by sophistries derived from this source—that it is wholly conjectural, and there is no other field perhaps in which learned men have so indulged their fancies." Now, it may be very convenient to meet an argument founded on a particular etymology by writing in this manner of etymology in general, but such a course is not philosophical, nor the way to get at the truth. The increasing importance which is attached to etymology as a branch of the science of language, sufficiently refutes Dr. Boone's representation of its little value. It is not wholly conjectural. Some men, indeed, have pursued the study of it with an improper license of fancy, but there is no sounder canon of Grammar than that laid down by MacCulloch—"The radical meaning of a word, when discovered, always furnishes the key, which explains and reconciles the remotest of its secondary significations."<sup>2</sup> Dr. Boone should have shown that my derivation of *Elohim* was wrong. Had he proved the etymology which I assigned to it to be incorrect, he would have subverted the argument raised upon it. But he contents himself with the rash and incor-

<sup>1</sup> I have ascertained from competent scholars that *khoda* or *codam* is not an indigenous Hindoo term, but is the Persian word adopted by Mohammedans in India, and occasionally used by the Hindoos also. There is no such word in Sanscrit.

There can be no question about the Persian word. The derivative to which Webster refers is *khodawan*, given in Richardson's Dictionary as meaning "a king, a prince, a lord, a master." In the "Arabian Nights' entertainments," there is the "Story of Codadad and his brothers,"—*Codadad*, given of God.

<sup>2</sup> Manual of English Grammar, Philosophical and Practical, p. 123.

rect assertion that all etymology is conjectural. Will he set aside Webster's account of the radical meaning of *God* in the same way? The first English Journalists have been forward to acknowledge the surpassing merits of his Dictionary as the best of the English language, and a long list of names, of the greatest weight in the United States, bears special testimony to its superiority in the exhibition of etymologies. I beg my missionary brethren not hastily to reject the evidence to which their attention is thus called regarding the proper sense of our common appellation for the Supreme Being. It has been seen how the same considerations which lead us to believe that there is a *GOD*, have led the Chinese to believe that there is a *SHANG-TE*. We now see that the radical meaning of the name *Shang-Te* is the same with that of the name *God*. Here is the Semitic race—Hebrews, Arabians, Chaldeans, and others. They call the Supreme Being *ELOHIM*—the Ruler, the Judge. Here is the Teutonic race of Goths and Saxons, joining hands with the Persian tribe, and calling the Supreme Being *GOD*—the Ruler, the Lord. Here is the great Mongolian race—the many millioned family of the Chinese—calling the Supreme Being *TE* and *SHANG-TE*—the Ruler, the Judge. This cannot be of chance—such a unity amid such a diversity. The sounds are various, but the thought is one. The Jew, the Teuton, the Chinese, are evidently of one blood, one nature; different in temperament, in complexion, in habits, they come together as members of the same family into the presence of their common Parent. He has appointed them the bounds of their habitation far apart, but He is equally near to them in their separate places. They recognize Him in the same way, and they call Him, to His ear, and to the mental understanding of one another, by the same name. Our inquiry has thus connected itself with one of the most important questions in Natural and Theological Science—the question of the unity of our race, and it sheds a light upon it, which will be hailed, if I do not greatly err, by many minds. For my own part, I must use *Shang-Te*, in speaking to the Chinese of God, because it is the term which naturally connects them by the mysterious springs of their mental constitution with Him. I must use it, because it is the term, which, by the affinity of our mental constitution, connects them with myself and with all other men.

It now only remains, in this chapter, to make a few observations on the general application of the term, into the nature of which we have been inquiring. This point was adverted to briefly on the 75th page, but the full consideration of it was deferred, till the evidence should be submitted that *Elohim* and *God* were relative terms. This has been done, and assuming that the point has been made good, the general application of the word *God* is no more mysterious—no more difficult of explanation—than a similar application of other relative terms, which ought to be restricted in their use.

For instance, in a nation there can be by right but one President, Emperor, or King, according to the nature of the government. In a time of confusion, however, many individuals may try to raise themselves to the supreme power; many chiefs may be saluted President, or Emperor, by their respective followers. But the usurpation does not confer the right. In the same way, there may be many claimants to the possession of the same property, but when their different pretensions are decided on, it will be assigned to him, whose it is, and he will be able to say, "I am owner alone, and besides me there is no other." Just so it is with the name *God*. In truth—in right, there is only one God, but "there are who are called Gods," even many. Their followers salute them by a title to which they have no claim. They are usurpers—existing it may be really as spirits, or existing as such only in the imaginations of their worshippers. The distinction of *God propriè*, and *god impropriè*, on which Dr. Boone insists as so important, only involves the subject with confusion. When he speaks of the word having in the one case "a proper sense," and in the other an improper, I find it exceedingly difficult to follow his reasoning. I admit a proper and an improper *application* of the name. The giving it *with its proper sense* to beings not entitled to it—this is the improper application. The impropriety is of the same kind as when a usurper is saluted emperor. That name does not thereby get a new and improper meaning. The calling one by it who ought not to be called by it, does not alter its true real signification. The word emperor is still the same, but he *who* wishes to be denoted, or whom others wish to denote, by it, is a false emperor.

The account which I gave in a former publication of the origin of Polytheism was the following—"Men served the true God, before they wrongly imagined any other. When they took His attributes and gave them to other beings, real or fictitious, they called them by the name which belonged to Him only." Dr. Boone says that this appears to him a correct account of what must have been the case with the first men, those who used the primitive language, but that "the proposition, 'men served the true God, before they conceived of false gods,' is an indefinite proposition, which is not true, if taken universally." Its fallacy, he further says, will be at once apparent, if I will make it universal—"All men served the true God, before they wrongly imagined another," for that this would require all men to have been monotheists, before they were polytheists, which is contrary to what we all know to be the fact. (Def. p. 56.) Now, will Dr. Boone point out to us a language, in which the word corresponding to our *God*, or *god*, if he pleases, was the production of a generic idea? If I were to admit that it is contrary to fact that the people of any nation were monotheists before they were polytheists, my faith in the Bible would be greatly shaken. The Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans charges guilt home upon the gentile

world of all ages, because of their polytheism. God has never left them with an excuse for it, and when we go back along the stream of history, we reach a point of time, when the ancestors of every existing nation stood in connection with the patriarchs, taught of God. Up to the building of the tower of Babel, the whole earth was of one language and one speech. Mankind used the word for God that Noah used. Perhaps polytheism had begun to be developed among them, yet it followed after monotheism. When their language was confounded, and they were scattered abroad over the earth, when did the different companies have the idea of God obliterated from their minds? Did they continue unable to communicate with one another of a Power or Powers, dealing with them so wondrously, till they had perverted the witnessing of nature and providence, and suddenly awoke with a religious consciousness all polytheistic, and then began to talk of this god and that god? This has not been the religious history of mankind. The records of men do not so clash with the conclusions to which we naturally proceed from the Oracles of God. "The most ancient nations," says Johannes Von Müller, "though entirely uncultivated in other things, had perfectly correct views and knowledge of God, of the world, of immortality, and even of the motions of the stars, while the arts which pertain to the conveniences of life are much younger."<sup>1</sup> "It is also true," says Dr. Hales, "of the *most ancient Heathen* records that have survived the wreck of time—the oldest subsisting fragments are usually the simplest and best, and afford the most favourable specimens of *primitive theology*, and exhibit a remarkable conformity with HOLY WRIT."

But the great points—and by which chiefly missionaries must be guided in their communication of the truth to the Chinese—are the nature and signification of the word *God*. Be it that monotheism preceded polytheism, or let it be argued that polytheism in some cases preceded monotheism, how shall I communicate the truth which is deposited in the Bible to the Chinese? According to the conclusions which I have sought—and I hope with success—to establish in this chapter, I must use for *God* a relative term, and a term conveying the idea of rule. With an absolute generic term, I shall be building up the system of error and sin against which the Bible warns its readers. I shall be placing a stumbling block in the way of the obedience of faith. I had better, a thousand times, never again write a Chinese character or speak a Chinese word. But with a relative term—with the term *Shang-Te*, or even the simple *Te*—I can teach the whole truth of Revelation, and, through the gracious and merciful blessing of God, both save myself and them that hear me.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Tholuck's "Nature and moral influence of Heathenism."

<sup>2</sup> Analysis of Chronology, vol. iv., p. 459.

## CHAPTER III.

ON THE GREEK TERM, THEOS. THE TERM USED FOR GOD IN TRANSLATIONS OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THE NORTH OF INDIA. THE TERMS USED FOR GOD IN CHINA BY ROMAN CATHOLICS, MOHAMMEDANS, AND JEWS.

Very little reference has been made in the preceding pages to *Theos*, the name in Greek corresponding to *Elohim* and *God*. Its etymology is involved in greater mystery than that of either of those terms, and any conclusion established from the ascertained facts concerning them, could not be shaken by peculiar views which may be taken of it.

Dr. Boone argues to make it probable that the idea conveyed originally by *Theos* was of a polytheistic nature. "Homer, Hesiod, and the Greeks of their age," he says, "used *Theos* as the general name of their deities, designating any one of them indifferently by this name, to be determined by the context, or occasionally using it, when standing absolutely, to denote *Zeus*, the highest Being known to them; then, when the philosophers learned from foreign travel, or from their own reflections, that there was an intelligent First Cause, a *Being* wholly different from *Zeus*, and one who had not been spoken of before, the question must have arisen by what name he should be called. Anaxagoras called his 'Disposing mind, the cause of all things' *Theos*, and from this grew up the monadic *theos* of the Greek philosophers." (Def. p. 104.) I differ, as much as can be, from this account of the way in which *Theos* came to represent the idea of God, but it is not necessary to go into the details of Grecian history in order to set it aside. Unless Dr. Boone can show that it was an absolute generic term—a generic term for a class of beings considered in themselves, as to their nature, without reference to any other beings—he accomplishes nothing towards the support of his proposal to render *Theos*, in translating the New Testament scriptures, by the Chinese *shin*. This he has not done. This, if the reasonings submitted in the last chapter be correct, he cannot do; and in reading the pages of his Defense, which treat of *Theos*, nothing has surprised me more, than that the authorities to which he appeals for confirmation of his views, should not have convinced him that the word in every language answering to *God* or *god* must be a relative term. For instance, having observed that "because men fail to discover a 'FIRST CAUSE,' to which they ascribe spirituality, free-will, intelligence, omnipotence, &c., we must not conclude that they have had no thoughts on the subject of Deity," he quotes the following passage from Morrell's work on "The speculative Philosophy of Europe in the nineteenth century:"—

"No one will affirm that the earlier ages of the world were destitute of any searchings after God. So far from that, everything in the mythological period was wondrously gilded with the divine. The only thing to be noticed is that men in those ages conversed mainly with nature; that they formed their conceptions of the *numina divina* with much reflection, and chiefly from nature; and that the argument from this source resulted more frequently than not in *polytheism*. Can we say that the process was illogical? I think not. Confine our view to nature only with its endless variations, and what is there unnatural in admitting the whole hierarchy of Olympus? Nay, history and present experience prove, that under such circumstances, the polytheistic hypothesis is by far the most acceptable to the human understanding. Even on this ground, however, the chief share in the argument is derived from the mind or the consciousness. The irresistible belief we have of causation is a primary law of our consciousness, and the first attempt we make to hypostatize the cause of the universe around us, is the transference of our own forms of intelligence, and our own personality, into the conception of that vast architect, or hierarchy of architects, by whom the world was constructed. The theistic argument then, in which the appeal to nature is the prominent feature, ends at best in the idea of a *Demurgus*."

According to this representation, the primary notion of a *god* is the conception of "*an architect*." It is nearly allied to that, to which the mind is led by the first of the sources of our idea of God, as given by McCosh—the Design exhibited in the separate works of creation. By the contemplation of the things that are made, the thoughts are raised to a maker of them. Be it that only one architect is supposed, or that a hierarchy of architects is believed in, the conception is relative, and the name is the verbal embodiment of the conception.

So far, therefore, as the relative nature of the term *Theos* is concerned, that point is not affected by the question as to the religion of those who first used it, whether they were monotheists or polytheists. I believe they were the former; Dr. Boone thinks it very likely they were the latter. On either hypothesis, the word is relative, as Justin Martyr,<sup>1</sup> in the second century, argued that it was, ranking it with "Father," "Lord," and "Master," and contending that God in the absolute was not only above all names, but above all existence. Ignorant as we are of its etymology, we cannot tell what particular relation it primarily denoted the Being intended by it as sustaining, but the following general view of its signification, from the pen of one of the first Biblical scholars of the present century, Moses Stuart of Andover, is well worth our study.

Reviewing Dr. Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament, in the North American Review, for April (1851), the learned writer observes, that in order to communicate to the world the important truths with which they were charged, it was necessary for the New Testament writers "either to employ old words in a new sense, that is, one in a greater or less degree new, or else to form new words." Of the latter expedient there are not many examples, and they are mostly cases of composition, where the different

<sup>1</sup> Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, vol. i., p. 96.

elements afford some clue to their meaning in combination, but the former expedient is very often resorted to. Illustrating the use of it, Dr. Stuart says :—

“ Let us begin with *theos*, God, the fountain of all true religion. What is *theos* in a Greek classic? A deified man, half human and half superhuman, a compound of power and pride, and cruelty and ambition and tyranny and lust, a being fraught with all human passions, especially the baser or the more destructive ones; a being local, limited in power, subject to the destinies, and destitute of holiness, justice, goodness and truth. If Plato and Socrates, and some few others, like Eschylus or Pindar, attained to higher and somewhat more spiritual views, these had nothing or little to do with the mass.<sup>1</sup> The gods of Homer's Iliad are those of the populace. And these, with the exception of *supremacy* in Jupiter alone, have not one moral or physiological quality of the God of the New Testament. They are neither omnipotent, omniscient, nor omnipresent; they are not endowed with proper creative power; they are neither holy nor just, nor all-wise nor good. They are not even spiritual nor incorporeal, but are formed of a kind of sublimated or transcendental substance. When, therefore, a New Testament writer appeals to the God of the Christians, or introduces him into any description or assertion, what idea could a heathen Greek affix in common with him to the word *theos*? Not one thing is common to their minds, when this word is first introduced and read, excepting that of Sovereignty or Supreme power. In what way then was the Greek to understand an Apostle? In no way except by explanation, or by what is said in the context and in other parts of Scripture. In these two ways, all knowledge of the Apostles' meaning must be acquired. Rarely, if ever, do they stop to define words; for they take it for granted, the reader will sufficiently understand them by a diligent perusal of the context. In the present case *supremacy* is the germ of the idea of *theos*, and this is common to both parties; but the attributes and character of the Supreme Being are matters of inquiry, and of subsequent information to the Greek reader. Better was it to use this *germ*, as a basis for development, than to coin a word entirely new. Definition immediate and formal, if it could be made, would not avail so effectually as further reading and consideration of the manner in which the Supreme is developed.”

<sup>1</sup> Granted that the populace—the mass—had the idea of their *gods* here set forth by the writer, yet had they no other and higher idea connected with the word *Theos*, used absolutely in the singular? I am better pleased in this matter to agree with the early Fathers and writers of the Christian church, than with the American Professor. Origen placed the idea of one God in the same class with the ideas common to the consciousness of all mankind. (See Neander's Church History, vol. II. p. 304.) Tertullian makes his appeal, against the prevalent heathenism, to the testimony of souls, not trained in the schools, but simple, rude and uncultivated, (*Ibid.*) “Marcion,” says Neander, “was the only one, who denied that any testimony concerning the God of the Gospel was to be found in the works of creation, or in the common consciousness of mankind. The more emphatically, therefore,” (as against this heretic, let Dr. Boone observe), “does Tertullian dwell on this testimony.” Here are some of his expressions—“The consciousness of God is the original dowry of the soul; *the same and differing in no respect, in Syria, and in Pontus; for the God of the Jews is the one whom men's souls call their God.*” “In the deepest emotions of their minds, they never direct their exclamations to their false gods, but employ the words :—*By God! As truly as God lives! God help me.* Moreover they do not thereby have their view directed to the Capitol, but to heaven.” I have already referred to the same fact, which Tertullian here remarks upon, as exemplified among the Chinese, turning away, under excitement and deep emotion, from all the *shin* which they worship, directly to *Shang-Te*, and making their appeal to Heaven. The subject is finely expanded by Lactan-

Most of the Protestant Missionaries in China have profited, I apprehend, more or less from the exegetical labours of Moses Stuart on various portions of the New Testament. Some of them have been his pupils. We cannot set a light value upon his judgment concerning the meaning of *Theos*. The beings, he tells us, which that term denoted to the first readers of the inspired writings, differed *in nature* from the true God. They were "neither spiritual nor incorporeal." They agreed with Him only in the attribute of Power or Supremacy. "Not one thing," he says, "was common to the minds of the Apostles, and their readers, in connection with the word *Theos*, but the notion "of sovereignty or supreme power." If the case was so, by what term shall we render *theos* in Chinese? By the term *shin*? Surely we cannot. That denotes *spirit* in the abstract, or a *spirit* in the concrete, and with the class of *shin* worshipped by the Chinese there is indissolubly associated the idea of *inferiority and subordination*. Shall we then render *Theos* by *Shang-Te*? If we do, our readers and hearers will certainly have that one notion in common with us, which the Greeks had with the first teachers of Christianity—the notion of supreme power. How many more notions they will have in common, I have endeavoured to show in the first chapter of this work.

