

IX.

No English sect possesses greater interest for students of English history than those belonging to the English Presbyterian Church. They were Puritans, those who brought about and fought in the English Civil War. About 1645, these Puritans were classed as Presbyterians and Independents on account of difference in the system of their Church government. So far as the doctrines went, both of them were Puritans. To bring before the readers' minds the place they occupied in their country during what may be called the most important period in its history, I quote the following:—"Of the practical divinity of Elizabeth's reign, a large proportion was contributed by the Puritans. The party embraced men of high rank and general education as well as men of theological learning; and the literature of the age bears many tokens of their influence. If we descend to the next age, the greatest men of the reign of James, Charles I and the Commonwealth present themselves as in a greater or less degree connected with the Puritans—Selden, Whitlock, Milton, with their pens; Rudyard, Hampden, Vane in Parliament; Owen, Marshall, Calamy, Baxter and a host of others in the pulpit; Cromwell, Essex and Fairfax in the field,—all ranged themselves under the Puritan cause. Never was a party more distinguished in its advocates." What was the end of the party? Dr. Merle

Daubigne, the French writer of Church History, summarised it in a few words :—“There was a Presbyterian Church in England, and it became Socinian.” That is, they ended by denying the divinity of Christ. With the reader’s permission, I give below a rather lengthy quotation, which would give an idea of the working of the English mind at the period of their greatest material and mental development. The writer is an Anglican divine :—“At the beginning of the last century *i.e.*, the 18th century, the Presbyterians, shared the decline which befel every kind of Nonconformity. Presbyterians assign two causes for this decay. The first and greatest was the sudden outburst of the Arian and Socinian doctrines. Arianism in the second century was the offspring of a metaphysical speculation on the nature of the deity ; in the nineteenth it was the result of indifference to evangelical doctrine, and to the dogmatic teaching of the New Testament. The seed was sown in the Church of England by the latitudinarian divines ; but the plant, transferred to Presbyterian soil, grew there to its full luxuriousness. These opinions first appeared among the Non-conformist at Exeter, when two Presbyterian ministers, who had adopted the Arian view of Dr. Samuel Clarke, refused to acknowledge the divinity of Christ and were excluded from their chapels by the trustees. This happened in 1719. The progress of Arianism amongst the Dissenters may be gathered from the fact that when in the

following May the doctrine of the Trinity came to be discussed before the Ministers of Cornwall and Devonshire, nineteen out of seventy-five who were present refused to subscribe to the Article of the Church of England on the Trinity.

“The controversy was soon revived in London. At a meeting at Salter’s Hall the question of subscription to creeds was agitated and the progress of loose opinions was now more striking. A hundred and ten ministers were present, of whom fifty-seven voted against the necessity of subscription to creeds. This led to an immediate separation; the one party requiring subscription to the first Article of the Church of England, and the other, though proposing still to hold the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity, objecting to any subscription. The seceders gradually became Arians or Socinians. The question of subscription was agitated at the same time, by the Independents, but it is said that the Presbyterians were the more hostile of the two, to creeds and confessions. They certainly lapsed more generally into Arian or Socinian principles.” So much for the Puritans.

The three principal Non-conformist sects in England are the Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians. Let us look at the Baptists. It will be tedious to the reader to trace the history of this sect. I will confine myself to that part only which concerns us. Early in their history the Baptists were separated into two divisions. One held the doctrine of general redemption

(Arminianism), the other held the doctrine of particular redemption (ultra Calvinism.) This difference in the matter of a particular doctrine was enough to drive the respective followers into antagonistic camps. In the 18th century "many of the general Baptists had gradually adopted the Arian or perhaps the Socinian theory." The Quakers in America form a large community, nearly half of them have adopted the Arian doctrine and now form a separate Church.

I will now take a sect which is more familiar to the Indians than any other Christian community. Thirty years ago the names of Martineau, Parker and Channing were familiar to most educated Hindus. The stir created in the minds of the educated classes by the teachings of the Brahmo Somaj, naturally made us curious to learn the doctrines of a Christian sect that approached nearest to it. To the present generation Unitarian literature is hardly known. For our purpose it is a subject of the greatest interest. What Unitarianism is may be best gathered from the saying of Dr. Priestly, who may be said to be in a way the originator of the sect in England. Dr. Priestly was the son of a dissenting minister and was himself at the Theological (Non-conformist) College at—Daventry. The English Universities were then closed to the Non-conformists and they had their own institutions for theological study. When he left the College he was "in an

unsettled state of mind"—"the tutors themselves being divided on the question of Trinity." That was at the middle of the eighteenth century when Arianism and dissent were not far removed from each other. Dr. Priestly held that "all who believe Christ to be a man and not God must necessarily think it idolatry to pay him divine honours. We have no other definition of idolatry than worship as God that which is not God. Do not all Protestants say it is idolatry in the Catholics, to pray to the Virgin Mary to Peter, Paul or any other saints, or even to angels or archangels? Do you not continually charge the Catholics with idolatry on this principle? Now it is on the very same principle, and no other, that we, who consider Christ as being a man, such as Peter and Paul, will say that it must be idolatry to worship or to pray to him." The English people did not like this sort of preaching, especially in a minister. Dr. Priestly was in charge of a congregation of Non-conformists. They proceeded in their characteristic way to demonstrate their disagreement. A riot ensued, Dr. Priestly's house and chapel were destroyed and he was driven from Birmingham. This happened in 1793. Priestly left his country and died in America in 1804.

Unlike other sects the Unitarians have no fixed Article of Faith or Catechism. The Cracow or the Racow Catechisms are not regarded as standards of Faith. There is no test nor any ecclesiastical court. "To us there is but one God—

the Father." Yet they celebrate the Lord's Supper to which everybody is welcome and partake it with the members of any Church, who may choose to join. "Perfect independence is the characteristic of the whole body, each congregation being, in church discipline, in its mode of worship, and in the peculiarity of its creed, free to act after its own judgment." The number of Unitarian congregations in England is about 300, the number of followers in the country would be about one hundred thousand.

It will be a mistake to estimate the number of Christians holding Arian, Socinian or Unitarian doctrines from the above three sects. The Universalists who believe that the sufferings of the Sinners are not eternal but Purgatorial in character are divided into two principal parties, one the orthodox and the other, those who embrace Arian or Unitarian sentiments.

