

Readings in Philosophy of Religion

Stephen Hicks, Ph.D.

Philosophy 329

2. Syllabus and Schedule

5. Comparative Religion

Christianity: *Some Recent Statements*

Christianity: *The Gospel According to Luke*

Christianity: *Asceticism and Some Saints*

Islam: excerpts from *Koran* and from Seyyid Qutb's *Milestones*

Judaism: *A Prayerbook for Shabbat*

Amerindian: *Lakota Sioux Self-Sacrifice*

56. Arguments For and Against the Existence of God

William Paley, *The Watch & the Watchmaker*

Charles Darwin, *On Evolution*

J. P. Moreland, *Yes, God Exists*

Kai Nielson, *No, God Does Not Exist*

John Hick, *Solving the Problem of Evil*

77. Faith and/or Reason

Quotations on Faith

Søren Kierkegaard, *A Panegyric on Abraham*

Michael Blumenthal, *Isaac*

William James, *The Will to Believe*

Antony Flew, R. M. Hare, and Basil Mitchell, *Theology & Falsification: A Symposium*

108. Ethics and the Meaning of Life

Mother Teresa, *No Greater Love*

A. C. Grayling, *Religion is Immoral*

Alexis de Tocqueville, *Man Needs Religion for Political Reasons*

Quotations from Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Sigmund Freud

Lois Hope Walker, *Religion Gives Meaning to Life*

W. T. Stace, *There Is Meaning in Absurdity*

Rupert Brooke, *The Great Lover*

* * *

Philosophy of Religion

Philosophy 329

Dr. Stephen Hicks

Scarborough 119 Phone: 226 4078

Office Hours: MWF 12-2 and by appointment

SHicks@Rockford.edu / www.StephenHicks.org

We will investigate the full range of philosophical issues on religion:

- Metaphysical issues about the existence of a God or gods, creation versus eternal evolution;
- Epistemological issues about reason, experience, faith, mysticism, and accepting tradition;
- Ethical issues about human nature, sin, virtues, and the meaning of life;
- Political issues about toleration and enforcement, separating church and state, and education.

In doing so we will read representatives of a wide range of perspectives on religion:

- Excerpts from Jewish, Christian, Islamic, and Buddhist texts
- A philosophical atheist and a philosophical theist
- And other essays from a variety of perspectives.

You will have the option to write up to six essays. There will be a required comprehensive final exam.

Readings

Philosophy of Religion course readings packet

Hermann Hesse, *Siddhartha* (Bantam)

C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (Collier)

George H. Smith, *Atheism: The Case against God* (Prometheus, ASIN: B004LB4CAS)

Assignments and Grading

Six optional essays (500 words each)

Final exam

<i>Number of essays done</i>	<i>Weighting of the essays</i>	<i>Weighting of the exam</i>	<i>Total</i>
0	0	100	100
1	10	90	100
2	20	80	100
3	30	70	100
4	40	60	100
5	50	50	100
6	60	40	100

Note: When submitting your essays, email them to SHicks@Rockford.edu. Do *not* attach your essay but instead cut-and-paste it into the body of your email.

Schedule and Readings

[PR] = selection is *Philosophy of Religion* course readings packet

<i>Week</i>	<i>Lectures and Discussion</i>	<i>Readings</i>
1 Aug 19	Introduction: Philosophy, religion, and philosophy of religion Defining religion philosophically	
	<i>Unit 1: What is religion?</i>	
2 Aug 26	Buddhism	Hermann Hesse, <i>Siddhartha</i>
3 Sep 2	First optional essay due Judaism Amerindian	<i>A Prayerbook for Shabbat</i> [PR] <i>Lakota Sioux Self-Sacrifice</i> [PR]
4 Sep 9	Christianity Islam	<i>Luke</i> [PR] <i>Koran</i> [PR] Seyyid Qutb, <i>Milestones</i>
5 Sep 16	Second optional essay due Class does not meet	
	<i>Unit 2: Is religion true?</i>	
6 Sep 23	Defining God.	George Smith, <i>Atheism</i> , Part I C. S. Lewis, <i>Mere Christianity</i> , Book IV
7 Sep 30	Third optional essay due. Natural theology: The Design Argument	William Paley, <i>The Watch & the Watchmaker</i> [PR] and Charles Darwin, <i>On Evolution</i> [PR] J. P. Moreland and Kai Neilson [PR]
8 Oct 7	Natural theology: The Theodicy Argument	Smith, <i>Atheism</i> , Part 4 (Ch. 12) and John Hick, <i>Solving the Problem of Evil</i> [PR]
9 Oct 14	Fall Break Class does not meet	
	<i>Unit 3: Is religion reasonable?</i>	
10 Oct 21	Fourth optional essay due	

	Defining faith	Quotations on Faith, Kierkegaard's <i>A Panegyric on Abraham</i> , and Blumenthal's <i>Isaac</i> [all in A] Flew, Hare, and Mitchell, <i>Theology & Falsification</i> [PR]
11 Oct 28	Faith: pro and con	Smith, <i>Atheism</i> , Part 2 (Chs. 4-6) and Lewis, <i>Mere Christianity</i> , Bk. III (Chs. 11 & 12)
	<i>Unit 4: Is religion good?</i>	
12 Nov 4	Fifth optional essay due Religion & ethics: divine command theory and religious morals	Lewis, <i>Mere Christianity</i> , Preface, Book I Mother Teresa, <i>No Greater Love</i> [PR]
13 Nov 11	Religion versus ethics: criticisms of religious ethics	Grayling, <i>Religion is Immoral</i> [PR] Smith, <i>Atheism</i> , Part 4 (Chapters 11 and 12)
	<i>Unit 5: Is religion useful?</i>	
14 Nov 18	Sixth optional essay due Religion & politics	Tocqueville, <i>Democratic Man Needs Religion ...</i> [PR] Excerpts from Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud [PR]
15 Nov 25	Thanksgiving Class does not meet	
16 Dec 2	Religion & the meaning of life Conclusions	Lois Hope Walker, <i>Religion Gives Meaning to Life</i> [PR] W. T. Stace, <i>There Is Meaning in Absurdity</i> [PR] Rupert Brooke, <i>The Great Lover</i> [PR]
17 Dec 9	6 p.m.: Final exam Exam question: <i>What is the philosophical significance of religion?</i>	Exam instructions: You will have two hours to answer the question in writing. The only specific requirement is that you discuss each of the readings for the semester.

A copy of this syllabus and schedule can be found online at www.StephenHicks.org.

For Honor Code and Disability issues, please consult the College's website.

Christianity: Some Recent Statements

"To the Amish, worldly things take your mind off what's real: the spiritual world, God's world. And so the Amish have rules to assure that they will not become attached to society. ... The point behind all the rules is to avoid pride—in yourself, in how you think, in how you look. You must look like everyone else: Men get the same bowl haircuts, do not grow mustaches and are allowed beards only when they come of age. No zippers are allowed on clothes. White toppers are not allowed to show buttons on their jackets—they must use hooks and eyes. Women use straight pins to fasten their clothes. Their hair must not be cut, and heads must be covered. The idea is to avoid becoming stylish or drawing attention to yourself.

"Amish behavior is nearly as circumscribed as Amish fashion. Children stop school after the eighth grade. Men do men things and women do women things. You will not see a woman sawing logs at a barn-raising. She will be inside cooking. In the Amish world, human imagination, innovation, intellect, and, above all, individuality are intentionally squashed." (Jeanne Laskas, "Fire, Hope and Charity," *Life*, June 1992, pp. 89-90)

Football player André Rison on basketball player Magic Johnson's having HIV: "If you go back to the Bible, it says that sex out of wedlock is a sin. I think maybe there was too much going on. The Lord decided to stick a sense of urgency into this thing. I guess he just needed a helluva good man to get the message across." (1991)

Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910): "The moral life was as simple as the Sermon on the Mount. A man should have faith in God, and live like Jesus. Turn the other cheek. Never offer violence. Killing was an absolute evil. War was absolute evil. Punishment, of any kind, was a crime. One should possess nothing and live like the poor. In the poor, in the Russian *muzhik*, was wisdom and virtue; in all humility, one should live like them. The flesh was sinful. By chastity one could avoid the most sinful of sins." (C. P. Snow, *The Realists*, pp. 208-9)

"Christianity, if practiced in the ideal, seems especially suited to the Russian character. Russians are preeminently a pious, compassionate and humble people, accepting faith as more powerful than logic and believing that life is controlled by superhuman forces, be they spiritual, autocratic or even occult. Russians feel far less need than most pragmatic Westerners to inquire why things happen, or how they can be made to happen (or not to happen) again. Disasters occur and they accept; orders are issued and they obey. This is something other than brute docility. It stems rather from a sense of the natural rhythms of life. Russians are contemplative, mystical and visionary. From their observations and meditations, they have produced an understanding of suffering and death which gives a meaning to life not unlike that affirmed by Christ." (Robert K. Massie. *Peter the Great*. New York: Random, 1980, p. 54)

"It's hard to stumble when you are on your knees." (Billboard at 7th Day Adventist Church, Rockford.)

"Remember that he who is least deserving of forgiveness probably needs it most."
 (Billboard at 7th Day Adventist Church, Rockford.)

Theologian F. Schleiermacher's American admirer and translator, George Ripley: "religion ... in its primitive elements, is neither knowledge nor action, but a sense of dependence on God, and of our need for redemption from sin." (Quoted in Robert D. Richardson, Jr., *Emerson: The Mind on Fire*, 1995)

"Steve Toler lost one \$30 white dress shirt and a convertible Thursday afternoon after a falling front-end loader gave him a brisk back rub at 50 mph in rush hour traffic.

"I've been a believer for a long time,' said a slightly bruised Toler, state public affairs manager for GTE South. 'I definitely feel the man upstairs had his hand on that car.'

"A chain holding a front-end loader on a trailer snapped. The loader fell off the trailer and onto Toler's car, totaling his convertible and nearly crushing him. 'If it was six inches one way or the other, things could have been pretty bad.'" (*Durham Morning Herald*, 1989)

Jimmy Swaggart on Original Sin: Humans are "rotten and stinking with corruption, and filled with sin." ("The Jimmy Swaggart Crusade," 1984)

C. S. Lewis: "I find in practice that when you are in trouble, the moment you regard it as 'punishment,' it becomes easier to bear. If you think of this world as a place intended simply for our happiness, you find it quite intolerable: think of it as a place of training and correction and it's not so bad." (*God in the Dock*)

"[Danny] Wuerffel threw three touchdown passes to Ike Hilliard and ran for another score as the Gators avenged a 24-21 setback to Florida State on November 30th.

"Wuerffel, a deeply religious young man, again thanked Jesus Christ for the victory. In fact, [Coach Steve] Spurrier even admitted that his team was blessed.

"First of all, I'll say what Danny always says. God looked down on the Gators this year,' Spurrier said. 'We have a lot to be thankful for. I want the players to realize that divine guidance or something like that helped us this year.'" (AOL, 01-03-97)

* * *

Christianity: The Gospel According to St. Luke

^{1:1}Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us, ^{1:2}even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, ^{1:3}it seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus; ^{1:4}that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed. ^{1:5}There was in the days of Herod, king of Judaea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abijah: and he had a wife of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth. ^{1:6}And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments

and ordinances of the Lord blameless. ^{1:7}And they had no child, because that Elisabeth was barren, and they both were *now* well stricken in years. ^{1:8}Now it came to pass, while he executed the priest's office before God in the order of his course, ^{1:9}according to the custom of the priest's office, his lot was to enter into the temple of the Lord and burn incense. ^{1:10}And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the hour of incense. ^{1:11}And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of altar of incense. ^{1:12}And Zacharias was troubled when he saw *him*, and fear fell upon him. ^{1:13}But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: because thy supplication is heard, and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. ^{1:14}And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. ^{1:15}For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and he shall drink no wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb. ^{1:16}And many of the children of Israel shall be turn unto the Lord their God. ^{1:17}And he shall go before his face in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient *to walk* in the wisdom of the just; to make ready for the Lord a people prepared *for him*. ^{1:18}And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years. ^{1:19}And the angel answering said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and I was sent to speak unto thee, and to bring thee these good tidings. ^{1:20}And behold, thou shalt be silent and not able to speak, until the day that these things shall come to pass, because thou believedst not my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season. ^{1:21}And the people were waiting for Zacharias, and they marvelled while he tarried in the temple. ^{1:22}And when he came out, he could not speak unto them: and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the temple: and he continued making signs unto them, and remained dumb. ^{1:23}And it came to pass, when the days of his ministration were fulfilled, he departed unto his house. ^{1:24}And after these days Elisabeth his wife conceived; and she hid herself five months, saying, ^{1:25}Thus hath the Lord done unto me in the days wherein he looked upon *me*, to take away my reproach among men. ^{1:26}Now in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, ^{1:27}to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. ^{1:28}And he came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord *is* with thee. ^{1:29}But she was greatly troubled at the saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this might be. ^{1:30}And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favor with God. ^{1:31}And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. ^{1:32}He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: ^{1:33}and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. ^{1:34}And Mary said unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? ^{1:35}And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also the holy thing which is begotten shall be called the Son of God. ^{1:36}And behold, Elisabeth thy kinswoman, she also hath conceived a son in her old age; and this is the sixth month with her that was called barren. ^{1:37}For no word from God shall be void of power. ^{1:38}And Mary said, Behold, the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her. ^{1:39}And Mary arose in these days and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Judah; ^{1:40}and entered into the house of Zacharias and saluted Elisabeth. ^{1:41}And it came to pass, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit; ^{1:42}and she lifted up her voice with a loud cry, and said, Blessed *art* thou among women, and blessed *is* the fruit of thy womb. ^{1:43}And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord

should come unto me? ^{1:44}For behold, when the voice of thy salutation came into mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. ^{1:45}And blessed is she that believed; for there shall be a fulfillment of the things which have been spoken to her from the Lord. ^{1:46}And Mary said,

My soul doth magnify the Lord,

^{1:47}And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.

^{1:48}For he hath looked upon the low estate of his handmaid:

For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.

^{1:49}For he that is mighty hath done to me great things;

And holy is his name.

^{1:50}And his mercy is unto generations and generations

On them that fear him.

^{1:51}He hath showed strength with his arm;

He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart.

^{1:52}He hath put down princes from *their* thrones,

And hath exalted them of low degree.

^{1:53}The hungry he hath filled with good things;

And the rich he hath sent empty away.

^{1:54}He hath given help to Israel his servant,

That he might remember mercy

^{1:55}(As he spake unto our fathers)

Toward Abraham and his seed for ever.

^{1:56}And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned unto her house. ^{1:57}Now Elisabeth's time was fulfilled that she should be delivered; and she brought forth a son. ^{1:58}And her neighbors and her kinsfolk heard that the Lord had magnified his mercy towards her; and they rejoiced with her. ^{1:59}And it came to pass on the eighth day, that they came to circumcise the child; and they would have called him Zacharias, after the name of the father. ^{1:60}And his mother answered and said, Not so; but he shall be called John. ^{1:61}And they said unto her, There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name. ^{1:62}And they made signs to his father, what he would have him called. ^{1:63}And he asked for a writing tablet, and wrote, saying, His name is John. And they marvelled all. ^{1:64}And his mouth was opened immediately, and his tongue loosed, and he spake, blessing God. ^{1:65}And fear came on all that dwelt round about them: and all these sayings were noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judaea. ^{1:66}And all that heard them laid them up in their heart, saying, What then shall this child be? For the hand of the Lord was with him. ^{1:67}And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied, saying,

^{1:68}Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel;

For he hath visited and wrought redemption for his people,

^{1:69}And hath raised up a horn of salvation for us

In the house of his servant David

^{1:70}(As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets that have been from of old),

^{1:71}Salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us;

^{1:72}To show mercy towards, our fathers,

And to remember his holy covenant;

^{1:73}The oath which he spake unto Abraham our father,

^{1:74}To grant unto us that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies

Should serve him without fear,

^{1:75}In holiness and righteousness before him all our days.

^{1:76}Yea and thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Most High:

For thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to make ready his ways;

^{1:77}To give knowledge of salvation unto his people

In the remission of their sins,

^{1:78}Because of the tender mercy of our God,

Whereby the dayspring from on high shall visit us,

^{1:79}To shine upon them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death;

To guide our feet into the way of peace.

^{1:80}And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel.

^{2:1}Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled. ^{2:2}This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria. ^{2:3}And all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city. ^{2:4}And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and family of David; ^{2:5}to enrol himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child. ^{2:6}And it came to pass, while they were there, the days were fulfilled that she should be delivered. ^{2:7}And she brought forth her firstborn son; and she wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn. ^{2:8}And there were shepherds in the same country abiding in the field, and keeping watch by night over their flock. ^{2:9}And an angel of the Lord stood by them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. ^{2:10}And the angel said unto them, Be not afraid; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people: ^{2:11}for there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord. ^{2:12}And this is the sign unto you: Ye shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger. ^{2:13}And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying,

^{2:14}Glory to God in the highest,

And on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.

2:15 And it came to pass, when the angels went away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing that is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us. 2:16 And they came with haste, and found both Mary and Joseph, and the babe lying in the manger. 2:17 And when they saw it, they made known concerning the saying which was spoken to them about this child. 2:18 And all that heard it wondered at the things which were spoken unto them by the shepherds. 2:19 But Mary kept all these sayings, pondering them in her heart. 2:20 And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they had heard and seen, even as it was spoken unto them. 2:21 And when eight days were fulfilled for circumcising him, his name was called JESUS, which was so called by the angel before he was conceived in the womb. 2:22 And when the days of their purification according to the law of Moses were fulfilled, they brought him up to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord 2:23 (as it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord), 2:24 and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons. 2:25 And behold, there was a man in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon; and this man was righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel: and the Holy Spirit was upon him. 2:26 And it had been revealed unto him by the Holy Spirit, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ. 2:27 And he came in the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, that they might do concerning him after the custom of the law, 2:28 then he received him into his arms, and blessed God, and said,

2:29 Now lettest thou thy servant depart, Lord,

According to thy word, in peace;

2:30 For mine eyes have seen thy salvation,

2:31 Which thou hast prepared before the face of all peoples;

2:32 A light for revelation to the Gentiles,

And the glory of thy people Israel.

2:33 And his father and his mother were marvelling at the things which were spoken concerning him; 2:34 and Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary his mother, Behold, this *child* is set for the falling and the rising of many in Israel; and for a sign which is spoken against; 2:35 yea and a sword shall pierce through thine own soul; that thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed. 2:36 And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher (she was of a great age, having lived with a husband seven years from her virginity, 2:37 and she had been a widow even unto fourscore and four years), who departed not from the temple, worshipping with fastings and supplications night and day. 2:38 And coming up at that very hour she gave thanks unto God, and spake of him to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem. 2:39 And when they had accomplished all things that were according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth. 2:40 And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him. 2:41 And his parents went every year to Jerusalem at the feast of the passover. 2:42 And when he was twelve years old, they went up after the custom of the feast; 2:43 and when they had fulfilled the days, as they were returning, the boy Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and his parents knew it not; 2:44 but supposing him to be in the company, they went a day's journey; and they sought for him among their kinsfolk and acquaintance: 2:45 and when they found him not, they returned to Jerusalem, seeking for him.

^{2:46}And it came to pass, after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the teachers, both hearing them, and asking them questions: ^{2:47}and all that heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers. ^{2:48}And when they saw him, they were astonished; and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing. ^{2:49}And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house? ^{2:50}And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them. ^{2:51}And he went down with them, and came to Nazareth; and he was subject unto them: and his mother kept all *these* sayings in her heart. ^{2:52}And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men.

^{3:1}Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene, ^{3:2}in the highpriesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. ^{3:3}And he came into all the region round about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins; ^{3:4}as it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make ye ready the way of the Lord, Make his paths straight. ^{3:5}Every valley shall be filled, And every mountain and hill shall be brought low; And the crooked shall become straight, And the rough ways smooth; ^{3:6}And all flesh shall see the salvation of God. ^{3:7}He said therefore to the multitudes that went out to be baptized of him, Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? ^{3:8}Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. ^{3:9}And even now the axe also lieth at the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. ^{3:10}And the multitudes asked him, saying, What then must we do? ^{3:11}And he answered and said unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise. ^{3:12}And there came also publicans to be baptized, and they said unto him, Teacher, what must we do? ^{3:13}And he said unto them, Extort no more than that which is appointed you. ^{3:14}And soldiers also asked him, saying, And we, what must we do? And he said unto them, Extort from no man by violence, neither accuse *any one* wrongfully; and be content with your wages. ^{3:15}And as the people were in expectation, and all men reasoned in their hearts concerning John, whether haply he were the Christ; ^{3:16}John answered, saying unto them all, I indeed baptize you with water; but there cometh he that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and *in* fire: ^{3:17}whose fan is in his hand, thoroughly to cleanse his threshing-floor, and to gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire. ^{3:18}With many other exhortations therefore preached he good tidings unto the people; ^{3:19}but Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias his brother's wife, and for all the evil things which Herod had done, ^{3:20}added this also to them all, that he shut up John in prison. ^{3:21}Now it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, that, Jesus also having been baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, ^{3:22}and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily form, as a dove, upon him, and a voice came out of heaven, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased. ^{3:23}And Jesus himself, when he began *to teach*, was about thirty years of age, being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph, the *son* of Heli, ^{3:24}the *son* of Matthat, the *son* of Levi, the *son* of Melchi, the *son* of Jannai, the *son* of Joseph, ^{3:25}the *son* of Mattathias, the *son* of Amos, the *son* of Nahum, the *son* of Esli, the *son* of Naggai, ^{3:26}the *son* of Maath, the *son* of Mattathias, the *son* of Semein, the *son* of Josech, the *son* of Joda, ^{3:27}the *son* of

Joanan, the son of Rhesa, the son of Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, the son of Neri,^{3:28} the son of Melchi, the son of Addi, the son of Cosam, the son of Elmadam, the son of Er,^{3:29} the son of Jesus, the son of Eliezer, the son of Jorim, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi,^{3:30} the son of Symeon, the son of Judas, the son of Joseph, the son of Jonam, the son of Eliakim,^{3:31} the son of Melea, the son of Menna, the son of Mattatha, the son of Nathan, the son of David,^{3:32} the son of Jesse, the son of Obed, the son of Boaz, the son of Salmon, the son of Nahshon,^{3:33} the son of Amminadab, the son of Arni, the son of Hezron, the son of Perez, the son of Judah,^{3:34} the son of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham, the son of Terah, the son of Nahor,^{3:35} the son of Serug, the son of Reu, the son of Peleg, the son of Eber, the son of Shelah^{3:36} the son of Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem, the son of Noah, the son of Lamech,^{3:37} the son of Methuselah, the son of Enoch, the son of Jared, the son of Mahalaleel, the son of Cainan,^{3:38} the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.

^{4:1} And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led in the Spirit in the wilderness ^{4:2} during forty days, being tempted of the devil. And he did eat nothing in those days: and when they were completed, he hungered. ^{4:3} And the devil said unto him, if thou art the Son of God, command this stone that it become bread. ^{4:4} And Jesus answered unto him, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone. ^{4:5} And he led him up, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. ^{4:6} And the devil said unto him, To thee will I give all this authority, and the glory of them: for it hath been delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. ^{4:7} If thou therefore wilt worship before me, it shall all be thine. ^{4:8} And Jesus answered and said unto him, It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. ^{4:9} And he led him to Jerusalem, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence: ^{4:10} for it is written,

He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, to guard thee:

^{4:11} and,

On their hands they shall bear thee up,

Lest haply thou dash thy foot against a stone.

^{4:12} And Jesus answering said unto him, It is said, Thou shalt not make trial of the Lord thy God.

^{4:13} And when the devil had completed every temptation, he departed from him for a season.

^{4:14} And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and a fame went out concerning him through all the region round about. ^{4:15} And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.

^{4:16} And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and he entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up to read. ^{4:17} And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah. And he opened the book, and found the place where it was written,

^{4:18} The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,

Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor:

He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,

And recovering of sight to the blind,

To set at liberty them that are bruised,

^{4:19}To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.

^{4:20}And he closed the book, and gave it back to the attendant, and sat down: and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on him. ^{4:21}And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears. ^{4:22}And all bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth: and they said, Is not this Joseph's son? ^{4:23}And he said unto them, Doubtless ye will say unto me this parable, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum, do also here in thine own country. ^{4:24}And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is acceptable in his own country. ^{4:25}But of a truth I say unto you, There were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land; ^{4:26}and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Zarephath, in the land of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. ^{4:27}And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian. ^{4:28}And they were all filled with wrath in the synagogue, as they heard these things; ^{4:29}and they rose up, and cast him forth out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong. ^{4:30}But he passing through the midst of them went his way. ^{4:31}And he came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee. And he was teaching them on the sabbath day: ^{4:32}and they were astonished at his teaching; for his word was with authority. ^{4:33}And in the synagogue there was a man, that had a spirit of an unclean demon; and he cried out with a loud voice, ^{4:34}Ah! what have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Nazarene? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. ^{4:35}And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the demon had thrown him down in the midst, he came out of him, having done him no hurt. ^{4:36}And amazement came upon all, and they spake together, one with another, saying, What is this word? for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out. ^{4:37}And there went forth a rumor concerning him into every place of the region round about. ^{4:38}And he rose up from the synagogue, and entered into the house of Simon. And Simon's wife's mother was holden with a great fever; and they besought him for her. ^{4:39}And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and immediately she rose up and ministered unto them. ^{4:40}And when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them. ^{4:41}And demons also came out from many, crying out, and saying, Thou art the Son of God. And rebuking them, he suffered them not to speak, because they knew that he was the Christ. ^{4:42}And when it was day, he came out and went into a desert place: and the multitudes sought after him, and came unto him, and would have stayed him, that he should not go from them. ^{4:43}But he said unto them, I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to the other cities also: for therefore was I sent. ^{4:44}And he was preaching in the synagogues of Galilee.

^{5:1}Now it came to pass, while the multitude pressed upon him and heard the word of God, that he was standing by the lake of Gennesaret; ^{5:2}and he saw two boats standing by the lake: but the fishermen had gone out of them, and were washing their nets. ^{5:3}And he entered into one of the boats, which was Simon's, and asked him to put out a little from the land. And he sat down and taught the multitudes out of the boat. ^{5:4}And when he had left speaking, he said unto Simon, Put out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught. ^{5:5}And Simon answered and said, Master, we toiled all night, and took nothing: but at thy word I will let down the nets. ^{5:6}And when they had done this, they inclosed a great multitude of fishes; and their nets were breaking; ^{5:7}and they beckoned unto their partners in the other boat, that they should come and

help them. And they came, and filled both the boats, so that they began to sink. ^{5:8}But Simon Peter, when he saw it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord. ^{5:9}For he was amazed, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken; ^{5:10}and so were also James and John, sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men. ^{5:11}And when they had brought their boats to land, they left all, and followed him. ^{5:12}And it came to pass, while he was in one of the cities, behold, a man full of leprosy: and when he saw Jesus, he fell on his face, and besought him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. ^{5:13}And he stretched forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou made clean. And straightway the leprosy departed from him. ^{5:14}And he charged him to tell no man: but go thy way, and show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them. ^{5:15}But so much the more went abroad the report concerning him: and great multitudes came together to hear, and to be healed of their infirmities. ^{5:16}But he withdrew himself in the deserts, and prayed. ^{5:17}And it came to pass on one of those days, that he was teaching; and there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, who were come out of every village of Galilee and Judaea and Jerusalem: and the power of the Lord was with him to heal. ^{5:18}And behold, men bring on a bed a man that was palsied: and they sought to bring him in, and to lay him before him. ^{5:19}And not finding by what *way* they might bring him in because of the multitude, they went up to the housetop, and let him down through the tiles with his couch into the midst before Jesus. ^{5:20}And seeing their faith, he said, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee. ^{5:21}And the scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this that speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone? ^{5:22}But Jesus perceiving their reasonings, answered and said unto them, Why reason ye in your hearts? ^{5:23}Which is easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk? ^{5:24}But that ye may know that the Son of man hath authority on earth to forgive sins (he said unto him that was palsied), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go unto thy house. ^{5:25}And immediately he rose up before them, and took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his house, glorifying God. ^{5:26}And amazement took hold on all, and they glorified God; and they were filled with fear, saying, We have seen strange things to-day. ^{5:27}And after these things he went forth, and beheld a publican, named Levi, sitting at the place of toll, and said unto him, Follow me. ^{5:28}And he forsook all, and rose up and followed him. ^{5:29}And Levi made him a great feast in his house: and there was a great multitude of publicans and of others that were sitting at meat with them. ^{5:30}And the Pharisees and their scribes murmured against his disciples, saying, Why do ye eat and drink with the publicans and sinners? ^{5:31}And Jesus answering said unto them, They that are in health have no need of a physician; but they that are sick. ^{5:32}I am not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance. ^{5:33}And they said unto him, The disciples of John fast often, and make supplications; likewise also the *disciples* of the Pharisees; but thine eat and drink. ^{5:34}And Jesus said unto them, Can ye make the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? ^{5:35}But the days will come; and when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, then will they fast in those days. ^{5:36}And he spake also a parable unto them: No man rendeth a piece from a new garment and putteth it upon an old garment; else he will rend the new, and also the piece from the new will not agree with the old. ^{5:37}And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the new wine will burst the skins, and itself will be spilled, and the skins will perish. ^{5:38}But new wine must be put into fresh wine-skins. ^{5:39}And no man having drunk old *wine* desireth new; for he saith, The old is good.

6:1 Now it came to pass on a sabbath, that he was going through the grainfields; and his disciples plucked the ears, and did eat, rubbing them in their hands. 6:2 But certain of the Pharisees said, Why do ye that which it is not lawful to do on the sabbath day? 6:3 And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read even this, what David did, when he was hungry, he, and they that were with him; 6:4 how he entered into the house of God, and took and ate the showbread, and gave also to them that were with him; which it is not lawful to eat save for the priests alone? 6:5 And he said unto them, The Son of man is lord of the sabbath. 6:6 And it came to pass on another sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man there, and his right hand was withered. 6:7 And the scribes and the Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath; that they might find how to accuse him. 6:8 But he knew their thoughts; and he said to the man that had his hand withered, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth. 6:9 And Jesus said unto them, I ask you, Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to destroy it? 6:10 And he looked round about on them all, and said unto him, Stretch forth thy hand. And he did so: and his hand was restored. 6:11 But they were filled with madness; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus.

6:12 And it came to pass in these days, that he went out into the mountain to pray; and he continued all night in prayer to God. 6:13 And when it was day, he called his disciples; and he chose from them twelve, whom also he named apostles: 6:14 Simon, whom he also named Peter, and Andrew his brother, and James and John, and Philip and Bartholomew, 6:15 and Matthew and Thomas, and James *the son of Alphaeus*, and Simon who was called the Zealot, 6:16 and Judas *the son of James*, and Judas Iscariot, who became a traitor; 6:17 and he came down with them, and stood on a level place, and a great multitude of his disciples, and a great number of the people from all Judaea and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, who came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases; 6:18 and they that were troubled with unclean spirits were healed. 6:19 And all the multitude sought to touch him; for power came forth from him, and healed *them* all. 6:20 And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed *are* ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God. 6:21 Blessed *are* ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed *are* ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh. 6:22 Blessed *are* ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you *from their company*, and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. 6:23 Rejoice in that day, and leap *for joy*: for behold, your reward is great in heaven; for in the same manner did their fathers unto the prophets. 6:24 But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. 6:25 Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger. Woe *unto* you, ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. 6:26 Woe *unto* you, when all men shall speak well of you! for in the same manner did their fathers to the false prophets. 6:27 But I say unto you that hear, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, 6:28 bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you. 6:29 To him that smiteth thee on the *one* cheek offer also the other; and from him that taketh away thy cloak withhold not thy coat also. 6:30 Give to every one that asketh thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again. 6:31 And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. 6:32 And if ye love them that love you, what thank have ye? for even sinners love those that love them. 6:33 And if ye do good to them that do good to you, what thank have ye? for even sinners do the same. 6:34 And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? even sinners lend to sinners, to receive again as much. 6:35 But love your enemies, and do *them* good, and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High: for he is kind toward the unthankful and evil. 6:36 Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful. 6:37 And judge not, and ye shall not be judged: and condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: release, and

ye shall be released: ^{6:38}give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, shall they give into your bosom. For with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again. ^{6:39}And he spake also a parable unto them, Can the blind guide the blind? shall they not both fall into a pit? ^{6:40}The disciple is not above his teacher: but every one when he is perfected shall be as his teacher. ^{6:41}And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? ^{6:42}Or how canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, let me cast out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye. ^{6:43}For there is no good tree that bringeth forth corrupt fruit; nor again a corrupt tree that bringeth forth good fruit. ^{6:44}For each tree is known by its own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes. ^{6:45}The good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and the evil *man* out of the evil *treasure* bringeth forth that which is evil: for out of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh. ^{6:46}And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? ^{6:47}Every one that cometh unto me, and heareth my words, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like: ^{6:48}he is like a man building a house, who digged and went deep, and laid a foundation upon the rock: and when a flood arose, the stream brake against that house, and could not shake it: because it had been well builded. ^{6:49}But he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that built a house upon the earth without a foundation; against which the stream brake, and straightway it fell in; and the ruin of that house was great.