The subject of the radical meaning of *Theos* will be found to introduce itself again, in connection with the second topic to which I wish to call at-

tention, in the following passage:—"And yet allowance might be made for this impiety of men (the worship of many gods), if their error proceeded altogether from ignorance of the Divine name. But when we see the worshippers of the gods often confessing and proclaiming the Supreme God, what pardon of their impiety can they expect, since they do not acknowledge the worship of Him, of whom it is impossible that man should be entirely ignorant? For when they swear, or wish, or give thanks, they do not name Jupiter, nor many *gods*, but God. Thus the truth, by the force of nature, breaks forth from their unwilling breasts. They do not indeed do the same in the midst of prosperity. Then chiefly God glides out of the memory of men, when, enjoying His benefits, they ought to give honour to the Divine goodness. But if any heavy necessity presses on them, then they remember God. If the terror of war hath raged, if pestilence hath brooded over them, if long drought hath denied their nourishment to the fruits of the earth, if a fierce tempest or storm of hail hath come upon them, they fly to God, assistance is sought from God, God is intreated to come to their relief. If any one be tossed by raging winds upon the sea, he calls on Him; if any one be tormented by violence, he instantly implores Him; if any one be reduced to the necessity of beggary, his appeal is to God alone, and it is by His divine and only influence that he intreats men to have compassion upon him. Therefore they never remember God, but when they are in misfortune. After the fear has left them, and the dangers have receded, then with alacrity they run to the temples of the *gods*, they pour out libations to them, they sacrifice to them, they crown them." (Div. Inst. Lib. II. Cap. I.) The evidence is to my mind convincing, that the Greek *Theos* and Latin *Deus* had a much higher meaning with the people of Europe in the time of the Apostles than Dr. Stuart is willing to allow, but I have made these observations in a note, rather than in the text, because this difference of opinion does not interfere with the application which I make of his remarks, to the question in dispute between myself and Dr. Boone.

tention in the present chapter—the practice of Biblical translators in the North of India, in the use of a term or terms to render *Elohim* and *Theos*.

More than twelve months ago, my attention was struck by the following passage and note in the memoirs of Dr. Carey :—

“I was pressing upon him (a Brahmin) the necessity of believing in Christ for salvation, when he asked how it was that the worship of idols had been followed from the beginning, and how it was that according to the Scripture itself, the worship of the Debtas was professed throughout the whole world, except one small nation from the beginning.

“*Note.*—Debtas—Idols or supposed powerful intelligences, inferior to God, and represented by images. They seem to answer exactly to the Greek word *Daimonion*, and the character of these supposed intelligences is well described, according to the Hindoo notion, in Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon, under the above word. The Hindoos, however, divide them into two kinds, viz., *Debta* or *Soor*, and *Doytyo* or *Asoor*, the first signifying the good or benign, the last, the bad or malignant powers.”<sup>1</sup>

On reading the above sentences, it occurred to me that those *debtas* of the Hindoos were probably the same as the *shin* of the Chinese, the *Debtas* or *Soors* being the *Shin*, and the *Doytyos* or *Asoors* the *Kwei*. I wrote to a friend in Calcutta, who was perfectly able to give me all necessary information on the subject,—the Rev. Mr. Lacroix—asking what was the nature of the *debtas*, and the meaning of the term, and what terms missionaries had used in the translation of the Scriptures for the words *God* and *Spirit*. To these inquiries I received full and satisfactory replies from the party to whom I addressed them. And not only did he answer them himself. In order that they might be met as completely as possible, he submitted them also to the Rev. Mr. Wenger of the Baptist Mission, who has taken, in the department of Biblical translation, the place of the late Dr. Yates. The observations of Mr. Wenger are so lucid as to the practice of translators in India, and so pertinent to the controversy agitated in China, that I am happy to give them at length.

He says :—

“1. *Devata* or *debta* is an abstract form derived from *deva*, and corresponds exactly, both as to its form and its etymology, with the Latin *deitas* derived from *deus*, terms which appear to have been, originally, identical with the Indian ones. *Deva*, in all probability, ought to mean *luminous* or *shining*, for it is connected with the root *diva*, from which we have *divasa*, day, and a very large number of other words—especially in Sanscrit—all implying luminousness. The term *deva* appears, in the first instance, to have been applied to the sun, moon, stars, &c., regarded as beings of a superhuman nature. It is not found in actual use, in any other sense, than that of *god* or *lord*. In the latter sense it is applicable to a king, a husband, &c. When it means *god*, it is descriptive of one or other of the inferior deities. *Devata*, the abstract, must originally have meant *Deity*, but is now most commonly used in a concrete sense, much in the same way as *deva*. I believe, however, that it may also denote the supposed divine principle which enters an idol after consecration, and leaves it again when the festival period is over. I am not aware that *deva* could be used in this latter sense, or

<sup>1</sup> Memoir of Dr. Carey. Boston Edition, p. 212.

separated from a personal agent or a visible form. So far as I know, neither *deva* (fem. *devī*) nor *devatā* has ever been used by any biblical translator in this part of India, for any other purpose than that of designating the false gods of idolaters.

"2. The term used for the true God in Biblical translations is *Ishwara*. This is not applied, in ordinary parlance, to any of those false gods, whom the Hindus themselves regard as decidedly inferior; and thereby it is distinguished from *devatā*. Among the Hindus, a large number confer the title *Ishwara* upon Shiva, and another large number upon Vishnu, according as they give the preference to the one or the other of these two; but should any other of the innumerable *devatās* be called *Ishwara*, it would be an unusual thing, and call for something like an explanation. *Ishwara* probably meant, at first, an *owner*, *lord*, or *ruler*. It always implies personality and authority. In Sanscrit poetry it is often applied to kings; and the derivative *aishwariya* (pron. oyshwurjo) means *lordly grandeur*. There is a compound of *Ishwara*; viz. *Parameshwara* (he who is *Ishwara* preeminently). This term has been used by Dr. Yates as an equivalent for Jehovah, excepting a few passages, in which it was thought necessary or very desirable to retain Jehovah. But the Hindus employ this term as a name of either Shiva or Vishnu. I am not aware that any serious inconvenience—of a practical nature—has arisen or is likely to arise, from this use of *Ishwara* and *Parameshwara*.

"3. Shiva and Vishnu are two gods of the great Hindu triad, and *Brahmā* (pronounce this Bromhah) is the third, but I am not aware that he is particularly worshipped, or that any temples are erected to him.

"There is another word, of the neuter Gender, closely resembling this last; viz. *Brahma* (pronounce Bromho). I hardly think the object which it is intended to designate, can be called a person, or said to be possessed of any personal authority. The sense almost invariably attached to the word in actual usage, is best described by the phrase *the soul of the universe*, the only object which possesses a real, permanent, and living existence. All Hinduism is pervaded with the idea that what we call created beings (whether material or immaterial) are so many parts, emanations, modifications or disguises of this same *Brahma*. As water can be turned into ice, so can *Brahma* into matter, &c. All life and especially all mind is a part of *Brahma*—whether modified or not, is not exactly agreed upon. No temples are erected to it; but the idea is pretty general, and frequently expressed by the educated class, that whatever be the visible object that is worshipped, no other object but *Brahma* can in reality receive worship. In the sun and the moon, in a male or female idol, *Brahma* alone is worshipped, whatever may be the intention of the worshipper. It is clear that *Brahma* is essentially a heathenish and pantheistic idea, serving the Hindus as a cloak with which to embellish their idolatry. The term *Brahma* therefore has been carefully kept out of the Scripture, excepting in a very few passages (as in 1 Cor. VIII., 4,) where a remarkable proverbial saying exactly to the point, warrants its use.

"4. The term for *spirit* is *ātmā*, which I believe originally meant either *breath*, or else the *conscious principle*, that which constitutes identity and personality. Unfortunately, *ātmā* is not a very convenient term, being by the Hindus understood to mean the original form of *Brahma*, when regarded as a conscious being. But there is no other term than can be used, in general. It implies comparative (if not absolute) immateriality, and consciousness, and the word enters largely into the composition of terms descriptive of moral character. For *Holy Spirit* Dr. Carey used *dharmātmā*, a term objected to by Dr. Yates, because the usage of the Bengali (and Sanscrit) languages leads the reader to regard it as an adjective, having the meaning *piously* or *religiously minded*. The same objection applies to *sadātmā*, which means, or may mean, *well-minded*. *Paramātmā* (*the spirit by way of preeminence*) is a standing Hindu term for *Brahma*, and therefore unsuitable. Dr. Yates has selected *pabitra ātmā*, spelt as two words; and this I believe to be the best that can be chosen, as it

is quite literal, and at the same time intelligible. If it were spelt as one word, *pa-bitrátmá*, it might mean *holy-minded*.

5. Although I am not able to judge of the peculiarities of the Chinese language—for a cursory glance at the classical works, as translated by Pauthier, is not a sufficient qualification—yet I venture to offer two remarks which appear to me of some importance, and applicable to all biblical translations :—

I. If possible, the term to be used for *God* should not be a compound term, for reasons so obvious that they need not be mentioned. The phrase *God of gods* (which we have rendered literally) is one illustration of the importance of this remark.

II. The term used for *God* should be one that implies at least the two ideas of *personality* and *authority* combined. Any elevated and unusual, but readily intelligible, term—say a poetical term—descriptive of a sovereign or a ruler, appears more appropriate than a term which does not convey the idea of authority. Most heathen gods, who are represented as persons, were originally kings or chieftains. The kings of the Medes and Persians were regarded as incarnations of the Deity; hence the decree passed for the ruin of Daniel, that during 30 days no other god save king Darius should be worshipped. In that passage, by the way, a term descriptive of a ruler, can be more easily handled than any other. The term *Augustus* points to the same thing. And Jehovah, in the Mosaic ritual, required of his people oblations, food (such as the shewbread), &c., precisely similar to those which in ancient times kings required of their subjects.

These two considerations, viewed in the abstract, lead me to think that in Chinese *ti* by itself would be suitable as a term for God, and say *shang-ti* for Jehovah or Lord. It is not for me, however, to affirm that this theoretical conclusion is practically desirable. May the Lord, by His Spirit, give to His servants in China, that wisdom from above, that shall lead them to a right decision, in a matter so closely connected with the glory of His own name.

I was correct in saying above that Mr. Wenger's observations were pertinent to the controversy agitated in China. It will be observed—*First*, that the term used in Biblical translations for the true God, in Bengal, is *Ishwara*, which is not the general or generic name of the Hindoo deities, or the beings worshipped by the Hindoo people, but a relative term, the distinctive title of two of the principal deities, probably meaning, at first *lord*, *owner*, or *ruler*, and implying personality and authority. There is here no sanction for the use of *shin* in Chinese, but between *Ishwara* and *Shang-Te* there is a close analogy. They are words of the same grammatical class, and of the same primary meaning. Some missionaries in China object to the use of *Shang-Te*, because some of their hearers understand by the name one of the Taouist idols, *Yuh-hwang* or *Heuen-Teen*. But in India it never seems to have occurred to any one as an objection to *Ishwara*, that the Being intended to be denoted by it was likely to be confounded with *Vishnu* or *Sheva*. If the Indian translators have done right in using *Ishwara* for *Elohim* and *Theos*, we cannot be wrong in using *Shang-Te* in China. And, on the other hand, if Dr. Boone have reason on his side in pleading for *shin*, then in India they ought to use *debtá*. Mr. Lacroix writes that "all temples whatever in India are devoted to the worship of *debtas*." It is the generic name for beings worshipped among the Hindoos. By a relative term, Dr. Boone says, we cannot teach the doctrine of the

*Trinity*, nor the *Divinity* of the Saviour. Let missionaries in India think of this. Let the various Bible Societies do the same. Can it be, that during more than fifty years, all the venerated and highly-gifted men who have laboured in India, have been striving thus not for the truth, but against the truth? Can it be that so many thousands of pounds have been spent in circulating the Scriptures, in versions opposed to the most sacred mysteries of our faith? No—the servants of the Gospel have not been walking in such darkness; they have not fallen into such fatal courses. I know that the use of *Ishwara* in Bengal has satisfied some minds that *a relative term must also be used for God in Chinese*. I would hope that it will modify even Dr. Boone's opinion as to the dangers inseparable from the use of such a term. One thing is plain—No Bible Society which has contributed of its funds to circulate the translations of missionaries in the North of India, can refuse with consistency its countenance and aid to the versions of those in China who employ the term *Shang-Te*.

It appears, *Secondly*, that translators of the Scriptures in India, use the term *dehta* to designate the false gods of idolaters. They have one word for *God*, and another word for *a god*. Their practice in this point agrees with that of the late Dr. Gutzlaff and of Dr. Medhurst, when they made their first version of the New Testament. All parties in China, however, are now agreed as to the impropriety of the method. Certainly the difficulty of carrying it out here is peculiarly great. *Dehta* is not found in actual use in any other sense than that of *god* or *lord*, but *shin* is in actual use for *spirit*. It does not occur, indeed, in any other sense. To express by means of it even the idea of *a god* would require a periphrasis. A phrase like—"The gods of the nations," must be rendered in some such way as—"The spirits which the nations honoured as powerful guardians."

*Thirdly*, Mr. Wenger states that the Latin words *deitas* and *deus* appear originally to have been identical with the Indian terms *devata* and *deva*, and that *deva* ought in all probability to mean *luminous* or *shining*. The same view has been taken by some eminent scholars of Germany—particularly by Professor Lassen of Bonn.<sup>1</sup> I wrote to Mr. Lacroix, calling his atten-

<sup>1</sup> Lassen says:—"The general denomination of God most widely spread among the Indo-Germanic nations sounds in Sanscrit *deva*, in Greek, *theos*, in Latin, *deus*, Lettic *diewas*, in Irish *dia*. In the German languages, it has been limited to a special God, who is called in old high German *Zio*, and in the Edda *Tyr*, but which must be called in the Gothic *Tius*; in the plural *tivar* denotes, in the Edda, gods and heroes.

"*Deva* is derived from the root *div*, to light, and retains even in the language of the Vedas, as an adjective, the signification of shining. This proves that with the Indo-Germanic nations, the conception of the Deity was derived from light, and that the objects of their earliest divine reverence were the appearances and effects of light." (Extracted from a number of the Oriental Christian Spectator.)

The same view of the primary connection between *Theos*, *Deus*, and *Deva* is maintained in an eloquent and admirable article on Comparative Philology in the *Edin-*

tion to this point, and asking him why, if *deva* and *deus* exactly corresponded in primary meaning, they might not in India take *debta*, and employ it as *theos* and *deus* had been employed by the early Christians. At the same time, I expressed my doubts of the proposed etymology, on the ground that no adjective, expressing the quality of a being in itself, could become the name of that being in relation to others, Sir Isaac Newton has observed that we do not say "my eternal," "my infinite," "my perfect." In the same way, the phrase "my luminous," or "my luminous one" would be objectionable, and incapable of becoming the basis of the relative name of God.

Both my correspondents kindly replied to the inquiry, and the doubt which I had expressed concerning the proposed etymology of *Deus* and *Theos*. Mr. Lacroix wrote:—"In regard to *Deva*, *Deb*, or *Debta*, pray, keep in mind, that whatever its etymology may be, this term is *never* used in India, except to distinguish a *god among many*—in other words, one of the pantheon of 330 millions, of which the Hindus boast,—but *NEVER* to signify *the* only true God in the sense of the Bible." Mr. Wenger expresses himself to the same effect:—"The difference between *Ishwara* and *Deva*, as used by the heathen, is not one of kind, but one of degree. The same being—say the sun—may be called *Ishwara* or *Deva*. But *Deva*, in the singular at least, has almost invariably a proper noun prefixed to it; because the use of the word at once suggests the idea of a multitude, out of which an individual is selected, which individual must be specified. In other words, *Deva* is current in the sense of a *god* (among many), but not in the sense of *God*, as contrasted with creatures; whilst *Ishwara* may have, and often does have, the meaning *God*."

"We could not use *Deva* in Gen. I., 1. The sentence would be understood to mean, a *god* created heaven and earth."

"The doubts about the etymology of *Deva* may be removed by the supposition that it may have meant *Illuminator*, viz. of the world. I do not vouch for the correctness of Lassen's views."

These observations deserve the attention of the missionaries in China who insist on using *shin* for God. It has been contended, that even if it were granted to them that *shin* means a *god*, they could never rise from that to the signification of *God*, and that the idea of a multitude is inseparably

*burgh Review* for the last quarter of 1851, and the writer would agree, I apprehend, with Mr. Wenger, in the supposition that *Deva* meant—"Illuminator." He denies also the connection between the Teutonic *God* and the Persian *Khoda*, and elucidates the Slavonic word for God which is "*Bog*," identifying it with the Sanscrit *Bhaga*, which signifies "the divider, distributor, or ruler." Touching in a note on our Chinese differences, he expresses a hope that "the old word *Shang-Te* may be adopted by Christians of whatever denomination in China."

connected with it, so that they cannot, while they use it, teach the Chinese that there is but one God. These representations, however, do not appear to have produced much effect. More regard may be paid to them when they are thus enforced by the judgment of parties of competent ability and experience, beyond the circle, and out of the heat of our peculiar controversy. I said before, that if it were right in India to render *Elohim* by *Ishwara*, it could not be wrong to render it in China by *Shang-Te*; I may say here, that if *dehta* would not suffice for *God* in India, neither will *shin* suffice for it in China. If the first verse of Genesis translated with *dehta* would only mean—"a god created heaven and earth," the same verse translated with *shin* can only mean—"a spirit created heaven and earth."

Mr. Wenger's suggestion, that the primary meaning of *Deva* may have been "The enlightener," would remove the difficulty which the view of it as an adjective, signifying "luminous," interposes in the way of its relative use. But I shall be slow to acquiesce in the etymology. Much more accordant with the natural sources of our idea of God, as developed by McCosh, is the old derivation of *theos* from *theo* or *tithémi*, *pono*, making the first conception of the Deity to be taken from the arrangements of His works.<sup>1</sup>

The proposal of Mr. Wenger, made before he had perused any of the publications on one side or the other of our controversy in China, that *Te* without adjunct should be used for God, is not without interest. Dr. Boone in more than one place takes a special objection to the use of *Shang-Te*, because it is a compound term, consisting of an adjective "Supreme," and a noun "Ruler," whereas he says, we want a simple, uncompounded word, like *God*. (Def. p. 43.) Again he says, that with such a compound phrase we cannot teach a strict and proper monotheism—"Does not the addition of the adjective *supreme* imply the existence of inferior gods? The belief in the existence of only *one supreme God* is not monotheism; but the belief in the existence of one God is." (Def. p. 91.)