It will be tiring to the reader to enumerate the various Christian sects that have split on account of embracing Arian principles. This has always been the case, I mean, after the Reformation and the process is still going on. John Milton was an Arian; even Calvin has been connected with it.* Most cultured Englishmen are familiar with the writings of Strauss and Renan; with the literature of New criticism; and it may be safely assumed that there are millions of people who hold Socinian or Arian views. In America the principles of Unitarianism are more generally recognised. These persons number by millions.

Many of the old sects, as the case is in England, have embraced Unitarianism. "The same causes which led to the defection of the English Presbyterians, induced the descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers to abandon the orthodox Faith. Boston, the chosen retreat of the self exiled Puritans, is now said to contain in the city and neighbourhood, one hundred and fifty congregations of the Unitarians. Throughout New England, comprising those Northern States which were first colonised by English Non-conformists, Socinian principles are extensively avowed and the Unitarian body, though by no means the greatest in point of number, is the wealthiest throughout the United States."

Let us try to understand what does all this mean. It can be expressed in a few words. Christianity is the religion of Christians who regard Christ to be God. Yet there are millions and millions of Christians who do not regard Christ in that light, yet they are looked upon by others and look upon themselves as Christians. I am talking of ordinary persons, not of cranks.

X.

Let me return to the Articles of Faith, prescribed for the English Church. I must beg my readers to go through what necessarily will be uninteresting matter. I do not think it will be found unprofitable for our purpose. I will try to be as brief as possible. The first five Articles, as mentioned before deal with the doctrine of the Trinity. We have seen how they fare among Christians. The next three Articles establish the rules of Christian Faith. The word Faith is somewhat hard to define. It has various meanings—"Some gave nine—others to the number of fifteen." I better reproduce the headings of the Articles. The sixth treats "of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation"—the seventh "of the Testaments" and the eighth "of the three Creeds". Part of the sixth Article lays down that "in the name of the Holy Scriptures, we do understand the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." A list is given of the Canonical Books, as distinguished from the Apocryphal Books. In the English Church any attempt to deny the canonicity of any of the canonical Books will be held as heresy and punished as such. Yet the canonicity of most of the books has been challenged by orthodox Christian divines. To us the subject will be practically unintelligible; so let us pass on to

the 7th, which treats of the Old Testament. Let me quote from an extremely orthodox authority. "There are, we will venture to say, not above fifty clergymen in England who fully and from their heart believe the precept of Leviticus or the pedigrees in the Book of Chronicles, the description of the hare as a ruminant animal, or the imprecations of Nahemiah on his enemies, to be immediately and absolutely the word of God in the same sense as they believe this of the sermon on the mount or the farewell discourse in St. John's Gospel." I am afraid the number among the laity will be considerably less and that as regards not only for the part that is quoted above but for a very large portion of the Book.

I now come to the creed. This word is supposed to be the same as *Kalma* of the Arabs. There is however, a material difference. The Mahomedan creed begins with the well-known sentence *Lailaha illullaha Mahamedur Rasul ul laha*. There is but one God and Mahomed is his prophet. The first part does not occur in the Koran; the second does in the Sura Inna Fatehna. I must disclaim all first-hand knowledge of the subject; an obliging Mahomedan friend is my authority. A minister of the Church of England subscribes to three creeds—the first, called the Apostles' creed, the second, the Nicene creed, and the third, called the Athenesian creed. The whole of the Apostles' creed occurs in the writings of two dignitaries who lived towards the end of the

4th century. The Nicene and the Athenian creeds were composed in the 5th century. The adoption of the different creeds in the several Churches took place many centuries later. At present a priest of the Roman Church repeats only the Nicene creed. Let us see. What is called the creed or the Kalma of the Christians was unknown to Christians during hundreds of years of Christianity. How do they now stand? Very few Christians, I mean, belonging to the laity, have any idea of their nature. Among the clergy there is considerable reluctance to repeating the Athenian creed on account of the "damnatory clauses."

Articles from the 9th to the 18th inclusive "bear reference to Christians considered as individuals."

They treat of such subjects as Original Sin. Free Will, Justification of Man, Good Works; of Work before Justification. The last three of these will be intelligible to Hindu readers, if I put them down as *Bhaktimarga* and *Karmamarga*. The 14th deals with Works of Supererogation the 15th of Christ alone without sin—the 16th of sin after Baptism the 17th on Predestination and Election—and the 18th, on obtaining Eternal salvation only by the name of Christ.

These can be divided into two classes.—Those that are peculiarly Christian and those that have been matters of speculation at every age and in every country. With us every one has his own views on the latter questions. It is not so with

the Christians. Their minds have been made up by their ministers or priests, and they must abide by their decisions. How far this is really done is a matter which every one must decide for himself. But what concerns us is the fact that all these Articles have been the subjects of hopeless and irreconcilable differences in the several Churches; and sects have formed mainly on differences of opinion concerning these points. Formerly, Christians used to kill one another for holding antagonistic opinions. At the present time they don't do it. In spite of all differences they live peacefully side by side.

The majority of Englishmen do not trouble themselves about differences of opinion that exist regarding them.

I now come to the remaining Articles. The 19th to the 39th, that is, 21 out of the total number of articles—as quoted before, “relate to Christians considered as members of a Church, or religious society. They are intended not only to declare positive doctrines but also to refute acknowledged heresies, especially the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome.” The twenty-one Articles for our purpose may be classed under certain main divisions. Those that relate to the Sacraments and their administration; these have been noticed before; those that are expressly intended “to refute acknowledged Heresies such as on Purgatory etc.,” those that bear on the internal discipline of the Church, and lastly those that define the relation of the Church with

the State. Controversy of the Church of England with the Roman Catholic Church, can not possess much interest for us. The expressions internal discipline of the Church and the relation of the Church with the State will not be readily or clearly understood by most of us. What has Faith got to do with these things, will be in the mind of most Hindus. But they are matters of considerable importance to Christians. In the English Church the ecclesiastical tribunals are the Courts of Arches and the Houses of Convocation of the two ecclesiastical Provinces of York and Canterbury. Each house is divided into two houses, one composed of the Higher dignitaries, the other of, as they are called, the inferior clergy. This is the highest Ecclesiastical court. Of course, the King in Council is the ultimate head of the Anglican Church, and appeals from the decisions of the houses of Convocation lie to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and they advise the King with their finding.