^{7:1}After he had ended all his sayings in the ears of the people, he entered into Capernaum. ^{7:2}And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick and at the point of death. ^{7:3}And when he heard concerning Jesus, he sent unto him elders of the Jews, asking him that he would come and save his servant. ^{7:4}And they, when they came to Jesus, besought him earnestly, saying, He is worthy that thou shouldest do this for him; ^{7:5}for he loveth our nation, and himself built us our synagogue. ^{7:6}And Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thyself; for I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: ^{7:7}wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say the word, and my servant shall be healed. ^{7:8}For I also am a man set under authority, having under myself soldiers: and I say to this one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. ^{7:9}And when Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned and said unto the multitude that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. ^{7:10}And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole. ^{7:11}And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went to a city called Nain; and his disciples went with him, and a great multitude. ^{7:12}Now when he drew near to the gate of the city, behold, there was carried out one that was dead, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow: and much people of the city was with her. ^{7:13}And when the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not. ^{7:14}And he came nigh and touched the bier: and the bearers stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise. ^{7:15}And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he gave him to his mother. ^{7:16}And fear took hold on all: and they glorified God, saying, A great prophet is arisen among us: and, God hath visited his people. ^{7:17}And this report went forth concerning him in the whole of Judaea, and all the region round about. ^{7:18}And the disciples of John told him of all these things. ^{7:19}And John calling unto him two of his disciples sent them to the Lord, saying, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another? ^{7:20}And when the men were come unto him, they said, John the

Baptist hath sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another? ^{7:21}In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits; and on many that were blind he bestowed sight. ^{7:22}And he answered and said unto them, Go and tell John the things which ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them. ^{7:23}And blessed is he, whosoever shall find no occasion of stumbling in me. ^{7:24}And when the messengers of John were departed, he began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind? ^{7:25}But what went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately, are in kings' courts. ^{7:26}But what went ye out to see? a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. ^{7:27}This is he of whom it is written,

Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,

Who shall prepare thy way before thee.

^{7:28}I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there is none greater than John: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of God is greater than he. ^{7:29}And all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. ^{7:30}But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him. ^{7:31}Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation, and to what are they like? ^{7:32}They are like unto children that sit in the marketplace, and call one to another; who say, We piped unto you, and ye did not dance; we wailed, and ye did not weep. ^{7:33}For John the Baptist is come eating no bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a demon. ^{7:34}The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold, a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! ^{7:35}And wisdom is justified of all her children. ^{7:36}And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he entered into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. ^{7:37}And behold, a woman who was in the city, a sinner; and when she knew that he was sitting at meat in the Pharisee's house, she brought an alabaster cruse of ointment, ^{7:38}and standing behind at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. ^{7:39}Now when the Pharisee that had bidden him saw it, he spake within himself, saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have perceived who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him, that she is a sinner. ^{7:40}And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Teacher, say on. ^{7:41}A certain lender had two debtors: the one owed five hundred shillings, and the other fifty. ^{7:42}When they had not *wherewith* to pay, he forgave them both. Which of them therefore will love him most? ^{7:43}Simon answered and said, He, I suppose, to whom he forgave the most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. ^{7:44}And turning to the woman, he said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath wetted my feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. ^{7:45}Thou gavest me no kiss: but she, since the time I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. ^{7:46}My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but she hath anointed my feet with ointment. ^{7:47}Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, *the same* loveth little. ^{7:48}And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. ^{7:49}And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that even forgiveth sins? ^{7:50}And he said unto the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.

^{8:1}And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God, and with him the twelve, ^{8:2}and certain

women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities: Mary that was called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had gone out,^{8:3}and Joanna the wife of Chuzas Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, who ministered unto them of their substance.^{8:4}And when a great multitude came together, and they of every city resorted unto him, he spake by a parable:^{8:5}The sower went forth to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side; and it was trodden under foot, and the birds of the heaven devoured it.^{8:6}And other fell on the rock; and as soon as it grew, it withered away, because it had no moisture.^{8:7}And other fell amidst the thorns; and the thorns grew with it, and choked it.^{8:8}And other fell into the good ground, and grew, and brought forth fruit a hundredfold. As he said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.^{8:9}And his disciples asked him what this parable might be.^{8:10}And he said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to the rest in parables; that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand.^{8:11}Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God.^{8:12}And those by the way side are they that have heard; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word from their heart, that they may not believe and be saved.^{8:13}And those on the rock *are* they who, when they have heard, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, who for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away.^{8:14}And that which fell among the thorns, these are they that have heard, and as they go on their way they are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of *this* life, and bring no fruit to perfection.^{8:15}And that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit with patience.^{8:16}And no man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but putteth it on a stand, that they that enter in may see the light.^{8:17}For nothing is hid, that shall not be made manifest; nor *anything* secret, that shall not be known and come to light.^{8:18}Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he thinketh he hath.^{8:19}And there came to him his mother and brethren, and they could not come at him for the crowd.^{8:20}And it was told him, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee.^{8:21}But he answered and said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these that hear the word of God, and do it.^{8:22}Now it came to pass on one of those days, that he entered into a boat, himself and his disciples; and he said unto them, Let us go over unto the other side of the lake: and they launched forth.^{8:23}But as they sailed he fell asleep: and there came down a storm of wind on the lake; and they were filling *with water*, and were in jeopardy.^{8:24}And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, Master, master, we perish. And he awoke, and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water: and they ceased, and there was a calm.^{8:25}And he said unto them, Where is your faith? And being afraid they marvelled, saying one to another, Who then is this, that he commandeth even the winds and the water, and they obey him?^{8:26}And they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is over against Galilee.^{8:27}And when he was come forth upon the land, there met him a certain man out of the city, who had demons; and for a long time he had worn no clothes, and abode not in *any* house, but in the tombs.^{8:28}And when he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I beseech thee, torment me not.^{8:29}For he was commanding the unclean spirit to come out from the man. For oftentimes it had seized him: and he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters; and breaking the bands asunder, he was driven of the demon into the deserts.^{8:30}And Jesus asked him, What is thy name? And he said, Legion; for many demons were entered into him.^{8:31}And they entreated him that he would not command them to depart into the abyss.^{8:32}Now there was there a herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they entreated him that he

would give them leave to enter into them. And he gave them leave. ^{8:33}And the demons came out from the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the lake, and were drowned. ^{8:34}And when they that fed them saw what had come to pass, they fled, and told it in the city and in the country. ^{8:35}And they went out to see what had come to pass; and they came to Jesus, and found the man, from whom the demons were gone out, sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus: and they were afraid. ^{8:36}And they that saw it told them how he that was possessed with demons was made whole. ^{8:37}And all the people of the country of the Gerasenes round about asked him to depart from them, for they were holden with great fear: and he entered into a boat, and returned. ^{8:38}But the man from whom the demons were gone out prayed him that he might be with him: but he sent him away, saying, ^{8:39}Return to thy house, and declare how great things God hath done for thee. And he went his way, publishing throughout the whole city how great things Jesus had done for him. ^{8:40}And as Jesus returned, the multitude welcomed him; for they were all waiting for him. ^{8:41}And behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him to come into his house; ^{8:42}for he had an only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she was dying. But as he went the multitudes thronged him. ^{8:43}And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, who had spent all her living upon physicians, and could not be healed of any, ^{8:44}came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: and immediately the issue of her blood stanch'd. ^{8:45}And Jesus said, Who is it that touched me? And when all denied, Peter said, and they that were with him, Master, the multitudes press thee and crush *thee*. ^{8:46}But Jesus said, Some one did touch me; for I perceived that power had gone forth from me. ^{8:47}And when the woman saw that she was not hid, she came trembling, and falling down before him declared in the presence of all the people for what cause she touched him, and how she was healed immediately. ^{8:48}And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace. ^{8:49}While he yet spake, there cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue's *house*, saying, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Teacher. ^{8:50}But Jesus hearing it, answered him, Fear not: only believe, and she shall be made whole. ^{8:51}And when he came to the house, he suffered not any man to enter in with him, save Peter, and John, and James, and the father of the maiden and her mother. ^{8:52}And all were weeping, and bewailing her: but he said, Weep not; for she is not dead, but sleepeth. ^{8:53}And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead. ^{8:54}But he, taking her by the hand, called, saying, Maiden, arise. ^{8:55}And her spirit returned, and she rose up immediately: and he commanded that *something* be given her to eat. ^{8:56}And her parents were amazed: but he charged them to tell no man what had been done.

^{9:1}And he called the twelve together, and gave them power and authority over all demons, and to cure diseases. ^{9:2}And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick. ^{9:3}And he said unto them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor wallet, nor bread, nor money; neither have two coats. ^{9:4}And into whatsoever house ye enter, there abide, and thence depart. ^{9:5}And as many as receive you not, when ye depart from that city, shake off the dust from your feet for a testimony against them. ^{9:6}And they departed, and went throughout the villages, preaching the gospel, and healing everywhere. ^{9:7}Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done: and he was much perplexed, because that it was said by some, that John was risen from the dead; ^{9:8}and by some, that Elijah had appeared; and by others, that one of the old prophets was risen again. ^{9:9}And Herod said, John I beheaded: but who is this, about whom I hear such things? And he sought to see him. ^{9:10}And the apostles, when they were returned, declared unto him what things they had done. And he took them, and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida. ^{9:11}But the multitudes perceiving it followed him: and he welcomed them, and

spake to them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of healing he cured. ^{9:12}And the day began to wear away; and the twelve came, and said unto him, Send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages and country round about, and lodge, and get provisions: for we are here in a desert place. ^{9:13}But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy food for all this people. ^{9:14}For they were about five thousand men. And he said unto his disciples, Make them sit down in companies, about fifty each. ^{9:15}And they did so, and made them all sit down. ^{9:16}And he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them, and brake; and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude. ^{9:17}And they ate, and were all filled: and there was taken up that which remained over to them of broken pieces, twelve baskets. ^{9:18}And it came to pass, as he was praying apart, the disciples were with him: and he asked them, saying, Who do the multitudes say that I am? ^{9:19}And they answering said, John the Baptist; but others say, Elijah; and others, that one of the old prophets is risen again. ^{9:20}And he said unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Peter answering said, The Christ of God. ^{9:21}But he charged them, and commanded *them* to tell this to no man; ^{9:22}saying, The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up. ^{9:23}And he said unto all, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. ^{9:24}For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. ^{9:25}For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self? ^{9:26}For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory, and *the glory* of the Father, and of the holy angels. ^{9:27}But I tell you of a truth, There are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God. ^{9:28}And it came to pass about eight days after these sayings, that he took with him Peter and John and James, and went up into the mountain to pray. ^{9:29}And as he was praying, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment *became* white and dazzling. ^{9:30}And behold, there talked with him two men, who were Moses and Elijah; ^{9:31}who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem. ^{9:32}Now Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: but when they were fully awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him. ^{9:33}And it came to pass, as they were parting from him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah: not knowing what he said. ^{9:34}And while he said these things, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them: and they feared as they entered into the cloud. ^{9:35}And a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my Son, my chosen: hear ye him. ^{9:36}And when the voice came, Jesus was found alone. And they held their peace, and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen. ^{9:37}And it came to pass, on the next day, when they were come down from the mountain, a great multitude met him. ^{9:38}And behold, a man from the multitude cried, saying, Teacher, I beseech thee to look upon my son; for he is mine only child: ^{9:39}and behold, a spirit taketh him, and he suddenly crieth out; and it teareth him that he foameth, and it hardly departeth from him, bruising him sorely. ^{9:40}And I besought thy disciples to cast it out; and they could not. ^{9:41}And Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you, and bear with you? bring hither thy son. ^{9:42}And as he was yet a coming, the demon dashed him down, and tare *him* grievously. But Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and healed the boy, and gave him back to his father. ^{9:43}And they were all astonished at the majesty of God. But while all were marvelling at all the things which he did, he said unto his disciples, ^{9:44}Let these words sink into your ears: for

the Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of men. ^{9:45}But they understood not this saying, and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it; and they were afraid to ask him about this saying. ^{9:46}And there arose a reasoning among them, which of them was the greatest. ^{9:47}But when Jesus saw the reasoning of their heart, he took a little child, and set him by his side, ^{9:48}and said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this little child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same is great. ^{9:49}And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out demons in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us. ^{9:50}But Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against you is for you. ^{9:51}And it came to pass, when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, ^{9:52}and sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. ^{9:53}And they did not receive him, because his face was *as though he were* going to Jerusalem. ^{9:54}And when his disciples James and John saw *this*, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them? ^{9:55}But he turned, and rebuked them. ^{9:56}And they went to another village. ^{9:57}And as they went on the way, a certain man said unto him, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. ^{9:58}And Jesus said unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven *have* nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head. ^{9:59}And he said unto another, Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. ^{9:60}But he said unto him, Leave the dead to bury their own dead; but go thou and publish abroad the kingdom of God. ^{9:61}And another also said, I will follow thee, Lord; but first suffer me to bid farewell to them that are at my house. ^{9:62}But Jesus said unto him, No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.

^{10:1}Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come. ^{10:2}And he said unto them, The harvest indeed is plenteous, but the laborers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth laborers into his harvest. ^{10:3}Go your ways; behold, I send you forth as lambs in the midst of wolves. ^{10:4}Carry no purse, no wallet, no shoes; and salute no man on the way. ^{10:5}And into whatsoever house ye shall enter, first say, Peace *be* to this house. ^{10:6}And if a son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon him: but if not, it shall turn to you again. ^{10:7}And in that same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the laborer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. ^{10:8}And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you: ^{10:9}and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. ^{10:10}But into whatsoever city ye shall enter, and they receive you not, go out into the streets thereof and say, ^{10:11}Even the dust from your city, that cleaveth to our feet, we wipe off against you: nevertheless know this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh. ^{10:12}I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city. ^{10:13}Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which were done in you, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. ^{10:14}But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the judgment, than for you. ^{10:15}And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt be brought down unto Hades. ^{10:16}He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me. ^{10:17}And the seventy returned with joy, saying, Lord, even the demons are subject unto us in thy name. ^{10:18}And he said unto them, I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven. ^{10:19}Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy:

and nothing shall in any wise hurt you. ^{10:20}Nevertheless in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven. ^{10:21}In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father; for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. ^{10:22}All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal *him*. ^{10:23}And turning to the disciples, he said privately, Blessed *are* the eyes which see the things that ye see: ^{10:24}for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not. ^{10:25}And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and made trial of him, saying, Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? ^{10:26}And he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? ^{10:27}And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. ^{10:28}And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live. ^{10:29}But he, desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbor? ^{10:30}Jesus made answer and said, A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho; and he fell among robbers, who both stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half dead. ^{10:31}And by chance a certain priest was going down that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. ^{10:32}And in like manner a Levite also, when he came to the place, and saw him, passed by on the other side. ^{10:33}But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he was moved with compassion, ^{10:34}and came to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on *them* oil and wine; and he set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. ^{10:35}And on the morrow he took out two shillings, and gave them to the host, and said, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee. ^{10:36}Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbor unto him that fell among the robbers? ^{10:37}And he said, He that showed mercy on him. And Jesus said unto him, Go, and do thou likewise. ^{10:38}Now as they went on their way, he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. ^{10:39}And she had a sister called Mary, who also sat at the Lord's feet, and heard his word. ^{10:40}But Martha was cumbered about much serving; and she came up to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me. ^{10:41}But the Lord answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things: ^{10:42}but one thing is needful: for Mary hath chosen the good part, which shall not be taken away from her.

^{11:1}And it came to pass, as he was praying in a certain place, that when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, even as John also taught his disciples. ^{11:2}And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Father, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. ^{11:3}Give us day by day our daily bread. ^{11:4}And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation. ^{11:5}And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say to him, Friend, lend me three loaves; ^{11:6}for a friend of mine is come to me from a journey, and I have nothing to set before him; ^{11:7}and he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee? ^{11:8}I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will arise and give him as many as he needeth. ^{11:9}And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. ^{11:10}For every one that asketh

receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. ^{11:11}And of which of you that is a father shall his son ask a loaf, and he give him a stone? or a fish, and he for a fish give him a serpent? ^{11:12}Or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion? ^{11:13}If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall *your* heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him? ^{11:14}And he was casting out a demon that was dumb. And it came to pass, when the demon was gone out, the dumb man spake; and the multitudes marvelled. ^{11:15}But some of them said, By Beelzebub the prince of the demons casteth he out demons. ^{11:16}And others, trying *him*, sought of him a sign from heaven. ^{11:17}But he, knowing their thoughts, said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and a house divided against a house falleth. ^{11:18}And if Satan also is divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye say that I cast out demons by Beelzebub. ^{11:19}And if I by Beelzebub cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. ^{11:20}But if I by the finger of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you. ^{11:21}When the strong *man* fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace: ^{11:22}but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him his whole armor wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. ^{11:23}He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth. ^{11:24}The unclean spirit when he is gone out of the man, passeth through waterless places, seeking rest, and finding none, he saith, I will turn back unto my house whence I came out. ^{11:25}And when he is come, he findeth it swept and garnished. ^{11:26}Then goeth he, and taketh to *him* seven other spirits more evil than himself; and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man becometh worse than the first. ^{11:27}And it came to pass, as he said these things, a certain woman out of the multitude lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck. ^{11:28}But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it. ^{11:29}And when the multitudes were gathering together unto him, he began to say, This generation is an evil generation: it seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah. ^{11:30}For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation. ^{11:31}The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and shall condemn them: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here. ^{11:32}The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here. ^{11:33}No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, putteth it in a cellar, neither under the bushel, but on the stand, that they which enter in may see the light. ^{11:34}The lamp of thy body is thine eye: when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when it is evil, thy body also is full of darkness. ^{11:35}Look therefore whether the light that is in thee be not darkness. ^{11:36}If therefore thy whole body be full of light, having no part dark, it shall be wholly full of light, as when the lamp with its bright shining doth give thee light. ^{11:37}Now as he spake, a Pharisee asketh him to dine with him: and he went in, and sat down to meat. ^{11:38}And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first bathed himself before dinner. ^{11:39}And the Lord said unto him, Now ye the Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter; but your inward part is full of extortion and wickedness. ^{11:40}Ye foolish ones, did not he that made the outside make the inside also? ^{11:41}But give for alms those things which are within; and behold, all things are clean unto you. ^{11:42}But woe unto you Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and every herb, and pass over justice and the love of God: but these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. ^{11:43}Woe unto you Pharisees! for ye love the chief seats in the synagogues, and the salutations in the marketplaces. ^{11:44}Woe

unto you! for ye are as the tombs which appear not, and the men that walk over *them* know it not. ^{11:45}And one of the lawyers answering saith unto him, Teacher, in saying this thou reproachest us also. ^{11:46}And he said, Woe unto you lawyers also! for ye load men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. ^{11:47}Woe unto you! for ye build the tombs of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. ^{11:48}So ye are witnesses and consent unto the works of your fathers: for they killed them, and ye build *their tombs*. ^{11:49}Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets and apostles; and *some* of them they shall kill and persecute; ^{11:50}that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; ^{11:51}from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary: yea, I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation. ^{11:52}Woe unto you lawyers! for ye took away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered. ^{11:53}And when he was come out from thence, the scribes and the Pharisees began to press upon *him* vehemently, and to provoke him to speak of many things; ^{11:54}laying wait for him, to catch something out of his mouth.

^{12:1}In the mean time, when the many thousands of the multitude were gathered together, insomuch that they trod one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. ^{12:2}But there is nothing covered up, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. ^{12:3}Wherefore whatsoever ye have said in the darkness shall be heard in the light; and what ye have spoken in the ear in the inner chambers shall be proclaimed upon the housetops. ^{12:4}And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. ^{12:5}But I will warn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him. ^{12:6}Are not five sparrows sold for two pence? and not one of them is forgotten in the sight of God. ^{12:7}But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not: ye are of more value than many sparrows. ^{12:8}And I say unto you, Every one who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: ^{12:9}but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God. ^{12:10}And every one who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven. ^{12:11}And when they bring you before the synagogues, and the rulers, and the authorities, be not anxious how or what ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: ^{12:12}for the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say. ^{12:13}And one out of the multitude said unto him, Teacher, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me. ^{12:14}But he said unto him, Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? ^{12:15}And he said unto them, Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth. ^{12:16}And he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: ^{12:17}and he reasoned within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have not where to bestow my fruits? ^{12:18}And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my grain and my goods. ^{12:19}And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry. ^{12:20}But God said unto him, Thou foolish one, this night is thy soul required of thee; and the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be? ^{12:21}So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God. ^{12:22}And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for *your* life, what ye shall eat; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. ^{12:23}For the life is more than the food, and the body than the raiment. ^{12:24}Consider the ravens, that they sow not, neither

reap; which have no store-chamber nor barn; and God feedeth them: of how much more value are ye than the birds! ^{12:25}And which of you by being anxious can add a cubit unto the measure of his life? ^{12:26}If then ye are not able to do even that which is least, why are ye anxious concerning the rest? ^{12:27}Consider the lilies, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say unto you, Even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. ^{12:28}But if God doth so clothe the grass in the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven; how much more *shall he clothe* you, O ye of little faith? ^{12:29}And seek not ye what ye shall eat, and what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. ^{12:30}For all these things do the nations of the world seek after: but your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. ^{12:31}Yet seek ye his kingdom, and these things shall be added unto you. ^{12:32}Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. ^{12:33}Sell that which ye have, and give alms; make for yourselves purses which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief draweth near, neither moth destroyeth. ^{12:34}For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. ^{12:35}Let your loins be girded about, and your lamps burning; ^{12:36}and be ye yourselves like unto men looking for their lord, when he shall return from the marriage feast; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may straightway open unto him. ^{12:37}Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them sit down to meat, and shall come and serve them. ^{12:38}And if he shall come in the second watch, and if in the third, and find *them* so blessed are those servants. ^{12:39}But know this, that if the master of the house had known in what hour the thief was coming, he would have watched, and not have left his house to be broken through. ^{12:40}Be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh. ^{12:41}And Peter said, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even unto all? ^{12:42}And the Lord said, Who then is the faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall set over his household, to give them their portion of food in due season? ^{12:43}Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. ^{12:44}Of a truth I say unto you, that he will set him over all that he hath. ^{12:45}But if that servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and the maidservants, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; ^{12:46}the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he expecteth not, and in an hour when he knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the unfaithful. ^{12:47}And that servant, who knew his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many *stripes*; ^{12:48}but he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few *stripes*. And to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom they commit much, of him will they ask the more. ^{12:49}I came to cast fire upon the earth; and what do I desire, if it is already kindled? ^{12:50}But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! ^{12:51}Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division: ^{12:52}for there shall be from henceforth five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. ^{12:53}They shall be divided, father against son, and son against father; mother against daughter, and daughter against her mother; mother in law against her daughter in law, and daughter in law against her mother in law. ^{12:54}And he said to the multitudes also, When ye see a cloud rising in the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it cometh to pass. ^{12:55}And when *ye see* a south wind blowing, ye say, There will be a scorching heat; and it cometh to pass. ^{12:56}Ye hypocrites, ye know how to interpret the face of the earth and the heaven; but how is it that ye know not how to interpret this time? ^{12:57}And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? ^{12:58}For as thou art going with thine adversary before the magistrate, on the way give diligence to be quit of him; lest haply he drag

thee unto the judge, and the judge shall deliver thee to the officer, and the officer shall cast thee into prison. ^{12:59}I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou have paid the very last mite.

^{13:1}Now there were some present at that very season who told him of the Galilaeans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. ^{13:2}And he answered and said unto them, Think ye that these Galilaeans were sinners above all the Galilaeans, because they have suffered these things? ^{13:3}I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish. ^{13:4}Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? ^{13:5}I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. ^{13:6}And he spake this parable; A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard; and he came seeking fruit thereon, and found none. ^{13:7}And he said unto the vinedresser, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why doth it also cumber the ground? ^{13:8}And he answering saith unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it: ^{13:9}and if it bear fruit thenceforth, well; but if not, thou shalt cut it down. ^{13:10}And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath day. ^{13:11}And behold, a woman that had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years; and she was bowed together, and could in no wise lift herself up. ^{13:12}And when Jesus saw her, he called her, and said to her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. ^{13:13}And he laid his hands upon her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. ^{13:14}And the ruler of the synagogue, being moved with indignation because Jesus had healed on the sabbath, answered and said to the multitude, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the day of the sabbath. ^{13:15}But the Lord answered him, and said, Ye hypocrites, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? ^{13:16}And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo, *these* eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the sabbath? ^{13:17}And as he said these things, all his adversaries were put to shame: and all the multitude rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him. ^{13:18}He said therefore, Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I liken it? ^{13:19}It is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his own garden; and it grew, and became a tree; and the birds of the heaven lodged in the branches thereof. ^{13:20}And again he said, Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God? ^{13:21}It is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened. ^{13:22}And he went on his way through cities and villages, teaching, and journeying on unto Jerusalem. ^{13:23}And one said unto him, Lord, are they few that are saved? And he said unto them, ^{13:24}Strive to enter in by the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able. ^{13:25}When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, open to us; and he shall answer and say to you, I know you not whence ye are; ^{13:26}then shall ye begin to say, We did eat and drink in thy presence, and thou didst teach in our streets; ^{13:27}and he shall say, I tell you, I know not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. ^{13:28}There shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and yourselves cast forth without. ^{13:29}And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. ^{13:30}And behold, there are last who shall be first, and there are first who shall be last. ^{13:31}In that very hour there came certain Pharisees, saying to him, Get thee out, and go hence: for Herod would fain kill thee. ^{13:32}And he said unto them, Go and say to that fox, Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures to-day and to-

morrow, and the third *day* I am perfected. ^{13:33}Nevertheless I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the *day* following; for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem. ^{13:34}O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen *gathereth* her own brood under her wings, and ye would not! ^{13:35}Behold, your house is left unto you *desolate*: and I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

^{14:1}And it came to pass, when he went into the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees on a sabbath to eat bread, that they were watching him. ^{14:2}And behold, there was before him a certain man that had the dropsy. ^{14:3}And Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath, or not? ^{14:4}But they held their peace. And he took him, and healed him, and let him go. ^{14:5}And he said unto them, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a well, and will not straightway draw him up on a sabbath day? ^{14:6}And they could not answer again unto these things. ^{14:7}And he spake a parable unto those that were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief seats; saying unto them, ^{14:8}When thou art bidden of any man to a marriage feast, sit not down in the chief seat; lest haply a more honorable man than thou be bidden of him, ^{14:9}and he that bade thee and him shall come and say to thee, Give this man place; and then thou shalt begin with shame to take the lowest place. ^{14:10}But when thou art bidden, go and sit down in the lowest place; that when he that hath bidden thee cometh, he may say to thee, Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou have glory in the presence of all that sit at meat with thee. ^{14:11}For everyone that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted. ^{14:12}And he said to him also that had bidden him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, nor thy kinsmen, nor rich neighbors; lest haply they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. ^{14:13}But when thou makest a feast, bid the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: ^{14:14}and thou shalt be blessed; because they have not *wherewith* to recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just. ^{14:15}And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God. ^{14:16}But he said unto him, A certain man made a great supper; and he bade many: ^{14:17}and he sent forth his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for *all* things are now ready. ^{14:18}And they all with one *consent* began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have bought a field, and I must needs go out and see it; I pray thee have me excused. ^{14:19}And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them; I pray thee have me excused. ^{14:20}And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come. ^{14:21}And the servant came, and told his lord these things. Then the master of the house being angry said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor and maimed and blind and lame. ^{14:22}And the servant said, Lord, what thou didst command is done, and yet there is room. ^{14:23}And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and hedges, and constrain *them* to come in, that my house may be filled. ^{14:24}For I say unto you, that none of those men that were bidden shall taste of my supper. ^{14:25}Now there went with him great multitudes: and he turned, and said unto them, ^{14:26}If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. ^{14:27}Whosoever doth not bear his own cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. ^{14:28}For which of you, desiring to build a tower, doth not first sit down and count the cost, whether he have *wherewith* to complete it? ^{14:29}Lest haply, when he hath laid a foundation, and is not able to finish, all that behold begin to mock him, ^{14:30}saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish. ^{14:31}Or what king, as he goeth to encounter another

king in war, will not sit down first and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? ^{14:32}Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and asketh conditions of peace. ^{14:33}So therefore whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple. ^{14:34}Salt therefore is good: but if even the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be seasoned? ^{14:35}It is fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill: *men* cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

^{15:1}Now all the publicans and sinners were drawing near unto him to hear him. ^{15:2}And both the Pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them. ^{15:3}And he spake unto them this parable, saying, ^{15:4}What man of you, having a hundred sheep, and having lost one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? ^{15:5}And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. ^{15:6}And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and his neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost. ^{15:7}I say unto you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repented, *more* than over ninety and nine righteous persons, who need no repentance. ^{15:8}Or what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a lamp, and sweep the house, and seek diligently until she find it? ^{15:9}And when she hath found it, she calleth together her friends and neighbors, saying, Rejoice with me, for I have found the piece which I had lost. ^{15:10}Even so, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repented. ^{15:11}And he said, A certain man had two sons: ^{15:12}and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of *thy* substance that falleth to me. And he divided unto them his living. ^{15:13}And not many days after, the younger son gathered all together and took his journey into a far country; and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. ^{15:14}And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that country; and he began to be in want. ^{15:15}And he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. ^{15:16}And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him. ^{15:17}But when he came to himself he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger! ^{15:18}I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: ^{15:19}I am no more worthy to be called your son: make me as one of thy hired servants. ^{15:20}And he arose, and came to his father. But while he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. ^{15:21}And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son. ^{15:22}But the father said to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: ^{15:23}and bring the fatted calf, *and* kill it, and let us eat, and make merry: ^{15:24}for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry. ^{15:25}Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard music and dancing. ^{15:26}And he called to him one of the servants, and inquired what these things might be. ^{15:27}And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound. ^{15:28}But he was angry, and would not go in: and his father came out, and entreated him. ^{15:29}But he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine; and *yet* thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: ^{15:30}but when this thy son came, who hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf. ^{15:31}And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that

is mine is thine. ^{15:32}But it was meet to make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive *again*; and *was* lost, and is found.

^{16:1}And he said also unto the disciples, There was a certain rich man, who had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he was wasting his goods. ^{16:2}And he called him, and said unto him, What is this that I hear of thee? render the account of thy stewardship; for thou canst be no longer steward. ^{16:3}And the steward said within himself, What shall I do, seeing that my lord taketh away the stewardship from me? I have not strength to dig; to beg I am ashamed. ^{16:4}I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. ^{16:5}And calling to him each one of his lord's debtors, he said to the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? ^{16:6}And he said, A hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bond, and sit down quickly and write fifty. ^{16:7}Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, A hundred measures of wheat. He saith unto him, Take thy bond, and write fourscore. ^{16:8}And his lord commended the unrighteous steward because he had done wisely: for the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of the light.

^{16:9}And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles.

^{16:10}He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much. ^{16:11}If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true *riches*? ^{16:12}And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own? ^{16:13}No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. ^{16:14}And the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all these things; and they scoffed at him. ^{16:15}And he said unto them, Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God. ^{16:16}The law and the prophets *were* until John: from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it. ^{16:17}But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fall. ^{16:18}Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery.

^{16:19}Now there was a certain rich man, and he was clothed in purple and fine linen, faring sumptuously every day: ^{16:20}and a certain beggar named Lazarus was laid at his gate, full of sores, ^{16:21}and desiring to be fed with the *crumbs* that fell from the rich man's table; yea, even the dogs come and licked his sores. ^{16:22}And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and that he was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom: and the rich man also died, and was buried.

^{16:23}And in Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. ^{16:24}And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am in anguish in this flame. ^{16:25}But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things: but now here he is comforted and thou art in anguish. ^{16:26}And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they that would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us.

^{16:27}And he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house; ^{16:28}for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. ^{16:29}But Abraham saith, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. ^{16:30}And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one go to them from the dead, they will repent. ^{16:31}And he

said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead.

^{17:1}And he said unto his disciples, It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come; but woe unto him, through whom they come! ^{17:2}It were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble. ^{17:3}Take heed to yourselves: if thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. ^{17:4}And if he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him. ^{17:5}And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith. ^{17:6}And the Lord said, If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would obey you. ^{17:7}But who is there of you, having a servant plowing or keeping sheep, that will say unto him, when he is come in from the field, Come straightway and sit down to meat; ^{17:8}and will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? ^{17:9}Doth he thank the servant because he did the things that were commanded? ^{17:10}Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do. ^{17:11}And it came to pass, as they were on their way to Jerusalem, that he was passing along the borders of Samaria and Galilee. ^{17:12}And as he entered into a certain village, there met him ten men that were lepers, who stood afar off: ^{17:13}and they lifted up their voices, saying, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. ^{17:14}And when he saw them, he said unto them, Go and show yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, as they went, they were cleansed. ^{17:15}And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, with a loud voice glorifying God; ^{17:16}and he fell upon his face at his feet, giving him thanks: and he was a Samaritan. ^{17:17}And Jesus answering said, Were not the ten cleansed? but where are the nine? ^{17:18}Were there none found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger? ^{17:19}And he said unto him, Arise, and go thy way: thy faith hath made thee whole. ^{17:20}And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: ^{17:21}neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you. ^{17:22}And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it. ^{17:23}And they shall say to you, Lo, there! Lo, here! go not away, nor follow after *them*: ^{17:24}for as the lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall the Son of man be in his day. ^{17:25}But first must he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation. ^{17:26}And as it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. ^{17:27}They ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. ^{17:28}Likewise even as it came to pass in the days of Lot; they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; ^{17:29}but in the day that Lot went out from Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all: ^{17:30}after the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed. ^{17:31}In that day, he that shall be on the housetop, and his goods in the house, let him not go down to take them away: and let him that is in the field likewise not return back. ^{17:32}Remember Lot's wife. ^{17:33}Whosoever shall seek to gain his life shall lose it: but whosoever shall lose *his life* shall preserve it. ^{17:34}I say unto you, In that night there shall be two men on one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. ^{17:35}There shall be two women grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. ^{17:36}*There shall be two men in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left.* ^{17:37}And they answering say unto

him, Where, Lord? And he said unto them, Where the body *is*, thither will the eagles also be gathered together.