I purposely reserved for the present place these objections to the use of *Shang-Te*, thinking that their appropriateness, if not their force, would be illustrated by Mr. Wenger's remarks.

Now, it must have appeared even to a cursory reader of the preceding pages, that *Te* and *Shang-Te* are used interchangeably, and the one nearly as frequently as the other. If the advocates of *shin* were willing to use *Te*, I should have no further controversy with them. *Te* cannot be used for God, without admitting that by Heaven the Chinese do not intend the material heavens, but the governing Spirit who is in heaven, for if *Shang-*

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle says in his Introduction to "The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell"—"To know God, *Theos*, the MAKER, must always be the highest glory for a man."

*Te* be sometimes explained as meaning *T'een*, *T'een* and *Te* are more frequently interchanged. Between two versions of the old Testament, the one of which rendered *Elohim* by *Shang-Te*, and the other rendered it by *Te*, there would be no antagonism. There might be different opinions as to the force, perspicuity, and elegance, attaching to the different renderings, but the Chinese would learn the same truth from them both.

I do not see that we must necessarily have a simple uncompounded word in Chinese for God. The nature of the language often requires us to use two or more characters for one English word. *Saviour*, for instance, is expressed by *Kew-choo*, *lawyer* by *sung-sze*, and *soul* most commonly, among missionaries, by *ling-hwun*. I am not aware that any great difficulties have been found by translators in the use of *Shang-Te*.

The prefixing of *Shang* to *Te* has not the effect among the Chinese, which Dr. Boone would attribute to it—of distinguishing merely the *Supreme God* from *inferior deities*. As well might be reason that because Abraham lifted up his hand to the *most high* God, therefore he believed in a multitude of other gods. The effect of *Shang* is, I conceive, to give emphasis to the *Te*, just as we think that we raise the meaning of our word, by writing the first letter with a capital—*God* and not *god*. *Te* indicates the general notion of rule which the mind receives from the contemplation of nature and providence. *Shang-Te* denotes the conclusion to which the mind comes, in harmony with revealed truth, that there is one great Supreme Ruler—one God. When a Chinese reasoner wishes to rise from the thought of many spiritual beings, working and governing in the universe, he does so by means of the term *Shang-Te*. Hence, though *Shang-Te* is sometimes called *T'een-che Shin* i. e. the Spirit of or in heaven, the expression is explained so as to prevent its being supposed that He is merely one of the *Teen-shin*, or heavenly spirits. It is said—“By *Shang-Te* and by Heaven the same Being is intended. When we collect the *shin* of heaven and express the idea of them in a word, we use the name *Shang-Te*.”<sup>1</sup> Let the reader refer to the discussion in the first chapter about the five *Tes*, and he will be convinced that *Te* and *Shang-Te* convey to the Chinese the idea of one Being, and that as it is contrary to the doctrine of antiquity to say that there are more *Shang-Tes* than one, it is equally contrary to it to say that there are more *Tes* than one. The objection, therefore, to the use of the compound term that it would suggest the idea of inferior gods has no validity. There is no reason why on account of it we should deny ourselves the advantages of definiteness and authority which attach to *Shang-Te*. Some missionaries in India find it preferable to use for God the compound *Parameshwarā*

<sup>1</sup> 上帝即天也，聚天之神而言之，則謂之上帝

(which others have employed for *Jehovah*) instead of *Ishwara*. "It is the word," writes Mr. Lacroix, "which I for one always use."

We ought also, I think, in this matter to have some respect to the use of *Te* in the sense of emperor, and in application to the sovereigns of China. Such an employment of the term is perhaps to be regretted, yet it shows more clearly the analogy between *Te* and the Hebrew *Elohim*. Both the names are applied away from the supreme Being to earthly monarchs, and on exactly the same principles. At least, the explanation which is given by critics of such a usage of the Hebrew words, is that which Chinese scholars assign for the similar usage of *Te*. Hengstenberg says upon the first verse of the 82d Psalm, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods;"—"In the Law of Moses, all those whose office it is to command, to judge, and to arbitrate, all those to whom in any respect reverence and regard is due, are set apart as the representatives of God upon earth. We are taught to recognize in governors a reflection of the majesty of God. But it was in connection with the office of judge that the stamp of divinity was most conspicuous." In accordance with these principles, the name *Elohim* was given to governors, especially in their judicial capacity, as the representatives of God upon earth. What now do the Chinese say on the application of *Te* to emperors? In the Dictionary *Heae Shing* we read:—"Te means the Lord and Governor of heaven; but because emperors are appointed by Heaven to regulate matters, they are also honoured as *Tes*."<sup>1</sup> The subject is fully treated in the T'ang edition of the Classics, in the discussion of the meaning of the first sentence of the Shoo-king, where Yaou is spoken of as "the *Te* Yaou." "*Te*," it is said, "is one of the names of heaven, and the reason why it is named *Te*, is that *Te* means to judge. Respect is thus had to the unlimited impartiality of Heaven, not recognizing any distinction between self and others, but judging and examining all things, with a justice and equity reaching to the utmost distance. On this account Heaven is named *Te*. The five *Tes*—*i. e.* the five ancient emperors—agreed with this in their principles, being also able to exercise discerning judgment, on which account the name was applied to them." A few columns farther on, we meet with the important words:—"The meaning of *T'een* and *Te* is the same. A human sovereign may be called *Te*, but he cannot be called *T'een*, for the name Heaven is spoken with reference to the body (*i. e.* nature or essence), and a human sovereign cannot share the nature of Heaven."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Medhurst's Inquiry on the proper mode of rendering the word God, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> 帝者天之一名所以名帝,帝者諦也,言天蕩然無心,忘於物我,言公平通遠審諦,故謂之帝也。

These passages make it clear that the name *Te* is given to emperors as the representatives of Heaven, the vicegerents of God, while there is nothing in the application to raise in them the thought that they are *in nature* more

五帝道同於此亦能審諦故取其名天之與帝，  
義爲一也，人主可得稱帝，不可得稱天者，以天  
隨體而立名，人主不可同天之體也\*

\* "A human sovereign cannot share the nature of Heaven." I may not find a more appropriate place than this to consider an objection urged by Dr. Boone against the use of *Te* and *Shang-Te*, on the ground that *Shang-Te* is explained as not referring to the 體, or substance of the being so styled. He says:—

"Take, for instance, the explanation of the words *t'ien* 天 and *tí* 帝 given by Ching-tsz' when commenting on the 18th Section of the *Chau Lí*: *T'ien yü tí yih yé; t'ien yen k'í t'í, tí yen k'í chú* 天與帝一也，天言其體，帝言其主， *T'ien* (Heaven) and *Tí* (Ruler) are the same; [the name] heaven refers to its (the ruling power's) (t'í 體) substance; *tí*, the Ruler, refers to its *ruling*.

"If we are correct in using the word *tí* 體 substance, to express that in which the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are *one*; when we say 'the three Persons are one *Sháng-tí*,' how can the phrase *Sháng-tí*, which does not refer to the *substance* of the being indicated, but only to *his ruling*, teach that the oneness of the three Persons consists in their having only one *tí* 體 substance, or their being con-substantial? Will the words 'Three Persons and Supreme Ruler,' express the Athanasian view of the Trinity?"—(Def. p. 91.)

It might here be replied, And what advantage is gained by using *shin* rather than *Te* or *Shang-Te*? If *Te* be not used by the Chinese to denote the *substance* of the Being so denominated, *it is used to denote the substance of shin*. Attention was called to this point in the note on p. 107. Dr. Boone assuredly will be in a worse case with *shin* as regards 'the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity,' in his view of it, than the Missionaries who use *Shang-Te*. *Our substanceless Ruler is the substance of his God*. A preliminary difficulty, it is evident, has to be met by Dr. Boone, before he can with propriety call upon others to explain "the remarkable fact" which he points out in regard to the phrase *Shang-Te*.

But I do not wish to take shelter behind any difficulty that besets an opponent. The difficulty which Dr. Boone urges against the use of *Shang-Te*, may be fairly resolved, I think, in the following way—if, indeed, it ought to be called a difficulty at all. The words of the scholar Ching should be rendered, "*T'een* and *Te* are one Being; speaking of His substance, we call Him *T'een*; speaking of His rule, we call Him *Te*." Dr. Boone introduces the words "the name" before the second *T'een*, and the words "the title" before the second *Te*. He also renders the character 其 (*ke*) by the neuter pronoun "*its*," and supplies the words "*the ruling power's*" to explain it. Now, I ask Dr. Boone what is the antecedent to 其? Is it *T'een* or *Te* or *Yih*? If it be *T'een*, he ought to have translated "*its*," and supplied "*heaven's*." If it be *Te*, he ought to have translated "*his*," and supplied "*the ruler's*." If it be *yih*, he ought to have translated the first clause—" *T'een and Te are the same Being or the same thing*," according as he considered the subject spoken of in the Ritual to be

than other men. In such a usage of the word there is nothing idolatrous. There is nothing in it even to support a despotical throne. The ruler may be an autocrat, a king, or the president of a republic. It is his "regulation of matters"—his being invested with authority and ruling righteously—which constitutes him a *Te*. The term, however, in this signification is used extensively, and I would therefore argue, that in the translation of the Scriptures, we should employ for *Elohim* and *Theos*, in their proper application, the name *Shang-Te*. Not that there would be any danger, in the use of the simple *Te*, of our seeming to forbid civil government, as Dr. Boone fears. (Essay, p. 67.) We often find the term on the same page in its two-fold application, only raised, when given to God, above the place which it occupies as given to the emperor. No more should we be setting ourselves against civil government, in writing and preaching that there is only one *Te*, than the Apostle attacks the principles of social order, when he declares that to us Christians there is only one Lord, Jesus Christ.<sup>1</sup>

a person or thing; the translation of 其 would then either be "his" or "its," according to the decision on that previous inquiry.

The view which I take of the passage is sufficiently indicated in the translation which I have proposed. The import of the declaration, in the phraseology of the last chapter, I conceive to be this—"The Divinity considered in the absolute—as to essence, in Himself—we call *T'een* or *Heaven*; considered relatively—as He is towards other beings—we call Him *The Ruler*." Now as a translation of *Elohim* and *Theos*, we do not want the name of Deity in the absolute. We want the name of Deity in relation, and in the Chinese name we have a term expressing personality and authority, as precisely as any term could do. Be it that the Chinese greatly err in their conception of Deity in the absolute, we can correct that error, and lead them to the right notion of Him.

At the risk of being considered a defender of Chinese notions whether good or bad, I will add that *T'een*, used to awaken the thought of God in the absolute, conveys in many Chinese works important and correct ideas. That in such an application the mind does not rest in the material heaven was proved, I consider, in the first chapter, pp. 37, 38. Heaven used symbolically for Him who dwells and rules above it, calls up the ideas of Unity, Brilliancy, and Purity. Behind the material screen there is one Being, Glorious, Pure, and Infinite! Other ideas may also be associated with it, but these are distinctly indicated.

<sup>1</sup> In illustration of these remarks, I beg to quote the following passage from the 13th volume of the collected statutes of the present dynasty, as published in the 39th year of Keen-lung:—帝授神器統一寰瀛剪滅巨寇乾坤載清，一著戎衣若雨甘雨大告武成作神人主，—"Te gave thee the empire, to govern all within its circle. Thou cuttedst off and didst exterminate the great banditti, till the land became tranquil and pure. Thou donnedst once thine armour, and it was as if it rained sweet rain. There was a great announcement of the completion of thine enterprise, and thou becamest the lord of spirits and men." In such language do the Tartar emperors celebrate the founder of their dynasty. Let the reader mark it. 1st, Dr. Medhurst in more than one place has referred to the

Leaving these remarks on the objection to the use of *Shang-Te*, taken from the fact of its being a compound term, I proceed to consider the characters used for *God* by the Roman Catholics. More than one of the points to which I have adverted will present themselves again in the exhibition of them.

It is well known that the name which they use for *God* is *T'een-choo*, which means—"The Lord of heaven," and it is the more deserving of attention at the present time, because some Protestant missionaries are also employing it. The Bishop of Victoria writes:—"T'een-choo, (the Lord of heaven,) the Roman Catholic term for 'God,' has doubtless many things to recommend it as preferable—being stereotyped by nearly a century and a half of usage in a religion, which numbers its tens of thousands in every province of the empire, and whose religious nomenclature Protestant christians have adopted, on most other points. But better satisfied as I should be, to see a compromise effected on that basis, I have but little hope at present on any other term than *T'een-shin*. Glad should I be if the able pen of Dr. Medhurst could induce the Protestant missionary body to accept *T'een-choo* as the basis of compromise."

Since he penned these sentences, the Bishop of Victoria has abandoned the hope of a compromise on the basis of the combination *T'een-shin*, or Heavenly spirit. Nor do I think that there is any likelihood of so happy a result being effected on the basis of the name *T'een-choo*. There is, indeed, no comparison between the merits of these two terms. Were I reduced to make an election between them, I should not hesitate a moment in deciding

phrase 神器, as a designation of the empire. Whatever be the precise import of the characters, the thing denoted by them appears here as the gift of *Te*. 2d, The emperor is often spoken of as "the lord of all the *shin*"—百神之主. Here we see that he is so, by virtue of the gift of *Te*. He who subjects spirits and men to the emperor, cannot be Himself put under him. This passage alone would prove that the Chinese recognize three orders of intelligent beings, *Te* or God, *shin* or spirits, and men. 3d, In rendering *Theos* by this word *Te*, we should no more be declaring war against the emperor's title, than the emperor himself declares war against it. Dr. Boone says that if we use *Te* for God, we must "forbid all Christians to call the emperor by this title, or we must call a man 'August God,' than which it would be better for us to cut out our tongues." (Essay, p. 57.) It has been shown in the text, that *Te*, as applied to the emperor, does not indicate any participation in the Divine nature. I should have thought that the words of Christ in John X., 35, would have made Dr. Boone pause, before he wrote that we should cut out our tongues rather than make such an application of a term. Wherein does he better himself by adopting *shin* for *God*? Let us suppose that he is talking with a Roman Catholic Chinese, and asks him who taught him to pray to the Virgin Mary. The Chinese will answer—"My *shin-foo* taught me so." "Your *shin-foo* taught you so! Do you know what you are saying? Did God the Father teach you to worship the Virgin Mary?" "God, the Father! I mean my spiritual father, my priest." "Sir, I forbid you to call a man by this title. It would be better for you to cut out your tongue." What, I again ask, does Dr. Boone gain, by attempting to metamorphose the word *spirit* into *God*?

for the latter. All essential truth may be taught by means of it, whereas error is inseparable from the use of *T'een-shin*, or any other generic term of nature. When, however, we weigh the claims of *T'een-choo* against *Shang-Te*, those of the latter appear to me greatly to preponderate.

The names agree in various important particulars. *First, They are both relative terms.* *Shang-Te* denotes—The Supreme Ruler. *T'een-choo* denotes—The Lord of heaven. I claim the benefit of this agreement in the controversy between Dr. Boone and myself. As I said with reference to the use of *Ishwara* in India, “If it be right to use *Ishwara* for God in India, it cannot be wrong to use *Shang-Te* for God in China,” so now I say with reference to *T'een-choo*, If the Roman Catholics have committed no serious error in using *T'een-choo* for God, we cannot be committing any serious error in the use of *Shang-Te*. Considering the grammatical character of the two appellations—the identity, that is, of their grammatical character—there is no antagonism between the Scriptures, as they may be given by the Roman Catholics to the Chinese, and as they are given to them by the Protestant missionaries, who use *Shang-Te*, so far as the use of terms for *Elohim* and *Theos* is concerned. The scholarship of many of the Romish missionaries has never been called in question. They came into China nobly furnished with the science and learning of the West, and their productions in Chinese show how they profited in the language and literature of this land. Their employment of the term *shin* in the meaning of *spirit*, and of *T'een-choo*, a relative name, to signify *God*, are facts not to be lightly valued in adjudicating upon the questions now agitated among the Protestant missionaries.

*Second, Shang-Te and T'een-choo are with the Chinese synonymous terms. They are understood to denote the same Being.* In the note translated from Regis' version of the Yih-king on page 69, it will be seen how he observes that “the expressions ‘Lord and governor of heaven,’ ‘Lord of all things,’ and ‘Lord of heaven,’ are only synonyms of *Shang-Te*.” The most common Chinese definition of this name indeed is—“*Shang-Te* is the Lord and Governor of heaven.” In the soliloquy of the great Shun, given on page 100, one of the names which he gives to the Supreme Being is *T'een-choo*, *Shang-Te*, “The Lord of heaven, *Shang-Te*.” It was expressly stated by the Governor of Fuh-keen province, in his communications with the Bishop of Victoria, that “*Shang-Te* conveys to the Chinese mind the idea of one universal Ruler of the world; the same being as *T'een-choo*, the God of Western nations.” He defined *Shang-Te* to be *Teen shang che choo*, “The Lord of heaven on high.” Thus then, no objection can be advanced against the use of *Shang-Te*, which does not lie as much against *T'een-choo*. The composing the strife between the Dominicans on the one hand, and the Jesuits on the other, by a Papal rescript, requiring that they should both

use *T'een-choo* for God, was nothing but an ingenious device, unworthy, I must pronounce it, both of those who counselled it, and those who accepted it. Some Protestant missionaries who have been considered advocates of *shin* would now agree to a compromise on the basis of *T'een-choo*. Of what nature can their objections be to the use of *Shang-Te*? If valid against it, they are equally valid against *T'een-choo*.

There is a *third* point in which *T'een-choo* and *Shang-Te* agree together. *They are both compound terms.* The objection pressed by Dr. Boone against *Shang-Te* on this ground lies equally against the rival term. It must suffice, however, to have simply noticed this point of agreement. Enough has been said on the difficulty arising from it already. In the first note appended to this chapter, will be found some extracts from a Roman Catholic work, illustrating the use of terms both for *God* and *god*. If all Protestant missionaries, abandoning the use of a generic term, will unite to use a relative name for God, the special objection pleaded against a compound term will not be a matter of difficult adjustment. I have now, before passing on from the consideration of *T'een-choo*, to state *why* I consider that its claims to be used as the translation of *Elohim* and *Theos* are inferior to those of *Shang-Te*.