Every sect has got its own Ecclesiastical court. Some of the prominent ones can be mentioned. The Presbyterians have got their General Assemblies, their Presbyteries, Synods, classes and consistories. The Wesleyan have their Conference; the Baptists, who are congregationalists have their general Baptist Association and the Baptist Union. These are all Nonconformist churches—or as we shall say in this country, non-official churches—and their connection

with the State cannot be so intimate as that of the Established or the Government Church. The relations of the various churches with their own people are, however, intimate and close. No where the instinct for organisation which characterises the English people is more in evidence. I give a list of the names of the prominent Associations of one division (there are about a dozen of them) of the Methodists. There is the Leaders' meeting; the local preachers' meeting, the trustees' meeting, the district meeting; there are special financial, mixed and minor district meetings. All these "connect the Conference, as the supreme authority, with the individual methodist; and by means of which it becomes acquainted with his circumstances and even with his wishes." There is no organisation in the world, civil or military, that equals the organisation of the Church of England.

XI.

The three main forms of Church Government familiar to Englishmen are Episcopacy or as the Scots call it, Prelacy, Presbyterianism and the Congregational. Prelacy has been explained to signify "Church Government by Archbishops, Bishops, Chapters, Archdeacons and all other ecclesiastical offices depending on that hierarchy." The Presbyterians have no bishops, and they set their Church Government in presbyteries or associations of ministers and elders. The Congregationalists or Independents, as they were formerly called, "maintain as a fundamental principle that every society of believers united for religious fellowship and Christian worship is a perfect Church within itself, that it possesses full power to regulate its own affairs and is independent of all external control." Most of the prominent Non-conformist Churches are congregational.

There are various views of Church Government and of its relations with the laity and the State. There is Erastianism called after Dr. Erastus who held that "the Christian Minister was a mere lecturer on divinity, and that Christian Churches were merely secular associations." Ecclesia from which the familiar term ecclesiastic is derived had no connection originally with religion. In England the sovereign is the Head of the Church and the State, in Roman Churchse

it is the Pope who is not only the Head of the Church but is recognised as the vicegerent of God, in Russia the Czar is the Head of the State, Head of the Church and the vicegerent of God.

To us this business of Church government or its relations with the State is practically strange. We have got nothing at present to correspond with either. Hinduism does not easily recall any such idea. But these matters are very serious with Christians. In fact it is doubtful whether they attach greater importance to questions of doctrines or to the methods of internal discipline or to the definition of the relation of the Church with the people and with the State. The fights of Presbyterians with the Independents; of Episcopacy with both, taking all these to profess pretty nearly the same rules of Faith are unintelligible to us.

Here as in everything else there is complete divergence of opinion. All these divergences are based on strict Scriptural authorities. As to what constitutes divine right (*in-jure divino*) is a matter of uniform difference among the various sects. An example may make it clear for us to understand the nature of some of these differences. We are familiar with the expression "an ordained minister" of the Church. This ordination is a religious ceremony. Its essential feature "is laying hands" on the candidate. Unless this ceremony is gone through a candidate cannot be a minister of the Church. In the

Anglican Church it is the bishop who ordains a candidate.

To understand this laying of hands I better quote the Scriptures "And he ordained twelve, they should be with him—and that he might send them forth to preach." *Mark III 14* "After these things the Lord appointed other servants also, and sent them two and two before his face into every place whether he himself would come." *Luke XI.* "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." *Acts Xiii, 2. 3.*

So far as we can understand, the idea is, that the Apostles ordained their disciples, they in course of time ordained others who again ordained more, and this process is going on ever since. This is known as Apostolic succession. In ordaining, the spirit of the Apostles is supposed to descend. Unless the ordination is done by one fitted to do it, in the Anglican church it is the Bishop who alone can do it—the subsequent proceedings, as the lawyers term it, are null and void. The ecclesiastical language is considerably warmer.

Let us see how this question of Apostolic succession is regarded by some divines. John Wesley with his brother Charles, was the founder of the Wesleyan or the Methodist Sect.

He began life as an Anglican Minister and remained to the end of his days a strong admirer of the Anglican Church. There was a Wesleyan Mission in America, the Ministers belonged to the Church of England. When the American war of Independence broke out the Ministers who were Englishmen left for their country and the Wesleyan community was left without their pastors. To a Christian it meant a serious state of affairs. During the war this state of things continued. After the declaration of Independence new ministers had to be appointed. Then a curious thing followed. Wesley himself was a minister of the Church of England, but of course not a bishop. He ordained two Missionaries—Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury as ministers in the American Church. A just clamour arose as none but a bishop can ordain a minister. Wesley's opinion was emphatic. In a letter to his brother Charles, he wrote, "the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove. But this does in no wise interfere with my remaining in the Church of England: from which I have no more desire to separate than I had fifty years ago."

There is a sequel to the above which is not without interest. Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury assumed the titles of bishops. Now Wesley was the founder of the Methodist Church; in Church discipline the Church is Congregational. So the parent Congregational Church created an

Episcopal Church in America. Wesley's views on this subject also were equally plain. When he heard that the two ministers had assumed the title of Bishop he wrote to one of them, Mr. Asbury—"How dare you suffer yourself to be called bishop? I shudder, I start at the very thought! Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, scoundrel, and I am content. But they shall never by my consent, call me bishop." I don't think it is generally known that bishops and angels were interchangeale terms in early Christian Churches. They are so to this day among the Irvingites.

Let us try to summarise all that we have been writing about the different Protestant sects. To a Christian, if the Articles of Faith of the Anglican Church be any guide, religion is mainly made up of questions on Creed Worship, Faith, Doctrines and Discipline, internal and external. There is an endless number of sects in England alone. Each differs from the others in some way or other regarding its views on nearly every one of those questions. Suppose we ask the educated Englishman with whom we supposed ourselves to be dealing regarding this divergence of opinion among his coreligionists—his answer probably will be some- thing like this. It is true, he will say, that we differ among ourselves in many respects, it may be true that we cannot fasten on any particular doctrine as an Article of Faith which we all unanimously regard as essential to^oChristainity—Still all of us

consider ourselves Christians. We may belong to particular sects but that does not stand in the way of regarding the others, recognising them, or to call them Christians." This will be the opinion of most Englishmen whether belonging to the Anglican Church or to any other Church.

XII.

We have been dealing with the various Protestant sects in England. I will now take the case of one sect, the Church of England. Its Articles are clearly defined, they have been in existence for nearly four hundred years. In what light are the doctrines of the Church regarded by the Anglican Community? As before I will not take the laity, I will go to its ordained ministers and try to find out in what light they regard the tenets which they profess and which they are supposed to teach to their flock.