^{18:1}And he spake a parable unto them to the end that they ought always to pray, and not to faint; ^{18:2}saying, There was in a city a judge, who feared not God, and regarded not man: ^{18:3}and there was a widow in that city; and she came oft unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. ^{18:4}And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; ^{18:5}yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest she wear me out by her continual coming. ^{18:6}And the Lord said, Hear what the unrighteous judge saith. ^{18:7}And shall not God avenge his elect, that cry to him day and night, and *yet* he is longsuffering over them? ^{18:8}I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth? ^{18:9}And he spake also this parable unto certain who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and set all others at nought: ^{18:10}Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican. ^{18:11}The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. ^{18:12}I fast twice in the week; I give tithes of all that I get. ^{18:13}But the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote his breast, saying, God, be thou merciful to me a sinner. ^{18:14}I say unto you, This man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted. ^{18:15}And they were bringing unto him also their babes, that he should touch them: but when the disciples saw it, they rebuked them. ^{18:16}But Jesus called them unto him, saying, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for to such belongeth the kingdom of God. ^{18:17}Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein. ^{18:18}And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? ^{18:19}And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, *even* God. ^{18:20}Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honor thy father and mother. ^{18:21}And he said, All these things have I observed from my youth up. ^{18:22}And when Jesus heard it, he said unto him, One thing thou lackest yet: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. ^{18:23}But when he heard these things, he became exceeding sorrowful; for he was very rich. ^{18:24}And Jesus seeing him said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! ^{18:25}For it is easier for a camel to enter in through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. ^{18:26}And they that heard it said, Then who can be saved? ^{18:27}But he said, The things which are impossible with men are possible with God. ^{18:28}And Peter said, Lo, we have left our own, and followed thee. ^{18:29}And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or wife, or brethren, or parents, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, ^{18:30}who shall not receive manifold more in this time, and in the world to come eternal life. ^{18:31}And he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written through the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man. ^{18:32}For he shall be delivered up unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and shamefully treated, and spit upon: ^{18:33}and they shall scourge and kill him: and the third day he shall rise again. ^{18:34}And they understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, and they perceived not the things that were said. ^{18:35}And it came to pass, as he drew nigh unto Jericho, a certain blind man sat by the way side begging: ^{18:36}and hearing a multitude going by, he inquired what this meant. ^{18:37}And they told him that Jesus of Nazareth passeth by. ^{18:38}And he cried, saying, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me. ^{18:39}And they

that went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried out the more a great deal, Thou son of David, have mercy on me. ^{18:40}And Jesus stood, and commanded him to be brought unto him: and when he was come near, he asked him, ^{18:41}What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? And he said, Lord, that I may receive my sight. ^{18:42}And Jesus said unto him, Receive thy sight; thy faith hath made thee whole. ^{18:43}And immediately he received his sight, and followed him, glorifying God: and all the people, when they saw it, gave praise unto God.

^{19:1}And he entered and was passing through Jericho. ^{19:2}And behold, a man called by name Zacchaeus; and he was a chief publican, and he was rich. ^{19:3}And he sought to see Jesus who he was; and could not for the crowd, because he was little of stature. ^{19:4}And he ran on before, and climbed up into a sycomore tree to see him: for he was to pass that way. ^{19:5}And when Jesus came to the place, he looked up, and said unto him, Zacchaeus, make haste, and come down; for to-day I must abide at thy house. ^{19:6}And he made haste, and came down, and received him joyfully. ^{19:7}And when they saw it, they all murmured, saying, He is gone in to lodge with a man that is a sinner. ^{19:8}And Zacchaeus stood, and said unto the Lord, Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have wrongfully exacted aught of any man, I restore fourfold. ^{19:9}And Jesus said unto him, To-day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham. ^{19:10}For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost. ^{19:11}And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear. ^{19:12}He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. ^{19:13}And he called ten servants of his, and gave them ten pounds, and said unto them, Trade ye *herewith* till I come. ^{19:14}But his citizens hated him, and sent an ambassage after him, saying, We will not that this man reign over us. ^{19:15}And it came to pass, when he was come back again, having received the kingdom, that he commanded these servants, unto whom he had given the money, to be called to him, that he might know what they had gained by trading. ^{19:16}And the first came before him, saying, Lord, thy pound hath made ten pounds more. ^{19:17}And he said unto him, Well done, thou good servant: because thou wast found faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. ^{19:18}And the second came, saying, Thy pound, Lord, hath made five pounds. ^{19:19}And he said unto him also, Be thou also over five cities. ^{19:20}And another came, saying, Lord, behold, *here is* thy pound, which I kept laid up in a napkin: ^{19:21}for I feared thee, because thou art an austere man: thou takest up that which thou layedst not down, and reapest that which thou didst not sow. ^{19:22}He saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I am an austere man, taking up that which I laid not down, and reaping that which I did not sow; ^{19:23}then wherefore gavest thou not my money into the bank, and I at my coming should have required it with interest? ^{19:24}And he said unto them that stood by, Take away from him the pound, and give it unto him that hath the ten pounds. ^{19:25}And they said unto him, Lord, he hath ten pounds. ^{19:26}I say unto you, that unto every one that hath shall be given; but from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away from him. ^{19:27}But these mine enemies, that would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me. ^{19:28}And when he had thus spoken, he went on before, going up to Jerusalem. ^{19:29}And it came to pass, when he drew nigh unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount that is called Olivet, he sent two of the disciples, ^{19:30}saying, Go your way into the village over against *you*; in which as ye enter ye shall find a colt tied, whereon no man ever yet sat: loose him, and bring him. ^{19:31}And if any one ask you, Why do ye loose him? thus shall ye say, The Lord hath need of him. ^{19:32}And they that were sent went away, and found even as he had said unto them. ^{19:33}And as they were loosing the colt, the owners thereof said unto

them, Why loose ye the colt? ^{19:34}And they said, The Lord hath need of him. ^{19:35}And they brought him to Jesus: and they threw their garments upon the colt, and set Jesus thereon. ^{19:36}And as he went, they spread their garments in the way. ^{19:37}And as he was now drawing nigh, even at the descent of the mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen; ^{19:38}saying, Blessed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord: peace in heaven, and glory in the highest. ^{19:39}And some of the Pharisees from the multitude said unto him, Teacher, rebuke thy disciples. ^{19:40}And he answered and said, I tell you that, if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out. ^{19:41}And when he drew nigh, he saw the city and wept over it, ^{19:42}saying, If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. ^{19:43}For the days shall come upon thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, ^{19:44}and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation. ^{19:45}And he entered into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold, ^{19:46}saying unto them, It is written, And my house shall be a house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of robbers. ^{19:47}And he was teaching daily in the temple. But the chief priests and the scribes and the principal men of the people sought to destroy him: ^{19:48}and they could not find what they might do; for the people all hung upon him, listening.

^{20:1}And it came to pass, on one of the days, as he was teaching the people in the temple, and preaching the gospel, there came upon him the chief priests and the scribes with the elders; ^{20:2}and they spake, saying unto him, Tell us: By what authority doest thou these things? or who is he that gave thee this authority? ^{20:3}And he answered and said unto them, I also will ask you a question; and tell me: ^{20:4}The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men? ^{20:5}And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say, Why did ye not believe him? ^{20:6}But if we shall say, From men; all the people will stone us: for they are persuaded that John was a prophet. ^{20:7}And they answered, that they knew not whence *it was*. ^{20:8}And Jesus said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things. ^{20:9}And he began to speak unto the people this parable: A man planted a vineyard, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into another country for a long time. ^{20:10}And at the season he sent unto the husbandmen a servant, that they should give him of the fruit of the vineyard: but the husbandmen beat him, and sent him away empty. ^{20:11}And he sent yet another servant: and him also they beat, and handled him shamefully, and sent him away empty. ^{20:12}And he sent yet a third: and him also they wounded, and cast him forth. ^{20:13}And the lord of the vineyard said, What shall I do? I will send my beloved son; it may be they will reverence him. ^{20:14}But when the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned one with another, saying, This is the heir; let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours. ^{20:15}And they cast him forth out of the vineyard, and killed him. What therefore will the lord of the vineyard do unto them? ^{20:16}He will come and destroy these husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others. And when they heard it, they said, God forbid. ^{20:17}But he looked upon them, and said, What then is this that is written,

The stone which the builders rejected,

The same was made the head of the corner?

^{20:18}Every one that falleth on that stone shall be broken to pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust. ^{20:19}And the scribes and the chief priests sought to lay hands on him in that very hour; and they feared the people: for they perceived that he spake this parable against

them. ^{20:20}And they watched him, and sent forth spies, who feigned themselves to be righteous, that they might take hold of his speech, so as to deliver him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor. ^{20:21}And they asked him, saying, Teacher, we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly, and acceptest not the person of *any*, but of a truth teachest the way of God: ^{20:22}Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Caesar, or not? ^{20:23}But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, ^{20:24}Show me a denarius. Whose image and superscription hath it? And they said, Caesar's. ^{20:25}And he said unto them, Then render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's. ^{20:26}And they were not able to take hold of the saying before the people: and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace. ^{20:27}And there came to him certain of the Sadducees, they that say that there is no resurrection; ^{20:28}and they asked him, saying, Teacher, Moses wrote unto us, that if a man's brother die, having a wife, and he be childless, his brother should take the wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. ^{20:29}There were therefore seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died childless; ^{20:30}and the second: ^{20:31}and the third took her; and likewise the seven also left no children, and died. ^{20:32}Afterward the woman also died. ^{20:33}In the resurrection therefore whose wife of them shall she be? for the seven had her to wife. ^{20:34}And Jesus said unto them, The sons of this world marry, and are given in marriage: ^{20:35}but they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: ^{20:36}for neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection. ^{20:37}But that the dead are raised, even Moses showed, in *the place concerning* the Bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. ^{20:38}Now he is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him. ^{20:39}And certain of the scribes answering said, Teacher, thou hast well said. ^{20:40}For they durst not any more ask him any question. ^{20:41}And he said unto them, How say they that the Christ is David's son? ^{20:42}For David himself saith in the book of Psalms,

The Lord said unto my Lord,

Sit thou on my right hand,

^{20:43}Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.

^{20:44}David therefore calleth him Lord, and how is he his son? ^{20:45}And in the hearing of all the people he said unto his disciples, ^{20:46}Beware of the scribes, who desire to walk in long robes, and love salutations in the marketplaces, and chief seats in the synagogues, and chief places at feasts; ^{20:47}who devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater condemnation.

^{21:1}And he looked up, and saw the rich men that were casting their gifts into the treasury. ^{21:2}And he saw a certain poor widow casting in thither two mites. ^{21:3}And he said, Of a truth I say unto you, This poor widow cast in more than they all: ^{21:4}for all these did of their superfluity cast in unto the gifts; but she of her want did cast in all the living that she had. ^{21:5}And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and offerings, he said, ^{21:6}As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in which there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. ^{21:7}And they asked him, saying, Teacher, when therefore shall these things be? and what *shall be* the sign when these things are about to come to pass? ^{21:8}And he said, Take heed that ye be not led astray: for many shall come in my name, saying, I am *he*; and, The time is at hand: go ye not after them. ^{21:9}And when ye shall hear of wars and tumults, be not terrified: for these things must needs come to pass first; but the end is not

immediately. ^{21:10}Then said he unto them, Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; ^{21:11}and there shall be great earthquakes, and in divers places famines and pestilences; and there shall be terrors and great signs from heaven. ^{21:12}But before all these things, they shall lay their hands on you, and shall persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and prisons, bringing you before kings and governors for my name's sake. ^{21:13}It shall turn out unto you for a testimony. ^{21:14}Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate beforehand how to answer: ^{21:15}for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to withstand or to gainsay. ^{21:16}But ye shall be delivered up even by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolk, and friends; and *some* of you shall they cause to be put to death. ^{21:17}And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. ^{21:18}And not a hair of your head shall perish. ^{21:19}In your patience ye shall win your souls. ^{21:20}But when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand. ^{21:21}Then let them that are in Judaea flee unto the mountains; and let them that are in the midst of her depart out; and let not them that are in the country enter therein. ^{21:22}For these are days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. ^{21:23}Woe unto them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days! for there shall be great distress upon the land, and wrath unto this people. ^{21:24}And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led captive into all the nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. ^{21:25}And there shall be signs in sun and moon and stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the billows; ^{21:26}men fainting for fear, and for expectation of the things which are coming on the world: for the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. ^{21:27}And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. ^{21:28}But when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh. ^{21:29}And he spake to them a parable: Behold the fig tree, and all the trees: ^{21:30}when they now shoot forth, ye see it and know of your own selves that the summer is now nigh. ^{21:31}Even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh. ^{21:32}Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all things be accomplished. ^{21:33}Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. ^{21:34}But take heed to yourselves, lest haply your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and that day come on you suddenly as a snare: ^{21:35}for so shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of all the earth. ^{21:36}But watch ye at every season, making supplication, that ye may prevail to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man. ^{21:37}And every day he was teaching in the temple; and every night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called Olivet. ^{21:38}And all the people came early in the morning to him in the temple, to hear him.

^{22:1}Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover. ^{22:2}And the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might put him to death; for they feared the people. ^{22:3}And Satan entered into Judas who was called Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve. ^{22:4}And he went away, and communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might deliver him unto them. ^{22:5}And they were glad, and covenanted to give him money. ^{22:6}And he consented, and sought opportunity to deliver him unto them in the absence of the multitude. ^{22:7}And the day of unleavened bread came, on which the passover must be sacrificed. ^{22:8}And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and make ready for us the passover, that we may eat. ^{22:9}And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we make ready? ^{22:10}And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house whereinto he goeth. ^{22:11}And ye shall say unto the master of the house, The

Teacher saith unto thee, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? ^{22:12}And he will show you a large upper room furnished: there make ready. ^{22:13}And they went, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. ^{22:14}And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him. ^{22:15}And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: ^{22:16}for I say unto you, I shall not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. ^{22:17}And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: ^{22:18}for I say unto you, I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. ^{22:19}And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. ^{22:20}And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, *even* that which is poured out for you. ^{22:21}But behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. ^{22:22}For the Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been determined: but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed! ^{22:23}And they began to question among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing. ^{22:24}And there arose also a contention among them, which of them was accounted to be greatest. ^{22:25}And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. ^{22:26}But ye *shall* not be so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. ^{22:27}For which is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth. ^{22:28}But ye are they that have continued with me in my temptations; ^{22:29}and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, ^{22:30}that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. ^{22:31}Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: ^{22:32}but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, establish thy brethren. ^{22:33}And he said unto him, Lord, with thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death. ^{22:34}And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, until thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me. ^{22:35}And he said unto them, When I sent you forth without purse, and wallet, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. ^{22:36}And he said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet; and he that hath none, let him sell his cloak, and buy a sword. ^{22:37}For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors: for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment. ^{22:38}And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough. ^{22:39}And he came out, and went, as his custom was, unto the mount of Olives; and the disciples also followed him. ^{22:40}And when he was at the place, he said unto them, Pray that ye enter not into temptation. ^{22:41}And he was parted from them about a stone's cast; and he kneeled down and prayed, ^{22:42}saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. ^{22:43}And there appeared unto him an angel from heaven, strengthening him. ^{22:44}And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground. ^{22:45}And when he rose up from his prayer, he came unto the disciples, and found them sleeping for sorrow, ^{22:46}and said unto them, Why sleep ye? rise and pray, that ye enter not into temptation. ^{22:47}While he yet spake, behold, a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them; and he drew near unto Jesus to kiss him. ^{22:48}But Jesus said unto him, Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss? ^{22:49}And when they that were about him saw what would follow, they said, Lord, shall we smite with the sword? ^{22:50}And a certain one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his right ear.

^{22:51}But Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye *them* thus far. And he touched his ear, and healed him. ^{22:52}And Jesus said unto the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders, that were come against him, Are ye come out, as against a robber, with swords and staves? ^{22:53}When I was daily with you in the temple, ye stretched not forth your hands against me: but this is your hour, and the power of darkness. ^{22:54}And they seized him, and led him *away*, and brought him into the high priest's house. But Peter followed afar off. ^{22:55}And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the court, and had sat down together, Peter sat in the midst of them. ^{22:56}And a certain maid seeing him as he sat in the light of *the fire*, and looking stedfastly upon him, said, This man also was with him. ^{22:57}But he denied, saying, Woman, I know him not. ^{22:58}And after a little while another saw him, and said, Thou also art *one* of them. But Peter said, Man, I am not. ^{22:59}And after the space of about one hour another confidently affirmed, saying, Of a truth this man also was with him; for he is a Galilaean. ^{22:60}But Peter said, Man, I know not what thou sayest. And immediately, while he yet spake, the cock crew. ^{22:61}And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said unto him, Before the cock crow this day thou shalt deny me thrice. ^{22:62}And he went out, and wept bitterly. ^{22:63}And the men that held *Jesus* mocked him, and beat him. ^{22:64}And they blindfolded him, and asked him, saying, Prophesy: who is he that struck thee? ^{22:65}And many other things spake they against him, reviling him. ^{22:66}And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council, saying, ^{22:67}If thou art the Christ, tell us. But he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: ^{22:68}and if I ask *you*, ye will not answer. ^{22:69}But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God. ^{22:70}And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am. ^{22:71}And they said, What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth.

^{23:1}And the whole company of them rose up, and brought him before Pilate. ^{23:2}And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king. ^{23:3}And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest. ^{23:4}And Pilate said unto the chief priests and the multitudes, I find no fault in this man. ^{23:5}But they were the more urgent, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judaea, and beginning from Galilee even unto this place. ^{23:6}But when Pilate heard it, he asked whether the man were a Galilaean. ^{23:7}And when he knew that he was of Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him unto Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem in these days. ^{23:8}Now when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he was of a long time desirous to see him, because he had heard concerning him; and he hoped to see some miracle done by him. ^{23:9}And he questioned him in many words; but he answered him nothing. ^{23:10}And the chief priests and the scribes stood, vehemently accusing him. ^{23:11}And Herod with his soldiers set him at nought, and mocked him, and arraying him in gorgeous apparel sent him back to Pilate. ^{23:12}And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day: for before they were at enmity between themselves. ^{23:13}And Pilate called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people, ^{23:14}and said unto them, Ye brought unto me this man, as one that perverteth the people: and behold, I having examined him before you, found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him: ^{23:15}no, nor yet Herod: for he sent him back unto us; and behold, nothing worthy of death hath been done by him. ^{23:16}I will therefore chastise him, and release him. ^{23:17}Now he must needs release unto them at the feast one prisoner. ^{23:18}But they cried out all together, saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas:—^{23:19}one who for a certain insurrection made in the city, and for murder, was cast into

prison. ^{23:20}And Pilate spake unto them again, desiring to release Jesus; ^{23:21}but they shouted, saying, Crucify, crucify him. ^{23:22}And he said unto them the third time, Why, what evil hath this man done? I have found no cause of death in him: I will therefore chastise him and release him. ^{23:23}But they were urgent with loud voices, asking that he might be crucified. And their voices prevailed. ^{23:24}And Pilate gave sentence that what they asked for should be done. ^{23:25}And he released him that for insurrection and murder had been cast into prison, whom they asked for; but Jesus he delivered up to their will. ^{23:26}And when they led him away, they laid hold upon one Simon of Cyrene, coming from the country, and laid on him the cross, to bear it after Jesus. ^{23:27}And there followed him a great multitude of the people, and of women who bewailed and lamented him. ^{23:28}But Jesus turning unto them said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. ^{23:29}For behold, the days are coming, in which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the breasts that never gave suck. ^{23:30}Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us. ^{23:31}For if they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? ^{23:32}And there were also two others, malefactors, led with him to be put to death. ^{23:33}And when they came unto the place which is called The skull, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand and the other on the left. ^{23:34}And Jesus said, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And parting his garments among them, they cast lots. ^{23:35}And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also scoffed at him, saying, He saved others; let him save himself, if this is the Christ of God, his chosen. ^{23:36}And the soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, offering him vinegar, ^{23:37}and saying, If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself. ^{23:38}And there was also a superscription over him, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS. ^{23:39}And one of the malefactors that were hanged railed on him, saying, Art not thou the Christ? save thyself and us. ^{23:40}But the other answered, and rebuking him said, Dost thou not even fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? ^{23:41}And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss. ^{23:42}And he said, Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom. ^{23:43}And he said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise. ^{23:44}And it was now about the sixth hour, and a darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour, ^{23:45}the sun's light failing: and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst. ^{23:46}And Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost. ^{23:47}And when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man. ^{23:48}And all the multitudes that came together to this sight, when they beheld the things that were done, returned smiting their breasts. ^{23:49}And all his acquaintance, and the women that followed with him from Galilee, stood afar off, seeing these things. ^{23:50}And behold, a man named Joseph, who was a councillor, a good and righteous man ^{23:51}(he had not consented to their counsel and deed), *a man of Arimathaea, a city of the Jews, who was looking for the kingdom of God:* ^{23:52}this man went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. ^{23:53}And he took it down, and wrapped it in a linen cloth, and laid him in a tomb that was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain. ^{23:54}And it was the day of the Preparation, and the sabbath drew on. ^{23:55}And the women, who had come with him out of Galilee, followed after, and beheld the tomb, and how his body was laid. ^{23:56}And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments. And on the sabbath they rested according to the commandment.

^{24:1}But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came unto the tomb, bringing the spices which they had prepared. ^{24:2}And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb. ^{24:3}And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. ^{24:4}And it came to pass, while they were

perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in dazzling apparel: ^{24:5}and as they were affrighted and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? ^{24:6}He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, ^{24:7}saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. ^{24:8}And they remembered his words, ^{24:9}and returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest. ^{24:10}Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the *mother* of James: and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles. ^{24:11}And these words appeared in their sight as idle talk; and they disbelieved them. ^{24:12}But Peter arose, and ran unto the tomb; and stooping and looking in, he seeth the linen cloths by themselves; and he departed to his home, wondering at that which was come to pass. ^{24:13}And behold, two of them were going that very day to a village named Emmaus, which was threescore furlongs from Jerusalem. ^{24:14}And they communed with each other of all these things which had happened. ^{24:15}And it came to pass, while they communed and questioned together, that Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. ^{24:16}But their eyes were holden that they should not know him. ^{24:17}And he said unto them, What communications are these that ye have one with another, as ye walk? And they stood still, looking sad. ^{24:18}And one of them, named Cleopas, answering said unto him, Dost thou alone sojourn in Jerusalem and not know the things which are come to pass there in these days? ^{24:19}And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, The things concerning Jesus the Nazarene, who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: ^{24:20}and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him up to be condemned to death, and crucified him. ^{24:21}But we hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel. Yea and besides all this, it is now the third day since these things came to pass. ^{24:22}Moreover certain women of our company amazed us, having been early at the tomb; ^{24:23}and when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive. ^{24:24}And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not. ^{24:25}And he said unto them, O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! ^{24:26}Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? ^{24:27}And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. ^{24:28}And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they were going: and he made as though he would go further. ^{24:29}And they constrained him, saying, Abide with us; for it is toward evening, and the day is now far spent. And he went in to abide with them. ^{24:30}And it came to pass, when he had sat down with them to meat, he took the bread and blessed; and breaking *it* he gave to them. ^{24:31}And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight. ^{24:32}And they said one to another, Was not our heart burning within us, while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the scriptures? ^{24:33}And they rose up that very hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, ^{24:34}saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. ^{24:35}And they rehearsed the things *that happened* in the way, and how he was known of them in the breaking of the bread. ^{24:36}And as they spake these things, he himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace *be* unto you. ^{24:37}But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit. ^{24:38}And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and wherefore do questionings arise in your heart? ^{24:39}See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. ^{24:40}And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet. ^{24:41}And while they still disbelieved for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here anything to eat?

^{24:42}And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish. ^{24:43}And he took it, and ate before them. ^{24:44}And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. ^{24:45}Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; ^{24:46}and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; ^{24:47}and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. ^{24:48}Ye are witnesses of these things. ^{24:49}And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high. ^{24:50}And he led them out until *they were* over against Bethany: and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. ^{24:51}And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven. ^{24:52}And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: ^{24:53}and were continually in the temple, blessing God.

* * *

Christianity: Asceticism and Monasticism

On St. Francis of Assisi:

"He restrained his sensual appetites with such strict discipline as that he would barely take what was necessary to support life. For he was wont to say that it was difficult to satisfy the needs of the body without yielding unto the inclinations of the senses.

"Wherefore he would hardly, and but seldom, allow himself cooked food when in health, and when he did allow it, he would either sprinkle it with ashes, or by pouring water thereupon would as far as possible destroy its savour and taste. Of his drinking of wine what shall I say, when even of water he would scarce drink what he needed, while parched with burning thirst?

"... The bare ground for the most part served as a couch unto his wearied body, and he would often sleep sitting, with a log or a stone placed under his head, and, clad in one poor tunic, he served the Lord in cold and nakedness.

"When he was at the hermitage of Sartiano, a grievous temptation of the flesh laid hold on him. When the lover of chastity felt its oncoming, he laid aside his habit, and began to scourge himself severely with a cord, saying, "Ah, brother ass, thus must thou be led, thus must thou submit unto the lash! . . . Then, impelled by a marvellous fervour of spirit, he threw open the door of his cell, and went out into the garden, where [he] plung[ed] his now naked body into a great snow-heap. ... Then the tempter departed, routed, and the holy man returned unto his cell victorious, in that, by enduring the external cold in right penitent fashion, he had so extinguished the fire of lust within that thereafter he felt it no whit.

"When he bethought him of the first beginning of all things, he was filled with a yet more overflowing charity, and would call the dumb animals, howsoever small, by the names of *brother* and *sister*, forasmuch as he recognized in them the same origin as in himself . . ." (From W. T. Jones, *A History of Western Philosophy*, Volume II)

Some other saints:

"The early Christian fathers delighted in such simple self-tortures as hairshirts, and failing to wash. Others proceeded to more desperate extremes, such as Ammonius who tortured his body with a red-hot iron until it was covered with burns It would not be necessary to dwell on these depressing details if it were not for the fact that the Church erected these appalling practices into a virtue, often canonizing those who practiced them [St. Margaret Marie Alacoque] sought out rotten fruit and dusty bread to eat. Like many mystics she suffered from a lifelong thirst, but decided to allow herself no drink from Thursday to Sunday, and when she did drink, preferred water in which laundry had been washed She cut the name Jesus on her chest with a knife, and because the scars did not last long enough, burnt them in with a candle She was canonized in 1920 St. Rose ate nothing but a mixture of sheep's gall, bitter herbs and ashes. The Pazzi, like the Alacoque, vowed herself to chastity at an incredibly early age (four, it is said)." (G. Rattray Taylor, *Sex in History*, New York: Thames and Hudson, 1954, p. 44)

Charles de Blois, nephew of Philip IV:

Charles was an ascetic of exaggerated piety who sought spirituality by mortifying the flesh. Like Thomas a Becket, he wore unwashed clothes crawling with lice; he put pebbles in his shoes, slept on straw on the floor next to his wife's bed, and after his death was found to have worn a coarse shirt of horsehair under his armor, and cords wound so tightly around his body that the knots dug into his flesh. By these practices a seeker of holiness expressed contempt for the world, self-abasement, and humility, although he often found himself guilty of a perverse pride in his excesses. Charles confessed every night so that he might not go to sleep in a state of sin. He fathered a bastard son called Jehan de Blois, but sins of the flesh did not have to be eschewed, only repented. He treated the humble with deference, it was said, met the complaints of the poor with goodness and justice, and refrained from too heavy taxes. Such was his reputation for saintliness that when he undertook to walk barefoot in the snow to a Breton shrine, the people covered his path with straw and blankets, but he took another way at a cost of bleeding and frozen feet, so that for weeks afterward he was unable to walk.

His piety detracted not at all from his ferocious pursuit of the dukedom. He stated his claim below the walls of Nantes by having his siege engines hurl into the city the heads of thirty captured partisans of Montfort. His successful siege of Quimper was followed by a ruthless massacre of 2,000 civilian inhabitants of all ages and both sexes. According to then current laws of war, the besieged could make terms if they surrendered, but not if they forced a siege to its bitter end, so presumably Charles felt no compunctions. On this occasion, after he had chosen the place of assault, he was warned of rising flood waters, but refused to alter his decision, saying, "Does not God have empire over the waters?" When his men succeeded in taking the city before being

trapped by the flood, the people took it for a miracle owed to Charles's prayers.
 (Barbara Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror*, p. 74)

Medieval poverty movements

The poverty movements grew out of the essence of Christian doctrine: renunciation of the material world—the idea that made the great break with the classical age. It maintained that God was positive and life on earth negative, that the world was incurably bad and holiness achieved only through renunciation of earthly pleasures, goods, and honors. To gain victory over the flesh was the purpose of fasting and celibacy, which denied the pleasures of this world for the sake of reward in the next. Money was evil, beauty vain, and both were transitory. Ambition was pride, desire for gain was avarice, desire of the flesh was lust, desire for honor, even for knowledge and beauty, was vainglory. Insofar as these diverted man from seeking the life of the spirit, they were sinful. The Christian ideal was ascetic: the denial of sensual man. The result was that, under the sway of the Church, life became a continual struggle against the senses and a continual engagement in sin, accounting for the persistent need for absolution.

Repeatedly, mystical sects arose in an effort to sweep away the whole detritus of the material world, to become nearer to God by cutting the earth-binding chains of property. Embedded in its lands and buildings, the Church could only react by denouncing the sects as heretical. The Fraticelli's stubborn insistence on the absolute poverty of Christ and his twelve Apostles was acutely inconvenient for the Avignon papacy, which condemned their doctrine as "false and pernicious" heresy in 1315 and, when they refused to desist, excommunicated them and other associated sects at various times during the next decade. Twenty-seven members of a particularly stubborn group of Spiritual Franciscans of Provence were tried by the Inquisition and four of them burned at the stake at Marseille in 1318. (Barbara Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror*, p. 37)

* * *

Islam:

Quran (Koran) excerpts

[2.62] Surely those who believe, and those who are Jews, and the Christians, and the Sabians, whoever believes in Allah and the Last day and does good, they shall have their reward from their Lord, and there is no fear for them, nor shall they grieve.

[2.94] If the home of the Hereafter with Allah is indeed for you specially and not for others, of mankind, then long for death if you are truthful."

[2.96] A criticism of the Jews: "you will find them (the Jews) the greediest of mankind for life ... Everyone of them wishes that he could be given a life of a thousand years."

[2.127] And (remember) when Ibrahim (Abraham) and (his son) Isma'il (Ishmael) were raising the foundations of the House (the *Ka'bah* at Makkah), (saying), "Our Lord! Accept (this service) from us. Verily! You are the All-Hearer, the All-Knower."

[4.56] (As for) those who disbelieve in Our communications, We shall make them enter fire; so oft as their skins are thoroughly burned, We will change them for other skins, that they may taste the chastisement; surely Allah is Mighty, Wise.

[4.88] What is the matter with you, then, that you have become two parties about the hypocrites, while Allah has made them return (to disbelief) for what they have earned? Do you wish to guide him whom Allah has caused to err? And whomsoever Allah causes to err, you shall by no means find a way for him.

[4.89] They desire that you should disbelieve as they have disbelieved, so that you might be (all) alike; therefore take not from among them friends until they fly (their homes) in Allah's way; but if they turn back, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them, and take not from among them a friend or a helper.

[4.150] Surely those who disbelieve in Allah and His apostles and (those who) desire to make a distinction between Allah and His apostles and say: We believe in some and disbelieve in others, and desire to take a course between (this and) that.

[4.151] These it is that are truly unbelievers, and We have prepared for the unbelievers a disgraceful chastisement.

[5.64] And the Jews say: The hand of Allah is tied up! Their hands shall be shackled and they shall be cursed for what they say. Nay, both His hands are spread out, He expends as He pleases; and what has been revealed to you from your Lord will certainly make many of them increase in inordinacy and disbelief; and We have put enmity and hatred among them till the day of resurrection; whenever they kindle a fire for war Allah puts it out, and they strive to make mischief in the land; and Allah does not love the mischief-makers.

[5.85] Strongest among men in enmity to the Believers wilt thou find the Jews and Pagans.

[5.86] And those who disbelieve and reject Our communications, these are the companions of the flame.

[8:12] I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Therefore strike off their heads and strike off every fingertip of them.

[9.1] (This is a declaration of) immunity by Allah and His Apostle towards those of the idolaters with whom you made an agreement.

[9.2] So go about in the land for four months and know that you cannot weaken Allah and that Allah will bring disgrace to the unbelievers.