*First,* The prefix *T'een* or Heaven is objectionable. It localizes the *Choo*. God is indeed the Lord of heaven, but He is the Lord of the earth also, and of every portion of the universe. His revealing His glory in heaven has nothing to do with the relation which He sustains to us, as our Ruler and Lord. *Shang* would not be so objectionable as a prefix, but still *Shang-Te* would be to be preferred to *Shang-Choo*.

*Secondly,* The term *Choo* is required to render *Lord* in the translation of the Scriptures. The words *God* and *Lord* often come together in the same verse, and to use *Choo* in both cases must be awkward and unsatisfactory. I find the exclamation of Thomas, when convinced that the risen Saviour stood before him, rendered, "my true Lord, my heavenly Lord"<sup>1</sup>—an inadequate translation, surely, of the words, "my Lord, and my God!"

*Thirdly,* Though there is an intimate connection between the ideas of a Ruler and a Lord, it has been shown that it is the former which corresponds to the idea of God. It is of a more general signification, and all the truth taught in the Scriptures concerning God, may be more easily and better developed by the use of *Te* than by the use of *Choo*.

*Fourthly,* *Shang-Te* is the indigenous, vernacular, designation of God in Chinese. *T'een-choo* is only a synonym of it. *Shang-Te* is in Chinese what *God* is in English, what *Elohim* was in Hebrew, what *Theos* was in Greek. To *Shang-Te* the Chinese mind quick responds. The Bible in Chinese

<sup>1</sup> 多默諾曰,我真主,我天主

without *Shang-Te*, would be like the Bible in English, without the word *God*. For *God* we might insert various synonyms. We might say in this passage—"The Almighty," and in that—"The Lord of heaven;" but would such a version be as "profitable for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness," as the present? Surely not. And the Missionary who will exchange the name *Shang-Te* for the name *T'een-choo*, similarly abandons the vantage ground, whence he might, with greatest prospect of success, direct his enterprise to get possession of the hearts of the Chinese people, in the name of the only living and true God.

*Fifthly*, Whose seal and superscription are upon the combination *T'een-choo*? The seal and superscription of Pope Clement XI. His Constitution is the only letter of commendation which the name has. I stand upon my Protestant freedom, and decline to acknowledge it. Let it be a rule to those who profess fealty and subjection to the See of Rome, but let not Protestants seek to be entangled with such a yoke of bondage. I do not say—Away with the term. It is a Popish invention—

*"Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."*

The term is a good term, to render the words "The Lord of heaven," wherever they may occur. It is a good term to use in speaking of God, whenever we may wish to describe Him, as the Lord of heaven, but it is no translation of *Elohim* or *Theos*. The Bishop of Victoria did not write wisely, when he penned the wish that Dr. Medhurst could induce all Protestant missionaries to unite in using *T'een-choo*. Distant be the day, when the Bible Society, which has been described in Papal Bulls as "strolling with effrontery through the world," shall go to the Vatican, and, as if there were not "a wise man, or a man able to judge," among all the Protestant missionaries in China, receive from thence the term which it is to sanction in the Scriptures that it publishes for the millions of the Chinese. It has been said to me, when urging this point in conversation—"Such remarks would suit the platform of Exeter Hall better than the field of calm dispassionate argument." It is possible that they might be acceptable to some audiences in Exeter Hall, but they would be so, I venture to believe, because of their justice. The relations of Popery and Protestantism are not those in which Protestant missionaries should needlessly recognize the authority and submit to the dictation of "Apostolical Constitutions" issuing from Rome.

*Sixthly*, We have been accustomed to think that it was a good thing for Protestant missionaries to be able, by the use of a different name for God, to discriminate their teaching of Christianity among the Chinese from that of Popery. If the Roman Catholics had kept by the proper word for God, it would be absurd in us to use an improper word, that we might avoid being confounded with them. But as they have given up the *natural* word of the language, and adopted a term which is only a synonym of that, it is

to be accounted a happy circumstance, that without coming into collision with Romanists in what they teach about God, Protestants may stand out, distinct and apart from them, before the eyes of the Chinese people. The *T'een-choo Kaou* is to the Chinese the name for Popery. What is there so attractive to Protestants in Transubstantiation, Mariolatry, the Veneration of the Cross, and all the other Anti-christian tenets of Rome, that we must go out of our way to seek identification with them? Protestant principle, and philosophical reason, alike point out the impropriety of changing the name *Shang-Te* for *T'een-choo*.

Few words will be necessary upon the practice of the Mohammedans in China, in the term which they use as the representative of *Allah*. The character which they so employ is *Choo*, Lord. It is a relative term. They scout the worship of the *shin*, declaring that they are created beings, and they further say that the Being whom they intend by *Choo*, is the same as the *Shang-Te* of the classics.<sup>1</sup> Their testimony, therefore, is all in favour of the two theses which I have maintained—that the *Shang-Te* of the Chinese is the true God, and that the name *God* is a relative term. A missionary who uses *Shang-Te* for God will have to encounter the same difficulties in presenting the truth to a Mohammedan Chinese, which have to be encountered in other countries, in dealing with men of the same religion; but a missionary who uses *shin* for God, will instantly be met by Mohammedans with the charge that he is a setter forth of beings which have been made, as entitled to be revered—that he worships and serves the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. And this charge cannot be refuted, but by the missionary's saying that he uses the word in a non-natural sense, and understands it in a manner altogether different from his hearers.

I come, last of all, to notice the practice of the Jews in China. All doubt is now removed as to the existence of one Colony at least of the descendants of Abraham in this country, and it can no longer be said that it was a Jesuit invention, to represent them as using the terms *T'een* and *Shang-Te* for God. The accounts of them first given to the world about a hundred and fifty years ago by the Romish missionaries, have been corroborated by the fuller information which has been gained concerning them during the past year. The Jews do not worship the *shin*. They place, indeed, the worship of *shin* along with that of idols. In the Tablet recording the rebuilding of their temple, in 1483, it is said—"From the beginning of the world, the

<sup>1</sup> I hoped to be able to give a quotation from a Mohammedan work in Chinese in illustration of this statement—that the *Choo* or *Allah* of the Koran is the same as the *Shang-Te* of the Chinese. Dr. Medhurst is in possession of such a work, where this particular point is argued. Unfortunately he has been unable to lay his hand upon it just when it is wanted, but he says—"Of the point there cannot be any doubt."

patriarchs have handed down the precept that we must not make images and similitudes, and that we must not worship the *shin* and the *kwei*, for images and similitudes cannot give protection, nor can the *shin* and the *kwei* afford us aid."<sup>1</sup> While the Jews have thus stood aloof from the *shin*, they do not hesitate to speak of worshipping and serving *T'een*, using that word, as they told the Romish missionaries, who visited them in the last century, instead of Jehovah. That it is not the material heaven of which they think, is plain from all their monuments, and in illustration of it I need only give the following couplets, written on pillars in the principal hall of their temple:—"When you look up and contemplate *the all-creating Heaven*, do you dare to withhold your reverence and awe? When you look down and worship *the ever-living Lord*, you ought to maintain purity of body and mind."<sup>2</sup> "Before the wide vault, we burn the fragrant incense without reference to name or form. Tracing our religion up to the western world, we resist our evil desires, and alone maintain truth and purity."<sup>3</sup>

On other two pillars is an inscription beginning—"The decrees of *Te* are clear and bright,"<sup>4</sup> which words are taken from the Book of Odes, the *Te* spoken of being *Shang-Te*. It is to be lamented that the present Jews have lost all knowledge of the Hebrew language, so that we cannot learn from them what Chinese word they consider equivalent to *Elohim*, and it does not appear that Gozani, or any other of the Romish missionaries who visited the temple so long back, put any specific question to them on this point. Unless, therefore, there shall yet be discovered some version of the Pentateuch made while they had Rabbis conversant with the language of their fore-fathers among them, it is not likely we shall obtain the satisfaction, which the knowledge of that particular matter would afford us. We do know, however, that they now consider, and have always considered, *Shang-Te* to be the true God. The inscription just referred to is a sufficient proof of this, and I may mention that when two of these Jews, who visited Shang-hae during the last year, were asked shortly after their arrival by a gentleman, himself, I believe, preferring the term *shin* for *God*, whom

<sup>1</sup> 自開闢天地祖師相傳不塑于形像不詔于神  
鬼形像無佑神鬼無濟

<sup>2</sup> 仰瞻造化天敢不起恭起敬俯拜長生主自宜  
潔體潔心

<sup>3</sup> 對太空以蕪梅檀都忘名象遡西土而抗嗜欲  
獨守清真

<sup>4</sup> 帝命曰明曰旦

they worshipped, they at once replied "*Shang-Te*." Indeed, using *T'een*, the absolute name of the Deity in Chinese, for Jehovah, I think it impossible that the Jews, if ever they translated the Pentateuch into this language, could use any other term for *Elohim* than *Te* or *Shang-Te*.

The first of my theses, then, is supported by the authority of the Jews, and their support of the second also may reasonably be inferred. I have heard it said that their authority is not worth much, but I must dissent from that opinion. If the Jews coming into China had adopted the notions of the Chinese without discrimination, then indeed their value as witnesses on either side of the question debated among missionaries would be very slight. But they kept aloof from the idolatry which they found; they kept aloof from the worship of the *shin*. They acted with reason and reflection in the course which they adopted, and doing this, I cannot but hold their views to be entitled to great weight in the matters which I have been discussing.

I have now exhibited the various topics which I proposed to consider in the present chapter. My principal object in it was to show that in rendering God in Chinese by a relative term, I was borne out by the practice of missionaries in other most important fields of labour, and by the practice of those natives and foreigners who, monotheists themselves, have, as a matter of course, or by their acknowledged attainments, been thoroughly acquainted with this most difficult language. I will not write as if I doubted whether I had successfully accomplished that object. I believe that I have done so, and I now beg the missionary friends from whom I differ so entirely in this controversy, to consider the various *testimonia auctoritatis* submitted to them. Surely, the prince of American exegetes, the host of Indian missionaries, Jesuits, Dominicans, and Franciscans—all the servants of the Roman see, Mohammedans, and Jews, would not be found thus united in one opinion, if that were not according to truth and reason.

#### APPENDIX.—Note I. EXAMPLES OF THE USE OF TERMS BY THE ROMANISTS IN CHINA.

The following passages are extracted from "The correct explanations of the Sacred King"—a Roman Catholic work of great merit, first published in 1642:—

##### 1. A description of God.

"*T'een-choo* in the original text of the West is *Theos*. He is the Lord of heaven, earth, and all things, self-existent, perfectly spiritual without any form, without beginning and without end, ever living, ever ruling. He is everywhere present. All good and all happiness centre in Him. He is above all. Before heaven and earth, He existed alone—this *T'een-choo*. By His almighty power, He made heaven, earth, men, and all things, out of nothing, and over all His works He constantly presides, ruling them, preserving them, leading them, so that everything obtains its proper place. Moreover, He is perfectly righteous and just, so that the good and the bad of all time have their reward and punishment from Him, without the slightest omission. He is indeed the great source from whom we have our life, and the great Lord who governs us. All people therefore in the world ought to acknowledge, obey, and reverently

honour Him. He is not one of the *T'een-choos*, of which the Buddhists assign one to every heaven. Let the reader distinguish Him from these."<sup>1</sup>

2. The doctrine of the Trinity is called "The doctrine of *T'een-choo*, three persons and one substance."<sup>2</sup> From several pages of writing on this mysterious subject, I selected the following paragraph:—

"It may be said, 'Since the Father begat the Son, the Father must have been before the Son, and since the Father and the Son together send forth the Spirit, the Father and the Son must have been before the Spirit. Since there are thus the conditions of first and last, there must be the differences of having a beginning and not having a beginning, and it is impossible that the three persons should all be without beginning.' But to this reasoning it is replied—'We may consider the distinction of first and last in two ways, either with reference to time or order. When we speak of a father and his son, the father must have been many years before his son—this is the distinction of first and last with reference to time. But when we speak of fire and warmth, as soon as there is fire, it sends forth heat, only as the fire emits the heat and the heat comes from the fire, we say that the one is before the other, with reference, that is, to the order of nature. Now, it is somewhat in this way with the three persons of *T'een-choo*. There being the Father, there was contemporaneously the Son. There being the Father and the Son, there was contemporaneously the Spirit. The Father, from the beginning before any beginning, begat the Son, so that the Son had no beginning. The Father and the Son, from the beginning before any beginning, together sent forth the Spirit, so that neither had the Spirit any beginning.' These remarks show that there is no distinction of time, when we speak of first and last with reference to the three persons. But the Father begat the Son, the Son was begotten of the Father, the Father and the Son together send forth the Spirit—all this is spoken with regard to order.

"There is the Sun. It has a body, light, and heat. If we speak of time, the time of these three is the same. There being the sun's body, contemporaneously there are both light and heat. But since the light is produced from the body, and the heat from the body and the light, they are to be viewed as first and last in order of nature. Again, in our mental constitution there are the three faculties of perception, love, and memory. There being the mental nature, these three faculties manifest themselves at the same time. They are not—this first and that last in time, but the three faculties coming forth from the substance of our nature, may be viewed as first and last with regard to their order.

<sup>1</sup> 天主西土原文曰陡斯乃天地萬物之主是自  
有者至神無形無始無終常活常王無所不在  
萬善萬福渾然全備無以尚之未有天地之先  
獨有此一天主以其全能從無物中造成天地  
人物而常爲之宰制保護開引俾萬彙咸得其  
所且又至義至公古今善惡悉有賞罰毫髮不  
遺是誠生我御我之大原大主所以宇內兆民  
皆當認從而虔奉之非釋氏諸天各一天主之  
謂也觀者辨之

<sup>2</sup> 天主三位一體之理



“The Bible records of the wicked king Ahaziah, that, in a dangerous sickness, he sent messengers to pray to the spirits of the land (*t'oo-shin*), when God (*T'een-choo*) sent a holy prophet to meet them, saying, ‘Is there no true God (*Choo*) in the kingdom? What mean ye by going to ask false spirits (*wei-shin*)? Your king shall not recover of his sickness. God (*T'een-choo*) has determined his death.’ The messengers returned, and the king died, as they were told.

“The Bible also records, how God (*T'een-choo*) reproves the worshippers of evil spirits (*seay-shin*), saying, ‘I will now judge the sin of those who worship spirits that have no power, and I will cut off their name from among men. Can those spirits save them? I alone am the true God (*Choo*), and besides me there is no God (*Choo*). I alone can destroy men, and in a little bring them to life again. I alone can inflict all kinds of suffering upon men, and in a little change those inflictions into blessings. When men break my laws, and are enduring my punishments, who can deliver them?’<sup>1</sup>

On the confession of Peter, which is rendered—“Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, (*T'een-choo*), the Holy Father,”<sup>2</sup> it is said:—“The word ‘living’ clearly points out the distinction between true and false Gods (*T'een-choo*). The true God is the living God (*Choo*), ever living, ever reigning, ever taking care for the affairs of the world, ever observing the actions of men, to reward them and to punish them. False gods (*Choo*) are dead gods (*Choo*). They seem to be gods (*Choo*), but are not. In the Bible, God (*T'een-choo*) speaks to men saying, ‘The spirits of the land are all evil demons, or wooden images, or figures of mud. They have eyes, but they see not. They have ears, but they hear not. They have noses, but they smell not. They have feet, but they walk not. The true God (*Choo*) is only one. I am He. If I wish to wound a man, no spirit can heal him. If I wish to slay a man, no spirit can keep him alive. I alone can heal and preserve alive. I alone hold in my hand the power of life and death.’

“St. Austin says in explanation of Peter's words, ‘They who reverence the false spirits of the land, can easily see their gods (*Choo*), but their gods cannot see them, for they are all blind and dead gods. The eyes of the true God (*Choo*) are seeing eyes:

<sup>1</sup> 天主苦患世人,用罰其罪,乃世人多昧厥自,置主不禱,妄禱邪神,豈知邪神本于吾苦無涉,安能我救哉,且求之於彼,愈重天主聖怒,而苦難愈加矣

經記惡王阿谷西亞,病危命使禱于土神,天主遣先知聖人,急逐之曰,豈國內無真主乎,往問僞神何爲,爾王病必不退,天主已判其死矣,使者返,而王果死

又經載天主責拜邪神者云,彼拜無能之神者, (致發吾怒),今將嚴判其非,削其名於人之中,彼神能救之乎,蓋真主惟我,我外豈別有主哉,惟我能滅世人,未幾而復活之,惟我能降百苦,未幾而吉祥之人,犯吾法而罹吾形,孰能救之乎

<sup>2</sup> 師實乃基利斯督,生活天主聖父之子

they are living. The chief disciple knowing, how multitudes of men are bewildered about the spirits of the land, when he would point out the true God (*Choo*), adds the word *living*.”<sup>1</sup>

I have rendered, in the above passages, the words *T'een-choo*, and *Choo*, by God, or god, according to their application, this being the meaning which the writer wished to be attached to them, though they properly signify—“The Lord of heaven,” and “Lord.” The phrase 偽神 (*wei-shin*)—“false spirits,” appears to me inappropriate, if “false” is to be understood as denying the existence of the spirits. A Chinese graduate once said to me—“Spirits are spirits. They may be bad or good, true or deceiving, but though you say that they are false, you cannot take away their existence. When you say there is only one spirit, you talk nonsense, and when you say that there are false spirits, you talk nonsense also, unless you mean false in the sense of deceiving.” The concluding passage from Augustin, however, is conclusive as showing that the writer could in no way by means of *shin* bring out even the idea of a god. The manner in which 天主 and 主 are interchanged, is worthy the attention of those who, instead of those terms, and on sounder principles of philology, prefer to use 上帝 and 帝。

**Note II.—ON THE NAME JEHOVAH. IS IT BETTER TO TRANSLATE IT OR TRANSFER IT?**

From the observations of Mr. Wenger, given on p. 119, it appears that in versions in the North of India, the name *Jehovah* has been for the most part translated. *Elohim* is rendered by *Ishwara*, and *Yehova* by *Parameshwara*, which means—*Ishwara par excellence*. The propriety of such a course may be called in question. The two Hebrew words convey very different ideas. They belong, indeed, to the same being, but *Jehovah* brings Him before the mind as He is in Himself, and *Elohim* as He is related to His creatures. The one predicates of Him that He is the self-existent One; the other that He is the Lord and Governor of the universe. It would seem desirable, that if *Jehovah* be translated, a word or words should be employed for it, that will awaken, as nearly as possible, its proper meaning, in the mind of a reader.