There are two historic cases on record, for the Denison case proved abortive, on technical grounds, whose proceedings give us an insight into the attitude of the mind of the Anglican ministers as regards the doctrines of the Established Church. They are the Gorham trial and the case instituted by the Bishop of Salisbury against Revd. Messrs. Wilson and Williams. I will take the last case.

I would again ask my readers to bear in mind two facts. One is that the dispute did not lie between two sects; it was confined to the members of the Established Church; secondly, that it was not a difference of opinion confined to the laity, but the dispute arose out of alleged heterodoxy charged by a Bishop against two ordained ministers of the Church of England regarding the cardinal doctrines of the Christian Faith.

I will give it in as few words as I can. It should be added here that the trial took place less than 50 years ago and that there must be many Englishmen living, who can remember the fight. In the "Essays and Reviews" a number of articles appeared expressing opinions regarding questions of Christian Faith and doctrines which were deemed by the orthodox as extremely obnoxious. Altogether seven articles appeared out of which two were selected as specially objectionable. They were written by the Reverend Messrs. Williams and Wilson. Public opinion at last got so excited that it was resolved to bring the articles to the test of law, and the Bishop of Salisbury undertook the prosecution. The case was first tried in the Anglican Ecclesiastical court—the court of Arches as it is called. Altogether 32 charges, each based on heterodoxy, were framed against the two ministers. Dr. Lushington who presided relinquished 27 of the charges, convicted the accused of 5 and sentenced them to a year's suspension from their sacred office. The two convicted ministers preferred an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Law Lords who sat as judges were the Lord Chancellor, Lord Cranworth, Lord Chelmsford and Lord Kingsdown. With them sat as judges the two Primates, the Arch-Bishop of York and the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury and also the Bishop of London. During the course of the proceedings two out of the five charges were given up and the judges ultimately acquit-

ted the accused. The Bishop of London concurred entirely and the two Primates partially with the Law Lords.

Of the three questions that engaged the attention of the Appellate court one is of particular interest: Is the Bible the word of God? The importance of the answer to this question to the Christians is evident. The accused ministers had maintained that "the Bible may well be denominated 'Holy,' and said to be the word of God, God's word written, or Holy writ, yet that these terms cannot be affirmed to be clearly predicated of every statement and representation contained in every part of the Old and New Testaments." We learn that it was maintained by the court that "the doctrine alleged by the prosecutors to be the doctrine of the Church was not found either in the Articles or in any of the formularies of the Churches and that the doctrine maintained by the appellants was not contradicted by or plainly inconsistent with the Articles or formularies which the accusers alleged against them." What this means to a Christian can be guessed by my readers. It meant that a Christian might hold that no particular part of the Bible need necessarily be considered as Word of God.

Interesting as the judgment is, the effect it produced in the country would be more interesting study; but it will take long to follow it. Suffice it to say that the whole Anglican Church was divided in its opinions. In the Houses of

Convocation—the upper House was of one opinion, the Lower of another. How did the laity look upon the question? There were some who belived the Bible to be the Word of God and there were others who did not. Yet they are all classed as Christians, and regard one another as such.

XIII.

I will look at the question from another point of view.

Supposing a group of men were to subscribe to the following Articles of Faith :

(1) We believe in God the Eternal Father, and in his son Jesus Christ and in the Holy Ghost.

(2) We believe that through the Atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.

We believe that these ordinances are—1st. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, 2nd. Repentance, 3rd. Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins, 4th. Laying on hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit, 5th. the Lord's Supper.

(4) We believe in the literal resurrection of the body and that the dead in Christ will rise first.

They can be taken to be Christians. Yet it will be a mistake to think that this view will be unanimously entertained. The Mormons, for it is a part of their doctrines that I have quoted above, are not regarded as Christians by every body. "Mormonism" says the divine from whose book I have often quoted "is not entitled to be termed a Christian sect. It stands in the same relationship to Christianity with Mahomedanism." Their polygamy cannot stand in the way. The institution prevails in the Syriac Church.

Here is a sect who call themselves Christians but are not recognised as such by some at least among them who are known as Christians.

I have been trying to impress on my readers the idea that an Englishman when he talks of religion generally thinks of creed, worship, doctrine and discipline and the word religion to him means questions connected with these four points. Let me demolish the structure that we have been constructing. I have only to mention the sect of the Quakers. They are Christians "without a creed, a liturgy (i. e., prescribed form of worship), a priesthood or a sacrament." A few facts regarding them will be of particular interest to us. "Some of the early Quakers indulged in eccentricities and extravagances of no measured kind. Some travelled and preached naked or barefoot or dressed in sack cloth. Even the women in some cases distinguished themselves by the impropriety and folly of their conduct. In some cases religious excitement seems to have produced or been attended by insanity." We further learn that the "theology of Quakerism had become somewhat mystic quietist during nearly a century. About the year 1826 an American Quaker named Hicks openly denied the divinity of Christ, depreciated the value of the Scripture and recognised no other Saviour than the inward light. A large body of the American Quakers followed him, and still maintains a separate existence." I have already alluded to this fact.

One particular fact I would like to impress on my readers. Quakerism among the English Christian sects has adopted no creed but it has its doctrines. The characteristic doctrine is undoubtedly this—"that there is an immediate revelation of the Spirit of God, to each individual soul, that this light is universal and comes both to the heathen and the Christian and thereby the Love and Grace of God towards mankind are universal," "The Quakers not only have no stated ministry, but they hold that no form of worship is so good as a patient waiting upon God in silence by such as find no outward ceremony, no observation, no words, yea not the best and purest words even the words of scriptures, able to satisfy their weary and afflicted souls. Hence, although permitting addresses from their members, they sit frequently silent both in family worship and in their meetings." The Quakers are, I need hardly say, regarded as good Christians like any member say of the Established Church.

If we find in the diary of any man "an account of his conversing with Cicero, Aristotle and Augustus and then with Moses and Abraham—who again give place to Charles XII of Sweden while Frederick of Prussia is succeeded by the author of the "Whole Duty of Man" probably it will set him to wonder as to the religious persuasion of the writer. If he reads "a little further, the assessor finds Paul and David sunk into a sadly low state of Christian life and Mahomed a Christian Convert" his wonder

is not likely to diminish, yet the above occurs in the spiritual diary of Swedenborg. That Swedenborg believed God is one ranks him among millions of other Socinians. But when he maintains that "an ancient word is supposed to have existed before the present Bible, still extant is Great Tartary, and that the writing of St. Paul should not be included in the present Bible" his orthodoxy will be gravely misdoubted by most learned divines. Yet the members of the innumerable Swedenborgian societies, the New Jerusalem Church as they call their Communion, are regarded in the same light as any other Christian sect.