[9.3] And an announcement from Allah and His Apostle to the people on the day of the greater pilgrimage that Allah and His Apostle are free from liability to the idolaters;

therefore if you repent, it will be better for you, and if you turn back, then know that you will not weaken Allah; and announce painful punishment to those who disbelieve.

[9.4] Except those of the idolaters with whom you made an agreement, then they have not failed you in anything and have not backed up any one against you, so fulfill their agreement to the end of their term; surely Allah loves those who are careful (of their duty).

[9.5] So when the sacred months have passed away, then slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them captives and besiege them and lie in wait for them in every ambush, then if they repent and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate, leave their way free to them; surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.

[9.12] And if they break their oaths after their agreement and (openly) revile your religion, then fight the leaders of unbelief-- surely their oaths are nothing-- so that they may desist.

[9.13] What! Will you not fight a people who broke their oaths and aimed at the expulsion of the Apostle, and they attacked you first; do you fear them? But Allah is most deserving that you should fear Him, if you are believers.

[9.14] Fight them, Allah will punish them by your hands and bring them to disgrace, and assist you against them and heal the hearts of a believing people.

[9.17] The idolaters have no right to visit the mosques of Allah while bearing witness to unbelief against themselves, these it is whose doings are null, and in the fire shall they abide.

[9.28] O you who believe! The idolaters are nothing but unclean, so they shall not approach the Sacred Mosque after this year; [...]

[9.29] Fight those who do not believe in Allah, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Apostle have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth, out of those who have been given the Book, until they pay the tax in acknowledgment of superiority and they are in a state of subjection.

[9.30] And the Jews say: Uzair is the son of Allah; and the Christians say: The Messiah is the son of Allah; these are the words of their mouths; they imitate the saying of those who disbelieved before; may Allah destroy them; how they are turned away!

[9.34-35] O you who believe! most surely many of the doctors of law and the monks eat away the property of men falsely, and turn (them) from Allah's way; and (as for) those who hoard up gold and silver and do not spend it in Allah's way, announce to them a painful chastisement,

On the day when it shall be heated in the fire of hell, then their foreheads and their sides and their backs shall be branded with it; this is what you hoarded up for yourselves, therefore taste what you hoarded.

[9.123] O you who believe! fight those of the unbelievers who are near to you and let them find in you hardness; and know that Allah is with those who guard (against evil).

The Clear Evidence [98.1-8]

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

Those who disbelieved from among the followers of the Book and the polytheists could not have separated (from the faithful) until there had come to them the clear evidence:

An apostle from Allah, reciting pure pages,

Wherein are all the right ordinances.

And those who were given the Book did not become divided except after clear evidence had come to them.

And they were not enjoined anything except that they should serve Allah, being sincere to Him in obedience, upright, and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate, and that is the right religion.

Surely those who disbelieve from among the followers of the Book and the polytheists shall be in the fire of hell, abiding therein; they are the worst of men.

(As for) those who believe and do good, surely they are the best of men.

Their reward with their Lord is gardens of perpetuity beneath which rivers flow, abiding therein for ever; Allah is well pleased with them and they are well pleased with Him; that is for him who fears his Lord.

The Slanderer [104.1-9]

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

Woe to every slanderer, defamer,

Who amasses wealth and considers it a provision (against mishap);

He thinks that his wealth will make him immortal.

Nay! he shall most certainly be hurled into the crushing disaster,

And what will make you realize what the crushing disaster is?

It is the fire kindled by Allah,

Which rises above the hearts.

Surely it shall be closed over upon them,

In extended columns.

The Disbelievers [109.1-6]

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

Say: O unbelievers!

I do not serve that which you serve,
 Nor do you serve Him Whom I serve:
 Nor am I going to serve that which you serve,
 Nor are you going to serve Him Whom I serve:
 You shall have your religion and I shall have my religion.

* * *

Seyyid Qutb, *Milestones* (Dar Al-Ilm, Damascus, Syria)

"It is therefore necessary that Islam's theoretical foundation ... materialize in the form of an organized and active group from the very beginning. It is necessary that this group separate itself from the **jahili** society." (47)

"When Islam strives for peace, its objective is not that superficial peace which requires that only that part of the earth where the followers of Islam are residing remain secure. The peace which Islam desires is that the religion (i.e., the Law of the society) be purified for God, that the obedience of all people be for God alone." (63)

"The highest form of triumph is the victory of soul over matter, the victory of belief over pain, and the victory of faith over persecution." (151)

"All men die, and of various causes, but not all gain such victory . . . It is God's choosing and honoring a group of people who share death with the rest of mankind but who are singled out from other people for honor" (151)

* * *

Judaism:

A Prayerbook for Shabbat, Festivals, and Weekdays

[Edited and translated by Rabbi Jules Harlow, Rabbinical Assembly of the United Synagogue of America. New York, 1985]

REFLECTIONS ON PRAYER

SPIRITUAL SECURITY

To attain a degree of spiritual security one cannot rely upon one's own resources. One needs an atmosphere, where the concern for the spirit is shared by a community. We are in need of students and scholars, masters and specialists. But we need also the company of witnesses, of human beings who are engaged in worship, who for a moment sense the truth that life is meaningless without attachment to God.

We often discover that a human being is a being driven by alien pressures, by false fears. Living becomes drifting, aimless moving. To pray is to stand still, to rise above

enforced digression, and to await signs of direction. Tearing off inner masks, imposed makeup, delusions, conditionings, conceits, a spark breaks through all thoughts: what is worth being thirsty for?

THE SYNAGOGUE

What does a person expect to attain when entering a synagogue? In the pursuit of learning one goes to a library, for esthetic enrichment one goes to the art museum, for pure music to the concert hall.

Many are the facilities which help us to acquire the important worldly virtues, skills and techniques. But where should one learn about the insights of the spirit? Many are the opportunities for public speech. Where are the occasions for inner silence? It is easy to find people who will teach us how to be eloquent. Who will teach us how to be still? It is surely important to develop a sense of humor. Is it not also important to have a sense of reverence? Where should one learn the eternal wisdom of compassion? The fear of being cruel? The danger of being callous? Where should one learn that the greatest truth is found in contrition?

Important and precious as the development of our intellectual faculties is, the cultivation of a sensitive conscience is indispensable. We are all in danger of sinking in the darkness of vanity; we are all involved in our own egos. Where should we become sensitive to the pitfalls of cleverness, or to the realization that expediency is not the acme of wisdom?

We are constantly in need of self-purification. We are in need of experiencing moments in which the spiritual is as relevant and as concrete as the esthetic, for example. Everyone has a sense of beauty; everyone is capable of distinguishing between the beautiful and the ugly. But we also must learn to be sensitive to the spirit.

THE SELF IS SILENT

We never pray as individuals, set apart from the rest of the world. The liturgy is an order which we can enter only as part of the Community of Israel. Every act of worship is an act of participating in an eternal service, in the service of all souls of all ages.

In a sense, our liturgy is a higher form of silence. It is pervaded by an awed sense of the grandeur of God which resists description and surpasses all expression. The individual is silent. He does not bring forth his own words. His saying the consecrated words is in essence an act of listening to what they convey. The spirit of Israel speaks, the self is silent.

PUBLIC WORSHIP

Public worship aids us by liberating our personality from the confining walls of the individual ego. Imprisoned in self, we easily fall prey to morbid brooding. Interference with our career, personal disappointments and disillusionments, hurts to our vanity, the fear of death—all these tend so to dominate our attention that our minds move in a fixed and narrow system of ideas, which we detest but from which we see no escape.

With a whole wide world of boundless opportunities about us, we permit our minds, as it were, to pace up and down within the narrow cell of the ego prison. But participation in public worship breaks through the prison of the ego and lets in the light and air of the world. Instead of living but one small and petty life, we now share the multitudinous life of' our people. Against the wider horizons that now open to our ken, our personal cares do not loom so large. Life becomes infinitely more meaningful and worthwhile, when we become aware, through our participation in public worship, of sharing in a common life that transcends that of our personal organism.

REFLECTIONS ON GOD

WE PRAISE BEFORE WE PROVE

Understanding God is not attained by calling into session all arguments for and against Him, in order to debate whether He is a reality or a figment of the mind. God cannot be sensed as a second thought, as an explanation of the origin of the universe. He is either the first and the last, or just another concept.

Speculation does not precede faith. The antecedents of faith are the premise of wonder and the premise of praise. Worship of God precedes affirmation of His realness. We praise before we prove. We respond before we question.

Proofs for the existence of God may add strength to our belief; they do not generate it. Human existence implies the realness of God. There is a certainly without knowledge in the depth of our being that accounts for our asking the ultimate question, a preconceptual certainty that lies beyond all formulation or verbalization.

SILENCE IS PRAISE

God, may he be exalted, cannot be comprehended by the intellect. None but He Himself can comprehend what He is.... Thus all the philosophers say: "We are dazzled by His beauty, and He is hidden from us because of the intensity with which He becomes manifest, just as the sun is hidden to eyes that are too weak to apprehend it." This has been expounded upon in words that it would serve no useful purpose to repeat here. The most apt phrase concerning this subject is tile statement in the Book of Psalms, "Silence is praise to You" (65:2). Interpreted, this means, "Silence with regard to You is Praise." This is a most perfectly put phrase regarding this matter. In regard to whatever we say intending to magnify and exalt, we find that while it may have some application to Him, may He be exalted, it does have some deficiency. Accordingly, silence is more appropriate.

KNOWING

The sum total of what we know of You is that we do not know You.

IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

The meaning of having been created in the image of God is in a mystery. It is impossible to say exactly what it means to have been created in the image of God. Perhaps we may

surmise the intention was for man to be a witness for God, a symbol of God. Looking at man, one should be able to sense the presence of God. But instead of living as a witness, man, in so many ways, has become all imposter; instead of becoming a symbol, he became an idol. In man's presumption he has developed a false sense of sovereignty which fills the world with terror.

* * *

Amerindian: Lakota Sioux

Lakota Self-Sacrifice

Amanda Porterfield

[From *The Power of Religion* (Oxford University Press, 1998)]

In the soft light of early morning on the last day of July, with the last pink of dawn still visible in her rearview mirror, Cinda Stevens drives west on Interstate 90 in South Dakota toward the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, the home of the Oglala Sioux, the largest subdivision of the western, or Teton, Sioux. Cinda is a nursing student, born and raised in a Midwestern city far from Pine Ridge. Although she has never been in contact with any Pine Ridge relatives, her mother's grandfather was born on the reservation. Hoping to meet some relatives, and to learn more about their religion, Cinda has decided to visit the annual Pine Ridge sun dance, a Plains Indian ceremony of spiritual and cultural renewal.

The sun dance originated in the eighteenth century, probably among the Cheyenne, and spread to other Plains tribes as a major ceremonial event drawing various populations together for feasting, courtship, religious purification, and ordeals designed to infuse hunters and warriors with experiences of spiritual power. Although it may have continued on in some form in secret, the sun dance in its full form died out among the western Sioux after it was banned in 1881 by the U.S. government as part of its efforts to destroy the "savage" customs of the Sioux and persuade them to accept western culture. But it was reborn in modified form on the reservations, where it emerged publicly after 1934, when the government ban against it was partially lifted. No longer a ritual instigated by hunters and warriors seeking power for future conquests, or seeking to repay the spirits for conquests already made, the sun dance became a ritual of spiritual renewal that helped the Sioux retain their cultural identity and endure the hardships of reservation life.

Along with the Brule, Hunkpapa, Mnikowojus, and other subdivisions of the western Sioux, the Oglala are often called Lakota, which is the name of their language. The Lakota are well known for their resistance to the U.S. Army and to the encroachment of western culture onto the northern plains during the nineteenth century. Today's Lakota descend from the tribes of the Hunkpapa Chief Sitting Bull, who led the Sioux war of resistance in the 1860s and 1870s, and the legendary Oglala warrior and holy man Crazy

Horse, who joined Sitting Bull in defeating General George Armstrong Custer in 1876, killing nearly his entire force at the Battle of Little Bighorn. After this defeat, the U.S. Army conquered the Lakota, killing many, including Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse. The Lakota were forced to relinquish most of their lands, give up their traditional occupations of hunting and warfare, and accept dependence on insufficient rations from the U.S. government.

In an attempt to reverse this desperate situation at the end of the nineteenth century, many Lakota embraced the ghost dance, a religious movement promising a supernatural transformation of life on earth, in which the broken and violated world the Lakota had come to inhabit would be rolled away, and the abundant world of the past, with its deceased inhabitants, rolled back in. The ghost dance began among the Paiute Indians of Nevada and swept through a number of western tribes stricken by disease, poverty, and the destruction of their lifeways. Enthusiasm for the ghost dance declined swiftly among the Lakota after 1890, when U.S. soldiers massacred more than two hundred men, women, and children in Big Foot's Mnikowojus band at Wounded Knee Creek. Some of the men were wearing ghost shirts, painted with sacred emblems and figures, believed to protect the wearer from bullets. U.S. Army officers regarded these shirts as military provocations.

While forced to abandon their nomadic life as hunters and severely punished for their reputation as warriors, the Lakota retained important elements of their religion, including their spiritual concepts of war and warriors. Other traditional elements that persist in Lakota religion today include belief in Wakan Tanka, the creator God on high who is also a universal spiritual presence encompassing more than four hundred spirits in the Lakota pantheon, and belief in the importance of vision quests and similar forms of religious experience that establish personal relationships between individuals and spirits who bestow power on them. The Lakota also preserve commitment to the gifts believed to be brought to their people by the legendary White Buffalo Cow Woman as a means of communicating with the spirit world, especially the gifts of the sacred pipe, the sweat lodge, and the sun dance.

Since most of the Lakota are Christian (three-fourths of Pine Ridge residents are Catholic or Episcopal), the traditional elements of Lakota religion coexist with Christian belief and experience, and often blend together. Thus Wakan Tanka and the creator God described in the Bible are often understood to be one and the same, and Christian ideas about the redemptive power of Jesus's suffering confirm the traditional Lakota belief that self-sacrifice can be a means of gaining access to the spirit world. Both Christian clerics and traditional holy men have encouraged linkages between Christianity and Lakota religion, although the clerics tend to view Lakota religion as a preparation for Christianity, while the holy men assume the reverse.

In the 1970s, leaders of the leftist American Indian Movement (AIM) turned to the Oglala Sun Dance Chief Frank Fools Crow and to the life story of the Oglala holy man Black Elk for spiritual instruction. As the religious education of AIM members

deepened, the sun dance became increasingly popular among these and other urban Indians, as well as among tourists and religious seekers looking to Lakota religion for inspiration. The sun dance has grown to accommodate this larger sphere of interested people, and now functions as a means of initiation into Lakota spirituality for those on the periphery of the culture, as well as an experience of spiritual renewal and means of affirming and developing Lakota religion for insiders. The sun dance is one of the most prominent expressions of Lakota religion today. Led by men at campsites both on and off the reservations, sun dances attract thousands of spectators each year, and dozens of individuals pledging to participate in traditional ordeals of self-sacrifice.

Like many of her New Age friends, Cinda is interested in Lakota spirituality because of its respect for the environment, and because it seems to offer an alternative to the consumerism, greed, and materialism that she believes are characteristic of American culture. In her view, the Lakota still represent a tradition of spiritual resistance to American culture, even if its military aspect has diminished. Cinda also feels a strong pull toward the people at Pine Ridge because she is a person with some Oglala blood, and she is eager to find the spiritual roots of her mother's people, and to sink some spiritual roots of her own in alongside.

With these somewhat romantic expectations, Cinda is not fully prepared for either the poverty or the commercialism she encounters when she leaves the Interstate and drives onto the reservation for the first time. She sees dilapidated homes, rusted-out cars, worn clothes, and a number of shops that look to her like tourist traps selling cheap pipes, fake headdresses, candy, and film.

"I don't know what I expected to find," she says aloud, chiding herself for being disappointed. "I guess I was looking for a Garden of Eden. An idyllic village scene with paint horses and a sparkling stream. Something out of a movie about Indians in the nineteenth century."

Following directions obtained at the Pine Ridge Visitor's Center, Cinda finds the campsite where the sun dance is being held. It is the second day of the four-day dance, and the campsite is crowded with people, cars, and innumerable tents set up in a large circle almost a quarter mile in diameter. Cinda parks her car and walks toward the tents, intent on observing as much as she can, and also on finding someone she can talk to, someone who will help guide her toward a real experience of Lakota spirituality.

As Cinda remembers from Fools Crow's account, the sun dance camp involves several concentric areas. The outer circle is comprised of tents and booths, where spectators eat, sleep, and visit, and where food and crafts are sold. Inside that circle are the sweat lodges and preparation tents, where pledgers stay during the four days of the sun dance, praying, fasting, resting, and receiving instruction. This middle circle also includes an open area through which the dancers pass on their way to the innermost circle, and through which spectators pass on their way to the shade arbor encircling the

innermost area. The inner "mystery circle," as it is called, is considered sacred ground, and no one is allowed to enter without permission of the sun dance leaders.

In the center of the mystery circle stands the sacred tree. It was "killed" the day before the sun dance began in a ceremony symbolizing the suspension of ordinary growth and the establishment of a four-day hiatus in ordinary time in which spiritual transformation and renewal can occur. Carefully selected from a stand of forty- to fifty-foot cottonwoods, the tree has been blessed by the sun dance chief, chopped once on each of four sides by a young woman believed to be a virgin, and then cut down by several men and trucked to the sun dance campsite. With thanks to Grandmother Earth for producing it, the tree has been stripped of its lower leaves, planted in a hole in the center of the ceremonial space where the sun dance chief has deposited flesh offerings from his own body, and then hung with pouches of tobacco for the spirits, colored flags representing the spirits of the cardinal directions, and doll-like representations of a holy man and a buffalo that may inspire visions in those who dance. As the focus of the dancers' religious experiences, the tree creates a sacred world in which power seems to flow between spirits and dancers, and between the dancers who communicate with the spirits and the people.

After inspecting the sacred tree from the shade arbor, Cinda watches the pledgers dancing in the hot sun for more than an hour. Later, she returns to the tent area, stopping at a booth where a middle-aged woman selling leather goods is working on a small fringed bag. The woman looks up in a friendly way, and Cinda plunges in.

"I'm sorry to interrupt you," Cinda says, "but I wonder if you could tell me where I could find out something about Lakota spirituality." Surprised by such a blunt request, the woman draws back a few inches and looks at Cinda quizzically, and somewhat dubiously. If outsiders come to the sun dance to be initiated into Lakota spirituality, they do not succeed easily, or without proving themselves worthy.

"My great-grandfather was an Oglala from Pine Ridge," Cinda adds quickly, hoping to avoid the woman's dismissal.

"Oh, well, then," says the woman, her smile returning. "Perhaps you have some relatives here. What was your grandfather's name?"

The two discuss names and families for a while, and Cinda repeats some of the things her mother has told her about her great-grandfather. The woman directs Cinda to a group of tents across the circle, and suggests that she introduce herself there.

"They might be related to your family," the woman says. "One of the men over there will be pierced tomorrow. And one of the women may give a flesh offering. They might help you find some of the experience you are looking for."

Thanking the woman for her help, Cinda moves away, ruminating about the possibility of meeting lost relatives, and apprehensive about suddenly coming close to people whose religious beliefs were leading them to inflict deliberate and considerable pain on

themselves. Uneasy, but intensely interested, she resolves to find out more about the religious experiences sought by the pledgers.

Walking around the circle to the cluster of tents the woman selling bags had described, Cinda approaches a man who looks like he might be in his seventies, sitting on a camp stool in front of one of the tents, smoking a hand-rolled cigarette, apparently deep in thought. Stopping a few yards away, she clears her throat, says hello, and explains that she is looking for some relatives. He looks her in the eyes for a moment, and then calls into the tent in Lakota. A small boy comes out, followed by his mother and grandmother, who greet Cinda politely. Another stool and some chairs appear, and they all sit together for a while, figuring out Cinda's relationship, pointing out the tents of other relatives around the circle, and telling stories about those who are gone.

"It is good that you have come during the summer for a sun dance," the man says after a while, "because the sun dance is traditionally the time when members of the same band come together and join other bands and other tribes. It is a time when the people get together, and the relatives come home."

Happy at being so warmly included, Cinda describes her desire for a firsthand experience of Oglala spirituality. "I know that I'm just a beginner," she confesses, "and that you have spent your lives in touch with the spirits and the reality they represent. And I know I have missed out on a lot, in terms of being trained and prepared for a real experience of the spirits. But I would like to go back with something to remember, something I can call on, and build on."

"There is a lot for you to learn, and you will need to be patient," the man responds. "The holy men will have to teach you. And the women will have to teach you. You will have to come back here many times to participate in the ceremonies, to learn from the people, and work with them."

"One more thing I will tell you," he says. "To receive power from the spirits, you must purify and humble yourself. You must be ready to cry to the spirits for help."

Having pitched her own small tent among those of her newfound relatives, Cinda is awakened just before dawn the next morning by the camp crier, calling the people to the third day of the sun dance, the day that the piercing will begin. After washing and eating, she and the others arrive in the shade arbor in time to see the pledgers file through the two yellow flags at the eastern door of the mystery circle. Some of the men are carrying pipes filled with sacred tobacco. Many of the men have figures or designs painted on their bodies, and quite a few have red circles painted on their chests indicating the spots where they will be pierced. They move clockwise around the mystery circle, stopping before the sun dance altar, located at the west of the circle, facing the rising sun. After placing their pipes alongside the altar, the pledgers sing, "Tunkashila, Grandfather, have pity on us. We have come here and are doing this so that everything will be right with us." The tension among the spectators is palpable, and some of the pledgers' relatives begin to cry, their sobs contributing to the petition to

the grandfather spirit to infuse the pledgers, and their people, with spiritual power. One of Cinda's cousins points out his brother Ben, who has pledged to be pierced. Ben hopes to receive power from the spirits so that he can bring strength to his people as an ambulance driver, paramedic, and someday, he hopes, as a religious healer.

Moving to the north and then to the south, the pledgers sing and dance, raising their hands occasionally in appeals to Wakan Tanka or the guiding grandfather spirit Tunkashila, reaching up to touch their spiritual power and feeling it run down through their arms. Many participants in the sun dance believe that this contact with the spirits gives the dancers powers of healing, and at a certain point in the morning, the sun dance chief admits a number of individuals who are sick or injured into the mystery circle to be blessed by the dancers. Through simple acts of touching, the dancers generate hope in these individuals, as well as feelings of being infused with holy power. After the healing blessings have been performed, Ben's older half-sister May asks permission to enter the mystery circle to make a flesh offering.

As a woman, May cannot be pierced. But she can smoke the sacred pipe, purify herself in the women's sweat lodge, receive instruction from the religious leaders of the sun dance, and pray and dance to the spirits, to Grandmother Earth, Tunkashila, and Wakan Tanka. And she can make a flesh offering.

May is inspired to make this self-sacrifice as part of her recovery from alcoholism. She needs help from the spirits to be a good influence on her children and nieces and nephews, and to go back to school so that she can get a good job and be a strong member of her community. And as in the other ordeals of the sun dance, the power May may receive as an individual as a result of her self-sacrifice is not a gift for her alone, but one that will benefit her community. As the older women explain it, the spirits might give power to the people through her.

Now within the mystery circle, May dances and sings, reaching her arm up to Wakan Tanka, and then down to Grandmother Earth. Feeling her weakness and fear like a presence inside her, May wants intensely to focus her life, find direction, and break through her fear. She cries to Wakan Tanka for help and strength. As the sun dance chief directs her to a spot on the ground near the altar, May tunes in on the drums, and allows their sound to fill her consciousness and expand her senses, so that the beat of the drums and the beat of her heart seem to be one, and she feels life in the ground beneath her, holding and lifting her toward the sky.

The chief sits down cross-legged on the ground next to her, takes some grey powdered medicine from a bag, and rubs it on the outside of her upper left arm, where May indicates she wants to take her flesh. He hands her a sharp razor. Using the thumb and index finger on both hands he pinches her skin tightly in two places about two inches apart, raising the skin away from the muscles. With little hesitation, May makes the appropriate cuts and lifts out a small rectangle of skin. The chief rubs more medicine on her wound, takes the piece of flesh she gives him, and places it respectfully in another

pouch, where he will keep it until he places it on the altar as a gift to the spirits. As he helps her stand up, May becomes aware of her weakness and then feels it flowing out of her as her body begins to sway. Moved by gratitude, relief, and happiness, she feels a new strength flowing into her body. The drums beating through her, she begins to dance, tears flowing down her cheeks, left arm lifted to the sky.

Later that day, Ben and a dozen other men are pierced. The holy man attending Ben makes two incisions on both sides of his chest, inserts wooden skewers under the skin on either side, and ties ropes to the skewers. Dazed from the piercing, and from two-and-a-half days without food or much water, he gets to his feet slowly, his head bent, his shoulders drooping. He follows his guide, who holds the loose ends of the ropes in his hands, walks closer to the sacred tree, and fixes the ropes in the fork of the tree above their heads. This task completed, the holy man begins blowing an eagle whistle, and Ben lifts his head up and steps backward, pulling against the ropes affixed to his chest, strengthened by the sound of the whistle and the feeling of spiritual power it invokes. Taking up his own eagle whistle, he blows it repeatedly, calling to Tunkashila. The sun shines through the leaves of the sacred tree above him, and through the hoop held by the figure of the holy man hung in the branches, which becomes for Ben a visible expression of the circle of people drawn in union and support around him. He feels exalted and strong. The skewers in his chest break through his skin and he stumbles backward, free.

The next day, other men are pierced for two different ordeals. Several are pierced in both breasts and in the center of the chest and then suspended a foot off the ground from ropes tied to four posts. One of the men dances, shoulders turning and feet stepping in the air as the drums beat and the sun dance chief blows his eagle whistle. Cinda, her relatives, and all the people around them stand transfixed by the man's apparent communication with the spirit world.

Also on the fourth day, several men are pierced and attached with ropes to buffalo skulls. For some spectators, this is the culminating ordeal, and the courageous efforts the pledgers make to break free of the heavy skulls dramatize a common experience of life. Many of the spectators and pledgers have been pulled down by life, and the life of their people has been pulled down by many weights—poverty, unhappiness, bad health, untimely deaths, poor education, and lack of opportunity. The dancers drag the skulls across the ground, and when they weaken visibly, the sun dance chief invites children into the circle, who sit and ride on the skulls, adding weight to help the dancers in their struggle. Amidst encouragement and wailing from all sides, the dancers finally tear free, living symbols of the victory of their people.

As a witness to this culminating act of courage and self-sacrifice, Cinda feels that she, too, has been infused with the power of the spirits. She has also come to feel the strength of the Oglala people. As one who has begun to experience the power of the sun dance for herself, Cinda finds herself identified with the Lakota community and its ongoing effort to survive.

* * *

William Paley, *The Watch and the Watchmaker*

[From *Natural Theology, or Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity Collected from the Appearances of Nature* (1802)]

Statement of the Argument:

IN CROSSING A HEATH, suppose I pitched my foot against a *stone*, and were asked how the stone came to be there, I might possibly answer, that, for anything I knew to the contrary, it had lain there for ever; nor would it, perhaps, be very easy to show the absurdity of this answer. But suppose I found a *watch* upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place, I should hardly think of the answer which I had given—that, for anything I knew, the watch might have always been there is answer serve for the Yet why should not this answer serve for the watch as well as for the stone? why is it not as admissible in the second case as in the first? For this reason, and for no other; viz., that, when we come to inspect the watch, we perceive (what we could not discover in the stone) that its several parts are framed and put together for a purpose, e.g. that they are so formed and adjusted as to produce motion, and that motion so regulated as to point out the hour of the day; that, if the different parts had been differently shaped from size from what they what they are, if a different size from what they are, or placed after any other manner, or in any other order than that in which they are placed, either no motion at all would have been carried on in the machine, or none which would have answered the use that is now served by it. To reckon up a few of the plainest of these parts, and of their offices, all tending to one result: We see a cylindrical box containing a coiled elastic spring, which, by its endeavor to relax itself, turns round the box. We next observe a flexible chain (artificially wrought for the sake of flexure) communicating the action of the spring from the box to the fusee. We then find a series of wheels, the teeth of which catch in, and apply to, each other, conducting the motion from the fusee to the balance, and from the balance to the pointer, and, at the same time, by the size and shape of those wheels, so regulating that motion as to terminate in causing an index, by an equable and measured progression, to pass over a given space in a given time. We take notice that the wheels are made of brass, in order to keep them from rust; the springs of steel, no other metal being so elastic; that over the face of the watch there is placed a glass, a material employed in no other part of the work, but in the room of which, if there had been any other than a transparent substance, the hour could not be seen without opening the case. This mechanism being observed, (it requires indeed an examination of the instrument, and perhaps some previous knowledge of the subject, to perceive and understand it; but being once, as we have said, observed and understood,) the inference, we think, is inevitable, that the watch must have had a maker that there must have existed, at some time, and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers who formed it for the purpose

which we find it actually to answer; who comprehended its construction, and designed its use.

I. Nor would it, I apprehend, weaken the conclusion, that we had never seen a watch made; that we had never known an artist capable of making one; that we were altogether incapable of executing such a piece of workmanship ourselves, or of understanding in what manner it was performed; all this being no more than what is true of some exquisite remains of ancient art, of some lost arts, and, to the generality of mankind, of the more curious productions of modern manufacture. Does one man in a million know how oval frames are turned? Ignorance of this kind exalts our opinion of the unseen and unknown artist's skill, if he be unseen and unknown, but raises no doubt in our minds of the existence and agency of such an artist, at some former time, and in some place or other. Nor can I perceive that it varies at all the inference, whether the question arise concerning a human agent, or concerning an agent of a different species, or an agent possessing, in some respect, a different nature.

II. Neither, secondly, would it invalidate our conclusion, that the watch sometimes went wrong, or that it seldom went exactly right. The purpose of the machinery, the design, and the designer, might be evident, and, in the case supposed, would be evident, in whatever way we accounted for the irregularity of the movement, or whether we could account for it or not. It is not necessary that a machine be perfect, in order to show with what design it was made; still less necessary, where the only question is, whether it were made with any design at all.

III. Nor, thirdly, would it bring any uncertainty into the argument, if there were a few parts of the watch, concerning which we could not discover, or had not yet discovered, in what manner they conduced to the general effect; or even some parts, concerning which we could not ascertain whether they conduced to that effect in any manner whatever. For, as to the first branch of the case, if by the loss, or disorder, or decay of the parts in question, the movement of the watch were found in fact to be stopped, or disturbed, or retarded, no doubt would remain in our minds as to the utility or intention of these parts, although we should be unable to investigate the manner according to which, or the connection by which, the ultimate effect depended upon their action or assistance; and the more complex is the machine, the more likely is this obscurity to arise. Then, as to the second thing supposed, namely, that there were parts which might be spared without prejudice to the movement of the watch, and that he had proved this by experiment, these superfluous parts, even if we were completely assured that they were such, would not vacate the reasoning which we had instituted concerning other parts. The indication of contrivance remained, with respect to them, nearly as it was before.

IV. Nor, fourthly, would any man in his senses think the existence of the watch, with its various machinery, accounted for, by being told that it was one out of possible combinations of material forms; that whatever he had found in the place where he found the watch, must have contained some internal configuration or other; and that

this configuration might be the structure now exhibited, viz., of the works of a watch, as well as a different structure.

V. Nor, fifthly, would it yield his inquiry more satisfaction, to be answered, that there existed in things a principle of order, which had disposed the parts of the watch into their present form and situation. He never knew a watch made by the principle of order; nor can he even form to himself an idea of what is meant by a principle of order, distinct from the intelligence of the watchmaker.

VI. Sixthly, he would be surprised to hear that the mechanism of the watch was no proof of contrivance, only a motive to induce the mind to think so:

VII. And not less surprised to be informed, that the watch in his hand was nothing more than the result of the laws of *metallic* nature. It is a perversion of language to assign any law as the efficient, operative cause of anything. A law presupposes an agent; for it is only the mode according to which an agent proceeds; it implies a power; for it is the order according to which that power acts. Without this agent, without this power, which are both distinct from itself, the *law* does nothing, is nothing. The expression, "the law of metallic nature," may sound strange and harsh to a philosophic ear; but it seems quite as justifiable as some others which are more familiar to him such as "the law of vegetable nature," "the law of animal nature," or, indeed, as "the law of nature" in general, when assigned as the cause of phenomena in exclusion of agency and power, or when it is substituted into the place of these.

VIII. Neither, lastly, would our observer be driven out of his conclusion, or from his confidence in its truth, by being told that he knew nothing at all about the matter. He knows enough for his argument: he knows the utility of the end: he knows the subserviency and adaptation of the means to the end. These points being known, his ignorance of other points, his doubts concerning other points, affect not the certainty of his reasoning. The consciousness of knowing little need not beget a distrust of that which he does know

Application of the Argument

Every indication of contrivance, every manifestation of design, which existed in the watch, exists in the works of nature; with the difference, on the side of nature, of being greater and more, and that in a degree which exceeds all computation. I mean that the contrivances of nature surpass the contrivances of art, in the complexity, subtilty, and curiosity of the mechanism; and still more, if possible, do they go beyond them in number and variety; yet in a multitude of cases, are not less evidently mechanical, not less evidently contrivances, not less evidently accommodated to their end, or suited to their office, than are the most perfect productions of human ingenuity

* * *

Charles Darwin, *On Evolution*

[Excerpt from Chapter XIV of *On the Origin of Species* (1859).]