I do not know, however, that this has been attempted in any version of the Bible. In the Septuagint, *Yehova* is generally rendered by *Kurios*, Lord, sometimes by *Theos*,

<sup>1</sup> 生活二字,明指真偽天主之殊,蓋真主活主也,恒活恒王,恒理世事,恒視人行,以褒賞,以貶罰,偽主死主也,似主而非主也,經內天主謂人曰,土神皆或邪魔,或木偶,或泥臺,備目而不視,備耳而不聆,備鼻而不嗅,備足而不行,真主惟一,我是也,我欲傷人,無神能醫,欲殺無神能活,獨我能醫,能活,獨我握生死之柄,奧斯定聖人解曰,敬偽土神,易見其主,但其主不能見彼,蓋皆盲主死主,真主之目明目也,生活也,宗徒知人多迷于土神,指真主加生活二字者故,

and occasionally by *Despotes*. The Vulgate, so far as I have examined it, uniformly adheres to the rendering *Dominus*.

Dr. Morrison, in the version of the Old Testament, rendered *Yehova* by *Shin-choo* (神主), which is the name given by the Chinese to the Spirit-tablet, used in all sacrifices, but by which doubtless he intended to represent the idea—*Divine Lord*. For the combination *Yehova-Elohim*, he gives *Shin-chay*, *Shin-choo* (神者神主), "He who is spirit, the spiritual Lord." Dr. Marshman sometimes translates the word by the same characters, *Shin-choo*, and sometimes he transfers the original by the characters 耶賀華 (*Yay-ho-hwa*). In some cases, if not in all, he gives for the combination *Yehova-Elohim* simply *Shin-choo*. Dr. Gutzlaff, rendering *Elohim* by *Shang-Te*, for *Yehova* has given *Hwang Shang-Te* (皇上帝), "The Sovereign *Shang-Te*," and for the combination *Yehova-Elohim*, *Shang-choo*, *Hwang Shang-Te* (上主皇上帝), "The Supreme Lord, the Sovereign *Shang-Te*."

So far as precedent goes, it is in favour of translating the original term, and were it to be given by *Choo* (主), or *Shang-choo* (上主), we should be able to plead the example of the Septuagint, sanctioned by the consent of our Lord and the Apostles. It has been agreed, however, by the missionaries at Shanghai—those translating *Elohim* by *shin*, as well as those translating it by *Shang-Te*—to transfer the word *Yehova* from the Hebrew. There are many who will regret their decision. By whatever characters the sound of the Hebrew word is represented—and there are already four or five varieties in the field, as if not one but half a dozen apples of discord had been thrown among Chinese missionaries—the Chinese can only understand that the combination is a proper name. Jehovah is brought down to the level of false gods, and only by means of explanations and commentaries can the evil be remedied.

Might we not translate the word according to its proper signification, and for *Yehova* say *Tsze-yew-chay* (自有者), "The self-existent?" The combination *Yehova-Elohim* would be represented by *Tsze-yew-che-Shang-Te* (自有之上帝). The name would not then lie meaningless beneath the eye, nor fall meaningless upon the ear, but would quicken the mind to the thought of God as the self-existent One, the Being, who is, and who was, and who is to come.

## CHAPTER IV.

ON THE DIFFERENT CHINESE TERMS USED BY PROTESTANT MISSIONARIES FOR THE WORD SPIRIT—NAMELY, SHIN, LING, AND FUNG.

There may be a few passages in the Scriptures, where *ruach* or *pneuma* occurs in the original text, which are given in Chinese without the use of any one of the three terms—*shin*,<sup>1</sup> *ling*,<sup>2</sup> and *fung*.<sup>3</sup> They must, however, be of a peculiar nature. Three different editions of the whole or part of the New Testament were published during the past year (1851), and I find that, with the exception of such cases, the term used for *spirit* is in one *shin*, in another *ling*, and in the third *fung*.

This diversity is exceedingly to be regretted. No one will contend that a Chinese reader will receive the same, or nearly the same, idea from the three characters. In two of the editions, moreover, the character *shin*, which stands in the other for *spirit*, appears as the representative of *God*. Thus there is not only diversity but antagonism. A house divided is in a bad case, but a house divided *against itself* cannot stand. I shall endeavour to set forth the claims which are made on behalf of each of the three different terms to be used as the translation of *ruach*, *pneuma*, or *spirit*, and to discuss, so far as I know them, the obstacles which prevent all Protestant missionaries from agreeing in some one of them.

I. The claims of the character *shin* are entitled to be first heard—and that for this reason, that there is nobody who denies that it means *spirit*. All foreigners who have ever had occasion to learn the Chinese language—whatever may have been their different religions, or however they may have differed in their views of the same religion—all have concurred in regarding *shin* to be possessed of this signification. Of Pagans, we have Japanese, Cochin-Chinese, and Manchows, bearing testimony to this statement. Of Monotheists, we have Mohammedans, and Jews. Of Christians, we have Nestorians, Romanists, and Protestants. Even those missionaries who use the term to convey the sense of *God* allow that it means *spirit*. “The *shin* of China,” said Dr. Morrison, “denotes spirit or God.” In 1848, Dr. Boone stated that when used in the concrete, *shin* was to be translated a *god* or *gods*, and that when used in an abstract sense, it means Divinity or divine energy. (Essay on the rendering of the words *Elohim* and *Theos*, pp. 9, 10.) In his Defense, however, he “readily admits” that there are many cases in which to render *shin* by a *god* or *gods* would be “very absurd” (p. 126), and is content to try to make it appear that it is not “an absurdity to fancy that Chinese writers may have used the word *shin*

<sup>1</sup>神<sup>2</sup>靈<sup>3</sup>風

n the sense of a *god*, or *gods*, and in that of *spirit* also." (*Ibid.*) Dr. Boone himself, then, has no doubt that *shin* means *spirit*, while he believes that it may also mean a *god*.

This being the case—there being but one mind as to the signification of *shin*—why is it not adopted by all missionaries as the translation of *ruach* and *pneuma*? We are here from different nations—from different sections of the Christian Church—yet having one great object in view—to bring the Chinese to the faith of the Gospel. Our differences, it must be admitted, weaken our force. Were we “all one,” this people would sooner be brought to the acknowledgment of the truth. Why then do we multiply our differences, and multiply them in such a manner as to compel the heathen to take knowledge of them? We all agree that *shin* means *spirit*. It would only seem natural that all should use it in that sense, in translating the sacred Scriptures. No attempt has ever been made to show that a wrong or a feeble sense was given to any one passage where *ruach* or *pneuma* was rendered by this term. In several passages, Drs. Marshman and Morrison, elsewhere avoiding it, and using it in another sense, were obliged to resort to its employment. It might everywhere be employed, and no one would be able to say, that the Bible was not in such case translated, as well, at least, as it could be by using any other character for *spirit*.

In these circumstances, I do not think that it is too much to say that all Protestant missionaries might unite in rendering *ruach* and *pneuma* by *shin*. Some of them, indeed, think that other terms—*ling* or *fung*—may be used instead of it, but this is not the opinion of others. There are many—a majority, in fact—who believe that by no other character can they convey to a Chinese reader the mind of the Spirit. Is it right, in the face of this fact, to take *shin*, and attempt to render with it the words *Elohim* and *Theos*? They who do so, grant that it means *spirit*. They will not refuse to believe our assertion that we are pressed in conscience to use it, and it alone, to express that word in Chinese. Let them use another term for *spirit*, if they think they have another suitable. But they should not try to use this term in the sense of *God*. Upon them the antagonism of different versions of the Scriptures in Chinese is chargeable. They cannot retort the argument by which, writing as one of those who render *spirit* by *shin*, I have sought to press them. They allow themselves that it never means *God*—the true *God*—in any Chinese book. We deny that it ever means a *god*. They can plead no concessions of ours in favour of their application of the term. They say we use it rightly, and we ask, Why then use it differently from us? We say they use it wrongly. They cannot, therefore, say to us, Why not use it as we do?

I might now proceed to consider the claims which the character *ling* has to be used as the translation of *spirit*, but as Dr. Boone has endeavoured,

at great length, to make good the position that the word *shin* may have the sense of a *god* as well as of *spirit*, it is due perhaps to him and his friends that I should point out wherein, it seems to me, lies the fallacy of his reasoning, and into what errors of translation he has, in some instances, fallen.

He endeavours to show, in the first place by argument, that *shin* may sometimes be translated without absurdity a *god*, *the god*, *gods*, &c., and then to prove by sundry quotations that "the word is used, in some cases at any rate, in the sense of *god* and not *spirit*." I shall in the same order, examine first his reasoning, and next his quotations.

First, Dr. Boone says :—

"The word *God*, whether used *proprie* or *improprie*, is closely allied to the word *spirit*; *spirit* may be called the genus; *God*, *god*, *gods*, the species. This we soon perceive if we attempt to form a definition of the word *God*, when used *proprie*. No matter what attributes of power, wisdom, &c., we may ascribe to a being, if this being be material or corporeal, he is not *God* (*proprie*); to be *God* he must be a spirit possessed of certain characteristic attributes. Let us then look into the matter minutely, and endeavor to ascertain, 1st, The *characteristic* difference between a being who is truly and properly *God*, and a mere spirit; and 2dly, The characteristic difference between a *god*, *gods*, as these words are used by polytheists, and mere spirits."

Now, I agree with Dr. Boone that *spirit* may be called the genus, and *God*, *god*, *gods*, the species. I agree also that to make any being either *God* or a *god*, it is not enough that he be regarded only as a *spirit*. The characteristic—the *differentia*—which distinguishes *God* or *gods* from other spirits must be ascertained, and that added to the genus will give the species. The importance of this point will justify me in illustrating it fully from Whately's Logic.

"Whatever term," says that writer, "can be affirmed of several things, must express either their *whole essence*, which is called the *species*, or a *part* of their essence (*viz.* either the *material part*, which is called the *genus*, or the *formal and distinguishing part*, which is called *Differentia*, or, in common discourse, *characteristic*); or something *joined* to the essence, whether *necessarily* (*i. e.* to the *whole species*, or, in other words, *universally*, to every individual of it), which is called a *Property*; or contingently (*i. e.* to some individuals only of the species), which is an *Accident*." "It is evident that the Genus and Difference make up the species. *E. G.* 'rational' and 'animal' constitute 'man.'"<sup>1</sup>

It may assist us in the application of those principles, to exhibit in a tabular form the constitution of one or two *species* by the combination of the *genus* and *differentia*. I shall take first the *species* just mentioned—*man*.

Genus Characteristic

Animal + Rationality = a rational animal, an individual of the *species man*.

<sup>1</sup> Elements of Logic, Book II., chap. v., § 3.

I shall take again the *species angel*, of which, considered with reference to the *genus spirit*, the *characteristic* will be—the being employed by God to execute His will. Then,

*Genus*            *Characteristic*

Spirit+Being a minister of God = a spirit-minister of God, an individual of the *species angel*.

Now, as Dr. Boone and I agree that *God* and *gods* equally belong to the *genus spirit*, we have only to add to the word *spirit* what distinguishes *God* and *gods* from other *spirits*, and we shall have the *species* with its appropriate name. Unhappily, we do not agree in what we consider to be the *characteristic* of the *species*, but omitting any discussion of our differences on this head, let me point out the anomalous conclusion at which Dr. Boone finally arrives. *His genus and his species have the same name.* The *genus shin* or *spirit plus* the *characteristic* of the *species god* remains after all nothing but the *genus spirit*. “Rationality” being added to the *genus* “animal,” there results the *species* “man.” How is it, that adding “divinity” to “spirit,” Dr. Boone cannot produce anything more than “spirit?” Here is something so peculiar and unparalleled in language, that we are justified *a priore* in inquiring—“How can this thing be?”

The *characteristic* of the *species god* is regarded by Dr. Boone to be—“*the being considered by men proper objects of worship.*” (Def. p. 108). Now, the name of a *species*, it has been shown—Dr. Boone indeed maintains it as distinctly as I do—contains the idea of the *genus* to which it belongs, and its own *characteristic* as well. *Shin* is the *genus*. All admit that it represents the idea of *spirit*. Does it imply also the idea of being a proper object of worship likewise? By no means. Some *shins* are worshipped, and some are not. Whether any particular *shin* be an object of worship, is indicated by the predicates which are given about it. There are millions of *shins* that never can be regarded as to be worshipped. Is it not plain that *shin* just means *spirit* and nothing more?

But I have admitted, Dr. Boone will say, that some *shins* are worshipped, and he will ask—“Are not those *shins gods*?” I might admit that they are, and yet be as far as I am now from understanding how the term *shin* can be employed to translate *god*—to say nothing of rendering *God*, as applied to Jehovah, by it. Accepting Johnson’s definition that “any person or thing deified or too much honoured” is a *god*, it may be said—“The sun is a god, Gold is a god, The belly is a god, The stars are gods.” But “sun,” “gold,” “belly,” “star,” cannot be substituted for the word *god*. To propose such substitution would only expose a person to ridicule, and that there is any more reason in the proposition to render *god* by the Chinese character *shin*, I am obliged to profess myself unable to discover.

If Dr. Boone will always associate his characteristic of the species *god* with the generic word *shin*, his renderings of the sacred text will not be so perplexing and erroneous as they now are. He constitutes the species in the following way—

*Genus*                      *Characteristic*

Spirit (or *Shin*) + Being worshipped = a worshipped-spirit, an individual of the species *god*.

Then let him add to *shin* in Chinese the characters which shall denote “being worshipped,” and a reader will be able to understand his meaning. In the same way, let him add to *shin* the *characteristic* by which he distinguishes *God* from all other spirits, and we shall know, in the first verse of Genesis for instance, that he does not intend to say that some one spirit, or many spirits together, made the heavens and the earth, but that the One Spirit, who is “infinite, eternal, unchangeable, in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth,” did so. It is only in this way that a generic term can be made to teach of any species comprehended in it, or of any single individual.

I need not dwell longer on Dr. Boone’s attempts to show by reasoning that *shin* may sometimes be translated “*a god, gods.*” The *characteristic* by which he distinguishes *gods* from other spirits has always appeared to me to put the effect in the place of the cause, but there is no necessity to insist on that particular point, as *shin* indicates *no characteristic of any kind*, but is simply the term for *spirit*. I proceed therefore, *secondly*, to examine the quotations which he gives from Chinese authors to justify the sense, which he puts upon it. They are only five or six. Their scantiness cannot but be matter of surprise. Dr. Medhurst has translated all the passages adduced under the word *shin* in the Imperial Thesaurus, amounting to nearly *six hundred*, and shown that there is not one of them in which we do not obtain a good sense, rendering *shin* by *spirit*. Eighteen months ago, I took fifty-two Chinese volumes, and put them into the hands of three teachers, with instructions that they should write the characters *shin* and *ling*, at the top of the page, above every column where they occurred. When they brought me the volumes back, I copied out the different sentences which were marked, carefully studying at the same time the meaning of every one. They amounted altogether to more than sixteen hundred, of which about fourteen hundred were cases of the occurrence of *shin*. The result was an assurance to my own mind that it is not more certain that *jin* means *man*, or that *t’een* means *heaven*, than it is that *shin* means *spirit*, and *spirit* only. Against this large and constantly accumulating amount of evidence, Dr. Boone advances the reasoning which we have examined, and supports that reasoning by the adduction of half a dozen examples. Of those, five are taken from the work on Geography, published, in 1848, by

the Lieutenant-governor of Fuh-keen province. "He is admitted," says Dr. Boone, "to be a very accomplished writer," and the Editor of the *Chinese Repository* says he is willing to rest the philological evidence of the use of *shin* for *god* upon his single work. Let us then examine the various passages to which appeal is made.

The *first* is the following passage, commencing a dissertation of a religious nature, appended to the account of Persia:—"In high antiquity, the Persians and Indians all served the spirit of Fire (*Ho-shin*). In Judea and west of it, all served the spirit of Heaven (*T'een-shin*). In serving the spirit of Fire, they worshipped the rising sun, or kindled piles of faggots and did reverence towards the flames. Without the transforming influence of fire, people would not live; without the bright sun, the universe would be in darkness. From these considerations arose anciently this practice among the two nations, the idea being to requite the origin (of light and heat); it was no worship of a bad spirit (*seay-shin*)."<sup>1</sup> Now, the last words of this

<sup>1</sup> 按上古時，波斯、天竺，皆事火神，拂菻以西，皆事天神，事火神者，拜旭日，或燃柴薪，向之禮拜，民非火化不生，非白日，則宇宙無睹，故兩地之夷，上古卽有此俗，義起報本，非邪神也。

Dr. Boone's version of this passage does not materially differ from that given above, except in the rendering of *shin* by *god*. It is as follows:—"In the high antiquity, in Persia and India, all served the god of Fire (*Ho Shin*). Those who served the god of Fire worshiped the rising sun, or igniting faggots, they worshiped towards them. For the people considered that if there was no fire wherewith to cook, they could not live; and that if there was no bright sun, then in the universe there could be nothing seen. Therefore the foreigners of these two countries, from a high antiquity, had this custom. The idea arose from a desire to recompense the root (*i. e.* to acknowledge their god, the sun, as a source of blessing): it was not a (*sié shin*) depraved god, *i. e.* a being who afflicted them with curses, but a benignant being who sent them blessings."

