

which animates the Englishman as he traverses one of England's celebrated battlehelds. Even apart from the missionary question, if Egyptian, Persian, Greek, Carthaginian, or Roman history is so interesting, I cannot see why the Japanese history should not he so, at least, in a less degree. Ignorance of it puts the missionary at a great disadvantage.

At a still greater disadvantage is he placed

At a still greater disadvantage is he placed by not knowing the heathen religions of the people among whom he proposes to work. Every demonstration of the superiority of Christianity over Buddhism, or any other inferior religion, involves a comparison which cannot be made by one who does not know just what that inferior religion is. More than this, there are Buddhist saints, places, conditions, proverbs, books, doctrines, and commandments which have so become a part of the life and language of this people as to be at present inseparable. No matter if a man becomes indifferent to Buddhism, or even its avowed enemy, he can no more shake himself free from these Buddhist conceptions and language than an infidel in America can put such words as God. heaven, hell, or paradise out of his yocabulary, even though he should mention them only to ridicule them. If Col. Ingersoll had only very hazy ideas as to who our Lord was, had never heard of Adam or Abraham, Moses or David, was quite ignorant of the fact that the prophets or Sts. John, Peter, or Paul had ever existed, did not even know of there being such a book as the Bible, much less having studied it, it is safe to say that with all his eloquence he would not be much of a success on the infidel platform. What, then, can we expect of missionaries who in a Buddhist land are quite ignorant of Buddhism, and who have not Ingersoll's eloquence, but only very inferior broken Japanese with which to propagate their doctrines? The case would be indeed bad if it were not for this difference: Our mission is to build up; Ingersoll's is to pull down.

But this want of knowledge on the part of missionaries is their fault only in an indirect way. It is not generally known that Buddhism so takes to itself the philosophy and the old religion of each country into which it passes as to become almost as many different religions as there are countries in which it exists. Prof. Max Muller, indeed, in his "Note on Bishop Coplestone's "Buddhism, Primitive and Present, in Nagadha and in Ceylon," published last winter, makes only two great divisions, the southern and the northern, or, as some call them, the Little Go and the Go, and which he distinguishes as

Great Go, and which he distinguishes as Buddhism and Bodhism. These, he says, differ as much as Mohammedanism and Judaism, although he thinks they must have had some ancient connection. Before coming to Japan, I tried to procure as much information about Buddhism as possible. But, unfortunately, the writers of the books I read either dealt with ancient Buddhism generally, or confined themselves to the Buddhism of Ceylon, Burmah, and Siam. Even such a large volume as that of Prof. Rhys David's gives Japanese Buddhism, if I rightly remember, only half a page. I have since learnt that there are works on the Buddhism of China,