As this whole volume is one long argument, it may be convenient to the reader to have the leading facts and inferences briefly recapitulated.

That many and grave objections may be advanced against the theory of descent with modification through natural selection, I do not deny. I have endeavoured to give to them their full force. Nothing at first can appear more difficult to believe than that the more complex organs and instincts should have been perfected, not by means superior to, though analogous with, human reason, but by the accumulation of innumerable slight variations, each good for the individual possessor. Nevertheless, this difficulty, though appearing to our imagination insuperably great, cannot be considered real if we admit the following propositions, namely,-that gradations in the perfection of any organ or instinct, which we may consider, either do now exist or could have existed, each good of its kind,-that all organs and instincts are, in ever so slight a degree, variable,-and, lastly, that there is a struggle for existence leading to the preservation of each profitable deviation of structure or instinct. The truth of these propositions cannot, I think, be disputed.

It is, no doubt, extremely difficult even to conjecture by what gradations many structures have been perfected, more especially amongst broken and failing groups of organic beings; but we see so many strange gradations in nature, as is proclaimed by the canon, "Natura non facit saltum" ["Nature does not make leaps."], that we ought to be extremely cautious in saying that any organ or instinct, or any whole being, could not have arrived at its present state by many graduated steps.

Under domestication we see much variability. This seems to be mainly due to the reproductive system being eminently susceptible to changes in the conditions of life; so that this system, when not rendered impotent, fails to reproduce offspring exactly like the parent-form. Variability is governed by many complex laws,—by correlation of growth, by use and disuse, and by the direct action of the physical conditions of life. There is much difficulty in ascertaining how much modification our domestic productions have undergone; but we may safely infer that the amount has been large, and that modifications can be inherited for long periods. As long as the conditions of life remain the same, we have reason to believe that a modification, which has already been inherited for many generations, may continue to be inherited for an almost infinite number of generations. On the other hand we have evidence that variability, when it has once come into play, does not wholly cease; for new varieties are still occasionally produced by our most anciently domesticated productions.

Man does not actually produce variability; he only unintentionally exposes organic beings to new conditions of life, and then nature acts on the organisation, and causes variability. But man can and does select the variations given to him by nature, and thus accumulate them in any desired manner. He thus adapts animals and plants for his own benefit or pleasure. He may do this methodically, or he may do it unconsciously by preserving the individuals most useful to him at the time, without

any thought of altering the breed. It is certain that he can largely influence the character of a breed by selecting, in each successive generation, individual differences so slight as to be quite inappreciable by an uneducated eye. This process of selection has been the great agency in the production of the most distinct and useful domestic breeds. That many of the breeds produced by man have to a large extent the character of natural species, is shown by the inextricable doubts whether very many of them are varieties or aboriginal species.

There is no obvious reason why the principles which have acted so efficiently under domestication should not have acted under nature. In the preservation of favoured individuals and races, during the constantly-recurrent Struggle for Existence, we see the most powerful and ever-acting means of selection. The struggle for existence inevitably follows from the high geometrical ratio of increase which is common to all organic beings. This high rate of increase is proved by calculation, by the effects of a succession of peculiar seasons, and by the results of naturalisation, as explained in the third chapter. More individuals are born than can possibly survive. A grain in the balance will determine which individual shall live and which shall die,—which variety or species shall increase in number, and which shall decrease, or finally become extinct. As the individuals of the same species come in all respects into the closest competition with each other, the struggle will generally be most severe between them; it will be almost equally severe between the varieties of the same species, and next in severity between the species of the same genus. But the struggle will often be very severe between beings most remote in the scale of nature. The slightest advantage in one being, at any age or during any season, over those with which it comes into competition, or better adaptation in however slight a degree to the surrounding physical conditions, will turn the balance.

With animals having separated sexes there will in most cases be a struggle between the males for possession of the females. The most vigorous individuals, or those which have most successfully struggled with their conditions of life, will generally leave most progeny. But success will often depend on having special weapons or means of defence, or on the charms of the males; and the slightest advantage will lead to victory.

As geology plainly proclaims that each land has undergone great physical changes, we might have expected that organic beings would have varied under nature, in the same way as they generally have varied under the changed conditions of domestication. And if there be any variability under nature, it would be an unaccountable fact if natural selection had not come into play. It has often been asserted, but the assertion is quite incapable of proof, that the amount of variation under nature is a strictly limited quantity. Man, though acting on external characters alone and often capriciously, can produce within a short period a great result by adding up mere individual differences in his domestic productions; and every one admits that there are at least individual differences in species under nature. But, besides such differences, all naturalists have admitted the existence of varieties, which they think sufficiently distinct to be worthy of

record in systematic works. No one can draw any clear distinction between individual differences and slight varieties; or between more plainly marked varieties and subspecies, and species. Let it be observed how naturalists differ in the rank which they assign to the many representative forms in Europe and North America.

If then we have under nature variability and a powerful agent always ready to act and select, why should we doubt that variations in any way useful to beings, under their excessively complex relations of life, would be preserved, accumulated, and inherited? Why, if man can by patience select variations most useful to himself, should nature fail in selecting variations useful, under changing conditions of life, to her living products? What limit can be put to this power, acting during long ages and rigidly scrutinizing the whole constitution, structure, and habits of each creature,—favouring the good and rejecting the bad? I can see no limit to this power, in slowly and beautifully adapting each form to the most complex relations of life. The theory of natural selection, even if we looked no further than this seems to me to be in itself probable. ...

* * *

J. P. Moreland, *Yes, God Exists*

[From *Does God Exist? The Great Debate* by J. P Moreland and Kai Nielson 1990.]

IS IT REASONABLE in today's world to believe that God exists? My answer is yes, and the thesis I wish to defend is that it is rational to believe that God exists. I do not mean that God's existence can be proved with mathematical certainty, but I do want to argue that there are good reasons for believing in God, and the believer is well within her epistemic rights in believing that God exists.

There are a number of arguments I could offer on behalf of my thesis. Take, for example, the argument for God based on the design in the universe. In spite of David Hume, this argument has received strong support in recent years from astronomy, physics, and biology. Scientists are discovering that the universe is a finely-tuned and delicately-balanced harmony of fundamental constants, or cosmic singularities. These constants are the numerical values assigned to the various facets of the universe, such as the rate of expansion of the Big Bang, the value of the weak and strong nuclear forces, and a host of other constants of nature.

For example, in the formation of the universe, the balance of matter to antimatter had to be accurate to one part in ten billion for the universe to even arise. Had it been larger or greater by one part in ten billion, no universe would have arisen. There would also have been no universe capable of sustaining life if the expansion rate of the Big Bang had been one billionth of a percent larger or smaller.

Furthermore, the chance possibilities of life arising spontaneously through mere chance has been calculated by Cambridge astronomer Fred Hoyle as being 1×10^{40} , which Hoyle likens to the probabilities of a tornado blowing through a junkyard and forming a Boeing 747. Had these values, these cosmic constants which are independent

of one another, been infinitesimally greater or smaller than what they are, no life remotely similar to ours—indeed, no life at all would have been possible. The more we discover, the more it appears, as one scientist put it, “The universe seems to have evolved with life in mind.”

The harmony of these features cannot be explained by mere chance. Says Paul Davies, theoretical physicist at Cambridge: “It is hard to resist the impression that the present structure of the universe, apparently so sensitive to minor alterations in the numbers, has been rather carefully thought out ... the seemingly miraculous concurrence of these numerical values must remain the most compelling evidence for cosmic design.”

In biology, scientists have discovered that DNA molecules do not merely contain redundant order, but they contain what they call information. They say that DNA can be transcribed into RNA, and RNA can be translated into protein. Now Carl Sagan, and this is one of the few times I agree with him, has made certain claims about the search for extraterrestrial intelligence, called SETI. According to Sagan, in that search all we need to do is find one message with information in it from outer space, and we will be able to recognize the presence of intelligence. We don’t even need to be able to translate it; it is the presence of information instead of order that will tip us off to the presence of intelligence.

Well, what is sauce for the artificial goose ought to be sauce for the DNA gander, and I argue that the information in DNA molecules is evidence of intelligence behind it.

Or consider the arguments for God from the existence of moral value and meaning in life. If God does not exist, it is hard to see how there could be any such thing as prescriptive, non-natural morality. It just doesn’t seem that the Big Bang could spit out moral values, at least not at the rate it spit out hydrogen atoms.

As one philosopher put it: “In a world without God, mankind could not be more significant than a swarm of mosquitoes or a barnyard of pigs, for the same cosmic process that coughed them both up in the first place will eventually swallow them all up again.” Even the late J. L. Mackie, perhaps the greatest atheist of our century, said, “Moral properties constitute so odd a cluster of qualities and relations that they are most unlikely to have arisen in the ordinary course of events without an all-powerful god to create them.”

A typical atheist response to all of this is to say there are no irreducible moral truths in the world or irreducible moral properties. What one must do is to “create” values or decide to adopt the moral point of view. But it doesn’t seem to me that the choice between Mother Teresa and Hitler can be likened, say, to the choice as to whether I am going to be a baseball player or a tuba player. Such a choice is not a rational one, and according to this response to the theistic argument, neither is the choice of adopting a moral point of view.

Mention could also be made of the arguments from the exciting archaeological confirmations of much of the Bible, the puzzling question of how mind or

consciousness could have arisen in a world of only matter, and even if it did, how it could be trusted to give us truth about the world; and the fact that millions of people claim to have direct experiences of a benevolent Creator

Consider the first premise: *God created the universe from nothing a finite time ago.* This belief is rational in light of the philosophical and scientific support for it.

First the philosophical argument. It is impossible to traverse or cross an actual infinite number of events by successive addition. An actual infinite, what mathematicians call *aleph null*, \aleph_0 , is a set of distinct things whose number is actually infinite. Infinity, plus or minus any number including infinity, is still infinity. This contrasts with a potential infinite which can increase forever without limit but is always finite.

By contrast, an actual infinite has no room for growth and is nonfinite; that is, one of its subsets can be put into one-to-one correspondence with the set itself. The impossibility of crossing an actual infinite has sometimes been put by saying that one cannot count to infinity no matter how long he counts. For he will always be at some specific number which could be increased by one to generate another specific number; and that is true even if one counted forever.

Now if one cannot cross an actual infinite, then the past must have been finite. If it were infinite, then to come to the present moment, one would have had to have traversed an actual infinite to get here, which is impossible. Without a first event, there could be no second, third, or any specifiable number of events including the present one. To get to the present moment by crossing an actual infinite would be like trying to jump out of a bottomless pit. Not only could one never complete the jump, one could never even get started; for to reach any point in the series, one must already have crossed an infinite number of points to get to that point, as Zeno's puzzles clearly showed.

Put differently, suppose you go back through the events of the past in your mind. You will either come to a beginning, or you will not. If you come to a beginning, then the past is finite and my argument is settled. That would be the first event. If you had never come to a beginning, then the past is actually infinite-, and as you go back in your mind, you never in principle could exhaust the events of the past. It would be impossible to traverse the past going backward in your mind.

Since time doesn't go backward but forward, and the number of events traversed is not a function of the direction of movement, this amounts to saying that the present could never be realized. But since it has been realized-after all, here we are-there must have been a first event, and this event must have been spontaneously generated by a situation that was immutable, unchanging, timeless, and free.

Now most of the experiences we have in life where an event is spontaneously generated without sufficient conditions prior to it occur by means of *agent causation*, or what we would call agent causes. That is, you and I act every day; we raise our arms;

we do things. It seems reasonable, based upon agent causation, therefore, to say that the first event was spontaneously caused to be by a personal agent of some kind. The major alternative is that the first event popped into existence out of nothing without a cause, and that doesn't seem reasonable to me.

That there was a beginning to the universe is confirmed by two areas of science as well as philosophy. The first is the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which states that in a closed system the amount of energy available to do work is always decreasing. It can also be put by saying that the amount of disorganization, or randomness, increases toward a maximum. Applied to the universe as a whole, the Second Law states that every day the universe becomes more and more disorganized. In other words, it is burning up. It will eventually die a cold death. The main implication of this is, as one physicist put it, "the universe cannot have existed forever. Otherwise it would have already reached its equilibrium end state an infinite time ago. Conclusion: The universe did not always exist." Scientist Richard Slagel says, "In some way the universe must have been wound up."

The Big Bang provides another argument. In 1929 Edwin Hubble discovered a phenomenon known as the red shift, which implies that space is expanding outward and that all bodies in space are growing apart.

These and other observations have led to the Big Bang theory, which has two key features. First, around 15 billion years ago, according to the theory, everything—space, time, energy was all compacted into a mathematical point with no dimensions, and this exploded to form the present universe. In the words of Cambridge astronomer Fred Hoyle, "The universe was shrunk down to nothing." So the Big Bang implies the universe sprang into existence from a state of affairs that has been described by some as nothingness.

Second, because of the density of the universe, there was only one initial creation, and there will be no contraction or further explosion in the future. There was only one initial creation, or first event. What is the atheist to do here? Oxford's Anthony Kenny has the answer. He says, "A proponent of the Big Bang theory, at least if he is an atheist, must believe that the matter of the universe came from nothing and by nothing."

I would like to conclude by noting an observation by Robert Jastrow, director of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies. Jastrow says, "For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance—he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries."

Philosophically and scientifically, the belief that God created the universe a finite time ago is eminently reasonable

In summary, I have argued there are good reasons to believe that a personal God created the world a finite time ago. In addition to the arguments I cited at the

beginning, I appealed to the philosophical argument against the possibility of traversing an actual infinite and the scientific arguments employing the Second Law of Thermodynamics and the uniqueness of the Big Bang, which make this proposition reasonable.

For these and other reasons one is well within his or her epistemic rights in believing that the Christian God exists.

* * *

Kai Nielson, *No, There Is No God*

I AM GOING TO ARGUE quite to the contrary to what Professor Moreland has been saying, and this is what will seem offensive to many of you, but I certainly don't intend it to be offensive. I am going to argue that for somebody living in the twentieth century with a good philosophical *and* a good scientific education, who thinks carefully about the matter, that for such a person it is irrational to believe in God.

Now I don't mean by that that I think I'm more rational than Professor Moreland or the rest of you. Rational people in my view can have irrational beliefs. I'm sure I have some. If I can spot them or they are pointed out to me, I'll reject them. I also mean this in a doubly hypothetical way. By that I mean that if my arguments are right—that is the first hypothetical—and if people do have a good scientific and philosophical education—you can have one without the other—that then they should come to see that it is irrational to believe in God. What I will do is provide an argument for that in just a moment.

All right. Is the Christian view of our world the true one? The Christian, of course, sees the world in the same way as others, but sees more besides. Part of this "more besides," but not all of it, of course, is that God exists. Does He?

That question, I first want to contend, is not as straightforward as it may seem. The standard view—I mean the standard view at present, among at least philosophers and a large number of theologians, though it is not a view that either Professor Moreland or I myself accept, but it is a very standard view—is that you can't prove that God does exist and you can't prove that He doesn't exist. Indeed, some will say you can't even successfully argue that it is more probable that He does exist or more probable that God doesn't exist. In debates concerning religion neither side has been able to win the day here.

This being so, the argument goes—this is, let me repeat, the standard view—the believer is not being unreasonable in continuing to believe, and the atheist is not being unreasonable in not believing in God. Reason, a thoughtful attention to our experience or the reflective use of our intelligence, will not settle matters here. Whether we believe or not, so the standard view has had it, is a straight matter of faith. There is no showing

that belief or unbelief is the more reasonable, though it can be shown that both atheism and theism are reasonable views. What you can't do is show that one is more reasonable than the other. That is, by now, a very standard view. Philosophical theologians like John Hick or Terence Penelhum believe this—and indeed have given distinguished articulations of such views.

Now the first thing I want to note is that this is a far cry from the grand tradition of natural theology. In the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus and William of Occam thought they could prove that God exists and that it is irrational to be an atheist or an agnostic. Now, that's a great distance from the standard view. The standard view is a rather modern invention. A Moslem philosopher that I know regards it as a kind of a revisionism of Christianity, or, for that matter, of Islam where it is so influenced. And I take it that Professor Moreland, though he waffled a bit about this, doesn't have that standard view. He thinks that it is more probable that God exists than He does not, and in that sense you can give some kind of a proof of the existence of God. That is brave of him indeed because there are very very few Christians, at least Christians who are philosophers, people of Thomist persuasions apart, who think you can do that. In my discussion later, I will come to some of his arguments for this.

I reject the standard view as well. I think, as I said to you initially, that belief in God is irrational. That is, it is irrational for someone who has a good scientific and philosophic education. And I point out to you that I don't mean to say by this that I think that I'm more rational than Professor Hick or some religious person, because I remind you that rational people can have irrational beliefs. And what I'm maintaining is that belief in God for people in the twentieth century, not people at all times and at all places, with a good scientific and philosophic education, is irrational.

Now why do I say that? Why, in my view, is belief in God irrational? Take a belief in a Zeus-like, *anthropomorphic* God. Such a belief is just plainly false and superstitious. Such a being is an odd kind of being, and there is no evidence for His reality. Moreover, anything that could be observed, as an anthropomorphic God could or in any way directly be detected, would not be the God of Christianity or at least of advanced Judeo-Christianity. As I think it was Kierkegaard who quipped, "God is not a great green parrot you can possibly see." But the anthropomorphic God, and anthropomorphic conception of God, is not incoherent; it's just superstitious to believe in such a god. But at least since the Middle Ages, and even earlier than that, religious people have long since, at least when they are reflecting about the nature of God, ceased believing in an anthropomorphic Zeus-like God, while continuing to believe in the God of developed Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. And it is this belief, a much far more ethereal conception of God, that I maintain is incoherent.

There are a number of arguments for that. But I am going to stick with just one, developing it in some detail. This is a dangerous strategy because it puts all your eggs in one basket, but it will allow me to develop one argument I take to be of vital importance. I'm going to use the opposite argumentative strategy from Professor

Moreland. Professor Moreland gave you a battery of arguments. I'm going to give you one sustained argument principally. And if I have enough time, I'll give you some supplementary ones which will argue to the same conclusion.

Consider the problem about the reference of the word "God" or any alternative word in some other language with the same meaning. What does the word "God" refer to for Christians or for Jews?

Consider the sentence, God made the heavens and the earth," as distinct from "Louis made pasta and cake." Consider those two sentences. What is "God" in this first sentence supposed to stand for, and how is the referent of that term to be identified? Compare this with "Louis." I can say "Somebody asked, 'Who's Louis?'" and I'll say, "That chap over there." That's what philosophers would call an *ostensive definition*, an extralinguistic definition. I point out the reference of the term "Louis" by pointing to its referent. There is another way to give meaning to the term. I could say "Well, the professor, one of the professors of philosophy at the University of Mississippi," or "the professor of philosophy at the University of Mississippi who studied Kierkegaard in Denmark," or "the man sitting on the platform with the dark glasses on." I could give you a number of intra-linguistic definitions, what philosophers call "definite descriptions," which identify who Louis is. So when I say, "Louis made pasta and cake," you can understand what would make that sentence true or false.

Now go back to the religious sentence, "God made the heavens and the earth." How do we know, as we said when we rejected the anthropomorphic conception, that anything that could be pointed to or literally seen or literally observed or literally experienced or literally noted wouldn't be God? It would be some kind of temporal something that you could detect; something limited. So God, unlike Louis [Pojman, the moderator of this debate], can't be identified ostensively, extra-linguistically.

Well, let us try to identify, try to establish what this God is that we speak of and concerning whom we try to use premises to prove His existence. Let us try to identify God by means of definite descriptions, that is, intra-linguistically. Suppose we say, "God is the maker of the heavens and the earth," or "The being transcendent to the world on whom all things depend and who depends on nothing himself," or "the being of infinite love to whom all things are owed," or "the infinite sustainer of the universe," or "the heavenly father of us all."

Now the difficulty with those definite descriptions, unlike the ones I used to identify Louis, is that with them, if you have trouble about knowing what was referred to by the word "God," you are going to be equally puzzled about "A being transcendent to the world." How would you identify that? Or "the being of infinite love to whom all things are owed"? How do you know what it would be like to meet such a being? What is it that you're talking about in talking about a being of infinite love? Or "The maker of the heavens and the earth," rather than "The maker of the pasta and the cake"? How would you know what that refers to?

What I'm trying to say is (and I don't say these expressions are meaningless; or that they are linguistic irregularities) that they are what philosophers would call problematic conceptions. Indeed, they are so problematic and so obscure that it turns out that we don't know what we are talking about when we use them. We have a kind of familiar pictorial sense that we know what we are talking about, but when we think very carefully about what these expressions mean, they are so problematic that we can't use them to make true or false claims.

Suppose someone says, "Look, Nielsen, you should know better than that. God, in Judeo-Christianity and Islamic religions, is the Ultimate Mystery." And that is almost definitional. A non-mysterious god might be the god of some form of deism, but it wouldn't be the God of Christianity. But, if we say definitionally, "God is the Ultimate Mystery," if we are puzzled about the referent of "God," we are going to be terribly puzzled about what is "the Ultimate Mystery."

What are we talking about there? We need to have some account of who or what we are talking about in speaking of God. Some minimal understanding is necessary even for faith to be possible. If you have no understanding of those terms at all, then you can't take them on faith or take them on trust, because you don't know *what* to take on faith or you don't know *what* to take on trust or would you use such terms in a premise. For something to be a promise in an argument, its terms must not be so problematic that we do not understand them. No matter how tight Moreland's arguments might be, he can't use them in premises if we don't know what they mean. But—or so I shall argue—we don't know what they mean.

Suppose we say, "Look, Nielsen, if you're so bloody empiricist, what you are going to do is rule out molecular biology too." We often explain biological phenomena in physical chemical terms. But the relevant chemical processes are unobservable. There is an important distinction to be made here. They are only contingently unobservable; there is no logical ban on the possibility of their being observed, even if we don't know what it would be like presently to observe them. And the same thing is true about physics. There is no logical ban; they are just contingently unobservable.

In the case of God, however, anything that could be observed would not be the God of Christianity. It would be the anthropomorphic Zeus-like god that it would be superstitious to believe in. One of the responses to this is to say, "Well, God isn't directly observable, but He is indirectly observable. You observe Him through His works and so forth and so on, through the design in the world and the like." This, I shall add in passing, is very different than the design *of* the world, if indeed there is design. You observe God, it is said, indirectly in His works. But it makes no sense whatsoever to say something is indirectly observable, if it is not at least in theory or in principle directly observable as well. Suppose I say to you, "There's a glass of water under this podium," or, better still, suppose I say, "There's a still over there." And you say, "How do you know there's a still?" "Well, can't you see the smoke coming up?" I respond. That is, many believe, pretty good indirect evidence for there being a still. Yet,

even if it is not in reality terribly good evidence, still it is reasonable indirect evidence to there being a still there. But it is only indirect evidence at all, good or bad, because you know what it would be like to observe the bloody still, and to say, "Ah, yeah, that's what's making the smoke." That is plain enough, isn't it?

But there is no directly observing of God or directly noting His existence or personally encountering God. You can't encounter a transcendent being. (Think here literally of what you are saying.) And if so, then there is a logical ban on the very *possibility* of direct acquaintance with God. Being then parallel with the other cases, there can't be any indirect observation either. It just makes no sense to say you can indirectly observe something you have no idea of what it could even mean to directly observe.

Suppose one says, by way of counter argument, "But look, mathematics' objects are unobservable. We need numbers to do mathematics, and we need mathematics to do science." That is, of course, perfectly true. We do need numbers to do mathematics, and we do need mathematics to do science. Still we need not reify numbers into queer Platonic objects. There is one group of mathematicians that does this, but a lot of them don't. There is no need to make such a reification.

But suppose, all the same, we do reify numbers; that is, objectify them as to some sort of queer objects. Let us, for the sake of the argument, allow this to be legitimate—something I wouldn't in fact allow for the moment. Let us, that is, read numbers Platonically, and talk of numbers being eternal, of their being mathematical objects. If we do so, we cannot now, it will be claimed, say that the concept of God is incoherent. Remember, my principal basis for saying that it is irrational to believe in God is that I believe the concept of God in developed Judeo-Christianity is incoherent. I would also have to say then that to believe that there are numbers is incoherent, and that is absurd.

We can, we are now allowing, think of eternal realities, namely numbers. But God is also said to be an infinite *individual*, an infinite *person* transcendent to the universe. Acknowledging that there are eternal realities, such as numbers, gives us no purchase on this. We have no understanding of what we are talking about when we speak of an infinite person or an infinite individual transcendent to the world. Numbers, after all, are types, and not tokens, not individuals.

Let me explain what I mean by that bit of philosophical jargon. Suppose there were a blackboard here, and I wrote down the number 2 three times. How many numbers are there on the blackboard? Well, normally you would say, "There's one number; that is, one type and three tokens, three physical representations of the word 2." So that is the difference between the words *types* and *tokens*.

Numbers are, after all, types and not tokens, and they can be eternal objects, if you want to talk in that Platonic way. But we have no understanding of what it is for an individual, a token as distinct from a type, to be eternal, such that it could not *not* exist in any possible world. But God is supposed to be a person—an individual.

We compound the trouble when we speak of infinite individuals. And remember, God has to be an individual, not a type. God is not a “kind” term. “God” does not refer to a kind of reality but supposedly to an utterly unique, infinite individual. My argument is that it doesn’t make sense when you think it through. God is an infinite individual who created and sustained the world. And so even if numbers are eternal realities, and so we can give sense to eternal realities, we still haven’t given sense to an individual, a token, being an eternal reality, to say nothing of giving sense to there being an infinite individual.

The definite description, “The infinite individual who made the world,” is as puzzling as is God. Suppose it is said, “God’s reality *is sui generis*. God just has a distinct reality which is different from any other kind of reality. It is not like mathematical reality; it is not like physical reality and so forth.” But such talk of being *sui generis* is, I believe, evasive. Suppose I ask you to believe in poy, an utterly nonsensical term, a made-up word of mine. But I can’t tell you what poy is. You can’t in that circumstance, no matter how much you want to, believe in poy or have faith in poy. To do that, you would have to have some understanding of what poy is. Now what I’m trying to argue is when you really think through to what God is supposed to be, you will see that you have no more understanding of God, except as a familiarity in the language, than you have an understanding of poy. There’s no way of conceptually identifying God that isn’t equally problematic....

Suppose someone says ... “God by definition is eternal.” That’s fair enough, but it may have been eternally the case that there are no eternal individuals or persons. In saying that God is eternal, we are not saving that there are any eternal individuals or persons. We are only saying that *if* there is a God, He exists eternally. But of course, there might not be; there might never have been any eternal individuals or persons. Eternally, it might have been the case that there are no eternal individuals.

You need an argument to show that there must be an eternal individual or person. Professor Moreland tried to give one. To do that we must show that the very idea of there not being such a reality is self-contradictory. That seems at least to be either patently false or itself incoherent. To put it minimally, the notion of a logically necessary individual or person is itself at best problematical.

This being so, we cannot give coherent sense to the concept of God by that alleged definite description. It has been said, “Well, why couldn’t I offer any of the following: ‘God is a being which cannot not exist.’ ‘God is the being which exists in every possible world’?” But these are just alternative ways of speaking of a logically necessary individual or person, and it is this very notion that is so thoroughly problematic as to appear to be at least incoherent.

Let us go back, and I’m now about to finish, to our question at the beginning: Does God exist? If I am right in claiming that the concept of God in developed Judeo-Christian discourses is incoherent, then there can be no question of proving God’s

existence or establishing that He exists. Proof requires premises and conclusions. But if the concept of God is incoherent, it cannot be used in a premise purporting to prove that God exists. Moreover, it as well, and for the same reasons, cannot be used in a conclusion purporting to have been established by premises not employing the concept of God or other religious concepts. If the concept of God in developed Judeo-Christianity is incoherent, as I have argued it is, then arguments of the ontological type, cosmological type, or design type cannot possibly get off the ground. This being so, there is no need to consider their details. But these are the standard arguments for the existence of God. Moreover, if the very idea of there being a God of the requisite type for Judeo-Christianity is incoherent, no other argument can fare any better.

To worry this out a little bit, let me argue by analogy. Suppose I say, "All married bachelors are irascible. Jones is a married bachelor. Jones is irascible." Now that's a valid form, but it couldn't be a sound argument. Sound arguments are valid arguments with true premises, but if a premise is incoherent, then there can be no question of its being true. There is no need, if my argument is sound, even to look at the proof. Nothing could prove there is a round square or a married bachelor or that procrastination drinks melancholy. The very idea of such a thing is incoherent.

Before we go to the proofs or the evidence for God's existence, the believer must show that we know what we are talking about when we speak of God. And in closing, just one more thing. We, in some not very clear way, know our way around when we speak of God anthropomorphically, as we of course learned to use God-talk as children. That gives us the *illusion* that we understand what we are talking about when we speak of God. We are told that God is our *heavenly* Father, not a father like our real father, but our *heavenly* Father. And what's that? And eventually we move from anthropomorphic conceptions of God, which we do in some way understand, to nonanthropomorphic ones. When we engage in our devotions (if we do such things), the anthropomorphic ones reassert themselves and we feel comfortable that we understand what we are praying to, worshiping, and the like. But when we reflect, we realize that neither our religious nor our intellectual impulses will sustain the anthropomorphic conceptions. That way makes religion into superstition. So we are driven, when we reflect, to ever less anthropomorphic ones, but in doing so we pass over, unwittingly, in the very effort to gain a religiously adequate conception of God, to an incoherent conception. We do so de-anthropomorphize that we no longer understand what we are saying. Yet an anthropomorphic conception of God of any sort gives us a materially tainted God which is subject to evident empirical disconfirmation in the more obvious anthropomorphic forms, made so pantheistic that religion is naturalized, made into what in reality is a secular belief-system disguised in colorful language.

* * *

John Hick, Solving the Problem of Evil

[From *Philosophy of Religion*, 3rd ed., (Prentice-Hall, 1963), pp. 40-46.]

TO MANY, THE MOST powerful positive objection to belief in God is the fact of evil. Probably for most agnostics it is the appalling depth and extent of human suffering, more than anything else, that makes the idea of a loving Creator seem too implausible and disposes them toward one or another of the various naturalistic theories of religion.

As a challenge to theism, the problem of evil has traditionally been posed in the form of a dilemma: if God is perfectly loving, he must wish to abolish evil; and if he is all-powerful, he must be able to abolish evil. But evil exists; therefore God cannot be both omnipotent and perfectly loving.

Certain solutions, which at once suggest themselves, have to be ruled out so far as the Judaic-Christian faith is concerned.

To say, for example (with contemporary Christian Science), that evil is an illusion of the human mind, is impossible within a religion based upon the stark realism of the Bible. Its pages faithfully reflect the characteristic mixture of good and evil in human experience. They record every kind of sorrow and suffering, every mode of man's inhumanity to man and of his painfully insecure existence in the world. There is no attempt to regard evil as anything but dark, menacingly ugly, heartrending, and crushing. In the Christian scriptures, the climax of this history of evil is the crucifixion of Jesus, which is presented not only as a case of utterly unjust suffering, but as the violent and murderous rejection of God's Messiah. There can be no doubt, then, that for biblical faith, evil is unambiguously evil, and stands in direct opposition to God's will.

Again, to solve the problem of evil by means of the theory (sponsored for example, by the Boston "Personalist" School) of a finite deity who does the best he can with a material, intractable and coeternal with himself, is to have abandoned the basic premise of Hebrew-Christian monotheism; for the theory amounts to rejecting belief in the infinity and sovereignty of God.

Indeed, any theory which would avoid the problem of the origin of evil by depicting it as an ultimate constituent of the universe, coordinate with good, has been repudiated in advance by the classic Christian teaching, first developed by Augustine, that evil represents the going wrong of something which in itself is good. Augustine holds firmly to the Hebrew-Christian conviction that the universe is *good*—that is to say, it is the creation of a good God for a good purpose. He completely rejects the ancient prejudice, widespread in his day, that matter is evil. There are, according to Augustine, higher and lower, greater and lesser goods in immense abundance and variety; but everything which has being is good in its own way and degree, except in so far as it may have become spoiled or corrupted. Evil—whether it be an evil will, an instance of pain, or some disorder or decay in nature—has not been set there by God, but represents the distortion of something that is inherently valuable. Whatever exists is, as such, and in its proper place, good: evil is essentially parasitic upon good, being disorder and perversion in a fundamentally good creation. This understanding of evil

as something negative means that it is not willed and created by God; but it does not mean (as some have supposed) that evil is unreal and can be disregarded. On the contrary, the first effect of this doctrine is to accentuate even more the question of the origin of evil.

Theodicy,¹ as many modern Christian thinkers see it, is a modest enterprise, negative rather than positive in its conclusions. It does not claim to explain, nor to explain away, every instance of evil in human experience, but only to point to certain considerations which prevent the fact of evil (largely incomprehensible though it remains) from constituting a final and insuperable bar to rational belief in God.

In indicating these considerations it will be useful to follow the traditional division of the subject. There is the problem of *moral evil* or wickedness: why does an all-good and all-powerful God permit this? And there is the problem of the *non-moral evil* of suffering and pain, both physical and mental: why has an all-good and all-powerful God created a world in which this occurs?