Of a very different nature is a version given by the editor of the *Chinese Repository*, in the number of that periodical for August, 1850. He renders:—"In ancient times, the Indians and Persians all served (*ho-shin*) the god of Fire; in Judea and west of it all served (*tien shin*) the God of Heaven. Those who served the god of Fire worshiped the rising sun, with burning faggots turned towards it, and bowing down. The people [believed] that without the influence of fire they would die, and that if there was no sunlight, the whole world could not see; therefore the people of these two countries from of old had this custom, considering that in so doing they requited their origin, and that this was not a (*sié shin*) false god."

The reader will take notice of the misapprehension of the author's meaning, displayed in the manner in which the second sentence is rendered. The Governor of Fuh-keen was better informed as to Parsee practices than his translator would make him to be. It is the rendering of the last words, however, which is peculiarly deserving of reprehension. The editor of the *Chinese Repository* published an English and Chinese Vocabulary in 1844, where he gives *seay* (邪), as meaning "depraved," and *shin* as meaning "spirit," "gods." Where has he learned that "depraved" and

passage prove that I am correct in rendering *shin* by *spirit*. The Chinese divide the *shin* into two classes—*shen-shin* and *go-shin*, *i. e.*, “good *shin*, and evil *shin*,” or *ching-shin* and *seay-shin*, *i. e.*, “correct *shin* and depraved *shin*.” Is not this evidently our distinction—the Bible distinction—of spirits into *good* and *evil*? Where is the exigency to depart here from the meaning of the term, elsewhere established to be *spirit*?

Dr. Boone says:—“Now, the sun is the one being worshipped by the Parsees. Do they regard this being as a mere spirit? Could this author suppose that they regarded it as a mere spirit? Speaking of the ruin of Ormuz, our author says—‘There is an old temple there, where the sun, the god of Fire (*Ho-shin*), was honoured.’” Now, the question is not what the Parsees regard the sun to be, nor what this author thinks about their views, but it simply is, What has he said about them? The record is that “They served the spirit of Fire.” What he says about Ormuz is merely, that there is there “An old temple of the Fire-spirit of the sun.”<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Boone says again:—“Of the character of the Being worshipped by the Jews, and Europeans, *we* can have no question; and I think there can be no doubt that He who gave the law at Mount Sinai, and who is the alone object of worship of the Jews, the Romanists, and of all Europeans, was no mere spirit, and yet he calls him all through this section (the sequel of the sentence given above) the *shin* of heaven.” And elsewhere the author calls this Being *Shang-Te* and *T’een-Te*. He never calls Him *shin* alone. The combination “*T’een-shin*,” by which He is called here, will be found examined in an Appendix, in connection with the Bishop of Victoria’s proposal to use it for God. Evidently, the *T’een* is understood to single out this spirit from other spirits, either as an individual *shin*, or as one of the class—“Heavenly spirits.” In other places the author speaks of *T’een-shin*, in connection with Buddhism. Writing of Cambodia, he says—“A Buddhist priest from India got the kingdom, and taught the people to serve *T’een-shin*, and every morning to chant the sacred books.”<sup>2</sup> Again, writing of the manners and customs of the Hindoos, he gives a vivid description of the scenes at some of their festivals. Men are hung up in the air, he says, by hooks fixed in their backs, so that they look like flying birds, while they scatter fruits, which are eagerly snatched at, and carried home

“false” are interchangeable terms? When we speak of a “false god,” we deny the existence of the “god,” whereas the Chinese writer only indicates the character of the *shin*. If we are to twist and alter the signification of words in this manner, there is not only an end of controversy, but we expose our honesty also to suspicion.

<sup>1</sup> 有太陽火神古殿

<sup>2</sup> 天竺僧有其國教國人事天神每旦誦經咒

to the aged and the sick, "as gifts from *T'een-shin*."<sup>1</sup> Such applications of the phrase prove that the writer does not limit it so much as Dr. Boone thinks that he does, and show the propriety of our adhering in the interpretation of it to the acknowledged signification of its terms.

The *second* passage to which appeal is made in proof that *shin* may be translated a *god*, is a note explaining who Jupiter was. The writer has been narrating how Hannibal swore eternal enmity to the Romans before Jupiter, and in a note says that Jupiter was "an ancestral spirit, whom every nation of antiquity worshipped," adding—"I do not know exactly of what age he was a man."<sup>2</sup> No passage could establish more clearly the adherence of the writer to the usual signification of the character *shin*. Dr. Boone says that Jupiter is called in a note—"so-fung tsung-tsu *chi-shin*," "the god (*shin*) whom their ancestors worshipped." The whole note is very brief. Dr. Boone omitting the last clause—"I do not know of what age he was a man," and omitting also the four first characters, which contain the nominative to the verb *fung*, produced a version opposed to one of the first-learned laws of Chinese construction. Happily, however, he has corrected it in part in a table of *errata*, and desires the passage to be read—"the ancestral god (*shin*) whom they (each country) worshipped." But what is meant by "the ancestral god?" "An ancestral spirit," is the spirit of an ancestor. To the mind of the Chinese author, Jupiter had been a distinguished hero—the first founder of one or more of the kingdoms of the West. As the Chinese worship the spirits of the founders of all their various dynasties, so he understands that the people of the west worshipped the spirit of Jupiter. An analogous, almost the identical phrase, indeed, is found in the Yu-Luy, upon the 5th paragraph of the 11th chapter of Mencius. It is said—"A younger brother is commonly to be respected less (than an uncle), but when he is personating (a deceased parent or ancestor during sacrifice), then it is on him that the ancestral spirit (*tsoo-tsung shin-ling*) depends, and he is to receive the marks of respect."<sup>3</sup>

Two other passages are appealed to, where the writer, Dr. Boone says, "calls Jesus, when spoken of as an object of worship, by this name *shin*." The first of these occurs in an account of Roman Catholic practices in Manila. "The *Padres*," he says, "do not sacrifice to ancestors."<sup>4</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> 得果者,歸以奉家長及病者,以爲天神所賜

<sup>2</sup> 古時各國所奉祖宗之神,未詳何時人

<sup>3</sup> 有人平日知弟之爲卑,而不知其爲尸之時,乃祖宗神靈之所依,不可不敬者

<sup>4</sup> 巴禮者,不祀先祖,所奉之神,惟叻氏而已

only spirit to which they sacrifice is *Luh-she*,"—probably the *Logos*. The second passage occurs in a dissertation on Christianity. It is said—"They who follow the doctrines of Jesus, do not sacrifice to any other spirit, they do not make offerings to their ancestors; they consider Jesus to be the Saviour of the world, and depend on him for (the salvation of) their bodies and lives."<sup>1</sup> I have read over the whole dissertation, and every other passage in the Geography, where Christianity is spoken of, or the character *shin* used, many times, and the idea which the writer has of Christian worship seems to me to be this—We worship, he thinks, God, whom he calls *Shang-Te*, and *T'een-Te*, and we worship also Jesus, he existing now in heaven in a spiritual state—as a *shin*. That Jesus and the Father are one, he does not understand. He says that "the father of Jesus was called Joseph,"<sup>2</sup> that his mother "Mary became pregnant from a spirit,"<sup>3</sup> that "John the Baptist knew that Jesus was a perfect man,"<sup>4</sup> which is the very designation that he gives in the page before (Chap. VI., p. 37) to Moses. He defines Christ to mean the same as the Chinese characters "*shin-ling*,"<sup>5</sup> *i. e.*, according to Dr. Morrison, "spiritual, intellectual, not material." He says, indeed, that "Jesus said that Heaven was his Father, and that he was the only son of the Supreme Heaven, who had descended and been born to save and help mankind,"<sup>6</sup> but he evidently understands these assertions to be like Moses' "giving out that a *T'een-shin* descended on Mount Sinai, and gave him ten commandments,"<sup>7</sup> "making a pretence that they were spirit-principles, to excite the respect and belief of men."<sup>8</sup>

Thus, the manner in which he found Jesus spoken of in the Scriptures and Tracts published by many Protestant missionaries led the writer into error, and prevented him from rising to the comprehension of Christ as being one with the Father, not simply a spiritual being incarnate, but God manifest in the flesh, and now not one of the *shin-ling* like Confucius, but the Lord

<sup>1</sup> 奉耶穌之教者,不祀別神,不供祖先,以耶穌爲救世主,而以身命倚之

<sup>2</sup> 耶穌之父曰約色弗

<sup>3</sup> 馬利亞感神而孕

<sup>4</sup> 約翰知耶穌爲至人

<sup>5</sup> 基督如中國之云神靈

<sup>6</sup> 謂天爲父,已爲上天之獨子,降生以拯濟世人

<sup>7</sup> 託言天神降於西奈山,垂十誡

<sup>8</sup> 託於神道,以起人之崇信耳

of all. The opposing of the worship of Christ to that of ancestors might alone suffice to show that *shin* is to be understood in the sense of spirit. The Chinese sacrifice to the spirits of their ancestors, and Christians, this author believes, sacrifice to the spirit of the "perfect man," Jesus.

The last passages adduced from the Governor of Fuh-keen are two, in which he speaks of the inhabitants of the west of Africa, "utterly stupid and ignorant, approximating to birds and beasts."<sup>1</sup> "They sacrifice," he says, "to trees, birds, and beasts, as if they were *spirits*,"<sup>2</sup> and again—"The black natives of Guinea, a chaos of stupidity, worship birds and beasts as if they were *spirits*."<sup>3</sup> Where is the necessity to translate in these passages *shin* by any other term than *spirit*?

I have thus gone over all the instances adduced by Dr. Boone, from the work which is affirmed to be decisive as to the philological use of the term *shin*. Let the reader judge if they do not confirm the meaning which in thousands of other instances we are obliged to put upon it—whether they do not prove that the writer used *shin* just as we use *spirit*. The Editor of the *Chinese Repository*, on whose rendering of the first passage I have animadverted in a note, says—"Shin is rightly translated *gods* in these extracts, or else the author did not know how to use his own language, or else objects of worship are not properly called *gods* in English, as in Isaiah XLIV. It is impertinent to our common sense and usages of speech as Englishmen to tell us the latter; and if the Governor of Fuh-keen means anything else than *god* or *gods* by the word *shin* in these places, he is alive and his ideas can be ascertained." Well—the ideas of the Governor of Fuh-keen have been ascertained. About six months after the above sentences appeared in the *Repository*, the Bishop of Victoria had the interview with him, to which I have had occasion to refer several times. His Excellency then stated "clearly and unequivocally" that "the primary and essential idea conveyed by the term *shin* is something invisible and immaterial," (*moo-hing*); that "the *Shang-Te* of China and the *T'een-choo* of Christian nations cannot be reckoned among the *shin* on the ground of being included among worshipped objects, but may be called a *shin* as an invisible and incorporeal being;" that "the general idea attached to a *shin* was that of previous existence as a *man*, the contrary being obvious in the case of the *shin* of fire and other elements, and the *shin* of hills, &c.;" that "we could not truly say there was only *one shin*; it was untrue, for there was a variety of meanings of the term *shin*, and the Chinese could never understand it of

<sup>1</sup> 混沌無知,近禽獸

<sup>2</sup> 有祀樹木禽獸爲神

<sup>3</sup> 黑番混沌拜禽獸爲神

one worshipped Being or God, for there were many *shin* that were not worshipped."<sup>1</sup>

The Editor of the *Repository*, has probably, since the report of the interview from which I have taken the above statements was published, fallen back upon the alternative that "the author did not know how to use his own language." And yet Dr. Boone pronounces him—and most justly—to be "a very accomplished writer." The duty of missionaries is not to teach the Chinese how to speak and write their own language, but to learn from them the meaning of their words and their manner of using them in combination, that they may then speak and write to them of the things belonging to the kingdom of God. If any will alter the signification of Chinese terms, they will be "speaking in an unknown tongue, not unto men, but unto God, for no man understandeth them." Rather than pursue such a course, it is better to say with Paul—"I had rather speak five words with my understanding (so as to be understood), that *by my voice* I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an *unknown* tongue."

<sup>1</sup> In a note (Def. p. 123) Dr. Boone says—"This author calls the Being worshipped by Christians *T'een* 天, *Shang T'een* 上天, *Shang-Te* 上帝, *T'een-choo* 天主, *T'een-shin* 天神, and *shin* 神." This enumeration is neither correct nor complete. The instance—and I believe the only instance—where 天 and 上天 are used, is that in which he states that Jesus said that "Heaven was his father, and that he was the only son of the Supreme Heaven." *Shin* is not used to designate God. It is only applied to Christ in the cases discussed in the text. 天神 is a name, the precise meaning of which in its application by the writer is a matter of dispute. 天主 is always used in connection with 教 (*kaou*), denoting Popery. 上帝 is used, in speaking of David. It is said—"He revered and feared *Shang-Te*." It is used also, in speaking of Mohammed, who "preached that there was only one true Lord, *Shang-Te*." I have not noticed any other instances of its use. *T'een-Te* 天帝 occurs at least once. It is said—"The English kneel down and worship *T'een-Te*, and the Saviour, but they will not *k'ow-tow* to a sovereign." Moses is said to have taught to worship *Shin-T'een* 神天, which name the author does not seem to understand, for he changes it to *T'een-shin*. It was Dr. Morrison's favourite designation for *God*, and is generally supposed to have been coined by him. The title of the Bible, as published by him, was 神天聖書, "the Sacred Book of *Shin-T'een*." Inside, God was called 神, but somehow the Translator could not call the Bible, the Sacred Book of *Shin*. I have met in the book of "Actions and their Rewards" with one instance of the combination. A case of virtuous conduct is related, and it is added 赫赫神天,豈有如是之人,而令其饑寒者乎, "How is it possible that the glorious 神天 should allow such a man as this to come to a condition of penury?" *Shin-T'een* is only a synonym of *T'een* or *Shang-Te*.

There remains but one other passage to which Dr. Boone appeals in proof of his assertion that *shin* may be translated a *god*. It is taken from the "Easy Mirror of History," Chap. 22d, where the introduction of Buddhism into China by the Emperor Ming is narrated. "The Emperor," it is said, "heard that in the west there was a *shin* named *Fuh*, and he therefore sent messengers to India, who sought for his doctrines, obtained his books, and brought them to China, along with priests."<sup>1</sup> In connection with this passage, Dr. Boone quotes another sentence—"In India there is Buddha, a *shin*,"<sup>2</sup> and says that in the commentary on the Sacred Edict, Buddha is repeatedly called "*shin Fuh*."<sup>3</sup> He adds—"The word *shin* in all these instances must be rendered *god* and not *spirit*." But there is no "must be" in the case. We meet with such a passage as—"Heuentih's heart and *shin* became composed,"<sup>4</sup> and we can say—"Shin here *must be spirit*, for to render it by *god* would make nonsense." Or we meet with such a passage as—"The *shin* of this paragraph lies all in the last sentence,"<sup>5</sup> and we can say again—"Shin here *must be spirit*. To render it by *god* would make nonsense." Where is there a similar necessity, in the passages cited by Dr. Boone, to translate *shin* by *god*? We obtain a good sense in every one of them by rendering it "a spirit"—and it can be shown moreover, that the writers were attaching to it that idea. The History goes on to say—"According to the general scope of the Buddhist books, what is chiefly to be sought is a state of vacant nihility; they set a value on compassion, and condemn all taking of life. They teach that when man dies, the subtile spirit (*tsing shin*) is not extinguished, but is again immediately invested with a bodily form, and that there is a recompense for all the good and evil, which is done during life. In consequence, that which Buddhism most values is the sublimation of the subtile spirit, in order to arrive at the state of Buddha."<sup>6</sup> Again, in the commentary on the Sacred Edict, the Buddhist priests, only regarding and regulating their

<sup>1</sup> 帝聞西域有神,其名曰佛,因遣使之天竺,求其道,得其書,及沙門以來

<sup>2</sup> 天竺國有佛即神也

<sup>3</sup> 神佛

<sup>4</sup> 立德心神方定

<sup>5</sup> 此章之神全在下句

<sup>6</sup> 其書大抵以虛無爲宗,貴慈悲,不殺,以爲人死精神不滅,隨復受形,生時所行善惡,皆有報應,故所貴脩練精神,以至爲佛

hearts,<sup>1</sup> in order to become Buddha, are compared with the Taoist doctors, doing nothing but nourish their *spirits* (*tsing-shin*),<sup>2</sup> in order to become *spirits* and *genii* (*shin seen*).<sup>3</sup> Thus, in the context, both in the History, and the explanation of the Edict, the writers use the character *shin*, in its usual acceptation of *spirit*. Why give it another sense in the particular phrases in question?

Referring to the 40th volume of "The Historians," we find a fuller account of the introduction of Buddhism into China. It is related that "the Emperor Ming dreamt that he saw a man of gold, tall and large, with a brightness about his head, and questioned his ministers about it. One of them said, 'In the west there is a *shin*, named Fub; his image is sixteen cubits high, and of the colour of gold.' Upon this the Emperor sent messengers to India to ask for the doctrines and laws of Buddha, and from that time arose the making of images in China."<sup>4</sup> From this narrative it would appear that the word *shin* was used with reference to the image which the Emperor saw in his dream, a metonymical use of it, which need not be deemed strange. The polytheist calls his image a *god*; the Roman Catholic calls his a *saint*; the Chinese, according to the nature of his religious system, calls his image a *spirit*.

All the examples quoted by Dr. Boone to show that *shin* may be translated a *god* or *gods* have now been discussed. Let it be remembered that in 1848 he maintained that such was its proper rendering, while the instances where it is used for *spirit* were only exceptional. Now the case is reversed. It is admitted that the word does frequently mean *spirit*, and it is only pleaded that it *may* sometimes denote a *god*. I have examined the reasoning by which it is endeavoured to show *a priori* that the two-fold signification may attach to the term, and am obliged to regard it as eminently inconclusive. But the reasoning is not more inconclusive than the instances of actual usage appealed to in confirmation of it are unsatisfactory. *There has not yet been brought forward a single sentence in which it can be shown that shin ought to be translated a god or gods.* Why not make the appeal to what must be regarded as *crucial* examples? If *shin* were to be found associated with possessive pronouns, where we could render the

<sup>1</sup> 佛教只照管着一個心

<sup>2</sup> 道教只是留存這一點神氣

<sup>3</sup> 成佛,做神仙

<sup>4</sup> 帝夢見金人,長大,頂有光明,以問羣臣,或曰,西方有神,名曰佛,其形長丈六尺,而黃金色,帝於是遣使天竺,問佛道法,遂於中國圖畫形像焉。

combination—"my god," "your god," "their gods, &c.," we should not be able to dispute its meaning, and as decisive would be cases where it was in regimen with other nouns, and could be translated—"gods of the nations," "the gods of Japan, &c." But there are no cases of such a usage. With possessive pronouns *shin* means indubitably *spirit*—"my spirit," "your spirit, &c.," and the same in regimen—"the spirit of king *Wan*," "the spirits of his parents," "the spirits of ancestors," "the spirits of the hills and rivers."