Let us again refer to our friend the educated Englishman whom we have been taking as our guide. Probably this is what he will say "Yes, there are eccentric bodies among us—who hold views which many of us do not share and which if tested by the orthodox doctrines will be regarded as peculiar—still, we regard those people as Christians and we have a general sort of idea as to what Christianity is. This idea we do not discuss, neither do we force it on others." Let me now leave England, the rich, organised and educated England.

XIV.

To enable my readers to follow the account given below, a few words of explanation are necessary. According to the Christians, Christ was crucified at Calvery—a small hill in Bethany, about two miles from modern Jerusalem. "The Holy Sepulchre is a rock-cut tomb in which after his crucifixion the body of our Lord was placed." This tomb was situated in a garden "in the place where Christ was crucified." (John XIX. 41). Over this tomb is the Church of Holy Sepulchre. This Church is in joint possession of the Latins, Greeks, Armenians, Copts and Abyssinian Christians. The Sepulchre itself is enclosed in a small temple, divided into two parts—an outer and an inner. In the inner room is a marble slab, on which it is believed by many, the body of Christ was laid after Crucifixion. I have only to add that the account refers to Good Friday which is regarded as commemorating "the crucifixion of our Saviour which took place on the Friday before Passover." The year in which the description is written is not very remote. Many of those who took part may be living still, and for all that I know the scene is repeated every year.

"The vast building is overflowed with music. The solemn chords swell along the church, their majesty and sincerity protesting against the tawdry idolatry of the place. The procession

stopped at each of the stations through the dark church. At each station a sermon was preached, and at each in a different language, that every pilgrim in the crowd might have a chance of understanding. When the procession went up to the Calvary chapel we awaited its return and strolled about the church...At this moment the sublime chorus pealed again from the chapel and the procession began to descend.

"Meanwhile a Turkish guard had entered to keep order during the final ceremonies. They pushed the pilgrims backward with their guns, treating them with utter contempt. It was a commentary upon the ceremonies that the fight of the Christians in the Church were until recently so sanguinary that the Muslims were obliged to enter the tomb of Christ to preserve the peace among His followers

"They were now holding a space clear about a marble slab, upon which the body of Jesus is said to have been washed before his burial. Upon this when room was made, a friar laid a lace-edged shroud and a small velvet pillow. The crowd pressed forward, but the Turks thrust it violently back and the Colonel seeing that we were Howadji of a certain importance beckoned us to the inner circle and then quietly turning his back upon the slab, continued in that position to smoke his chibouque during the remaining ceremonies.

"As the procession descended the steps from Calvary I saw Wind and Shower holding candles

and weeping profusely. The crowd was very dense upon the stairs. There were several consular dignitaries and some ladies with the rest. All leaned towards the slab in earnest and wondering attention. The tapers flared wildly over the wild faces thrust forward with eager curiosity. Only the Muslim and the Monks who immediately surrounded the slab, were unconcerned. The true believers of one faith, looked contemptuously upon those of the other and smoked. These of the other preserved a stolid indifference, or scolded among themselves and took snuff.

"The scene which was hitherto only painful, became shocking when four monks brought forward a waxen image, four feet long, a ghastly idol, in an agonised posture, meant to represent Jesus after the Crucifixion and really resembling a cast of Casper Hauser just finishing and laid it lean, shrunken and puny upon the lace-edged shroud or sheet, on the slab.

"It was after midnight when these things ended. With mingled feelings of wonder, humiliation, indignation and sorrow, we turned from the church of the Holy Sepulchre. I do not wonder that the Muslim boys spit at these men and hate Christians."

The writer is a pious Protestant and had evidently been shocked at the scene he had witnessed. He prefaces his description with a quotation from Heine, "*Furchtet nichts fromme Seelen keine prophanirende 'Scherze sollen euer ohr*

Verletzen." He evidently meant it sincerely. He would certainly call what he described as shocking, but there is nothing in his writings to suggest that he regarded it as Non-Christian. To us hardly any word of explanation is needed. The consecration of all the senses to the adoration of one held as the Supreme Being is a common element of Hindu Communion.

Similar scenes are common in the continent. The ceremony of Anastasin or Resurrection is one of the most striking ceremonies in the Greek Church; in Greece, the bishop, the king and the queen take part. It takes place in the open near the Cathedral in Athens. Immense crowds watch the scene, "Suddenly a single report of a canon announced that twelve o'clock had struck, and that Easter day had begun; then the old archbishop elevating the cross, exclaimed in a loud exalting tone "Christos anesti," "Christ is risen" and instantly every single individual of all that host took up the cry and the vast multitude broke through and dispelléd for ever the intense and mournful silence which they had maintained so long with one spontaneous shout of indescribable joy and triumph: "Christ is risen," "Christ is risen." This writer is also a Protestant and he does not see anything unusual in it.

The same ceremonies are observed in Russia. There is an amusing story told—how the Czar of Russia was directly contradicted about fifty years ago on this occasion. It is customary with the Czar to greet a soldier from some Regiments

on this Easter morning. "Christos Anesti," Christ is risen, were the greetings of the Czar to a private. To his amazement he received the reply "no, he is not." "Who on earth are you" exclaimed the autocrat of all Russias. "I am a Jew," replied the soldier. I am afraid the story is apocryphal.

I now pass on to the debatable land of Christianity. For my purpose I cannot do better than take the Abyssinian (or Coptic) Church. It is a remnant of the old African Church. We are familiar through our reading English literature, with the Roman Church, or the Latin Church as it is called. We also hear occasionally of the Eastern or Greek Church. There was a time when the Asiatic Church and African Church were just as famous. Asia Minor and Africa (north) were Christian countries, as Christian as Italy and Byzantium were, but that is literally all ancient history. The sword and fire of Islam have destroyed almost every trace of Christianity from these lands. Whole of Africa excepting the South is Islam. The other exception is Abyssinia.

We have talked long about differences of creed and doctrine when talking of Protestant Churches. I will not therefore touch upon those subjects as they are seen in the Coptic Church. I will only mention a few points. The number of their sacraments is seven as they are in the Roman Church, but they hold with the Greek Church that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father alone.

In both these they differ from the Protestants. "The Christians of Abyssinia are at present divided into three parties—so inimical to each other that they curse one another, and will no longer partake of the sacrament together.....If we except the differences of opinion, concerning the unction of Jesus Christ they all have nearly the same superstition."