Christian thought has always considered moral evil in its relation to human freedom and responsibility. To be a person is to be a finite center of freedom, a (relatively) free and self-directing agent responsible for one's own decisions. This involves being free to act wrongly as well as to act rightly. The idea of a person who can be infallibly guaranteed always to act rightly is self-contradictory. There can be no guarantee in advance that a genuinely free moral agent will never choose amiss. Consequently the possibility of wrongdoing or sin is logically inseparable from the creation of finite persons, and to say that God should not have created beings who might sin amounts to saying he should not have created people.

This thesis has been challenged in some recent philosophical discussions of the problem of evil, in which it is claimed that no contradiction is involved in saying that God might have made people who would be genuinely free and who could yet be guaranteed always to act rightly. A quote from one of these discussions follows:

If there is no logical impossibility in a man's freely choosing the good on one, or on several occasions, there cannot be a logical impossibility in his freely choosing the good on every occasion. God was not, then, faced with a choice between making innocent automata and making beings who, in acting freely, would sometimes go wrong; there was open to him the obviously better possibility of making beings who would act freely but always go right. Clearly, his failure to avail himself of this possibility is inconsistent with his being both omnipotent and wholly good.²

A reply to this argument is suggested in another recent contribution to the discussion.³ If by a free action we mean an action which is not externally compelled but which flows from the nature of the agent as he reacts to the circumstances in which he finds himself, there is, indeed, no contradiction between our being free and our actions being "caused" (by our own nature) and therefore being in principle predictable. There is a contradiction, however, in saying that God is the cause of our acting as we do but that we are free beings in relation to God. There is, in other words, a contradiction in

saying that God has made us so that we shall of necessity act in a certain way, and that we are genuinely independent persons in relation to him. If all our thoughts and actions are divinely predestined, however free and morally responsible we may seem to be to ourselves, we cannot be free and morally responsible in the sight of God, but must instead be his helpless puppets. Such "freedom" is like that of a patient acting out a series of post-hypnotic suggestions: he appears, even to himself, to be free, but his volitions have actually been pre-determined by another will, that of the hypnotist, in relation to whom the patient is not a free agent.

A different objector might raise the question of whether or not we deny God's omnipotence if we admit that he is unable to create persons who are free from the risks inherent 'in personal freedom. The answer that has always been given is that to create such beings is logically impossible. It is no limitation upon God's power that he cannot accomplish the logically impossible, since there is nothing here to accomplish, but only a meaningless conjunction of words-in this case "person who is not a person." God is able to create beings of any and every conceivable kind; but creatures who lack moral freedom, however superior they might be to human beings in other respects, would not be what we mean by persons. They would constitute a different form of life which God might have brought into existence instead of persons. When we ask why God did not create such beings in place of persons, the traditional answer is that only persons could, in any meaningful sense, become "children of God," capable of entering into a personal relationship with their Creator by a free and uncomelled response to his love.

When we turn from the possibility of moral evil as a correlate of man's personal freedom to its actuality, we face something which must remain 'inexplicable even when it can be seen to be possible. For we can never provide a complete causal explanation of a free act; if we could, it would not be a free act. The origin of moral evil lies forever concealed within the mystery of human freedom.

The necessary connection between moral freedom and the possibility, now actualized, of sin throws light upon a great deal of the suffering which afflicts mankind. For an enormous amount of human pain arises either from the inhumanity or the culpable incompetence of mankind. This includes such major scourges as poverty, oppression and persecution, war, and all the injustice, indignity, and inequity which occur even in the most advanced societies. These evils are manifestations of human sin. Even disease is fostered to an extent, the limits of which have not yet been determined by psychosomatic medicine, by moral and emotional factors seated both in the individual and in his social environment. To the extent that all of these evils stem from human failures and wrong decisions, their possibility is inherent in the creation of free persons inhabiting a world which presents them with real choices which are followed by real consequences.

We may now turn more directly to the problem of suffering. Even though the major bulk of actual human pain is traceable to man's misused freedom as a sole or part cause, there remain other sources of pain which are entirely independent of the human

will, for example, earthquake, hurricane, storm, flood, drought, and blight. In practice it is often impossible to trace a boundary between the suffering which results from human wickedness and folly and that which falls upon mankind from without. Both kinds of suffering are inextricably mingled together in human experience. For our present purpose, however, it is important to note that the latter category does exist and that it seems to be built into the very structure of our world. In response to it, theodicy, if it is wisely conducted, follows a negative path. It is not possible to show positively that each item of human pain serves the divine purpose of good; but, on the other hand, it does seem possible to show that the divine purpose as it is understood in Judaism and Christianity could not be forwarded in a world which was designed as a permanent hedonistic paradise.

An essential premise of this argument concerns the divine purpose in creating the world. The skeptic's assumption is that man is to be viewed as a completed creation and that God's purpose in making the world was to provide a suitable dwelling-place for this fully-formed creature. Since God is good and loving, the environment which he has created for human life habit is naturally as pleasant and comfortable as possible. The problem is essentially similar to that of a man who builds a cage for some pet animal. Since our world, in fact, contains sources of hardship, inconvenience, and danger of innumerable kinds, the conclusion follows that this world cannot have been created by a perfectly benevolent and all-powerful deity.

Christianity, however, has never supposed that God's purpose in the creation of the world was to construct a paradise whose inhabitants would experience a maximum of pleasure and a minimum of pain. The world is seen, instead, as a place of "soul-making" in which free beings, grappling with the tasks and challenges of their existence in a common environment, may become "children of God" and "heirs of eternal life." A way of thinking theologically of God's continuing creative purpose for man was suggested by some of the early Hellenistic Fathers of the Christian Church, especially Irenaeus. Following hints from St. Paul, Irenaeus taught that man has been made as a person in the image of God but has not yet been brought as a free and responsible agent into the finite likeness of God, which is revealed in Christ. Our world, with all its rough edges, is the sphere in which this second and harder stage of the creative process is taking place.

This conception of the world (whether or not set in Irenaeus' theological framework) can be supported by the method of negative theodicy. Suppose, contrary to fact, that this world were a paradise from which all possibility of pain and suffering were excluded. The consequences would be very far-reaching. For example, no one could ever injure anyone else; the murderer's knife would turn to paper or his bullets to thin air; the bank safe, robbed of a million dollars, would miraculously become filled with another million dollars (without this device, on however large a scale, proving inflationary); fraud, deceit, conspiracy and treason would somehow always leave the fabric of society undamaged. Again, no one would ever be injured by accident: the

mountain-climber, steeplejack, or playing child failing from a height would float unharmed to the ground; the reckless driver would never meet with disaster. There would be no need to work, since no harm could result from avoiding work; there would be no call to be concerned for others in time of need or danger, for in such a world there could be no real needs or dangers.

To make possible this continual series of individual adjustments, nature would have to work by "special providences" instead of running according to general laws which men must learn to respect on penalty of pain or death. The laws of nature would have to be extremely flexible: sometimes gravity would operate, sometimes not; sometimes an object would be hard and solid, sometimes soft. There could be no sciences, for there would be no enduring world structure to investigate. In eliminating the problems and hardships of an objective environment, with its own laws, life would become like a dream in which, delightfully but aimlessly, we would float and drift at ease.

One can at least begin to imagine such a world. It is evident that our present ethical concepts would have no meaning in it. If, for example, the notion of harming someone is an essential element in the concept of a wrong action, in our hedonistic paradise there could be no wrong actions—nor any right actions in distinction from wrong. Courage and fortitude would have no point in an environment in which there is, by definition, no danger of difficulty. Generosity, kindness, the *agape* aspect of love, prudence, unselfishness, and all other ethical notions which presuppose life in a stable environment, could not even be formed. Consequently, such a world, however well it might promote pleasure, would not be very well adapted for the development of the moral qualities of human personality. In relation to this purpose it would be the worst of all possible worlds.

It would seem, then, that an environment intended to make possible the growth in free beings of the finest characteristics of personal life, must have a good deal 'in common with our present world. It must operate according to general and dependable laws; and it must involve real dangers, difficulties, problems, obstacles, and possibilities of pain, failure, sorrow, frustration, and defeat. If it did not contain the particular trials and perils which—subtracting man's own very considerable contribution—our world contains, it would have to contain others instead.

To realize this is not, by any means, to be in possession of a detailed theodicy. It is to understand that this world, with all its "heartaches and the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to," an environment so manifestly not designed for the maximization of human pleasure and the minimization of human pain, may be rather well adapted to the quite different purpose of "soulmaking."

NOTES

1. The word "theodicy," from the Greek *theos* (God) and *dike* (righteous), means the justification of God's goodness in the face of the fact of evil.

2. J. L. Mackie, "Evil and Omnipotence." *Mind* (April 1955), 209.

3. Flew, in *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*.

* * *

Quotations on Faith

"For whose sake is it that the proof [of the truth of the Scriptures] is sought? Faith does not need it; aye, it must even regard the proof as its enemy." (Søren Kierkegaard, in Kaufmann, *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*, p. 114)

"I would far rather feel remorse than know how to define it." (Thomas A Kempis, *Of the Imitation of Christ*, I.i.3)

"It would be a gain to the country if it were vastly more superstitious, more bigoted, more gloomy, more fierce in its religion than at present it shows itself to be." (Cardinal Newman, *History of My Religious Opinions from 1833 to 1839*)

"I remember an acquaintance saying to me that 'the Oriel Common Room stank of Logic.'" (Cardinal Newman, *Hist. of My Religious Opinions from 1841 to 1845*)

"Ten thousand difficulties do not make one doubt." (Cardinal Newman, *Position of My Mind Since 1845*)

"It is absurd to argue men, as to torture them, into believing." (Cardinal Newman, Sermon at Oxford, Dec. 11, 1831)

"Faith, *n.* Belief without evidence in what is told by one who speaks without knowledge, of things without parallel." (A. Bierce)

"Before the faith
No voice of Nature has validity."

(The Grand Inquisitor, in F. Schiller, *Don Carlos*, line 5275)

"If we submit everything to reason, our religion will have no mysterious and supernatural element. If we offend the principles of reason, our religion will be absurd and ridiculous ..." (Pascal, *Pensées*, 273)

"But at least learn of your inability to believe, since reason brings you to this, and yet you cannot believe. Endeavour then to convince yourself, not by increase of proofs of God, but by the abatement of your passions. You would like to attain faith, and do not know the way; you would like to cure yourself of unbelief, and ask the remedy for it. Learn of those who have been found like you, and who now stake all their possessions. These are people who know the way which you would follow, and who are cured of an ill of which you would be cured. Follow the way by which they began; by acting as if

they believed, taking the holy water, having masses said, etc. Even this will naturally make you believe, and deaden your acuteness." (Pascal, *Pensées*, 233)

"Credibile est, quia ineptum est." (Tertullian, *De carne Christi* 5.4)

"Reason is the greatest enemy that faith has; it struggles against the divine word, treating with contempt all that emanates from God. The Virgin birth was unreasonable; so was the Resurrection; so were the Gospels, the sacraments, the pontifical prerogatives, and the problem of life everlasting." (Martin Luther, quoted in William Manchester, *A World Lit Only By Fire*, p. 112)

"It is a quality of faith that it wrings the neck of reason. ... But how? It holds to God's Word: lets it be right and true, no matter how foolish and impossible it sounds. So did Abraham take his reason captive and slay it, in as much as he believed God's word, wherein was promised him from his unfruitful and as it were dead wife, Sarah, God would give him seed. ... There is no doubt faith and reason mightily fell out in Abraham's heart about this matter, yet at last did faith get the better, and overcame and strangled reason, that all-cruellest and most fatal enemy of God. So, too, do all other faithful men who enter with Abraham the gloom and hidden darkness of faith: they strangle reason ... and thereby offer to God the all-acceptablest sacrifice and service that can ever be brought to him." (Martin Luther, q in Jones, Vol. III, p. 64)

"So far as I can remember, there is not one word in the Gospels in praise of intelligence." (Bertrand Russell)

"If anyone had written to me that the truth was outside of Christ, I would rather remain with Christ than with the truth." (Dostoevsky, letter to a woman benefactor)

God said to Abraham, "Kill me a son"
 Abe says, "Man, you must be puttin' me on"
 God say, "No." Abe say, "What?"
 God say, "You can do what you want Abe, but
 The next time you see me comin' you better run"
 Abe says, "Where do you want this killin' done?"
 God says, "Out on Highway 61."

(Bob Dylan, "Highway 61 Revisited" [1965])

* * *

Søren Kierkegaard, *A Panegyric Upon Abraham*

[From *Fear and Trembling*, 1843]

If there were no eternal consciousness in a man, if at the foundation of all there lay only a wildly seething power which writhing with obscure passions produced everything that is great and everything that is insignificant, if a bottomless void never satiated lay hidden beneath all—what then would life be but despair? If such were the case, if there were no sacred bond which united mankind, if one generation arose after another like the leafage in the forest, if the one generation replaced the other like the song of birds in the forest, if the human race passed through the world as the ship goes through the sea, like the wind through the desert, a thoughtless and fruitless activity, if an eternal oblivion were always lurking hungrily for its prey and there was no power strong enough to wrest it from its maw—how empty then and comfortless life would be! But therefore it is not thus, but as God created man and woman, so too He fashioned the hero and the poet or orator. The poet cannot do what that other does, he can only admire, love and rejoice in the hero. Yet he too is happy, and not less so, for the hero is as it were his better nature, with which he is in love, rejoicing in the fact that this after all is not himself, that his love can be admiration. He is the genius of recollection, can do nothing except call to mind what has been done, do nothing but admire what has been done; he contributes nothing of his own, but is jealous of the intrusted treasure. He follows the option of his heart, but when he has found what he sought, he wanders before every man's door with his song and with his oration, that all may admire the hero as he does, be proud of the hero as he is. This is his achievement, his humble work, this is his faithful service in the house of the hero. If he thus remains true to his love, he strives day and night against the cunning of oblivion which would trick him out of his hero, then he has completed his work, then he is gathered to the hero, who has loved him just as faithfully, for the poet is as it were the hero's better nature, powerless it may be as a memory is, but also transfigured as a memory is. Hence no one shall be forgotten who was great, and though time tarries long, though a cloud of misunderstanding takes the hero away, his lover comes nevertheless, and the longer the time that has passed, the more faithfully will he cling to him.

No, not one shall be forgotten who was great in the world. But each was great in his own way, and each in proportion to the greatness of that which he *loved*. For he who loved himself became great by himself, and he who loved other men became great by his selfless devotion, but he who loved God became greater than all. Everyone shall be remembered, but each became great in proportion to his *expectation*. One became great by expecting the possible, another by expecting the eternal, but he who expected the impossible became greater than all. Everyone shall be remembered, but each was great in proportion to the greatness of that with which he *strode*. For he who strode with the world became great by overcoming the world, and he who strode with himself became great by overcoming himself, but he who strode with God became greater than all. So

there was strife in the world, man against man, one against a thousand, but he who strove with God was greater than all. So there was strife upon earth: there was one who overcame all by his power, and there was one who overcame God by his impotence. There was one who relied upon himself and gained all, there was one who secure in his strength sacrificed all, but he who believed God was greater than all. There was one who was great by reason of his power, and one who was great by reason of his wisdom, and one who was great by reason of his hope, and one who was great by reason of his love; but Abraham was greater than all, great by reason of his power whose strength is impotence, great by reason of his wisdom whose secret is foolishness, great by reason of his hope whose form is madness, great by reason of the love which is hatred of oneself.

By faith Abraham went out from the land of his fathers and became a sojourner in the land of promise. He left one thing behind, took one thing with him: he left his earthly understanding behind and took faith with him—otherwise he would not have wandered forth but would have thought this unreasonable. By faith he was a stranger in the land of promise, and there was nothing to recall what was dear to him, but by its novelty everything tempted his soul to melancholy yearning—and yet he was God's elect, in whom the Lord was well pleased! Yea, if he had been disowned, cast off from God's grace, he could have comprehended it better; but now it was like a mockery of him and of his faith. There was in the world one too who lived in banishment from the fatherland he loved. He is not forgotten, nor his Lamentation when he sorrowfully sought and found what he had lost. There is no song of Lamentations by Abraham. It is human to lament, human to weep with them that weep, but it is greater to believe, more blessed to contemplate the believer.

By faith Abraham received the promise that in his seed all races of the world would be blessed. Time passed, the possibility was there, Abraham believed; time passed, it became unreasonable, Abraham believed. There was in the world one who had an expectation, time passed, the evening drew nigh, he was not paltry enough to have forgotten his expectation, therefore he too shall not be forgotten. Then he sorrowed, and sorrow did not deceive him as life had done, it did for him all it could, in the sweetness of sorrow he possessed his delusive expectation. It is human to sorrow, human to sorrow with them that sorrow, but it is greater to believe, more blessed to contemplate the believer. There is no song of Lamentations by Abraham. He did not mournfully count the days while time passed, he did not look at Sarah with a suspicious glance, wondering whether she were growing old, he did not arrest the course of the sun, that Sarah might not grow old, and his expectation with her. He did not sing lullingly before Sarah his mournful lay. Abraham became old, Sarah became a laughing-stock in the land, and yet he was God's elect and inheritor of the promise that in his seed all the races of the world would be blessed. So were it not better if he had not been God's elect? What is it to be God's elect? It is to be

denied in youth the wishes of youth, so as with great pains to get them fulfilled in old age. But Abraham believed and held fast the expectation. If Abraham had wavered, he would have given it up. If he had said to God, "Then perhaps it is not after all Thy will that it should come to pass, so I will give up the wish. It was my only wish, it was my bliss. My soul is sincere, I hide no secret malice because Thou didst deny it to me" —he would not have been forgotten, he would have saved many by his example, yet he would not be the father of faith. For it is great to give up one's wish, but it is greater to hold it fast after having given it up, it is great to grasp the eternal, but it is greater to hold fast to the temporal after having given it up.

Then came the fullness of time. If Abraham had not believed, Sarah surely would have been dead of sorrow, and Abraham, dulled by grief, would not have understood the fulfillment but would have smiled at it as at a dream of youth. But Abraham believed, therefore he was young; for he who always hopes for the best becomes old, and he who is always prepared for the worst grows old early, but he who believes preserves an eternal youth. Praise therefore to that story! For Sarah, though stricken in years, was young enough to desire the pleasures of motherhood, and Abraham, though gray-haired, was young enough to wish to be a father. In an outward respect the marvel consists in the fact that it came to pass according to their expectation, in a deeper sense the miracle of faith consists in the fact that Abraham and Sarah were young enough to wish, and that faith had preserved their wish and therewith their youth. He accepted the fulfillment of the promise, he accepted it by faith, and it came to pass according to the promise and according to his faith—for Moses smote the rock with his rod, but he did not believe.

Then there was joy in Abraham's house, when Sarah became a bride on the day of their golden wedding.

But it was not to remain thus. Still once more Abraham was to be tried. He had fought with that cunning power which invents everything, with that alert enemy which never slumbers, with that old man who outlives all things—he had fought with Time and preserved his faith. Now all the terror of the strife was concentrated in one instant. "And God tempted Abraham and said unto him, Take Isaac, thine only son, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon the mountain which I will show thee."

So all was lost—more dreadfully than if it had never come to pass! So the Lord was only making sport of Abraham! He made miraculously the preposterous actual, and now in turn He would annihilate it. It was indeed foolishness, but Abraham did not laugh at it like Sarah when the promise was announced. All was lost! Seventy years of faithful expectation, the brief joy at the fulfillment of faith. Who then is he that plucks away the old man's staff, who is

it that requires that he himself shall break it? Who is he that would make a man's gray hairs comfortless, who is it that requires that he himself shall do it? Is there no compassion for the venerable oldling, none for the innocent child? And yet Abraham was God's elect, and it was the Lord who imposed the trial. All would now be lost. The glorious memory to be preserved by the human race, the promise in Abraham's seed—this was only a whim, a fleeting thought which the Lord had had, which Abraham should now obliterate. That glorious treasure which was just as old as faith in Abraham's heart, many, many years older than Isaac, the fruit of Abraham's life, sanctified by prayers, matured in conflict—the blessing upon Abraham's lips, the fruit was now to be plucked prematurely and remain without significance. For what significance had it when Isaac was to be sacrificed? That sad and yet blissful hour when Abraham was to take leave of all that was dear to him when yet once more he was to lift up his head, when his countenance would shine like that of the Lord, when he would concentrate his whole soul in a blessing which was potent to make Isaac blessed all his days—this time would not come! For he would indeed take leave of Isaac, but in such a way that he himself would remain behind; death would separate them, but in such a way that Isaac remained its prey. The old man would not be joyful in death as he laid his hands in blessing upon Isaac, but he would be weary of life as he laid violent hands upon Isaac. And it was God who tried him. Yea, woe, woe unto the messenger who had come before Abraham with such tidings! Who would have ventured to be the emissary of this sorrow? But it was God who tried Abraham.

Yet Abraham believed, and believed for this life. Yea, if his faith had been only for a future life, he surely would have cast everything away in order to hasten out of this world to which he did not belong. But Abraham's faith was not of this sort, if there be such a faith; for really this is not faith but the furthest possibility of faith which has a presentiment of its object at the extremest limit of the horizon, yet is separated from it by a yawning abyss within which despair carries on its game. But Abraham believed precisely for this life, that he was to grow old in the land, honored by the people, blessed in his generation, remembered forever in Isaac, his dearest thing in life, whom he embraced with a love for which it would be a poor expression to say that he loyally fulfilled the father's duty of loving the son, as indeed is evinced in the words of the summons, "the son whom thou lovest." Jacob had twelve sons, and one of them he loved; Abraham had only one, the son whom he loved.

Yet Abraham believed and did not doubt, he believed the preposterous. If Abraham had doubted—then he would have done something else, something glorious; for how could Abraham do anything but what is great and glorious! He would have marched up to Mount Moriah, he would have cleft the fire-wood, lit the pyre, drawn the knife—he would have cried out to God, "Despise not this sacrifice, it is not the best thing I possess, that I know well, for what is an old man

in comparison with the child of promise; but it is the best I am able to give Thee. Let Isaac never come to know this, that he may console himself with his youth." He would have plunged the knife into his own breast. He would have been admired in the world, and his name would not have been forgotten; but it is one thing to be admired, and another to be the guiding star which saves the anguished.

But Abraham believed. He did not pray for himself, with the hope of moving the Lord—it was only when the righteous punishment was decreed upon Sodom and Gomorrah that Abraham came forward with his prayers.

We read in those holy books: "And God tempted Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham, Abraham, where art thou? And he said, Here am I." Thou to whom my speech is addressed, was such the case with thee? When afar off thou didst see the heavy dispensation of providence approaching thee, didst thou not say to the mountains, Fall on me, and to the hills, Cover me? Or if thou wast stronger, did not thy foot move slowly along the way, longing as it were for the old path? When a call was issued to thee, didst thou answer, or didst thou not answer perhaps in a low voice, whisperingly? Not so Abraham: joyfully, buoyantly, confidently, with a loud voice, he answered, "Here am I." We read further: "And Abraham rose early in the morning" as though it were to a festival, so he hastened, and early in the morning he had come to the place spoken of, to Mount Moriah. He said nothing to Sarah, nothing to Eleazar. Indeed who could understand him? Had not the temptation by its very nature exacted of him an oath of silence? He cleft the wood, he bound Isaac, lie lit the pyre, he drew the knife. My hearer, there was many a father who believed that with his son he lost everything that was dearest to him in the world, that he was deprived of every hope for the future, but yet there was none that was the child of promise in the sense that Isaac was for Abraham. There was many a father who lost his child; but then it was God, it was the unalterable, the unsearchable will of the Almighty, it was His hand took the child. Not so with Abraham. For him was reserved a harder trial, and Isaac's fate was laid along with the knife in Abraham's hand. And there he stood, the old man, with his only hope! But he did not doubt, he did not look anxiously to the right or to the left, he did not challenge heaven with his prayers. He knew that it was God the Almighty who was trying him, he knew that it was the hardest sacrifice that could be required of him; but he knew also that no sacrifice was too hard when God required it—and he drew the knife.

Who gave strength to Abraham's arm? Who held his right hand up so that it did not fall limp at his side? He who gazes at this becomes paralyzed. Who gave strength the Abraham's soul, so that his eyes did not grow dim, so that he saw neither Isaac nor the ram? He who gazes at this becomes blind.—And yet rare enough perhaps is the man who becomes paralyzed and blind, still more

rare one who worthily recounts what happened. We all know it—it was only a trial.

If Abraham when he stood upon Mount Moriah had doubted, if he had gazed about him irresolutely, if when he drew the knife he had by chance discovered the ram, if God had permitted him to offer it instead of Isaac—then he would have betaken himself home, everything would have been the same, he has Sarah, he retained Isaac, and yet how changed! For his retreat would have been a flight, his salvation an accident, his reward dishonor, his future perhaps perdition. Then he would have borne witness neither to his faith nor to God's grace, but would have testified only how dreadful it is to march out to Mount Moriah. Then Abraham would not have been forgotten, nor would Mount Moriah, this mountain would then be mentioned, not like Ararat where the Ark landed, but would be spoken of as a consternation, because it was here that Abraham doubted.

Venerable Father Abraham! In marching home from Mount Moriah thou hadst no need of a panegyric which might console thee for thy loss; for thou didst gain all and didst retain Isaac. Was it not so? Never again did the Lord take him from thee, but thou didst sit at table joyfully with him in thy tent, as thou dost in the beyond to all eternity. Venerable Father Abraham! Thousands of years have run their course since those days, but thou hast no tardy lover to snatch the memorial of thee from the power of oblivion, for every language calls thee to remembrance—and yet thou dost reward thy lover more gloriously than does any other; hereafter thou dost make him blessed in thy bosom; here thou dost enthrall his eyes and his heart by the marvel of thy deed. Venerable Father Abraham! Thou who first wast sensible of and didst first bear witness to that prodigious passion which disdains the dreadful conflict with the rage of the elements and with the powers of creation in order to strive with God; thou who first didst know that highest passion, the holy, pure and humble expression of the divine madness which the pagans admired—for give him who would speak in praise of thee, if he does not do it fittingly. He spoke humbly, as if it were the desire of his own heart, he spoke briefly, as if becomes him to do, but he will never forget that thou hadst need of a hundred years to obtain a son of old age against expectation, that thou didst have to draw the knife before retaining Isaac; he will never forget that in a hundred and thirty years thou didst not get further than to faith.

* * *

Michael Blumenthal, Isaac

The ethical expression for what Abraham did is that he would murder Isaac; the religious expression is that he would sacrifice Isaac ... if faith does not make it a holy act to be willing

to murder one's son, then let the same condemnation be pronounced upon Abraham as upon every other man ...

Søren Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling*

Mute to his own testimony, a child
is sleeping, but faith is a summons
in the throat of the aging.

It is morning, still dark, and
the shadow of a tall mountain hangs
like a broken wing against the horizon.

Abraham, too, still sleeps,
but the words to a dark song rest
beside him. No one has heard
the voice from the altar but he,
no one suspects the hand on the child's throat.

In a corner of the tent,
Isaac stirs from the hands of a dream,
the pulse of a vague danger marking
a blue vein on his forehead. He senses
the blade's imminence, the stroke
of a quiet pain.

His father calls to him, but
He shrinks from the gleam of immortality
in the old man's eyes. Sarah wakes
to an ominous music, but says nothing.
She watches, all patience, as her husband
ties the child to the ass's back,
kisses them both on the forehead.

On the mountain, dawn has betrayed
 the stars. A goat brays a faint fear
 into the valley, portent of darkness.
 A father lifts his son, crying now,
 from the donkey's back, starts up the mountain.
 Sacrifice pencils the fine lines of his face.

Abraham steals a deep breath
 from the words of a prayer. The blade
 glistens like pyrite in the morning sun.
 The arm lifts, its own witness.

Reduced to wonder, the child's eyes
 stare into the face of a hunter, small lips
 forming the shape of a question.
 Betrayed, he is all memory. Death
 is the faith lie must now live by:

He will never forgive in this life.

* * *

William James, The Will to Believe

In the recently published Life by Leslie Stephen of his brother, Fitz-James, there is an account of a school to which the latter went when he was a boy. The teacher, a certain Mr. Guest, used to converse with his pupils in this wise: "Gurney, what is the difference between justification and sanctification?—Stephen, prove the omnipotence of God," etc. In the midst of our Harvard freethinking and indifference we are prone to imagine that here at your good old orthodox College conversation continues to be somewhat upon this order; and to show you that we at Harvard have not lost all interest in these vital subjects, I have, brought with me tonight something like a sermon on justification by faith to read to you—I mean an essay in justification of faith, a defense of our right to adopt a believing attitude in religious matters, in spite of the fact that our merely logical

intellect may not have been coerced. "The Will to Believe," accordingly, is the title of my paper.

I have long defended to my own students the lawfulness of voluntarily adopted faith; but as soon as they have got well imbued with the logical spirit, they have as a rule refused to admit my contention to be lawful philosophically, even though in point of fact they were personally all the time chock full of some faith or other themselves. I am all the while, however, so profoundly convinced that my own position is correct, that your invitation has seemed to me a good occasion to make my statements more clear. Perhaps your minds will be more open than those with which I have hitherto had to deal. I will be as little technical as I can, though I must begin by setting up some technical distinctions that will help us in the end.

i

Let us give the name of hypothesis to anything that may be proposed to our belief; and just as the electricians speak of live and dead wires, let us speak of any hypothesis as either live or dead. A live hypothesis is one which appeals as a real possibility to him to whom it is proposed. If I ask you to believe in the Mahdi, the notion makes no electric connection with your nature—it refuses to scintillate with any credibility at all. As an hypothesis it is completely dead. To an Arab, however (even if he be not one of the Mahdi's followers), the hypothesis is among the mind's possibilities: it is alive. This shows that deadness and liveness in an hypothesis are not intrinsic properties, but relations to the individual thinker. They are measured by his willingness to act. The maximum of liveness in an hypothesis means willingness to act irrevocably. Practically, that means belief; but there is some believing tendency wherever there is willingness to act at all.

Next, let us call the decision between two hypotheses an *option*. Options may be of several kinds. They may be—1, *living or dead*; 2, *forced or avoidable*; 3, *momentous or trivial*; and for our purposes we may call an option a *genuine* option when it is of the forced, living, and momentous kind.

1. A living option is one in which both hypotheses are live ones. If I say to you: "Be a theosophist or be a Mohammedan," it is probably a dead option, because for you neither hypothesis is likely to be alive. But if I say: "Be an agnostic or be a Christian," it is otherwise: trained as you are, each hypothesis makes some appeal, however small, to your belief.

2. Next, if I say to you: "Choose between going out with your umbrella or without it," I do not offer you a genuine option, for it is not forced. You can easily avoid it by not going out at all. Similarly, if I say, "Either love me or hate me," "Either call my theory true or call it false," your option is avoidable. You may remain indifferent to me, neither loving nor hating and you may decline to offer any judgment as to my theory. But if I say, "Either accept this truth or go without it," I put on you a forced option, for there is no standing place outside of the alternative. Every dilemma based on a

complete logical disjunction, with no possibility of not choosing, is an option of this forced kind.

3. Finally, if I were Dr. Nansen and proposed to you to join my North Pole expedition, your option would be momentous; for this would probably be your only similar opportunity, and your choice now would either exclude you from the North Pole sort of immortality altogether or put at least the chance of it into your hands. He who refuses to embrace a unique opportunity loses the prize as surely as if he tried and failed. *Per contra*, the option is trivial when the opportunity is not unique, when the stake is insignificant, or when the decision is reversible if it later prove unwise. Such trivial options abound in the scientific life. A chemist finds an hypothesis live enough to spend a year in its verification: he believes in it to that extent. But if his experiments prove inconclusive either way, he is quit for his loss of time, no vital harm being done.

It will facilitate our discussion if we keep all these distinctions well in mind.

ii

The next matter to consider is the actual psychology of human opinion. When we look at certain facts, it seems as if our passional and volitional nature lay at the root of all our convictions. When we look at others, it seems as if they could do nothing when the intellect had once said its say. Let us take the latter facts up first.

Does it not seem preposterous on the very face of it to talk of our opinions being modifiable at will? Can our will either help or hinder our intellect in its perceptions of truth? Can we, by just willing it, believe that Abraham Lincoln's existence is a myth, and that the portraits of him in *McClure's Magazine* are all of some one else? Can we, by any effort of our will, or by any strength of wish that it were true, believe ourselves well and about when we are roaring with rheumatism in bed, or feel certain that the sum of the two one-dollar bills in our pocket must be a hundred dollars? We can *say* any of these things, but we are absolutely impotent to believe them; and of just such things is the whole fabric of the truths that we do believe in made up—matters of fact, immediate or remote, as Hume said, and relations between ideas, which are either there or not there for us if we see them so, and which if not there cannot be put there by any action of our own.

In Pascal's *Thoughts* there is a celebrated passage known in literature as Pascal's wager. In it he tries to force us into Christianity by reasoning as if our concern with truth resembled our concern with the stakes in a game of chance. Translated freely his words are these: You must either believe or not believe that God is—which will you do? Your human reason cannot say. A game is going on between you and the nature of things which at the day of judgment will bring out either heads or tails. Weigh what your gains and your losses would be if you but should stake all you have on heads, or God's existence: if you win in such case, you gain eternal beatitude; if you lose, you lose nothing at all. If there were an infinity of chances, and only one for God in this wager, still you ought to stake your all on God; for though you surely risk a finite loss by this

procedure, any finite loss is reasonable, even a certain one is reasonable, if there is but—the possibility of infinite gain. Go, then, and take holy water, and have masses said; belief will come and stupefy your scruples—*Cela vous fera croire et vous abetira*. Why should you not? At bottom, what have you to lose?