And if *shin* never occurs in the sense of a *god*, how unreasonable is it to insist on using it in the sense of *God*! This is to be accomplished by a typographical device. "The word *god* and *God*," writes the Editor of the *Chinese Repository*, "differ in English as much as *man* and *Man* (*i. e.* *Mr. Man*) do. The absence of a capital letter is a hindrance to the easy understanding of many words in Chinese, but Dr. Medhurst must know that by leaving a blank space before the character *shin* when used for *God*, and none when used for *god*, the phrases—"my God, my God," "the God of Abraham," "the gods of the nations, &c.," will to an attentive reader of the Bible be far more intelligible than he represents them as likely to be." Now, what analogy is there between *god* and *God* and *man* and *Mr. Man*? Is *God* a meaningless proper name, simply serving to distinguish one being from all the others of the same kind? Is the expression "our God" of the same nature as "our Mr. Smith?" If we distinguish the character in the manner proposed, we shall certainly indicate that we intend some special emphasis to be put upon it, but we shall change neither its grammatical nature, nor its proper meaning. The Chinese are accustomed to leave a blank space in some instances before the character in question, or rather to leave many blank spaces and write it in an elevated position at the top of a column, and whenever they do so, they intend the spirit of *Shang-Te*. Just as we write "the SPIRIT of God," so do they denote the SHIN of *Shang-Te*.

I now return to the point from which I diverged to examine the grounds on which it was argued that *shin* sometimes meant *god*. The opinion of many, who are acknowledged to be good Chinese scholars, that it never does so, commands my fullest conviction;—but all admit that it means *spirit*. Why then, as I asked on page 141, may not all agree to use it as the representative of *ruach* and *pneuma*? A majority of Protestant missionaries do so use it. Other terms are proposed by some. If it be thought that they better express the sense of the Greek and Hebrew terms, let those who think so employ them, but while they do so, they ought not to impose a new meaning upon *shin*, and use it as the representative of *Elohim* and *Theos*, producing a version antagonistic to that of those who use it in its undenied and undeniable sense of *spirit*. The Apostle enjoins upon us that we "look

not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." It is impossible that different parties of missionaries should pursue their several courses, independent of and indifferent to one another. Seeking one object, servants of one master, bound to love one another, they cannot and they ought not to do so; and I would say—"If those who use *shin* for God will not abandon the attempt to impose that meaning upon it, then let those who use it in the sense of *spirit*, cease to do so, if they can find another term in the language that will answer as a translation of *ruach* and *pneuma*. They may continue to employ *Shang-Te* for God, but avoiding the use of *shin*, their version of the Scriptures and their general teaching will not come so directly into collision with those of their brethren." I can say, for one, that I have anxiously sought for another term, which I could use for *spirit* instead of *shin*. With what success will appear from the succeeding pages.

II. I now come to consider the claims which may be made on behalf of the term *ling*, as corresponding in Chinese to the Hebrew *ruach*, and the Greek *pneuma*. The definitions given of *shin* and *ling* in the Imperial Thesaurus show that they are closely related in signification. Under *shin* it is said—"Shin means *ling*,"<sup>1</sup> and then there is quoted from the Appendix to the Yih-king—"That which the *yin* and *yang* do not measure is called *shin*."<sup>2</sup> Under *ling* it is said—"Ling means *shin*, also good, magical, affectionate, felicitous."<sup>3</sup> The meaning of *ling* thus covers a larger space than

### <sup>1</sup> 神靈也

<sup>2</sup> 陰陽不測之謂神. These characters are rendered by Dr. Medhurst—

"The inscrutableness of the superior and inferior principles of nature is called *shin*, mysterious." In the version which I have given above, I have followed Regis, whose words are—"Quod non cadit sub mensuram modumque principiorum *yn*, *yang*, dicitur *chin*, *spiritus*." Chinese students will do well to consult the note which he has upon the passage. "We may conclude," he says, "that with the Chinese that is regarded, and called, *spirit*, which does not fall under measurement, which is devoid of quantity, which is not matter—neither *yin* nor *yang*." According to this view of the passage, we have in it a definition of *spirit*, and not an account of some quality in the *yin* and *yang*, which is *spiritual* or *mysterious*. By Dr. Medhurst the character 之 is understood between 陽 and 不. With Regis 陰陽 are the subject of

the verb 測, and I am not sorry to give, in illustration of such a construction, a passage, from among several which I have met with to the same effect, showing that the knowledge of the *shin* as a class is limited. It is said of music—"Viewing it in a rough manner, women and children can understand its wonderfulness, but viewing it with reference to its subtle principles, *spirits cannot fathom* its causes," 粗之則

婦豎皆能知其妙精之則鬼神不測其故

<sup>3</sup> 靈神也善也巫也寵也福也

that of *shin*. To a certain extent they explain one another, yet there are applications of *ling*, in which *shin* could not be employed.

Now, it is agreed on all hands that *shin* means *spirit*, *spiritual*. Dr. Morrison says—"Every evanescent, invisible, inscrutable, spiritual, operating power or cause is called *shin*." It is in this signification that *ling* is synonymous with it. The same writer gives a definition of *shin* in which it is said—"That which is subtile and *ling* is called *shin*,"<sup>1</sup> where the adjunct "subtile" fixes the meaning of *ling*. This, then, is the case for *ling*. It is used to define *shin*, and *shin* again is used to define it. May we not, therefore, use the one as well as the other to translate *ruach* and *pneuma*? A large body of the Protestant missionaries are using *ling* for this purpose. They are open to a charge of remarkable inconsistency in using at the same time *shin* for *God* and *god*. Chinese Lexicons say that *shin* and *ling* have the same meaning. Do Greek and Hebrew Lexicons say that *Theos* and *pneuma*, *Elohim* and *ruach*, have the same meaning? On this point, however, I do not wish to dwell. My inquiry at present is as to the possibility of using *ling* instead of *shin* for *spirit*.

The two words are synonymous, but there are few synonyms which may be interchanged in all cases. Each particular term has its own shade of meaning, to which attention must be paid by every one who is anxious to write with correctness and perspicuity. The words "soul" and "spirit" are closely related in English, and in many places where we speak of "the soul," the sense would not be materially affected, if we were to say "the spirit" instead. Such a substitution, however, in many other cases, would be exceedingly inappropriate, and might even lead to serious error. Before *ling* can be employed as a substitute for *shin* in translating the Scriptures, we must be well assured of the interchangeableness of the terms.

Now, let a foreign student ask any Chinese teacher whether *shin* and *ling* convey precisely the same idea, and I am persuaded he will reply in the negative. He will say that even where their meaning approaches most closely, there is a diversity between them, so that in some instances *shin* must be used, and in others *ling*. Such has been the result at least, when I have questioned Chinese scholars on the point, and an induction of examples taken from good writers, in which both the terms are used, has satisfied me of the correctness of their opinion, as well as shown wherein the terms, expressing one principal idea, do yet essentially differ. To a specimen of these examples I beg to call the attention of the reader.

In Kang-he's Dictionary under *ling*, we have a quotation—"The subtile intelligence of *shin* is called *ling*."<sup>2</sup> Here *ling* appears as a quality of *shin*,

<sup>1</sup> 精靈曰神

<sup>2</sup> 神之精明者曰靈

denoting its "subtile intelligence," and this is its most common signification, when it is used with reference to the *mind* of man. Dr. Morrison says that *shin-che-ling*<sup>1</sup> denotes "the intelligence of spirit." We read in the *Yu-luy*—"The mind is a thing the most capacious and the most *intelligent, spiritual, mysterious, unfathomable.*"<sup>2</sup> That *ling* in such sentences is to be translated "intelligent," can hardly be disputed. In explanation of the combination "capacious and intelligent," it is said, in the *Soo-e*—"The mind (*lit.* within the square inch, *i. e.* the heart as the seat of the mind), being capacious, may embrace everything; being intelligent, it may apprehend everything."<sup>3</sup>

Now "spiritual" and "intelligent" are synonymous terms. The second definition of spiritual given by Johnson is "mental, intellectual." They are not, however, interchangeable, and there are many instances where we may employ the one, in which it would destroy the meaning to substitute the other. Just so it is with *shin* and *ling*, where they have reference to the mind of man. The soul is spiritual, *i. e.*, it is incorporeal, and being spiritual, it has intelligence. To describe *its nature* we should require in Chinese to use the character *shin*: to describe *its quality*, we should use *ling*. It is *shin*: it HAS *ling*.<sup>4</sup>

But we have many examples in Chinese, where *ling* and *shin* come together, the latter being in the concrete, and denoting "a spirit, or spiritual being," and in these, while *ling* represents *a quality* of the being and not the nature, the quality is not so much that of intelligence, as of *efficaciousness*. Premare quotes a popular saying:—"A man who is old, has no vigour; a spirit (*shin*) who is old, has no efficaciousness (*ling*)."<sup>5</sup> The common application of it is in the case of temples and idols in a state of decay. From their ruinous condition it is inferred that the energies of the animating spirits are as if they were old and fading. The antithesis between the two members of the sentence determines the meaning of the various terms. It is the *quality* of an old man to be feeble; it is the *quality* of an old spirit to be devoid of *ling*, or efficaciousness.

<sup>1</sup> 神之靈

<sup>2</sup> 心之爲物,至虛至靈,神妙不測

<sup>3</sup> 方寸之內,虛無不包,靈無不覺

<sup>4</sup> We read—心本是神明之物, "The mind naturally is a thing which is spiritual and intelligent," and again—心是有靈之物, "The mind is a thing which HAS intelligence." Premare quotes the words—人心其神矣乎, "Is not the mind of man spirit?"

<sup>5</sup> 人老無能,神老無靈

On that part of the sixteenth chapter of the "Invariable Mean," where it is said that the *kwei-shin* cause every man in the empire to prepare himself properly in mind and body to offer sacrifice (see p. 19), the Paraphrast observes that "it is their *ling* which does this"<sup>1</sup> and the critical remarks upon the paraphrase call attention to the evidence of their *ling* or power, which is presented in the assertion that "they cause."<sup>3</sup>

On the 19th page, I have given a sentence of Choo He, where he says:—" *Kwei* is the efficaciousness (*ling*) of the *yin*, and *shin* is the efficaciousness of the *yang*." In his Theology of the Chinese (page 8), Dr. Medhurst translates the same passage—" *Kwei* is the spiritual part of the female principle, and *shin* the spiritual part of the male principle."<sup>3</sup> Probably he would now, after the full discussion which he has given of the relation between the words *shin* and *ling*, in his Essay on the "Proper mode of translating *ruach* and *pneuma*," rather render *ling* by "the spiritual energy" or "the efficaciousness," than by "the spiritual part." That it is rightly so rendered, is plain, I think, from the application of the same phrases in the following attempt to explain some mental phenomena on the principles of the Sung school:—"In the mind there is the union of the *animus* and *anima*. The *animus* can know the future. When there is anything which it does not know, by reflection and study it attains to the knowledge of it—by the energy of the *yang* (*yang-che-ling*). The *anima* can treasure up the past. When it has known anything, it retains and remembers it—by the efficaciousness of the *yin* (*yin-che-ling*)." <sup>4</sup>

In the third chapter of the Shang Lun, mention is made of a great officer of the principality of Loo presuming to offer a sacrifice to the spirit of the mountain T'ae, which could, by right, only be sacrificed to by his prince. Confucius reproved his conduct, saying that the spirit would not accept such a sacrifice. It is said:—"Adapting himself to the dread of spirits (which the officer had), he insisted on their *intelligence and vivacity*, to strike him with awe."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 富祭祀時，鬼神之靈，能使天下之人，各隨其所當祭者，齊明以肅於內，盛服以肅於外，以奉承乎祭祀。

<sup>2</sup> 使字正見他靈處

<sup>3</sup> 鬼者陰之靈也，神者陽之靈也

<sup>4</sup> 心者魂魄之合，魂能知來，有所未知，則思索而知之，陽之靈也，魄能藏往，其已知，則存而記之，陰之靈也

<sup>5</sup> 就其畏鬼神之念，即以鬼神之靈爽惕之

In the exposition of the first paragraph of the 9th chapter of the 7th section of the Book of Odes, it is said,—“When mountains are high, their spirits must be efficacious (*ke shin peih ling*).”<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt as to the meaning of the terms in this passage, and *ling* appears most clearly an attribute of the *shin*.

In the “Book of Actions and their Recompenses,” it is said that “such is the virtue of determined chastity, that heaven and earth agitate themselves in its behalf, and spirits for it put forth their energies (*kwei-shin heaou ling*).”<sup>2</sup>

In the 22d chapter of the “History of the Three Kingdoms,” an individual has the hardihood to say to Tsaou Ts’au, the hero of the work—“You are like one of those spirits in the temples (*shin*), which, though they receive sacrifices, give no proof of their power (*ling-yen*).”<sup>3</sup>

In a poem in praise of the Emperor Keen-wän of the Leang dynasty, it is said—“How great was Keen-wän! Gloriously does he shine in heaven. He was intelligent as a spirit (*ling-ming jo shin*), and pure as streams of water.”<sup>4</sup>

In the second volume of the Historians of the southern Tse dynasty, we have the following hymn, sung at the conclusion of the sacrifice to the Founder of husbandry, to escort his spirit (*sung shin*):—“Thy bird-upborne car is about to move, in the golden vehicle thou art soaring away. Thine instructions mounted aloft, thy righteousness was clear as a mirror. The music has had all its accompaniments; the ceremonies have been observed. Thou first leddest out the pairs of ploughmen, and in person didst travel over the green fields. Efficacious art thou and sage (*Ling-che shing-che*). To thy soft favours is due the abundant year.”<sup>5</sup>

In the statutes of the Ming dynasty, there is the following prayer to the spirit of the Standard:—“I, the Emperor, have sent the appointed officer A. B. to perform the sacrifice to the spirit of the Standard. It is by thine

<sup>1</sup> 其山既高,其神必靈矣

<sup>2</sup> 節烈之事,天地爲之震動,鬼神爲之效靈

“So dear to Heaven is saintly chastity,  
That when a soul is found sincerely so,  
A thousand liveried angels lacky her.”

Comus.

<sup>3</sup> 汝似廟中之神,雖受祭祀,恨無靈驗

<sup>4</sup> 皇矣簡文,於昭于天,靈明若神,周淡如川

<sup>5</sup> 羽籥從動,金駕時遊,教騰義鏡,樂綴禮脩,率先丹耦,躬遵綠疇,靈之聖之,歲殷澤柔

efficaciousness, O spirit, (*shin-che-ling*) that the warlike energy (of my troops) is sustained. Now, at the end of the year, there is presented to thee, according to the rules, the appropriate sacrifice. The flesh and wine are respectfully set forth. Regard them, O spirit, and enjoy the offering.”<sup>1</sup>

Many additional examples could be given, showing the difference between the terms *shin* and *ling*, but those adduced above are amply sufficient to enable me to answer the question, whether *ling* can be adopted instead of *shin* as a translation of *ruach* and *pneuma*. I do not think that it can be. Dr. Morrison says—“Any invisible or spiritual cause that is efficacious is said to be *ling*.” The instances that have been quoted attest the truth of the statement. The term *ling* denotes the *efficacy* of invisible or spiritual causes, but not those causes themselves, and in fact, it is often used where the causes cannot be called either spiritual or invisible. In the Lieutenant-governor of Fuh-keen’s Geography, we read of “the grave of a holy man,” in Java, which is “very *ling*.”<sup>2</sup> He says of English ships, that “their sails are adjusted effectively and ingeniously” *ling-keou*,<sup>3</sup> and of their gun-carriages that they are “very efficient and convenient”<sup>4</sup> (*ling-peen*). Jewish ladies also, according to him, “are beautiful, and of a nature fascinating and intelligent (*ling-hwuy*).”<sup>5</sup>

*Ling* is, indeed, used in the concrete, just as we use the words “intelligence” and “power.” Spiritual beings are called “intelligences.” Among other passages illustrating such a use of the word, we have, in Johnson’s Dictionary, the lines of Milton—

“How fully hast thou satisfied me, pure  
*Intelligence* of heaven, angel!”

The word “power” is also used in the same way, as when Paul writes to the Ephesians—“We wrestle against principalities, against *powers*,” or when Satan addresses the fallen angel,—

“Thrones, dominations, principedoms, virtues, *powers*.”

But though “intelligence,” the quality of a spiritual being, is sometimes put by a figure of speech for that being itself, it would be found impossible.

<sup>1</sup> 皇帝遣具官某致祭于旗靈之神，維神之靈實壯威武，適當歲暮禮宜時祀，敬陳牲醴，神其鑒之，尚享。

<sup>2</sup> 有聖墓極靈

<sup>3</sup> 其蓬關換靈巧

<sup>4</sup> 極其靈便

<sup>5</sup> 猶太女人姿姣好，而性靈慧

to substitute the word "intelligence" for "spirit" in any English book, and as impossible is it to substitute *ling* for *shin* in the Chinese scriptures.