Many Copts believe Virgin Mary to be one of the Trinity, with many Saint Tekla Haimanont takes a higher place than the Virgin. Their churches are built after the same model as those of the Jews, with three concentric compartments, the centre being occupied by the "Kadasta Kadastan" or Holy of Holies to which followers of other Communion are not allowed. "They practise circumcision and in the matters of eating they follow most strictly the dictates of Moses." They don't touch the flesh of the swine nor that of the camel. When they kill an animal for food—"the animal is thrown down, his head turned towards Jerusalem and the words "In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" are pronounced while the throat is being cut. We learn that most of the priests cannot read or write and finally, ablutions are not held in great favour. "Is he a Mussulman, that he washes so often? Of a truth Christianity is but a dirty religion in Abyssinia"—says the authority from whom I have taken the above. They don't regard the cross as other Christians do—they look upon it as any ordinary piece of wood and attach no significance to it.

XV.

I now pass on to Russia. We had occasion to allude to the Greek Church which is the prevailing form of Christianity of the people. I do not think it will be necessary to say more about it. What is more interesting for us will be to learn something of the doctrines and practices of some sects who pass for Christians in that country.

The Russian Church is thus dismissed by the same Protestant divine from whose pages I have quoted often before, "Their religion consists in childish superstitions which the court promotes by its presence and example." What the state of the Church was in the 17th and 18th centuries may be gathered from the following :—"The clergy were ignorant men; their disputes had reference to the correct form of the cross, the right position of the fingers and the best means of preserving the sacramental bread from mould. They condemn various heresies, the worst of which they declare to be that of shaving the beard. They say "of all the heresies that have come under the ban of the Church there is none so abominable, and worthy of punishment as of beard shaving; verily the blood of martyrs itself cannot wash away the guilt of so grievous a sin; who-so shaveth of his beard to please men thereby, he is a transgressor of the law and an enemy of God who made man after his own image."

The total number of Russians belonging to the Greek Orthodox Church is computed at 65 millions, while the Non-conformists *i. e.* those who do not conform to the official Church are numbered at twelve millions. Among the latter there are endless divisions including those who do not believe the divinity of Christ. It will be useless to try to give an account of these sects they will be unintelligible to us. Some of them recognise no priests and repudiate the orthodox rituals and the sacraments. Some of them regard the Czar as the "anti-Christ." Some of them are spiritualists with their "love-feasts" and "virgins." There are "Shakers" some "who do not pray" some "Sigh" and some "who do not pay taxes."

I give below a short account of a few sects. The Starovertzi or those of the old Faith "think it unlawful to eat certain kinds of food, including hares and potatoes; and they prove from the Old Testament the unlawfulness of cutting their beards."

The Scoptzi or the Castratii mutilate themselves. I give below a short account of the sect from a French source, it will give some idea of the history and morality of the sect.

"It was a peasant named Ivanoff who founded the sect. He had twelve disciples, and he mutilated them himself. He was arrested and knotted and sent to Siberia. The idea however grew, Ivanoff died, another, Kondrati Szelivanoff organised the sect. He was also arrested and sent

to Siberia. What followed however? Szelivanoff was named Saviour and Son of God. The Saviour was brought from the mines, do you know by whom? By the Czar Paul I. When he had seen him the Emperor declared him to be a lunatic. They shut him up in an asylum. Do you know what became of that asylum in which Szelivanoff was shut up? It became the New Jerusalem of a religion which went on growing larger and larger. The 30 Skopzis of old Ivanoff became a legion. For the people the martyr who died in a convent in 1832 is Christ Szelivanoff who will return some day from Siberia or France and seize the throne of Russia, crown the good people, judge the wicked and terminate the life of the world by one universal mutilation conferring infinite happiness—the happiness of the Hindu Nirvan—the extreme happiness of annihilation. He will come back the Great Judge Christ Szelivanoff when the holy sect of the Skopzi shall attain the figure 144000 and to secure that apocalyptic number the Skopzi brave the knout, deportation and the mines. Don't laugh. That is madness if you please but that is the madness of purity, of an ideal.

Les Colomb blanches (white doves) a sect of women who practise similar mutilations. It is not known generally that Saint Genevieve cut off with her scissors her left breast and that Oregon one of the most famous of the Early Fathers was a Scoptzi. Then there are the

Khlisti or Flagellants ; one of their practices resembles that of the Shakers, and we hear that they "perform their worship by leaping and dancing." Under the excitement caused by their supposed holiness and inspiration they call themselves not only teachers and prophets, but also "Saviours," "Redeemers," "Christs," "Mothers of God." Generally speaking they call themselves simply Gods and living Christs or Madonas." Then there are the jumpers whose creed is something like the above but some of whose ceremonies cannot be printed. There are the voluntary martyrs called Morelstschiki which is a mixture of Christianity and of old Scandinavian religion. "Some of them on an appointed day in each year, meet in a secret place with barbarous songs and strange ceremonies, they dig a deep pit, filling it with wood, straw and combustible matter. The most zealous then descend into the burning pit. When they stoically burn to death while their brothers applaud the saints who thus receive the baptism of fire." The followers of the sect recognise God the Father, manifested to men under the double form of Jesus Christ and Holy Ghost. They reject the true death and Resurrection of Christ. "The Philippons whose priests are old men or "Starike" are recruited among young boys whom their parent dedicate to their ministers in youth. As soon as the child's vocation is decided he no more touches any animal food, renounces all strong drink, and remains un-

married all his life." These secterians resemble the disciples of Manicheism, which we have seen in one of the early papers is a mixture of Christianity Zoroastrianism and Hinduism. There are the Beypoportchines who have no priestly hierarchy and they carry their dislike so far that if any of the priests of the orthodox Church enters the door of the house in which they might be staying they run out by another door.

"Among the Russians a distinction is made between Non-conformists, dissentors (dissidents) and heretics. The last are classified as follows:—

(1) Sects which take the Scriptures as the basis of their belief but interpret and complete the doctrines therein contained by means of the occasional inspiration or internal enlightenments of their leading members.

(2) Sects which pay little or no attention to Scripture and devise their doctrine from the supposed inspiration of their living teachers.

(3) Sects which believe in the re-incarnation of Christ.

(4) Sects which confuse religion with nervous excitement and are more or less erotic in their character." (Wallace.)