You probably feel that when religious faith expresses itself thus, in the language of the gaming table, it is put to its last trumps. Surely Pascal's own personal belief in masses and holy water had far other springs; and this celebrated page of his is but an argument for others, a last desperate snatch at a weapon against the hardness of the unbelieving heart. We feel that a faith in masses and holy water adopted willfully after such a mechanical calculation would lack the inner soul of faith's reality; and if we were ourselves in the place of the Deity, we should probably take particular pleasure in cutting off believers of this pattern from their infinite reward. It is evident that unless there be some preexisting tendency to believe in masses and holy water, the option offered to the will by Pascal is not a living option. Certainly no Turk ever took to masses and holy water on its account; and even to us Protestants these means of salvation seem such foregone impossibilities that Pascal's logic, invoked for them specifically, leaves us unmoved. As well might the Mahdi write to us, saying, "I am the Expected One whom God has created in his effulgence. You shall be infinitely happy if you confess me; otherwise you shall be cut off from the light of the sun. Weigh, then, your infinite gain if I am genuine against your finite sacrifice if I am not." His logic would be that of Pascal; but he would vainly use it on us, for the hypothesis he offers us is dead. No tendency to act on it exists in us to any degree.

The talk of believing by our volition seems, then, from one point of view, simply silly. From another point of view it is worse than silly, it is vile. When one turns to the magnificent edifice of the physical sciences, and sees how it was reared; what thousands of disinterested moral lives of men lie buried in its mere foundations; what patience and postponement, what choking down of preference, what submission to the icy laws of outer fact are wrought into its very stones and mortar; how absolutely impersonal it stands in its vast augustness—then how besotted and contemptible seems every little sentimentalist who comes blowing his voluntary smoke wreaths, and pretending to decide things from out of his private dream. Can we wonder if those bred in the rugged and manly school of science should feel like spewing such subjectivism out of their mouths? The whole system of loyalties which grow up in the schools of science go dead against its toleration; so that it is only natural that those who have caught the scientific fever should pass over to the opposite extreme, and write sometimes as if the incorruptibly truthful intellect ought positively to prefer bitterness and unacceptableness to the heart of its cup.

It fortifies my soul to know

That, though I perish, Truth is so—

sings Clough, while Huxley claims: "My only consolation lies in the reflection that, however bad our posterity may become, so far as they hold by the plain rule of not pretending to believe what they have no reason to believe, because it may be to their advantage so to pretend [the word "pretend" is surely here redundant], they will not have reached the lowest depth of immorality." And that delicious *enfant terrible* Clifford writes: "Belief is desecrated when given to unproved and unquestioned statements of the solace and private pleasure of the believer. ... Whoso would deserve well of his fellows in this matter will guard the purity of his belief with a very fanaticism of jealous care, lest at any time it should rest on an unworthy object, and catch a stain which can never be wiped away. . . . If [a] belief has been accepted on insufficient evidence [even though the belief be true, as Clifford on the same page explains] the pleasure is a stolen one. . . . It is sinful because it is stolen in defiance of our duty to mankind. That duty is to guard ourselves from such beliefs as from a pestilence which may shortly master our own body and then spread to the rest of the town. . . . It is wrong always, everywhere, and for every one, to believe anything upon insufficient evidence."

iii

All this strikes one as healthy, even when expressed, as by Clifford, with somewhat too much of robustious pathos in the voice. Free will and simple wishing do seem, in the matter of our credences, to be only fifth wheels to the coach. Yet if any one should thereupon assume that intellectual insight is what remains after wish and will and sentimental preference have taken wing, or that pure reason is what then settles our opinions, he would fly quite as directly in the teeth of the facts.

It is only our already dead hypotheses that our willing nature is unable to bring to life again. But what has made them dead for us is for the most part a previous action of our willing nature of an antagonistic kind. When I say "willing nature," I do not mean only such deliberate volitions as may have set up habits of belief that we cannot now escape from—I mean all such factors of belief as fear and hope, prejudice and passion, imitation and partisanship, the circumpressure of our caste and set. As a matter of fact we find ourselves believing, we hardly know how or why. Mr. Balfour gives the name of "authority" to all those influences, born of the intellectual climate, that make hypotheses possible or impossible for us, alive or dead. Here in this room, we all of us believe in molecules and the conservation of energy, in democracy and necessary progress, in Protestant Christianity and the duty of fighting for "the doctrine of the immortal Monroe," and for no reasons worthy of the name. We see into these matters with no more inner clearness, and probably with much less, than any disbeliever in them might possess. His unconventionality would probably have some grounds to show for its conclusions; but for us, not insight, but the *prestige* of the opinions, is what makes the spark shoot from them and light up our sleeping magazines of faith. Our reason is quite satisfied, in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of every thousand of us, if it can find a few arguments that will do to recite in case our credulity is criticized by some one else. Our faith is faith in some one else's faith, and in the greatest matters

this is most the case. Our belief in truth itself, for instance, that—there is a truth, and that our minds and it are made for each other—what is it but a passionate affirmation of desire, in which our social system backs us up? We want to have a truth; we want to believe that our experiments and studies and discussions must put us in a continually better and better position towards it; and on this line we agree to fight out our thinking lives. But if a pyrrhonistic sceptic asks us *how we know* all this, can our logic find a reply? Not certainly it cannot. It is just one volition against another—we willing to go in for life upon a trust or assumption which he, for his part, does not care to make.

As a rule we disbelieve all facts and theories for which we have no use. Clifford's cosmic emotions find no use for Christian feelings. Huxley belabors the bishops because there is no use for sacerdotalism in his scheme of life. Newman, on the contrary, goes over to Romanism, and finds all sorts of reasons good for staying there, because a priestly system is for him an organic need and delight. Why do so few "scientists" even look at the evidence for telepathy, so called? Because they think, as a leading biologist, now dead, once said to me, that even if such a thing were true, scientists ought to band together to keep it suppressed and concealed. It would undo the uniformity of Nature and all sorts of other things without which scientists cannot carry on their pursuits. But if this very man had been shown something which as a scientist he might *do* with telepathy, he might not only have examined the evidence, but even have found it good enough. This very law which the logicians would impose upon us—if I may give the name of logicians to those who would rule out our willing nature here—is based on nothing but their own natural wish to exclude all elements for which they, in their professional quality of logicians, can find no use.

Evidently, then, our nonintellectual nature does influence our convictions. There are passional tendencies and volitions which run before and others which come after belief, and it is only the latter that are too late for the fair; and they are not too late when the previous passional work has been already in their own direction. Pascal's argument, instead of being powerless, then seems a regular clincher, and is the last stroke needed to make our faith in masses and holy water complete. The state of things is evidently far from simple; and pure insight and logic, whatever they might do ideally, are not the only things that really do produce our creeds.

iv

Our next duty, having recognized this mixed-up state of affairs, is to ask whether it be simply reprehensible and pathological, or whether, on the contrary, we must treat it as a normal element in making up our minds. The thesis I defend is, briefly stated, this: *Our passional nature not only lawfully may, but must, decide an option between propositions, whenever it is a genuine option that cannot by its nature be decided on intellectual grounds; for to say, under such circumstances, "Do not decide, but leave the question open," is itself a passional decision—just like deciding yes or no is attended, with the same risk of losing the truth.* The thesis thus abstractly expressed will, I trust, soon become quite clear. But must first indulge in a bit more of- preliminary work.

It will be observed that for the purposes of this discussion we are on “dogmatic” ground—ground, I mean, which leaves systematic philosophical scepticism altogether out of account. The postulate that there is truth, and that it is the destiny of our minds to attain it, we are deliberately resolving to make, though the sceptic will not make it. We part company with him, therefore, absolutely, at this point. But the faith that truth exists, and that our minds can find it, may be held in two ways. We may talk of the empiricist way and of the absolutist way of believing in truth. The absolutists in this matter say that we not only can attain to knowing truth, but we can know when we have attained to knowing it; while the empiricists think that although we may attain it, we cannot infallibly know when. To know is one thing, and to know for certain that we know is another. One may hold to the first being possible without the second; hence the empiricists; and the absolutists, although neither of them is a sceptic, in the usual philosophic sense of the term, show very different degrees of dogmatism in their lives.

If we look at the history of opinions, we see that the empiricist tendency has largely prevailed in science, while in philosophy the absolutist tendency has had everything its own way. The characteristic sort of happiness, indeed, which philosophies yield has mainly consisted in the conviction felt by each successive school or system that by it bottom certitude had been attained. “Other philosophies are collections of opinions, mostly false; my philosophy gives standing ground forever”—who does not recognize in this the keynote of every system worthy of the name? A system, to be a system at all, must come as a closed system, reversible in this or that detail, perchance, but in its essential features never!

Scholastic orthodoxy, to which one must always go when one wishes to find perfectly clear statement, has beautifully elaborated this absolutist conviction in a doctrine which it calls that of “objective evidence.” If, for example, I am unable to doubt that I now exist before you, that two is less than three, or that if all men are mortal then I am mortal too, it is because these things illumine my intellect irresistibly. The final ground of this objective evidence possessed by certain propositions is the *adequatio intellectus nostri cum re*. The certitude it brings involves an *aptitudinem ad extorquendum certum assensum* on the part of the truth envisaged, and on the side of the subject *a quietem in cognitione*, when once the object is mentally received, that leaves no possibility of doubt behind; and in the whole transaction nothing operates but the *entitas ipsa* of the object and the *entitas ipsa* of the mind. We slouchy modern thinkers dislike to talk in Latin—indeed, we dislike to talk in set terms at all; but at bottom our own state of mind is very much like this whenever we uncritically abandon ourselves: You believe in objective evidence, and I do. Of some things we feel that we are certain: we know, and we know that we do know. There is something that gives a click inside of us, a bell that strikes twelve, when the hands of our mental clock have swept the dial and meet over the meridian hour. The greatest empiricists among us are only empiricists on reflection: when left to their instincts, they dogmatize like infallible

popes. When the Cliffords tell us how sinful it is to be Christians on such "insufficient evidence," insufficiency is really the last thing they have in mind. For them the evidence is absolutely sufficient, only it makes the other way. They believe so completely in an anti-Christian order of the universe that there is no living option: Christianity is a dead hypothesis from the start.

vi

But now, since we are all such absolutists by instinct, what in our quality of students of philosophy ought we to do about the fact? Shall we espouse and indorse it? Or shall we treat it as a weakness of our nature from which we must free ourselves, if we can?

I sincerely believe that the latter course is the only one on we can follow as reflective men. Objective evidence and certitude are doubtless very fine ideals to play with, but where on this moonlit and dream-visited planet are they found? I am, therefore, myself a complete empiricist so far as my theory of human knowledge goes. I live, to be sure, by the practical faith that we must go on experiencing and thinking over our experience, for only thus can our opinions grow more true; but to hold any one of them—I absolutely do not care which—as if it never could be reinterpretable or corrigible, I believe to be a tremendously mistaken attitude, and I think that the whole history of philosophy will bear me out. There is but one indefectibly certain truth, and that is the truth that pyrrhonistic scepticism itself leaves standing—the truth that the present phenomenon of consciousness exists. That, however, is the bare starting point of knowledge, the mere admission of a stuff to be philosophized about. The various philosophies are but so many attempts at expressing what this stuff really is. And if we repair to our libraries what disagreement do we discover! Where is a certainly true answer found? Apart from abstract propositions of comparison (such as two and two are the same as four), propositions which tell us nothing by themselves about concrete reality, we find no proposition ever regarded by any one as evidently certain that has not either been called a falsehood, or at least had its truth sincerely questioned by some one else. The transcending of the axioms of geometry, not in play but in earnest, by certain of our contemporaries (as Zollner and Charles H. Hinton), and the rejection of the whole Aristotelian logic by the Hegelians, are striking instances in point.

No concrete test of what is really true has ever been agreed upon. Some make the criterion external to the moment of perception, putting it either in revelation, the *consensus gentium*, the instincts of the heart, or the systematized experience of the race. Others make the perceptive moment its own test—Descartes, for instance, with his clear and distinct ideas guaranteed by the veracity of God; Reid with his "common sense"; and Kant with his forms of synthetic judgment *a priori*. The inconceivability of the opposite; the capacity to be verified by sense; the possession of complete organic unity or self-relation, realized when a thing is its own other—are standards which, in turn, have been used. The much lauded objective evidence is never triumphantly there; it is a mere aspiration or *Grenzbegriff*, marking the infinitely remote ideal of our thinking life. To claim that certain truths now possess it, is simply to say that when you think them

true and they are true, then their evidence is objective, otherwise it is not. But practically one's conviction that the evidence one goes by is of the real objective brand, is only one more subjective opinion added to the lot. For what a contradictory array of opinions have objective evidence and absolute certitude been claimed! The world is rational through and through—its existence is an ultimate brute fact; there is a personal God—a personal God is inconceivable; there is an extramental physical world immediately known—the mind can only know its own ideas; a moral imperative exists—obligation is only the resultant of desires; a permanent spiritual principle is in every one—there are only shifting states of mind; there is an endless chain of causes—there is an absolute first cause; an eternal necessity—a freedom; a purpose—no purpose; a primal One—a primal Many; a universal continuity—an essential discontinuity in things; an infinity—no infinity. There is this —there is that; there is indeed nothing which some one has not thought absolutely true, while his neighbor deemed it absolutely false; and not an absolutist among them seems ever to have considered that the trouble may all the time be essential and that the intellect, even with truth directly in its grasp, may have no infallible signal for knowing whether it be truth or no. When, indeed, one remembers that the most striking practical application to life of the doctrine of objective certitude has been the conscientious labors of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, one feels less tempted than ever to lend the doctrine a respectful ear.

But please observe, now, that when as empiricists we give up the doctrine of objective certitude, we do not thereby give up the quest or hope of truth itself. We still pin our faith on its existence, and still believe that we gain an ever better position toward it by systematically continuing to roll up experiences and think. Our great differences from the scholastic lies in the way we face. The strength of his system lies in the principles, the origin, the *terminus a quo* of his thought; for us the strength is in the outcome, the upshot, the *terminus ad quem*. Not where it comes from but what it leads to is to decide. It matters not to an empiricist from what quarter an hypothesis may come to him: he may have acquired it by fair means or by foul; passion may have whispered or accident suggested it; but if the total drift of thinking continues to confirm it, that is what he means by its being true.

vii

One more point, small but important, and our preliminaries are done. There are two ways of looking at our duty in the matter of opinion—ways entirely different, and yet ways about whose difference the theory of knowledge seems hitherto to have shown very little concern. We must know the truth; and we must avoid error—these are our first and great commandments as would-be knowers; but they are not two ways of stating an identical commandment, they are two separable laws. Although it may indeed happen that when we believe the truth A, we escape as an incidental consequence from believing the falsehood B, it hardly ever happens that by merely disbelieving B we necessarily believe A. We may in escaping B fall into believing other

falsehoods, C or D, just as bad as B; or we may escape B by not believing anything at all, not even A.

Believe truth! Shun error!—these, we see, are two materially different laws; and by choosing between them we may end by coloring differently our whole intellectual life. We may regard the chase for truth as paramount and the avoidance of error as secondary; or we may, on the other hand, treat the avoidance of error as more imperative, and let truth take its chance. Clifford, in the instructive passage I have quoted, exhorts us to the latter course. Believe nothing, he tells us, keep your mind in suspense forever, rather than by closing it on insufficient evidence incur the awful risk of believing lies. You, on the other hand, may think that the risk of being in error is a very small matter when compared with the blessings of real knowledge, and be ready to be duped many times in your investigation rather than postpone indefinitely the chance of guessing true. I myself find it impossible to go with Clifford. We must remember that these feelings of our duty about either truth or error are in any case only expressions of our passionnal life. Biologically considered, our minds are as ready to grind out falsehood as veracity, and he who says, "Better go without belief forever than believe a lie!" merely shows his own preponderant private horror of becoming a dupe. He may be critical of many of his desires and fears, but this fear he slavishly obeys. He cannot imagine any one questioning its binding force. For my own part, I have also a horror of being duped; but I can believe that worse things than being duped may happen to a man in this world: so Clifford's exhortation has to my ears a thoroughly fantastic sound. It is like a general informing his soldiers that it is better to keep out of battle forever than to risk a single wound. Not so are victories either over enemies or over nature gained. Our errors are surely not such awfully solemn things. In a world where we are so certain to incur them in spite of all our caution, a certain lightness of heart seems healthier than this excessive nervousness on their behalf. At any rate, it seems the fittest thing for the empiricist philosopher.

viii

And now, after all this introduction, let us go straight at our question. I have said, and now repeat it, that not only as a matter of fact do we find our passionnal nature influencing us in our opinions, but that there are some options between opinions in which this influence must be regarded both as an inevitable and as a lawful determinant of our choice.

I fear here that some of you my hearers will begin to scent danger, and lend an inhospitable ear. Two first steps of passion you have indeed had to admit as necessary—we must think so as to avoid dupery, and we must think so as to gain truth; but the surest path to those ideal consummations, you will probably consider, is from now onwards to take no further passionnal step.

Well, of course, I agree as far as the facts will allow. Wherever the option between losing truth and gaining it is not momentous, we can throw the change of

gaining truth away, and at any rate save ourselves from any chance of *believing falsehood*, by not making up our minds at all till objective evidence has come. In scientific questions, this is almost always the case; and even in human affairs in general, the need of acting is seldom so urgent that a false belief to act on is better than no belief at all. Law courts, indeed, have to decide on the best evidence attainable for the moment, because a judge's duty is to make law as well as to ascertain it, and (as a learned judge once said to me) few cases are worth spending much time over: the great thing is to have them decided on any acceptable principle, and got out of the way. But in our dealings with objective nature we obviously are recorders, not makers, of the truth; and decisions for the mere sake of deciding promptly and getting on to the next business would be wholly out of place. Throughout the breadth of physical nature facts are what they are quite independently of us, and seldom is there any such hurry about them that the risks of being duped by believing a premature theory need be faced. The questions here are always trivial options, the hypotheses are hardly living (at any rate not living for us spectators), the choice between believing truth or falsehood is seldom forced. The attitude of sceptical balance is therefore the absolutely wise one if we would escape mistakes. What difference, indeed, does it make to most of us whether we have or have not a theory of the roentgen rays, whether we believe or not in mind stuff, or have a conviction about the causality of conscious states? It makes no difference. Such options are not forced on us. On every account it is better not to make them, but still keep weighing reasons *pro et contra* with an indifferent hand.

I speak, of course, here of the purely judging mind. For purposes of discovery such indifference is to be less highly recommended, and science would be far less advanced than she is if the passionate desire of individuals to get their own faiths confirmed had been kept out of the game. See for example the sagacity which Spencer and Weismann now display. On the other hand, if you want an absolute duffer in an investigation, you must, after all, take the man who has no interest whatever in its results: he is the warranted incapable, the positive fool. The most useful investigator, because the most sensitive observer, is always he whose eager interest in one side of the question is balanced by an equally keen nervousness lest he become de-ceived.* Science has organized this nervousness into a regular technique, her so-called method of verification; and she has fallen so deeply in love with the method that one may even say she has ceased to care for truth by itself at all. It is only truth as technically verified that interests her. The truth of truths might come in merely affirmative form, and she would decline to touch it. Such truth as that, she might repeat with Clifford, would be stolen in defiance of her duty to mankind. Human passions, however, are stronger than technical rules. "Le coeur a ses raisons," as Pascal says, "que la raison ne connaît pas"; and however indifferent to all but the bare rules of the game the umpire, the abstract intellect, may be, the concrete players who furnish him the materials to judge of are usually, each one of them, in love with some pet "live hypothesis" of his own. Let us agree, however, that wherever there is no forced option, the dispassionately judicial

intellect with no pet hypothesis, saving us, as it does, from dupery at any rate ought to be our ideal.

The question next arises: Are there not somewhere forced options in our speculative questions, and can we (as men who may be interested at least as much in positively gaining truth as in merely escaping dupery) always wait with impunity till the coercive evidence shall have arrived? It seems *a priori* improbable that the truth should be so nicely adjusted to our needs and powers as that. In the great boarding house of nature, the cakes and the butter and the syrup seldom come out so even and leave the plates so clean. Indeed, we should view them with scientific suspicion if they did.

ix

Moral questions immediately present themselves as questions whose solution cannot wait for sensible proof. A moral question is a question not of what sensibly exists, but of what is good, or would be good if it did exist. Science can tell us what exists; but to compare the worths, both of what exists and of what does not exist, we must consult not science, but what Pascal calls our heart. Science herself consults her heart when she lays it down that the infinite ascertainment of fact and correction of false belief are the supreme goods for man. Challenge the statement, and science can only repeat it oracularly, or else prove it by showing that such ascertainment and correction bring man all sorts of other goods which man's heart in turn declares. The question of having moral beliefs at all or not having them is decided by our will. Are our moral preferences true or false, or are they only odd biological phenomena, making things good or bad for us, but in themselves indifferent? How can your pure intellect decide? If your heart does not want a world of moral reality, your head will assuredly never make you believe in one. Mephistophelian scepticism, indeed, will satisfy the head's play instincts much better than any rigorous idealism can. Some men (even at the student age) are so naturally cool-hearted that the moralistic hypothesis never has for them any pungent life, and in their supercilious presence the hot young moralist always feels strangely ill at ease. The appearance of knowingness is on their side, of naivete and gullibility on his. Yet, in the inarticulate heart of him, he clings to it that he is not a dupe, and that there is a realm in which (as Emerson says) all their wit and intellectual superiority is no better than the cunning of a fox. Moral scepticism can no more be refuted or proved by logic than intellectual scepticism can. When we stick to it that there is truth (be it of either kind), we do so with our whole nature, and resolve to stand or fall by the results. The sceptic with his whole nature adopts the doubting attitude; but which of us is the wiser, Omnipotence only knows.

Turn now from these wide questions of good to a certain class of questions of fact, questions concerning personal relations, states of mind between one man and another. Do you like me or not?—for example. Whether you do or not depends, in countless instances, on whether I meet you halfway, am willing to assume that you must like me, and show you trust and expectation. The previous faith on my part in

your liking's existence is in such cases what makes your liking come. But if I stand aloof, and refuse to budge an inch until I have objective evidence, until you shall have done something apt, as the absolutists say, *ad extorquendum assensum meum*, ten to one your liking never comes. How many women's hearts are vanquished by the mere sanguine insistence of some man that they *must* love him! he will not consent to the hypothesis that they cannot. The desire for a certain kind of truth here brings about that special truth's existence; and so it is in innumerable cases of other sorts. Who gains promotions, boons, appointments, but the man in whose life they are seen to play the part of life hypotheses, who discounts them, sacrifices other things for their sake before they have come, and takes risks for them in advance? His faith acts on the powers above him as a claim, and creates its own verification.

A social organism of any sort whatever, large or small, is what it is because each member proceeds to his own duty with a trust that the other members will simultaneously do theirs. Wherever a desired result is achieved by the cooperation of many independent persons, its existence as a fact is a pure consequence of the precursive faith in one another of those immediately concerned. A government, an army, a commercial system, a ship, a college, an athletic team, all exist on this condition, without which not only is nothing achieved, but nothing is even attempted. A whole train of passengers (individually brave enough) will be looted by a few highwaymen, simply because the latter can count on one another, while each passenger fears that if he makes a movement of resistance, he will be shot before any one else backs him up. If we believed that the whole car-full would rise at once with us, we should each severally rise, and train robbing would never even be attempted. There are, then, cases where a fact cannot come at all unless a preliminary faith exists in its coming. And where faith in a fact can help create the fact, that would be an insane logic which should say that faith running ahead of scientific evidence is the "lowest kind of immorality" into which a thinking being can fall. Yet such is the logic by which our scientific absolutists pretend to regulate our lives!

x

In truths dependent on our personal action, then, faith based on desire is certainly a lawful and possibly an indispensable thing.

But now, it will be said, these are all childish human cases, and have nothing to do with great cosmical matters, like the question of religious faith. Let us then pass on to that. Religions differ so much in their accidents that in discussing the religious question we must make it very generic and broad. What then do we now mean by the religious hypothesis? Science says things are; morality says some things are better than other things; and religion says essentially two things.

First, she says that the best things are the more eternal things, the overlapping things, the things in the universe that throw the last stone, so to speak, and say the final word. "Perfection is eternal"—this phrase of Charles Secretan seems a good way of

putting this first affirmation of religion, an affirmation which obviously cannot yet be verified scientifically at all.

The second affirmation of religion is that we are better off even now if we believe her first affirmation to be true.

Now, let us consider what the logical elements of this situation are in case the religious hypothesis in both its branches be really true. (Of course, we must admit that possibility at the outset. If we are to discuss the question at all, it must involve a living option. If for any of you religion be a hypothesis that cannot, by any living possibility be true, then you need go no farther. I speak to the "saving remnant" alone.) So proceeding, we see, first, that religion offers itself as a momentous option. We are supposed to gain even now, by our belief, and to lose by our nonbelief, a certain vital good. Secondly, religion is a forced option, so far as that good goes. We cannot escape the issue by remaining sceptical and waiting for more light, because, although we do avoid error in that way if religion be untrue, we lose the good, if it be true, just as certainly as if we positively chose to disbelieve. It is as if a man should hesitate indefinitely to ask a certain woman to marry him because he was not perfectly sure that she would prove an angel after he brought her home. Would he not cut himself off from that particular angel possibility as decisively as if he went and married someone else? Scepticism, then, is not avoidance of option; it is option of a certain particular kind of risk. Better risk loss of truth than chance of error—that is your faith vetoer's exact position. He is actively playing his stake as much as the believer is; he is backing the field against the religious hypothesis, just as the believer is backing the religious hypothesis against the field. To preach scepticism to us as a duty until "sufficient evidence" for religion be found, is tantamount therefore to telling us, when in presence of the religious hypothesis, that to yield to our fear of its being error is wiser and better than to yield to our hope that it may be true. It is not intellect against all passions, then; it is only intellect with one passion laying down its law. And by what, forsooth, is the supreme wisdom of this passion warranted? Dupery for dupery, what proof is there that dupery through hope is so much worse than dupery through fear? I, for one, can see no proof; and I simply refuse obedience to the scientist's command to imitate his kind of option, in a case where my own stake is important enough to give the right to choose my own form of risk. If religion be true and the evidence for it be still insufficient, I do not wish, by putting your extinguisher upon my nature (which feels to me as if it had after all some business in this matter), to forfeit my sole chance in life of getting upon the winning side—that chance depending, of course, on my willingness to run the risk of acting as if my passionnal need of taking the world religiously might be prophetic and right.

All this is on the supposition that it really may be prophetic and right, and that, even to us who are discussing the matter, religion is a live hypothesis which may be true. Now, to most of us religion comes in a still further way that makes a veto on our active faith even more illogical. The more perfect and more eternal aspect of the

universe is represented in our religions as having personal form. The universe is no longer a mere It to us, but a Thou, if we are religious; and any relation that may be possible from person to person might be possible here. For instance, although in one sense we are passive portions of the universe, in another we show a curious autonomy, as if we were small active centers on our own account. We feel, too, as if the appeal of religion to us were made to our own active good will, as if evidence might be forever withheld from us unless we met the hypothesis halfway. To take a trivial illustration: just as a man who in a company of gentlemen made no advances, asked a warrant for every concession, and believed no one's word without proof, would cut himself off by such churlishness from all social rewards that a more trusting spirit would earn—so here, one who should shut himself up in snarling logicality and try to make the gods extort his recognition willy-nilly or not get it at all, might cut himself off forever only opportunity of making the gods' acquaintance. This feeling, forced on us we know not whence, that by obstinately believing that there are gods (although not to do so would be so easy both for our logic, and our life) we are doing the universe the deepest service we can, seems part of the living essence of the religious hypothesis. If the hypothesis *were* true in all its parts, including this one, then pure intellectualism, with its veto on our making willing advances, would be an absurdity; and some participation of our sympathetic nature would be logically required. I, —therefore, for one, cannot see my way to accepting the agnostic rules for truth seeking, or willfully agree to keep my willing nature out of the game. I cannot do so for the plain reason, that *a rule of thinking which would absolutely prevent me from acknowledging certain kinds of truth if those kinds of truth were really there would be an irrational rule.* That for me is the long and short of the formal logic of the situation, no matter what the kinds of truth might materially be.

I confess I do not see how this logic can be escaped. But sad experience makes me fear that some of you may still shrink from radically saying with me, *in abstracto*, that we have the right to believe at our own risk any hypothesis that is live enough to tempt our will. I suspect, however, that if this is so, it is because you have got away from the abstract logical point of view altogether, and are thinking (perhaps without realizing it) of some particular religious hypothesis which for you is dead. The freedom to "believe what we will," you apply to the case of some patent superstition; and the faith you think of is the faith defined by the schoolboy when he said, "Faith is when you believe something that you know ain't true." I can only repeat, that this is misapprehension. *In concreto*, the freedom to believe can only cover living options which the intellect of the individual cannot by itself resolve; and living options never seem absurdities to him who has them to consider. When I look at the religious question as it really puts itself to concrete men, and when I think of all the possibilities which both practically and theoretically it involves, then this command that we shall put a stopper on our heart, instincts, and courage, and *wait*—acting of course meanwhile more or less as if religion were *not* true—till doomsday, or till such time as our intellect and senses working together may have raked in evidence enough—this command, I say, seems to me the queerest idol ever manufactured in the philosophic cave. Were we scholastic

absolutists, there might be more excuse. If we had an infallible intellect with its objective certitudes, we might feel ourselves disloyal to such a perfect organ of knowledge in not trusting to it exclusively, in not waiting for its releasing word. But if we are empiricists, if we believe that no bell in us tolls to let us know for certain when truth is in our grasp, then it seems a piece of idle fantasticality to preach so solemnly our duty of waiting for the bell. Indeed we may wait if we will—I hope you do not think that I am denying that—but if we do so, we do so at our peril as much as if we believed. In either case we *act*, taking our life in our hands. No one of us ought to issue vetoes to the other, nor should we bandy words of abuse. We ought, on the contrary, delicately and profoundly to respect one another's mental freedom: then only shall we bring about the intellectual republic; then only shall we have that spirit of inner tolerance without which all our outer tolerance is soulless, and which is empiricism's glory; then only shall we live and let live, in speculative as well as in practical things.

I began by a reference to Fitz-James Stephen; let me end by a quotation from him.

What do you think of yourself? What do you think of the world? ... These are questions with which all must deal as it seems good to them. They are riddles of the Sphinx, and in some way or other we must deal with them. ... In all important transactions of life we have to take a leap in the dark. ... If we decide to leave the riddles unanswered, that is a choice; if we waver in our answer, that, too, is a choice: but whatever choice we make, we make it at our peril. If a man chooses to turn his back altogether on God and the future, no one can prevent him; no one can show beyond reasonable doubt that he is mistaken. If a man thinks otherwise and acts as he thinks, I do not see that any one can prove that he is mistaken. Each must act as he thinks best; and if he is wrong, so much the worse for him. We stand on a mountain pass in the midst of whirling snow and blinding mist, through which we get glimpses now and then of paths which may be deceptive. If we stand still we shall be frozen to death. If we take the wrong road we shall be dashed to pieces. We do not certainly know whether there is any right one. What must we do? "Be strong and of a good courage." Act for the best, hope for the best, and take what comes. ... If death ends all, we cannot meet death better.

* * *

A. Flew, R. M. Hare, and B. Mitchell, *Theology & Falsification: A Symposium*

[Excerpt from Basil Mitchell, editor, *The Philosophy of Religion*, Oxford University Press, 1971.]

A. ANTONY FLEW

Let us begin with a parable. It is a parable developed from a tale told by John Wisdom in his haunting and revelatory article 'Gods'. Once upon a time two explorers came

upon a clearing in the jungle. In the clearing were growing many flowers and many weeds. One explorer says, 'some gardener must tend this plot.' The other disagrees, 'there is no gardener.' So they pitch their tents and set a watch. No gardener is ever seen. 'But perhaps he is an invisible gardener.' So they set up a barbed-wire fence. They electrify it. They patrol with bloodhounds. (For they remember how H. G. Wells's 'Invisible Man' could be both smelt and touched though he could not be seen.) But no shrieks ever suggest that some intruder has received a shock. No movements of the wire ever betray an invisible climber. The bloodhounds never give cry. Yet still the Believer is not convinced. 'But there is a gardener, invisible, intangible, insensible to electric shocks, a gardener who has no scent and makes no sound, a gardener who comes secretly to look after the garden which he loves.' At last the Sceptic despairs, 'But what remains of your original assertion? Just how does what you call an invisible, intangible, eternally elusive gardener differ from an imaginary gardener or even from no gardener at all?'

In this parable we can see how what starts as an assertion, that something exists or that there is some analogy between certain complexes of phenomena, may be reduced step by step to an altogether different status, to an expression perhaps of a 'picture preference'. The Sceptic says there is no gardener. The Believer says there is a gardener (but invisible, etc.). One man talks about sexual behaviour. Another man prefers to talk of Aphrodite (but knows that there is not really a superhuman person additional to, and somehow responsible for, all sexual phenomena). The process of qualification may be checked at any point before the original assertion is completely withdrawn and something of that first assertion will remain (tautology). Mr. Wells's invisible man could not, admittedly, be seen, but in all other respects he was a man like the rest of us. But though the process of qualification may be, and of course usually is, checked in time, it is not always judiciously so halted. Someone may dissipate his assertion completely without noticing that he has done so. A fine brash hypothesis may thus be killed by inches, the death by a thousand qualifications.

