

is as easy as to turn the finger on the palm of the hand: you have only to show a good example, and all the world will follow it.' How far this coincided with his own experience we cannot say; for, amongst all his disciples he had only one who was truly virtuous—and he died early." Confucius, although he is himself worshipped as if he existed in another sphere, did not teach the immortality of the soul. His followers do not deny the existence of a supreme being, but of a personal God they know nothing. Like the philosophical pagans of the time of Socrates, they are divided in their minds between pantheism and idolatry. A contemporary of Confucius was Laou-tsze, another reformer, who founded the Taou sect, so called from his book, Taou-tih-king, which is still extant. He taught a morality not inferior to that of Confucius, but his doctrines are abstruse and mystical, and favour gross idolatry. "We meet in his work the vestiges of adulterated truth—the Trinity, the Word, immortality—and the Taou priests think themselves possessed of the liquor of immortality, and pretend to understand the art of transmuting common metals into gold: but they die like all other mortals, and are, notwithstanding their art, generally very poor." About 170 years later a third reformer was born, who, in the estimation of the Chinese, ranks next to Confucius. This was Mang-tsze. It appears that the two existing sects had departed greatly in regard to their view of the ruling principle of life from the doctrines of their founders. One inculcated universal love, and the other a due regard to self. Mang-tsze was afraid that the clanship, which is even more characteristic of the Chinese than it used to be of the Scotch, and which was a powerful engine in the state and in religion, might be destroyed by an exclusive attention to either of these principles. He counselled love towards fellow-clansmen as members of the same family, a more moderate kind of affection towards those who stood in the relation merely of fellow-subjects, and left foreigners outside of the pale of Chinese sympathy. Doubtless Mang-tsze is responsible for much of the contempt for and aversion to foreigners which even now hinder European intercourse with China. In the year 65 A. D. the emperor Ming-te, on the occasion of a dream, remembered that Confucius had said "that the Holy One was in the west." He accordingly sent an embassy to India, which brought back a Buddhist priest, several Buddhist books that were afterwards translated into Chinese, and a large picture of Buddha, which became the model of millions of pictures and statues that have since adorned the temples of the new divinity. This foreign system, which has five hundred millions of adherents, is supposed to have commenced in India about 600 years before Christ, with the teaching of Gautama Buddha. The teachings of Buddha were not unlike those of Confucius: the latter is supposed indeed to have referred to Buddha in his historical work under the name of Fohi (sometimes, as we have seen, identified with Noah), who is made the author of the Yih-king, the oldest Chinese book. His morals were in some respects even an improvement on those of Confucius. He ignored the existence of a God altogether, unless it were he himself, and taught that every being might be a candidate for the Buddhahip, which is to be obtained by the uniform pursuit of it as an object through innumerable ages, under different forms. This great achievement is *nirwana*, the attaining unconsciousness and annihilation; "for consciousness or sentient existence," says Buddha, "is the offspring of ignorance and imperfection." The worship of Buddha has many points in common with the Roman Catholic ritual. "The difference in ceremony between the religion of the Chinese and that of the Roman Catholic Church is so slight, that the Roman Church finds it easy to make