About the knowledge of Christianity possessed by the people, the following will give some idea;—"A peasant, it is said, was once asked by a priest, if he could name the three Persons of the Trinity and replied without a moment's hesitation "How can one not know that Bathushka? Of course it is the Saviour, the Mother of God, and

Saint—Nicholas, the miracle worker!" That answer represents fairly enough the theological attainments of a very large section of the peasantry." How much truth there is in this story it is difficult to tell but according to many "The Russians are the most religious people in Europe" (Dicey)

One word more about some points in the Russian priesthood, and I shall conclude this paper. In Russia (a part of) the clergy form a separate caste or order. Their sons are expected to take orders and a license is necessary to enable them to follow any secular occupation. By youths of talents this is easily obtained, the refuse become priests or enter the monastic orders from which the higher offices of the Church are always chosen. Thus the clergy are divided into two ranks—the white and black or the secular or Parish priests and the regulars or monks; and we further learn that "it is not uncommon to see a priest who has been publicly whipped like a miserable vagabond perform his religious services a few hours after before his parishoners who witnessed his disgrace."

Let us try to sum up. The term Religion means to the majority of Christians good many things, it brings before his mind several ideas. Some of them are distinct, clear and definite. All these are grouped together and connected with questions relating to creed, doctrine worship and discipline. These again may be divided almost indefinitely into rituals, dress, music, in-

cense, taper, food, fasting ; symbols, objects, articles and beings of respect, veneration or worship—ceremonies—celebrations ; into questions regarding the Bible its genuineness, sanctity and interpretation ; cross, images, Icons, saints, relics ; regarding pilgrimages Holy water, Holy oil, Holy sanctum ; regarding methods of prayer—silent, loud, personal, congregational, choral, tumultous ; regarding marriage and celibacy, monks and nuns cloisters and convents.

The central figure of Christianity is Christ and there are endless views taken of the personality yet there is a consensus of opinion among the Christians as to who are Christians and what is Christianity. Let us ask our friend the educated Englishman as to what he has got to say. He would probably say yes, it is true that there is great diversity among us and very likely it will be hard to find out any article or creed or doctrine in which we all agree. There are eccentricities, there are corruptions. But when education becomes more general, the ignorance will disappear, many of the aberrant types that we meet with now, will cease to exist. As to what is Christianity it will be impossible to give a definition that will satisfy all or be applicable in the case of everybody, but on the whole we have got a general sort of idea as to what it is and we don't quarrel among ourselves as to the differences.

This is what we believe will be the opinion of most sensible Christians.

XVI.

Let me return to the Circular issued by the Census Commissioner to the Government of India, and have a look at the 'tests' that have been prepared "to pave the way for a decision as to what that standard should be" which is presumably to define the exact position of certain communities—occupying at present in the opinion of the official "an extensive debatable ground." The question to be considered is whether they are Hindus or Non-Hindus.

(1) Do the members of the caste or tribe worship the Great Hindu Gods?

(2) Are they allowed to enter Hindu temples or to make offerings at the shrine?

(3) Will good Brahmans act as their priests?

(4) Will degraded Brahmans do so? In what case are they recognised by persons outside the caste or are they Brahmans only in name?

(5) Will clean castes take water from them?

(6) Do they cause pollution (a) by touch (b) by proximity?

Most readers trying to follow what the Circular is intended to convey will be struck with the obscurity of its language. Taken as a whole it is difficult to clearly grasp as to what is exactly means, for practically every sentence is open to the same remarks. The terms castes—good Brahmans, degraded Brahmans, Pollution

—are, as we shall see later on used presumably with reference to certain meanings attached to them. It is hard to make out what these definitions are. The word Hindu is used pretty frequently and the Circular is intended to define Hinduism from Non-Hinduism.

The first question is—do the members of the caste or tribe worship the great “Hindu gods”? This is a sample of the ‘test’ that has been devised to differentiate a Hindu from a Non-Hindu.

What will attract most people’s attention is the curious nature of the language that has been used. What are the great Hindu Gods and what are the lesser Hindu Gods? What has Hinduism to do with the worship of either?

It seems that the Census Commissioner has got some sort of idea that there are greater Hindu Gods and there are lesser Hindu Gods and that some people worship the great Hindu Gods and that others worship the lesser Hindu Gods, and those that worship the greater Hindu Gods are presumably Hindus and those that don’t, are Non-Hindus.

Most people will wonder as to where has the official got his ideas from? What do the words mean and what sense is the statement intended to convey?

Suppose we slightly alter the question and put it with reference to certain European people. “Do the members of the nation or race worship the great Christian gods”? What will be considered of the query?

The Roman Catholics worship the Virgin Mary. Some among the Copts believe her to be one of the persons of the Trinity, some of them again worship certain saints fervently and in some cases more devoutly than they do the founder of Christianity. The Russian peasants assign a high place to their saints and many hardly know of any other object of worship. There are millions of Christians who hardly offer any worship to Jesus Christ. What purpose can such a question serve?

I will take the second "test."

(1) Are they allowed to enter Hindu temples or to make offerings at the shrine? "They" refers to castes and tribes occupying the extensive debatable ground.

If my Ooriah bearer Raghu and my up-country servant Ganga, both excellent Hindus, take into their heads on a Sunday morning to join in the worship of the *Sahiblogues* and with that object present themselves in their best linen at the door of the big cathedral at the corner of the maidan they will be politely—yes—why not—very politely told by the verger or whatever may be the name of the official who is in charge of such duties, elsewhere to seek spiritual comfort. If they in further quest of such comforts seek to enter any of the innumerable tile churches or chapels that abound in the town, they will not only be permitted to enter but will be encouraged to take part in the worship of the Christians, and if they choose, can make their responses as fer-

vently as any of them. Raghu and Ganga were not refused admittance into the cathedral because they were non-Christians. The question of Religion did not enter into it at all. It was something very different. If some of the Christian co-worshippers of Raghu and Ganga at the humble tile chapel off Dhurmtola Street were to present themselves at the cathedral they will very likely meet with the same fate. Still this fact will not mark the latter as non-Christians.

In certain states of America—such as Virginia, Georgia, Carolina—Negroes are not permitted to worship in the same church as the white people. There are different burial grounds for the two races. Yet both Negroes and the white people are undoubted Christians and consider each other as such.

In the Coptic church no one belonging to any other Communion is allowed within the Holy of Holies. Profession of Christianity makes no difference.

Mahomedans in this country sometimes make offerings at Hindu Temples and Hindus do the same in Mahomedan shrines. What has the question of religion to do with entering of temples and making of offerings?

It may be said that some sects object—does it follow that all Hindus object or does the fact that some dislike certain people to enter their place of worship, mark the latter as Non-Hindus?