The missionaries who use *shin* for God, have frequent occasion to speak of "The Spirit of God," and "The Holy Spirit." They will do so—most of them—by means of the phrases "*shin-che-ling*" and "*shing ling*." But both of these expressions have a definite meaning in Chinese. They denote attributes. No matter what meaning we say attaches to *shin*, the *ling* of *shin* is merely the intelligence or efficacy of *shin*. To speak of the Holy Ghost—the third person in the Trinity—by either of the combinations just mentioned, is to deny the doctrine of the Trinity. Dr. Boone will pardon me when I earnestly remonstrate with him on this point. I believe it was zeal for what he considered the truth, which led him to press so strongly his objection to a relative term for God. He believed no doubt—and perhaps still believes—that with such a term there cannot be taught "the orthodox doctrine" of the Athanasian creed. So deeply impressed as he is with the importance of teaching that the unity of the Godhead is a unity of substance, *how is that he predicates the third person to be only a quality?* A version of the New Testament with *ling* for *pneuma* does certainly predicate this. I know he does not mean to assert such an erroneous doctrine, but the proof is before my readers that he really does do so. A Chinese reading the printed word will no more be able to learn the personality of the Holy Spirit from it, than an Englishman would be able to learn it, from an edition of the Scriptures, in which "energy," "efficaciousness," "intelligence," or some similar word expressing a spiritual quality, were to be substituted in every case in the room of "spirit." Not only will he not learn the doctrine, but he will learn to deny it.

The consequence would just be the same, if the missionaries who use *Shang-Te* for God were to employ *ling* and not *shin* for *spirit*. The *ling* of *Shang-Te* would indicate the intelligence or the efficaciousness of *Shang-Te*, but nothing more. To say that He is *ling*, as must be done in translating John iv., 24, would not of itself convey any information concerning His nature. It would affirm no more of Him, than the Governor of Fuh-keen affirms concerning the grave of a saint in Java, and concerning the sails of English vessels and their gun-carriages. Any higher meaning that might be attached to it, would arise from the mind of the reader previously understanding that *Shang-Te* was a *shin*—a spirit.

From the preceding enquiry into the relation between *shin* and *ling*, I am brought to the conclusion that the latter cannot be used in translating the Scriptures as the representative of *ruach* and *pneuma*. In the Report of the Committee of the American Bible Society on the Chinese version, adopted in the end of 1850, and which recommends the use of *shin* for God, it is said that, having made such recommendation, "they can do no otherwise

than recommend that *Ling* be employed to denote *spirit*." But such counsel must have been given in ignorance of the ill effects likely to arise from using *ling* in such a manner. The Committee allow that *shin* does not mean *God*, but they think it may be made to mean so. Surely they are not prepared to sacrifice, to this attempt to alter the signification of a term, the doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit—to reduce the second person in the Trinity, the Revealer of the things of Christ, the Comforter, the Sanctifier, to a mere influence or energy. I know they are not. They would be shocked at the supposition of such a thing being charged against them. I am bound to state, however, my most painful conviction that such will be the effect of their recommendation to use *ling* for *spirit*. It has not been formed rashly. If it could be shown that *ling* does express the spiritual nature of the beings concerning which it is predicated, I should unfeignedly rejoice. But satisfied from a very large induction of facts that it does not do so, I cannot use it to render in Chinese *ruach* and *pneuma*. And, indeed, when we once adopt the principle that we may use words in a different sense from that which they properly have, it is impossible to set a limit to the errors and confusion to which it must lead. One word cannot be tampered with, without a hundred others being affected. As it has been thought requisite to say that the word in Chinese meaning *spirit* shall hereafter mean *God*, there has arisen the necessity to alter the signification of the character *ling* from *efficaciousness* into *spirit*. And change will not stop here. It will be necessary to depart from the proper acceptance of many more terms, and the Bible in Chinese will become less and less intelligible to the Chinese people, and be to them a repository of error and not of all-important saving truth.

III. The Committee of the American Bible Society say that, recommending the use of *shin* for *God*, they can do no otherwise than recommend that *ling* be employed to denote *spirit*. Some, however, of the American missionaries in China are using a different term, and adhere to the character *fung*, which was employed for the most part by Drs. Morrison and Marshman. It is strange in the authors of the Report not to deem the claims of *fung* worthy of any consideration. The authority of Dr. Morrison on behalf of the use of *shin* for *God* is often appealed to, and yet the term which he employed for *spirit* may be abandoned without a single remark. *Fung* generally means wind. In the Dictionary of De Guignes, it is defined—"The wind, the manners of kings, their examples and doctrine." Gonsalves says it means—"Wind, custom." Callery's account of it is the same—" *Ventus, mos, consuetudo*." Dr. Morrison gives its various applications very fully. "The breath of nature," he says, "is called *Fung*. The wind; air in motion; custom; usage; spirit; temper; feeling. To scatter or dispense, as by the wind; to diffuse instruction, or affect by example. Haste; fleetness.

The name of an office ; of a place ; of a bird ; and of a plant. A surname. The sexual appetence amongst cattle. Vulgarly used for insanity." From these explanations of the meaning of the term, its inappropriateness as the representative of *ruach* and *pneuma* at once becomes apparent. The only party who has ever endeavoured to construct an argument, from instances of its use, in favour of its being employed to denote an active conscious agent was a writer in the *Chinese Repository*, in 1849, under the signature of Philo, but it would be superfluous to go into an examination of the examples which he adduces, and try to set aside his version of them. When the Chinese would compare the material influence of *wind* with the inscrutable operation of *spirit*, they speak in the one case of *fung*, and in the other of *shin*.<sup>1</sup> *Ruach* and *pneuma* do sometimes mean *wind*, and where they do so, *fung* is the proper rendering of them, but in other cases the employment of it produces a version as unintelligible to the Chinese, as the English Scriptures would be to ourselves, if we were to read in them—"The wind of God is upon me," "The love of the wind," "Hear what the wind saith unto the churches," &c., &c. I do not wonder at the majority of missionaries who employ *shin* for *God*, abandoning the use of *fung* for *spirit*, but when they do so, they should not make the names of Morrison and Marshman a rallying cry against other missionaries who use *Shang-Te* for *God*. They do not themselves follow the example of those excellent men, where they think they were wrong. If their authority may be disregarded as to the term to be used for *ruach* and *pneuma*, why may it not also be disregarded as to the term to be used for *Elohim* and *Theos* ?

*Shin*, *ling*, and *fung*, the three terms proposed as the representative of *spirit* in the Chinese Scriptures, have thus been examined. That the first means *spirit* all admit, and it is much to be deplored that all do not unite in employing it in that sense. It does not appear that either *ling* or *fung* can be used instead of it, and thus, so long as one section of missionaries will use it for *Elohim* and *Theos*, versions of the Scriptures directly opposed to each other cannot be avoided. The first step towards harmony must be taken upon this term. If it were unanimously adopted to render *ruach* and *pneuma*, there would be hope of our agreeing in the term to be used for *God*, or, if that were not attained to, we might agree to differ, and on that word we could do so, without being in collision, or one party being able to charge the other with teaching error.

<sup>1</sup> 孔子之天下文明，則風動神化，有不知其所以然者矣

APPENDIX.—Note I.—ON THE PROPOSAL TO USE THE COMBINATION T'EEEN-SHIN FOR GOD.

Missionaries are under great obligation to the Bishop of Victoria, for the manner in which he obtained the opinions of the Lieutenant-governor of Fuh-keen, on the ideas which are attached by the Chinese to the name *Shang-Te* and the term *shin*. The writer of the preceding chapters felt greatly encouraged, on finding that the views which he had been led to take both of *Shang-Te* and *shin* were entirely in accordance with those of an individual, possessed of extensive information, and raised by position and character far above the suspicion which is commonly attached to the communications of the Chinese with foreigners.

Most of the eight positions which His Excellency stated, have been adduced in the course of the foregoing chapters. I now wish to offer a few remarks on the fifth, which was to the following effect:—

“Although *Shang-Te* would be the most intelligible term to the Chinese, yet he expressed the opinion that *T'een-choo* in the Chinese version of the Holy Scriptures would be an equally good term to designate the one God. He voluntarily proposed, however, ‘*shin-t'een*’ or ‘T'EEEN-SHIN,’ (giving a decided preference to the latter) as the term for ‘God’ in Chinese writings.”

The combination *T'een-shin* has not been received with favour by any section of the Protestant missionaries, and there is not the slightest likelihood of all parties coalescing in the proposal to use it for *God*. But it is an interesting inquiry—How came the Lieutenant-governor of Fuh-keen to suggest its use?

There are two facts concerning the phrase which are abundantly susceptible of proof. First, It is a generic phrase, and denotes a class of spirits—namely, the heavenly. Under the name there are included, in the State Ritual, only four spirits,—the Cloud, Rain, and Thunder-masters, and the Baron of the winds. The phrase, however, has often a much wider application, so that the Roman Catholic and many Protestant missionaries employ it quite idiomatically, when they use it to denote “angel, angels.” This generic signification of the term is an insuperable objection to the use of it for *God*. The Lieutenant-governor stated that we could not say in Chinese that there was only one *shin*, for there were many *shin*, actual existing beings, existing as *shin*. Now *t'een-shin* is only not so extensive a term as *shin*. There are many spirits of or in heaven, and we could not say, speaking the truth, that there is only one *T'een-shin*.

This is one fact, but there is a second, seemingly irreconcilable with it. The *t'een-shin* are many, and yet there is only one *t'een-shin*. The phrase is used as a synonym of *Shang-Te*. On what principle this is done, has been a matter of much dispute among Chinese philosophers themselves. One view, not unreasonable, is this—that, as the phrase “to serve Heaven,” is not to be understood as intending the material heaven, but *Shang-Te*, the Lord and Governor thereof, the term *shin* is added to *t'een*, to indicate this. It is said—“The sacrifice at the round hillock to *Shang-Te*, dwelling in the expansive heavens is an acknowledgement of our origin. This acknowledgement shows that by the way of Heaven, we understand a Spiritual Being.”

圜丘以祀昊天上帝者，報本也。報本所以神天之道。 It is said again—“The *T'een-shin* is the most honourable. One music only is used (in sacrificing to Him), showing that only one spiritual being is contemplated,”

天神至尊，一樂而已，明其神之不二。 According to this representation, 天 and 神 are to be taken as in apposition, 天 not qualifying

the 神, but 神 explaining 天. This, I apprehend, would be the view of the author of the Geography, but it would be found very difficult to set it forth, to the mass

of the people, so clearly as to prepare their minds to be instructed by the combination, as to "one only, living and true, God."

The impression on my own mind is, that it is in the Ritual of Chow that we first read of *T'een-shin*. Dr. Boone, in his Essay (p. 30), says, that in the Book of Rites we read—"The *T'een-shin* are six, they are sacrificed to nine times a year," but having searched for such a passage in vain, I conclude that he must have confounded a comment with the text. Now, the *Chow-le* requires a great deal of critical handling, before much authority can be attributed to its statements. A Taouist, idolatrous, element, flowed into the religion of China during the Tsin dynasty, and appeared in the ancient books when they were recovered and restored in the time of the Han. The *Chow-le* is much infected with it, nor is the *Le-ke* free. There are many questions in Chinese philosophy—and among others, this use of *T'een-shin* to indicate *Shang-Te*—which will not be cleared of all confusion and uncertainty, until the principles of historical criticism shall have been fully brought to bear upon the ancient *King*.

The proposal made by the Lieutenant-governor of Fuh-keen, was supposed to be strengthened, not long after, by the discovery of a prayer to *T'een-shin*, purporting to be the composition of the statesman, Ke-ying. A book written by an officer in Fuh-keen province some twenty years ago, was palmed off on a Missionary in Fuh-chow as the production of Ke-ying, and in one of the volumes was inserted the prayer in question. There can be little doubt of its being a fabrication, though a Chinese has been met with, who asserts that he saw it three years ago. (See the Bishop of Victoria's letter on the Chinese version of the Scriptures.) I am afraid the chances of his good memory and honesty will hardly be thought to outweigh the indications of forgery, which are so conspicuous about the document. Even if it could be proved to be genuine, it would only show the inadequacy of *T'een-shin* to represent the idea of God. My object in referring to it is to do an act of reparatory justice to the missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, who are at Fuh-chow.

In a letter written in May last year, to the Rev. Mr. Meller, of the British and Foreign Bible Society, on the imposition which had been practised in passing the work off as Ke-ying's, I wrote as if all the missionaries at Fuh-chow had been deceived, and expressed my surprise at their not immediately discovering such a clumsy forgery. The missionaries above mentioned have written to me that "the work had been purchased by none of them, nor had any of their number ever spent even a moment's time for the purpose of examining its merits." I am sorry my language was not more guarded and specific. I think it was the impression at the time of all missionaries out of Fuh-chow, that the document must have been seen and examined by all the Brethren there. This was not the case, however, and as the missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions have asked me to give their statement as extensive a circulation as the letter to Mr. Meller had, I hope it will receive it, through being introduced here.

**Note II.**—ON SOME STATEMENTS IN THE REPORT ON THE CHINESE VERSION OF THE SCRIPTURES, PRESENTED TO AND ADOPTED BY THE DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY IN DECEMBER, 1850.

In this Report, the use of *shin* to denote *God*, and *ling* to denote *spirit* is advocated and recommended. On the arguments employed with this view, it is not my intention here to make any observations. They have been fully discussed in the various chapters that have been submitted to the reader. There are two statements, however, designed to awaken a prejudgment in favour of the decisions arrived at, which being highly erroneous, and injurious to many missionaries in China, the writers themselves will, I am sure, be glad to see corrected.

*First*, In the introduction to the Report, it is said—"Your Committee feel bound to say, that those gentlemen, who, for some years past, have advocated the use of *Shangti*, or some other term, in opposition to *Shin*, (for several have been proposed,) did themselves, during many years, employ this very word to express *God*, whether true or false; whereas, the defenders of *Shin* have invariably maintained that this is the only word in the language which can properly be employed, and have unwaveringly adhered to this view ever since they were led to abandon the use of *Shangti*, which they found, when they entered on their missionary labours, had already been substituted in place of the early employed *Shin*."

Now, the Committee must have been strangely misinformed on the matter, about which they say they "feel bound" to speak. "Those gentlemen," they say, "who advocate the use of *Shang-Te*, did themselves for many years employ *shin* for *God*." Be it so. "Those gentlemen, who advocate the use of *shin*, did themselves for many years, employ *Shang-Te* for *God*." I have before me a copy of the prayers read by Dr. Boone, at the opening of his chapel in Shang-hae, in which *Shang-Te* is used for *God*, and *shin* for *spirit*. I have also an edition of a Catechism published by him, in 1846 or 1847, in which the same terms are used throughout. But perhaps the Committee mean to say, that those gentlemen who were using *Shang-Te* for *God*, did at the same time use *shin* in the same sense. So, "the defenders of *shin*, who have unwaveringly adhered to the view, that it is the only word which can properly be employed for *God*, since they gave up the use of *Shang-Te*," still—at the present time—allow that *shin* means *spirit*.

If the Committee do feel bound to speak of the past use of terms by the different sections of missionaries, there is the same inconsistency to be charged, and in equal measure, upon them both. If they will consider the present use of terms by them, they will see that the defenders of *Shang-Te* for *God* and *shin* for *spirit* are more consistent than the others.

*Second*, Towards the close of the Report, the Committee seek to dispose the minds of their readers, in favour of their decision, by stating that a large majority of the missionaries are of their opinion. They say:—"In favour of the use of *Shin* in preference to any term thus far advocated, your Committee would state, that a large majority of the Protestant missionaries in China are of their opinion. By late accounts received from that country, it seems that the proportion of missionaries at the various stations, in favour of one or other of the proposed words, is as follows: For *Shangti*, nineteen; for the transferred term, six; and for *Shin*, fifty-five. This, we think, indicates the predominant feeling of those who, being on the spot, may be considered as best qualified to form a correct judgment."

Now, I feel assured that the Committee, in giving these statements to the public, believed that they were reporting the truth. Nor would I entertain for a moment the idea that the accounts transmitted to them from China were willfully falsified. But they must have been furnished by some zealous advocates for the use of *shin*, whose thoughts, the offspring of their wishes, regarded more of their brethren as coinciding in their opinion than was actually the case.

Six brethren did—indeed, for a short time, propose to transfer the Hebrew term, under the form of *Aloho*, but finding that such an expedient would only increase the number of parties in the field, instead of diminishing them, they resumed the use of *Shang-Te*. At the end of 1850, when the Report of the Committee on the Chinese version was adopted by the American Bible Society, there were, so far as I can ascertain, 84 men in China, whose names could be quoted on the one side or the other, including the chaplains and teachers connected with the Bishop of Victoria, all then in favour of *shin*, the Rev. Dr. Parker, and the Rev. Dr. Gutzlaff, in the service of the United States Government and the British Government respectively, and two ordained Chinese ministers, in connection with the London Missionary Society.

Of those 84 individuals, 47 were in favour of the term *shin*,  
and 36 were in favour of the name *Shang-Te*.

One individual does not appear to have then declared himself on one side or the other, nor do I even now know what his opinions are.

The above statement shows a majority in favour of the use of *shin* for *God*, but by no means so large a majority as was reported to the American Bible Society.

Since 1850, various changes of opinion have taken place. Some missionaries have died, and some have removed from various causes from the field. Individuals, who were then using *shin* for *God*, are now using the Roman Catholic term, *T'een-choo*, and some who employed *ling* for *spirit* have returned to the use of *shin*. Others again have told me, that though they have not adopted either *T'een-choo* or *Shang-Te*, they do not and cannot use *shin* for *God*, without some qualifying term.

There are now, I believe, who use *shin* for *spirit*, thirty-nine missionaries; who use *ling* for *spirit*, twenty-eight missionaries; and who use *fung* for *spirit* from six to ten missionaries.

There is thus a decided majority of missionaries, who are agreed upon the use of *Shang-Te* for *God*, and *shin* for *spirit*.

I should not have thought of making these statements, but for the action of the American Bible Society. The question of numbers should hardly come into a subject of this kind. If it be entertained, great care should be taken to obtain correct lists, and respect should be had to the varying value of the names. On both sides of this controversy there are good names, and on both sides names which are of little worth, as regards the qualification to give an opinion on the meaning of Chinese terms.















