

he would see that by no means all Christians are bound up with the Creationist theory of soul. The Traducionist theory has always been strongly represented.) Further, he points out, if the argument be true that each soul has God for its Father directly, then there can be shown to be no need at all for the Christian machinery of atonement and redemption. If God creates each soul, He can create it pure at once.

But, he continues, let us suppose for a moment that God is the Father of all men. It is the clear duty of every Father to care for all His children. But Christ exhibits only a partial care. "He that believeth shall be saved: he that believeth not shall be damned." Very different from this is the original vow of Amida, who vowed that he would not accept Nirvana except he were assured of the ultimate salvation of all sentient beings throughout the universe.

Another point made in this connection is as follows:—The earthly father cares for the earthly wants of his offspring; it must, therefore, be the duty of the spiritual progenitor to care for their spiritual wants. But, supposing God to be the spiritual Father of the European nations, then from what we may gather of their history He, on His part, would seem to have been strangely neglectful of His parental duties of education and training; and they, on their part, would seem to have repaid the compliment by exhibiting remarkably little likeness to the moral qualities of their parent! Nay, the moral qualities seem to be wanting even in the parent, for did not Jesus Himself say that He had come to bring, not "peace upon the earth, but a sword"? And, though Christians may explain this away by maintaining that it was a sword of peace that Jesus brought, the history of Christendom points to a very different conclusion.

As Christians, we must confess this to our shame. But when the lecturer goes on to contrast with all this the peaceful history of Japan in its pre-Christian days, we can but marvel at the man's audacity. Shakespeare's historical dramas have not one-tenth of the bloodshed in them that we find in a Japanese play founded on historical facts, and, as for intrigue and diplomacy, there never were such places for the exhibition of these talents as the mediæval courts at Yedo and Kyoto.

The third lecture is on the conception of Jesus Christ by the operation of the Holy Ghost. This is dismissed as being supernatural, *ergo* miraculous, *ergo* unworthy of credit. But it is made a text for an essay upon miracles and prophecy, both of which are discarded upon apparently modern grounds as being utterly incredible. We can see in this lecture a very distinct trace of the influence of western antichristian literature. No Buddhist in the old days would have thought for one moment

of making such a statement. The lives of Buddhas and Buddhist saints and martyrs swarm with wondrous legends; and if the argument against miracles be applicable to Christianity, it is applicable with tenfold force to the "patristic" literature of Japanese Buddhism. The great Saint Nichiren was, in his way, as great a wonder worker as Saint Dunstan. The last two lectures are devoted to questions arising out of our Lord's passion.

There is an account given of the Crucifixion, and details taken from various sources of the deaths of the twelve apostles. An argument used in the previous lecture is then tacitly assumed—that the accounts which we have of these events were not published for several years after the events, and that consequently the accounts are possibly garbled. Under these circumstances, it is no unwarrantable supposition that Jesus, who, as we know, was crucified with thieves, and whose words we have already seen to be of so unsatisfactory a nature, was Himself a malefactor, and that His apostles were men of like character with Himself.

This consideration will of itself dispose of the Christian doctrine of the ascension of Christ, which is a manifest impossibility. For it is clear that man cannot be re-born in heaven except his life upon earth have been of a heavenly character, and it wants no argument to prove, and it requires no proof to show, that a malefactor's death upon the cross can be the gate to nothing but a re-birth in hell.

Nor, again, he says, will the substitution theory of the Christian faith stand the test of reason. It cuts, he says, at the roots of morality (morality is a very powerful word in Japan); for what is the good of leading a troublesomely virtuous life if you can satisfy God's justice by transferring your guilt to a substitute?

It is, further, not consistent with Christ's other sayings, and hence it is implied that those Christian teachers who have come to teach Japan do not know the meaning of their own doctrines.

It is finally stamped, he says, with the stamp of failure. For though nearly nineteen centuries have passed since the consummation of this great tragedy, the world, and especially the Christian world, is none the better for this great act—of justice? or injustice?

In giving this summary of Mr. Katsube's lectures, it must not be supposed that I am giving a literal translation, or indeed anything approaching a translation. I have tried to represent the course of the argument as faithfully as possible, though the words in which I have clothed it are mostly of my own choosing. To give lengthy verbal extracts or translations would, I fear, make this article needlessly bulky, without adding much to the information of the general reader.