Let me pass on to the next “test”

3. Will good Brahmans act as their priests?

I am Rari Sreni, Bharād-waja Gotra, Khardaimel. If such terms do not convey what must be apparent to everybody, then my labour has been in vain. I need hardly say that I am a good Brahman—in fact better than all other Brahmans—although there are people who affect to question such an apparent fact—quite groundlessly I need hardly say.

It will puzzle most Hindus to make out the idea the official intends to convey by “good Brahmin.” In the next “test,” he uses the expression “degraded Brahmins.” Let us see if we can make out what he means by the terms “good” and degraded.” A Brahman ministers to what are called “the low castes.” The Brahman, let us say, belonged to the Kulin class. After he accepts the ministry of “the low castes” he is boycotted by his previous Kulin Brahman associates. They will not eat, drink or even sit with him. He is sent to Coventry as a school boy would say. It is a social affair, it has nothing to do with religion or its observance.

Suppose an ordained minister of the Church of England was to do anything that his parishioners or Bishop take objection to, and suppose that the offence is of so serious a nature that his Bishop or the Court of Arches or the Houses of Convocation deem it expedient that he should be removed from the ministry and debarred from any further performance of his clerical duties, he will be, I am not sure of the word, unfrocked. The offending minister will still, I think, continue as

Reverend, for he has been once ordained, and that cannot be annulled but his license will very probably be taken away. As a minister one of his duties might have been to confirm candidates. He will of course not be permitted to do so again. He will have nothing to do with a minister's religious duties. Take the case of the "degraded Brahman." He is socially ostracised; his former associates, so to speak, will have nothing to do with him. But if he becomes a priest of a "low caste" he retains every one of the privileges of a priest and is just as much of a Brahman or of a priest as he formerly was. Supposing there are two Englishmen—brothers both—ordained as ministers. One of them is a curate in Mayfair—the other say in Hoxton. Supposing the former is to say to the other—an unlikely supposition—"look here, you minister to the costers, I work among the aristocracy, I will have nothing to do with you." If an Englishman can understand this state of things, he may have an idea of what we mean by, "Good Brahman" and "degraded Brahman." What has religion to do with it?

XVII.

In the light of the above explanation let us read again the 3rd "test." Will good Brahmins act as their priests? I may as well take the fourth test with it. It runs as follows:—

Will degraded Brahmins do so? In what case, are they recognised as Brahmins by persons outside the caste or are they Brahmins only in name?

It is hard to answer the questions, the difficulty is peculiar. The writer has evidently some idea of his own not only as to what constitutes good and degraded Brahmins but it looks as if he has some sort of notion that there are some functions peculiarly connected with good Brahmins and some that lie within the special province of the degraded ones. In the absence of a clearer knowledge of the writer's thoughts on the subject, one has to grope his way as to the meaning attached to the queries. Let me try.

Every Brahman is not a priest—that fact is probably known to all. Every Brahman can take up a priest's work that is also known to us. There is no such ceremony among us which corresponds with the ordination of a minister among Christians. Whether a Brahman in taking up a priest's work, will choose the people of any caste is entirely a matter of option with him. In case however he is already a priest of a "low

caste" he will find it hard to get people belonging to a high caste to solicit his ministrations. Take the instance of a Roman Catholic priest. It will be an unlikely thing for, say, a Wesleyan to ask him to hold service in a Methodist Chapel. It will be equally unlikely for the Roman Catholic to accede to such a request. Every possible question that is connected in the minds of both of them with religion will stand in the way.

Suppose a "Brahman" who ministers to the high caste is asked by a low caste to minister to him; the Brahman will most likely refuse. His high cast followers will also object. The refusals and objections will be on the ground that I have tried to explain above. They will be practically on what would be called social consideration.

Supposing a Brahman who ministers to a Brahman—I wonder whether it will be intelligible to a European—takes into his head to act as a priest to a Namasudra and as a consequence officiates at a Durga Puja in the latter's house he will perform exactly the same ceremonies, pronounce the same Mantras which would be equivalent to saying hold the same service in the Namasudra's house as he used to do in the house of his Brahman followers. A Roman Catholic priest will decline to hold service in a Methodist chapel on religious grounds. A high caste Brahman will decline to officiate as a priest in a sudra's house on social (or society) grounds.

The last part of the 4th question need not detain us long. In what case are they recognised as Brahmins by persons outside the caste or are they Brahmins only in name? "They" refers to degraded Brahmans.

A Brahman is always a Brahman just as an ordained Christian minister is always a minister. Only in the case of the Christian clergyman his license to act as a clergyman can be taken away while no power can ever make a Brahman anything but a Brahman and if he chooses to be a priest and can find people to accept him as such, there is nobody who can stand in his way. As to his being recognised or otherwise—that depends upon what is meant by recognition. A graduate of Oxford or Cambridge is a University man. There are graduates of other Universities in the country. When an ordinary Englishman talks of his son being in the University, it is pretty generally understood as to which two Universities he refers. Of course the other Universities are recognised—I should think—in a way.

I will take the last two questions together :—

(5) Will clean castes take water from them?

(6) Do they cause pollution (a) by touch (b) by proximity?

Let us take a scene with which every one of us is familiar. It is the morning. The mother or grandmother is holding her Pujah, worship as it is mistranslated. Communion is the nearest English word that occurs to me. It is a room kept

apart—the Thakurghar—there is no furniture, There she is at her prayers and Pujah. In the corner is crouching a little figure—the daughter or the granddaughter waiting till the Pujah will be over then she will have the flowers. Let us look at two of the principal articles used in the Pujah—water and flowers. The water is, wherever it is possible to obtain it, Ganges water, the flowers and leaves probably of her own picking, early in the morning. There may be a few other offerings—rice or fruits. Every thing is scrupulously clean. The grains of rice, the “Bel” leaves, the flowers, the few fruits have all been washed, probably with her own hands. The few vessels holding the water or the offering shine like burnished gold—they have all been cleaned. There is the worshipper. She has taken her bath early in the morning and has put on her cleanest cloth, if it is of linen, washed overnight. The room as I have said is bare; no one who is not equally clean—be it son, brother, sister or mother—will think of entering the room. The little girl in the corner has intruded—she is evidently a privileged person; but she keeps her distance. There are millions of Hindu homes where this takes place every day in the year.

Let us take an altogether different scene—an operation room in a hospital. We have all heard of anti-septic method of treatment and aseptic operations—both directed against contamination or infection as it is called—by poisonous material. If we substitute perfect cleanli-