And in this, it seems to me, lies the peculiar danger, the endemic evil of theological utterance. Take such utterances as 'God has a plan', 'God created the world', 'God loves us as a father loves his children.' They look at first sight very much like assertions, vast cosmological assertions. Of course, this is no sure sign that they either are, or are intended to be, assertions. But let us confine ourselves to the cases where those who utter such sentences intend them to express assertions. (Merely remarking parenthetically that those who intend or interpret such utterances as crypto-commands, expressions of wishes, disguised ejaculations, concealed ethics, or as anything else but assertions, are unlikely to succeed in making them either properly orthodox or practically effective.)

Now to assert that such and such is the case is necessarily equivalent to denying that such and such is not the case. Suppose, then that we are in doubt as to what someone who gives vent to an utterance is asserting, or suppose that, more radically,

we are sceptical as to whether he is really asserting anything at all, one way of trying to understand (or perhaps it will be to expose) his utterance is to attempt to find what he would regard as countering against, or as being incompatible with, its truth. For if the utterance is indeed an assertion, it will necessarily be equivalent to a denial of the negation of that assertion. And anything which would count against the assertion, or which would induce the speaker to withdraw it and to admit that it had been mistaken, must be part of (or the whole of) the meaning of the negation of that assertion. And to know the meaning of the negation of an assertion, is as near as makes no matter, to know the meaning of that assertion. And if there is nothing which a putative assertion denies then there is nothing which it asserts either: and so it is not really an assertion. When the Sceptic in the parable asked the Believer, 'Just how does what you call an invisible, intangible, eternally elusive gardener differ from an imaginary gardener at all?' he was suggesting that the Believer's earlier statement had been so eroded by qualification that it was no longer an assertion at all.

Now it often seems to people who are not religious as if there was no conceivable event or series of events the occurrence of which would be admitted by sophisticated religious people to be a sufficient reason for conceding 'there wasn't a God after all' or 'God does not really love us then.' Someone tells us that God loves us as a father loves his children. We are reassured. But then we see a child dying of inoperable cancer of the throat. His earthly father is driven frantic in his efforts to help, but his Heavenly Father reveals no obvious sign of concern. Some qualification is made—God's love is 'not a merely human love' or it is 'an inscrutable love', perhaps—and we realize that such sufferings are quite compatible with the truth of the assertion that 'God loves us as a father (but, of course, ...)'. We are reassured again. But then perhaps we ask: what is this assurance of God's (appropriately qualified) love worth, what is this apparent guarantee really a guarantee against? Just what would have to happen not merely (morally and wrongly) to tempt but also (logically and rightly) to entitle us to say 'God does not love us' or even 'God does not exist'? I therefore put to the succeeding symposiasts the simple central questions, 'What would have to occur or to have occurred to constitute for you a disproof of the love of, or of the existence of, God?'

B. R. M. HARE

I wish to make it clear that I shall not try to defend Christianity in particular, but religion in general—not because I do not believe in Christianity, but because you cannot understand what Christianity is, until you have understood what religion is.

I must begin by confessing that, on the ground marked out by Flew, he seems to me to be completely victorious. I therefore shift my ground by relating another parable. A certain lunatic is convinced that all dons want to murder him. His friends introduce him to all the mildest and most respectable dons that they can find, and after each of them has retired, they say, 'You see, he doesn't really want to murder you; he spoke to

you in a most cordial manner; surely you are convinced now?' But the lunatic replies, 'Yes, but that was only his diabolical cunning; he's really plotting against me the whole time, like the rest of them; I know it I tell you.' However many kindly dons are produced, the reaction is still the same.

Now we say that such a person is deluded. But what is he deluded about? About the truth or falsity of an assertion? Let us apply Flew's test to him. There is no behaviour of dons that can be enacted which he will accept as counting against his theory; and therefore his theory, on this test, asserts nothing. But it does not follow that there is no difference between what he thinks about dons and what most of us think about them—otherwise we should not call him a lunatic and ourselves sane, and dons would have no reason to feel uneasy about his presence in Oxford.

Let us call that in which we differ from this lunatic, our respective *bliks*. He has an insane blik about dons; we have a sane one. It is important to realize that we have a sane one, not no blik at all; for there must be two sides to any argument—if he has a wrong blik, then those who are right about dons must have a right one. Flew has shown that a blik does not consist in an assertion or system of them; but nevertheless it is very important to have the right blik.

Let us try to imagine what it would be like to have different bliks about other things than dons. When I am driving my car, it sometimes occurs to me to wonder whether my movements of the steering-wheel will always continue to be followed by corresponding alterations in the direction of the car. I have never had a steering failure, though I have had skids, which must be similar. Moreover, I know enough about how the steering of my car is made, to know the sort of thing that would have to go wrong for the steering to fail—steel joints would have to part, or steel rods break, or something—but how do I know that this won't happen? The truth is, I don't know; I just have a blik about steel and its properties, so that normally I trust the steering of my car; but I find it not at all difficult to imagine what it would be like to lose this blik and acquire the opposite one. People would say I was silly about steel; but there would be no mistaking the reality of the difference between our respective bliks—for example, I should never go in a motor-car. Yet I should hesitate to say that the difference between us was the difference between contradictory assertions. No amount of safe arrivals or benchtests will remove my blik and restore the normal one; for my blik is compatible with any finite number of such tests.

It was Hume who taught us that our whole *commerce* with the world depends upon our blik about the world; and that *differences* between bliks about the world cannot be settled by *observation* of what happens in the world. That was why, having performed the interesting experiment of doubting the ordinary man's blik about the world, and showing that no proof could be given to make us adopt one blik rather than another, he turned to backgammon to take his mind off the problem. It seems, indeed, to be impossible even to formulate as an assertion the normal blik about the world which makes me put my confidence in the future reliability of steel joints, in the

continued ability of the road to support my car, and not gape beneath it revealing nothing below; in the general non-homicidal tendencies of dons; in my own continued well-being (in some sense of that word that I may riot now *fully understand*) if I continue to do what is right according to my lights; in the general likelihood of people like Hitler coming to a bad end. But perhaps a formulation less inadequate than most is to be found in the Psalms: ‘the earth is weak and all the inhabitants thereof: I bear up the pillars of it.’

The mistake of the position which Flew selects for attack is to regard this kind of talk as some sort of *explanation*, as scientists are accustomed to use the word. As such, it would obviously be ludicrous. We no longer believe in God as an Atlas—*nous n'avons pas besoin de cette hypothèses*. But it is nevertheless true to say that, as Hume saw, without a blik there can be no explanation; for it is by our bliks that we decide what is and what is not an explanation. Suppose we believed that everything that happened, happened by pure chance. This would not of course be an assertion; for it is compatible with anything happening or not happening, and so, incidentally, is its contradictory. But if we had this belief, we should not be able to explain or predict or plan anything. Thus, although we should not be *asserting* anything different from those of a more normal belief, there would be a great difference between us; and this is the sort of difference that there is between those who really believe in God and those who really disbelieve in him.

The word ‘really’ is important, and may excite suspicion. I put it in, because when people have had a good *Christian upbringing*, as have most of those who now profess not to believe in *any sort* of religion, it is very hard to discover what they really believe. The reason why they find it so easy to think that they are not religious, is that they have never got into the frame of mind of one who suffers from the doubts to which religion is the answer. Not for them the terrors of the primitive jungle. Having abandoned some of the more picturesque fringes of religion, they think that they have abandoned the whole thing—whereas in fact they still have got, and could not live without, a religion of a comfortably substantial, albeit highly sophisticated, kind, which differs from that of many ‘religious people’ in little more than this, that ‘religious people’ like to sing Psalms about theirs—a very natural and proper thing to do. But nevertheless there may be a big difference lying behind—the difference between two people who, though side by side, are walking in different directions. I do not know in what direction Flew is walking; perhaps he does not know either. But we have had some examples recently of various ways in which one can walk away from Christianity, and there are any number of possibilities. After all, man has not changed biologically since primitive times; it is his religion that has changed, and it can easily change again. And if you do not think that such changes make a difference, get acquainted with some Sikhs and some Mussulmans of the same Punjabi stock; you will find them quite different sorts of people.

There is an important difference between Flew's parable and my own which we have not yet noticed. The explorers do not *mind* about their garden; they discuss it with interest, but not with concern. But my lunatic, poor fellow, minds about dons; and I mind about the steering of my car; it often has people in it that I care for. It is because I mind very much about what goes on in the garden in which I find myself, that I am unable to share the explorers' detachment.

C. BASIL MITCHELL

Flew's article is searching and perceptive, but there is, I think, something odd about his conduct of the theologian's case. The theologian surely would not deny that the fact of pain counts against the assertion that God loves men. This very incompatibility generates the most intractable of theological problems—the problem of evil. So the theologian *does* recognize the fact of pain as counting against Christian doctrine. But it is true that he will not allow it—or anything—to count decisively against it; for he is committed by his faith to trust in God. His attitude is not that of the detached observer, but of the believer.

Perhaps this can be brought out by yet another parable. In time of war in an occupied country, a member of the resistance meets one night a stranger who deeply impresses him. They spend that night together in conversation. The Stranger tells the partisan that he himself is on the side of the resistance—indeed that he is in command of it, and urges the partisan to have faith in him no matter what happens. The partisan is utterly convinced at that meeting of the Stranger's sincerity and constancy and undertakes to trust him.

They never meet in conditions of intimacy again. But sometimes the Stranger is seen helping members of the resistance, and the partisan is grateful and says to his friends, 'He is on our side.'

Sometimes he is seen in the uniform of the police handing over patriots to the occupying power. On these occasions his friends murmur against him; but the partisan still says, 'He is on our side.' He still believes that, in spite of appearances, the Stranger did not deceive him. Sometimes he asks the Stranger for help and receives it. He is then thankful. Sometimes he asks and does not receive it. Then he says, 'the Stranger knows best.' Sometimes his friends, in exasperation, say, 'Well, what *would* he have to do for you to admit that you were wrong and that he is not on our side?' But the partisan refuses to answer. He will not consent to put the Stranger to the test. And sometimes his friends complain, 'Well, if *that's* what you mean by his being on our side, the sooner he goes over to the other side the better.'

The partisan of the parable does not allow anything to count decisively against the proposition 'the Stranger is on our side.' This is because he has committed himself to trust the Stranger. But he of course recognizes that the Stranger's ambiguous

behaviour *does* count against what he believes about him. It is precisely this situation which constitutes the trial of his faith.

When the partisan asks for help and doesn't get it, what can he do? He can (a) conclude that the stranger is not on our side; or (b) maintain that he is on our side, but that he has reasons for withholding help.

The first he will refuse to do. How long can he uphold the second position without its becoming just silly?

I don't think one can say in advance. It will depend on the nature of the impression created by the Stranger in the first place. It will depend, too, on the manner in which he takes the Stranger's behaviour. If he blandly dismisses it as of no consequence, as having no bearing upon his belief, it will be assumed that he is thoughtless or insane. And it quite obviously won't do for him to say easily, 'Oh, when used of the Stranger the phrase "is on our side" means ambiguous behaviour of this sort.' In that case he would be like the religious man who says blandly of a terrible disaster, 'It is God's will.' No, he will only be regarded as sane and reasonable in his belief, if he experiences in himself the full force of the conflict.

It is here that my parable differs from Hare's. The partisan admits that many things may and do count against his belief: whereas Hare's lunatic who has a *blik* about dons doesn't admit that anything counts against his *blik*. Nothing can count against *bliks*. Also the partisan has a reason for having in the first instance committed himself, viz. the character of the Stranger; whereas the lunatic has no reason for *his blik* about dons—because, of course, you can't have reasons for *bliks*.

This means that I agree with Flew that theological utterances must be assertions. The partisan is making an assertion when he says, 'the Stranger is on our side.'

Do I want to say that the partisan's belief about the Stranger is, in any sense, an explanation? I think I do. It explains and makes sense of the Stranger's behaviour: it helps to explain also the resistance movement in the context of which he appears. In each case it differs from the interpretation which the others put up on the same facts.

'God loves men' resembles 'the Stranger is on our side' (and many other significant statements, e.g. historical ones) in not being conclusively falsifiable. They can both be treated in at least three different ways: (1) as provisional hypotheses to be discarded if experience tells against them; (2) as significant articles of faith; (3) as vacuous formulae (expressing, perhaps, a desire for reassurance) to which experience makes no difference and which make no difference to life.

The Christian, once he has committed himself, is precluded by his faith from taking up the first attitude: 'thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' He is in constant danger, as Flew has observed, of slipping into the third. But he need not; and, if he does, it is a failure in faith as well as in logic.

Mother Teresa, *No Greater Love*

(New World Library, 1997)

On Prayer

I don't think there is anyone who needs God's help I and grace as much as I do. Sometimes I am so helpless and weak. I think that is why God uses me. Because I cannot depend on my own strength, I rely on Him twenty-four hours a day. If the day had even more hours, then I would need His help and grace during those hours as well. All of us must cling to God through prayer.

My secret is very simple: I pray. Through prayer I become one in love with Christ. I realize that praying to Him is loving Him.

In reality, there is only one true prayer, only one substantial prayer: Christ Himself. There is only one voice that rises above the face of the earth: the voice of Christ. Perfect prayer does not consist in many words, but in the fervor of the desire which raises the heart to Jesus.

Love to pray. Feel the need to pray often during the day. Prayer enlarges the heart until it is capable of containing God's gift of Himself Ask and seek and your heart will grow big enough to receive Him and keep Him as your own.

We want so much to pray properly and then we fail. We get discouraged and give up. If you want to pray better, you must pray more. God allows the failure but He does not want the discouragement. He wants us to be more childlike, more humble, more grateful in prayer, to remember we all belong to the mystical body of Christ, which is praying always.

We need to help each other in our prayers. Let us free our minds. Let's not pray long, drawn-out prayers, but let's pray short ones full of love. Let us pray on behalf of those who do not pray. Let us remember, if we want to be able to love, we must be able to pray!

Prayer that comes from the mind and heart is called mental prayer. We must never forget that we are bound toward perfection and should aim ceaselessly at it. The practice of daily mental prayer is necessary to reach that goal. Because it is the breath of life to our soul, holiness is impossible without it.

It is only by mental prayer and spiritual reading that we can cultivate the gift of prayer. Mental prayer is greatly fostered by simplicity—that is, forgetfulness of self by transcendence of the body and of our senses, and by frequent aspirations that feed our prayer. "In mental prayer," says Saint John Vianney, "shut your eyes, shut your mouth, and open your heart." In vocal prayer we speak to God; in mental prayer He speaks to us. It is then that God pours Himself into us.

Our prayers should be burning words coming forth from the furnace of hearts filled with love. In your prayers, speak to God with great reverence and confidence. Do not drag behind or run ahead; do not shout or keep silent, but devoutly, with great sweetness, with natural simplicity, without any affectation, offer your praise to God with the whole of your heart and soul.

Just once, let the love of God take entire and absolute possession of your heart; let it become to your heart like a second nature; let your heart suffer nothing contrary to enter; let it apply itself continually to increase this love of God by seeking to please Him in all things and refusing Him nothing; let it accept as from His hand everything that happens to it; let it have a firm determination never to commit any fault deliberately and knowingly or, if it should fall, to be humbled and to rise up again at once—and such a heart will pray continually.

People are hungry for the Word of God that will give peace, that will give unity, that will give joy. But you cannot give what you don't have. That's why it is necessary to deepen your life of prayer.

Be sincere in your prayers. Sincerity is humility, and you acquire humility only by accepting humiliations. All that has been said about humility is not enough to teach you humility. All that you have read about humility is not enough to teach you humility. You learn humility only by accepting humiliations. And you will meet humiliation all through your life. The greatest humiliation is to know that you are nothing. This you come to know when you face God in prayer.

Often a deep and fervent look at Christ is the best prayer: I look at Him and He looks at me. When you come face to face with God, you cannot but know that you are nothing, that you have nothing.

*

It is difficult to pray if you don't know how to pray, but we must help ourselves to pray. The first means to use is silence. We cannot put ourselves directly in the presence of God if we do not practice internal and external silence.

The interior silence is very difficult, but we must make the effort. In silence we will find energy and true unity. The energy of God will be ours to do all things well, and so will the unity of our thoughts With His thoughts, the unity of our prayers with His prayers, the unity of our actions with His actions, of our life with His life. Unity is the fruit of prayer, of humility, of love.

In the silence of the heart God speaks. If you face God in prayer and silence, God will speak to you. Then you will know that you are nothing. It is only when realize your nothingness, your emptiness, that God can fill you with Himself. Souls of prayer are souls of great silence.

Silence gives us a new outlook on everything. We need silence to be able to touch souls. The essential thing is not what we say but what God says to us and through us. In that

silence, He will listen to us; there He will speak to our Soul, and there we will hear His voice.

Listen in silence, because if your heart is full of other things you cannot hear the voice of God. But when you have listened to the voice of God in the stillness of your heart, then your heart is filled with God. This will need much sacrifice, but if we really mean to pray and want to pray we must be ready to do it now. These are only the first steps toward prayer but if we never make the first step with a determination, we will not reach the last one: the presence of God.

This is what we have to learn right from the beginning; to listen to the voice of God in our heart, and then in the silence of the heart God speaks. Then from the fullness of our hearts, our mouth will have to speak. That is the connection. In the silence of the heart, God speaks and you have to listen. Then in the fullness of your heart, because it is full of God, full of love, full of compassion, full of faith, your mouth will speak.

Remember, before you speak, it is necessary to listen, and only then, from the fullness of your heart you speak and God listens.

The contemplatives and ascetics of all ages and religions have sought God in the silence and solitude of the desert, forest, and mountain. Jesus Himself spent forty days in the desert and the mountains, communing for long hours with the Father in the silence of the night.

We too are called to withdraw at certain intervals into deeper silence and aloneness with God, together as a community as well as personally. To be alone with Him, not with our books, thoughts, and memories but completely stripped of everything, to dwell lovingly in His presence—silent, expectant, and motionless.

We cannot find God in noise or agitation. Nature: trees, flowers, and grass grow in silence. The stars, the moon, and the sun move in silence.

What is essential is not what we say but what God tells us and what He tells others through us. In silence He listens to us; in silence He speaks to our souls. In silence we are granted the privilege of listening to His voice.

Silence of our eyes.

Silence of our ears.

Silence of our mouths.

Silence of our minds.

... in the silence of the heart

God will speak.

Silence of the heart is necessary so you can hear God everywhere—in the closing of the door, in the person who needs you, in the birds that sing, in the flowers, in the animals.

If we are careful of silence it will be easy to pray. There is so much talk, so much repetition, so much carrying on of tales in words and in writing. Our prayer life suffers so much because our hearts are not silent.

I shall keep the silence of my heart with greater care, so that in the silence of my heart I hear His words of comfort and from the fullness of my heart I comfort Jesus in the distressing disguise of the poor.

*

Real prayer is union with God, a union as vital as that of the vine to the branch, which illustration Jesus gives us in the Gospel of John. We need prayer. We need that union to produce good fruit. The fruit is what we produce with our hands, whether it be food, clothing, money, or something else. All of this is the fruit of our oneness with God. We need a life of prayer, of poverty, and of sacrifice to do it with love.

Sacrifice and prayer complement each other. There is no prayer without sacrifice, and there is no sacrifice without prayer. Jesus' life was spent in intimate union with His Father as He passed through this world. We need to do the same. Let's walk by His side. We need to give Christ a chance to make use of us, to be His word and His work, to share His food and His clothing in the world today.

If we do not radiate the light of Christ around us, the sense of the darkness that prevails in the world will increase.

We are called to love the world. And God loved the world so much that He gave Jesus. Today He loves the world so much that He gives you and me to be His love, His compassion, and His presence, through a life of prayer, of sacrifice, of surrender to God. The response that God asks of you is to be a contemplative.

If we take Jesus at His word, all of us are contemplatives in the heart of the world, for if we have faith, we are continually in His presence. By contemplation the soul draws directly from the heart of God the graces, which the active life must distribute. Our lives must be connected with the living Christ in us. If we do not live in the presence of God we cannot go on.

What is contemplation? To live the life of Jesus. This is what I understand. To love Jesus, to live His life in us, to live our life in His life. That's contemplation. We must have a clean heart to be able to see—no jealousy, anger, contention, and especially no uncharitableness. To me, contemplation is not to be locked in a dark place, but to allow Jesus to live his passion, His love, His humility in us, praying with us, being with us, and sanctifying through us.

Our contemplation is our life. It is not a matter of doing but being. It is the possession of our spirit by the Holy Spirit breathing into us the plenitude of God and sending us forth to the whole creation as His personal message of love.

We shall not waste our time in looking for extraordinary experiences in our life of contemplation but live by pure faith, ever watchful and ready for His coming by doing our day-to-day duties with extraordinary love and devotion.

Our life of contemplation simply put is to realize God's constant presence and His tender love for us in the least little things of life. To be constantly available to Him,

loving Him with our whole heart, whole mind, whole soul, and whole strength, no matter in what form He may come to us. Does your mind and your heart go to Jesus as soon as you get up in the morning? This is prayer, that you turn your mind and heart to God.

Prayer is the very life of oneness, of being one with Christ. Therefore, prayer is as necessary as the air, as the blood in our body, as anything, to keep us alive to the grace of God. To pray generously is not enough; we must pray devoutly, with fervor and piety. We must pray perseveringly and with great love. If we don't pray, our presence will have no power, our words will have no power.

We need prayers in order to better carry out the work of God, and so that in every moment we may know how to be completely available to Him.

We should make every effort to walk in the presence of God, to see God in all the persons we meet, to live our prayer throughout the day.

Knowledge of the self puts us on our knees, and it is very necessary for love. For knowledge of God produces love, and knowledge of the self produces humility. Knowledge of the self is a very important thing in our lives. As Saint Augustine says, "Fill yourselves first, and then only will you be able to give to others."

Knowledge of the self is also a safeguard against pride, especially when you are tempted in life. The greatest mistake is to think you are too strong to fall into temptation. Put your finger in the fire and it will burn. So we have to go through the fire. The temptations are allowed by God. The only thing we have to do is to refuse to give in.

*

Prayer, to be fruitful, must come from the heart and must be able to touch the heart of God. See how Jesus taught His disciples to pray. I believe each time we say "Our Father," God looks at His hands where He has carved us. ("I have carved you on the palm of my hand." Isaiah 49-16.) He looks at His hands, and He sees us there. How wonderful the tenderness and love of God!

If we pray the "Our Father," and live it, we will be holy. Everything is there: God, myself, my neighbor. If I forgive, then I can be holy and can pray. All this comes from a humble heart, and if we have this we know how to love God, to love self, and to love our neighbor. This is not complicated, and yet we complicate our lives so much, by so many additions. Just one thing counts—to be humble, to pray. The more you pray, the better you will pray.

A child has no difficulty expressing his little mind in simple words that say so much. Jesus said to Nicodemus: "Become as a little child." If we pray the gospel, we will allow Christ to grow in us. So pray lovingly like children, with an earnest desire to love much and to make loved the one that is not loved.

All our words will be useless unless they come from within. Words that do not give the light of Christ increase the darkness. Today, more than ever, we need to pray for the light to know the will of God, for the love to accept the will of God, for the way to do the will of God.

* * *

A. C. Grayling, *Religion is selfish, blinkered and immoral*

'Religious fanatics murder, bomb and terrorise in the name of their faith'

When politicians consult priests on moral matters, it is time to start worrying. Does it imply bankruptcy of policy, and a scrabbling for ideas? Does it suggest that a mask of sanctimony is being sought to cover policies that need disguise? Or—worse—do the politicians really believe what priests say?

Both of Britain's main political leaders have turned to religious figures lately, Tony Blair to the maverick Catholic theologian Hans Küng, William Hague to a vocal figure of America's "Religious Right" who believes that public welfare provision should be replaced by private charity. Hague's aim is simply to find new packaging for old right-wing policies. Blair's case is more troubling. He has genuine religious convictions, which prompted him to say at Küng's Tübingen conference yesterday: "A society where there is religious faith will always, in my view, be inherently more likely to pursue the good of mankind." His view is troubling because it is false: religion is precisely the wrong resource for thinking about moral issues, and indeed subverts moral debate.

It does so because it is irrelevant to the practical questions of an ethical life. Modern societies value personal autonomy, achievement in earning a living, providing for a family, saving against a rainy day, and being rewarded for success. Christian morality values the opposite. It tells people to consider the lilies which take no thought for the morrow. It tells believers to give their possessions to the poor, warns that a well-off person will find heaven unwelcoming, and preaches subjection to a deity. Such a morality contradicts the fundamental norms of contemporary society.

It is also irrelevant to modern sexual attitudes. Almost all religions confine sex to marriage, and their more orthodox members oppose homosexuality, contraception and abortion, and restrict women to the domestic sphere. Most people ignore the contrast between such views and today's ethos, and the churches accordingly either temporise or contradict their own earlier teachings.

But religious morality is not merely irrelevant, it is anti-moral. The great moral questions of today concern human rights, war, poverty, and the vast disparities between rich and poor. In the Third World a child dies every two-and-a-half seconds because of starvation or curable disease, while in the first world churchgoers decry pre-

marital sex and debate whether divorced couples can remarry in church. By focusing attention on trivia, gross harm is done to the cause of good in the world.

But religion is not only anti-moral, it is often immoral. Elsewhere in the world, religious fundamentalists and fanatics incarcerate women, mutilate genitals, amputate hands, murder, bomb and terrorise in the name of their faith. It is a mistake to think that our own milksop clerics would never behave likewise, for it is not so long in historical terms since Christian priests were burning heretics at the stake or mounting crusades against them, whipping people or slitting their noses and ears for having extra-marital sex, or preaching that masturbation is worse than rape because at least the latter can result in pregnancy. To this day adulterers are stoned to death in certain Muslim countries; if the priests were still on top in the once-Christian world, who can say it would be different? If one looked to religions to provide historical examples of the moral life in practice, one would have to forget a great deal of immorality.

Dispassionately considered, no system of religious ethics adds up to much. Christianity is jejune in its principles. Nietzsche pointed out that the Beatitudes, which state that the poor, the meek and the downtrodden are blessed and will be rewarded in an afterlife, bespeak the psychology of an enslaved people—he meant the Jewish experience of exile in Egypt before Moses. He might have added that they have served the purposes of the comfortably placed throughout history, reconciling the poor and humble to their lot and helping to prevent uprisings.

What little Christianity offers in positive moral injunctions is indistinguishable from the Judaism that preceded it, or from Mohism in ancient China with its ethic of brotherly love and its concern for widows, orphans and social justice.

But neither the Judaeo-Christian nor the Mohist ethics compares to the richness or insight of “pagan” Greek ethics, or to present-day concerns about human rights and animal rights, which are much broader, more inclusive, and more sensitive than anything envisaged in religious morality.

Moreover, concern for the welfare and rights of people, animals and the environment motivated by a sense of the intrinsic worth of these things, and not by divine threats and promises, is the only true source of morality.

This last point is a clincher. Religious ethics is based on a sanction of posthumous rewards and punishments. It makes goodness the diktat of a supernatural being. You do good, by the lights of your religion, in order to achieve eternal bliss. If there are indeed supernatural powers in the universe, it might be prudent to do what they require in the interests of saving your neck; but the motivation is not a moral but a self-regarding and self-interested one. If I see two men do good, one because he wishes to escape punishment by a supposed supernatural agency and the other because he respects his fellow man, I honour the latter infinitely more.

Alexis de Tocqueville, *Man Needs Religion for Political Reasons*

[Excerpt from *Democracy in America*: "How Religion in the United States Avails Itself of Democratic Tendencies."]

I HAVE shown in a preceding chapter that men cannot do without; dogmatic belief, and even that it is much to be desired that such belief should exist among them. I now add that, of all the kinds of dogmatic belief, the most desirable appears to me to be dogmatic belief in matters of religion; and this is a clear inference, even from no higher consideration than the interests of this world.

There is hardly any human action, however particular it may be, that does not originate in some very general idea men have conceived of the Deity, of his relation to mankind, of the nature of their own souls, and of their duties to their fellow creatures. Nor can anything prevent these ideas from being the common spring from which all the rest emanates.

Men are therefore immeasurably interested in acquiring fixed ideas of God, of the soul, and of their general duties to their Creator and their fellow men; for doubt on these first principles would abandon all their actions to chance and would condemn them in some way to disorder and impotence.

This, then, is the subject on which it is most important for each of us to have fixed ideas; and unhappily it is also the subject on which it is most difficult for each of us, left to himself, to settle his opinions by the sole force of his reason. None but minds singularly free from the ordinary cares of life, minds at once penetrating, subtle, and trained by thinking, can, even with much time and care, sound the depths of these truths that are so necessary. And, indeed, we see that philosophers are themselves almost always surrounded with uncertainties; that at every step the natural light which illuminates their path grows dimmer and less secure, and that, in spite of all their efforts, they have discovered as yet only a few conflicting notions, on which the mind of man has been tossed about for thousands of years without every firmly grasping the truth or finding novelty even in its errors. Studies of this nature are far above the average capacity of men; and even if the majority of mankind were capable of such pursuits it is evident that the leisure to cultivate them would still be wanting.

Fixed ideas about God and human nature are indispensable to the daily practice of men's lives; but the practice of their lives prevents them from acquiring such ideas.

The difficulty appears to be without a parallel. Among the sciences there are some that are useful to the mass of mankind and are within its reach; others can be approached only by the few and are not cultivated by the many, who require nothing beyond their more remote applications: but the daily practice of the science I speak of is indispensable to all, although the study of it is inaccessible to the greater number.

General ideas respecting God and human nature are therefore the ideas above all others which it is suitable to withdraw from the habitual action of private judgment and in which there is most to gain and least to lose a recognizing a principle of authority.

The first object and one of the principal advantages of religion is to furnish to each of these fundamental questions a solution that is at once clear, precise, intelligible, and lasting to the mass of mankind. There are religions that are false and very absurd, but it may be affirmed that any religion which remains within the circle I have just traced, without pretending to go beyond it (as many religions have attempted to do, for the purpose of restraining on every side the free movement of the human mind), imposes a salutary restraint on the intellect; and it must be admitted that, if it does not save men in another world, it is at least very conducive to their happiness and their greatness in this.

This is especially true of men living in free countries. When the religion of a people is destroyed, doubt gets hold of the bigger powers of the intellect and half paralyzes all the others. Every man accustoms himself to having only confused and changing notions on-the subjects most interesting to his fellow creatures and himself. His opinions are ill-defended and easily abandoned; and, in despair of ever solving by himself the hard problems respecting the destiny of man, he ignobly submits to think no more about, them.

Such a condition cannot but enervate the soul, relax the springs of the will, and prepare a people for servitude. Not only does it happen in such a case that they allow their freedom to be taken from them; they frequently surrender it themselves. When there is no longer any principle of authority in religion any more than in politics, men are speedily frightened at the aspect of this unbounded independence. The constant agitation of all surrounding things alarms and exhausts them. As everything is at sea in the sphere of the mind, they determine at least that the mechanism of society shall be firm and fixed; and as they cannot resume their ancient belief, they assume a master.

For my own part, I doubt whether man can ever support at the same time complete religious independence and entire political freedom. And I am inclined to think that if faith be wanting in him, he must be subject; and if he be free, he must believe.

* * *

Karl Marx, from “Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Law”

“*Man makes religion, religion does not make man.*”

“[Religion] is the *opium* of the people.”

“To abolish religion as the *illusory* happiness of the people is to demand their *real* happiness. The demand to give up illusions about the existing state of affairs in the *demand to give up a state of affairs which needs illusions.*”

Friedrich Nietzsche, from *Genealogy of Morals*

"It was the Jews who, with awe-inspiring consistency, dared to invert the aristocratic value equation (good = noble = powerful = beautiful = happy = beloved of God) and to hang on this inversion with their teeth, the teeth of the most abysmal hatred (the hatred of impotence), saying 'the wretched alone are the good; the poor, impotent, lowly alone are the good; the suffering, deprived, sick, ugly alone are pious, alone are blessed by God, blessedness is for them alone—and you, the powerful and noble, are on the contrary the evil, the cruel, the lustful, the insatiable, the godless to all eternity; and you shall be in all eternity the unblessed, accursed, and damned!'"

Sigmund Freud, from *Civilization & Its Discontents*

"The derivation of religious needs from the infant's helplessness and the longing for the father aroused by it seems to me incontrovertible"

"I cannot think of any need in childhood as strong as the need for a father's protection."

"The origin of the religious attitude can be traced back in clear outlines as far as the feeling of infantile helplessness."

And so the common man's religion is in the form of a Providence "in the figure of an enormously exalted father." "The whole thing is so patently infantile, so foreign to reality, that anyone with a friendly attitude to humanity it is painful to think that the great majority of mortals will never be able to rise above this view of life. It is still more humiliating to discover how large a number of people living to-day, who cannot but see that this religion is not tenable, nevertheless try to defend it piece by piece in a series of pitiful rearguard actions." For example, they will replace God with "an impersonal, shadowy and abstract principle."

Since life is so intensely hard, disappointing, and frustrating, we need palliative measures. "There are perhaps three such measures: powerful deflections, which cause us to make light of our misery; substitutive satisfactions, which diminish it; and intoxicating substances, which make us insensitive to it. Something of the kind is indispensable."

* * *

Lois Hope Walker, *Religion Gives Meaning to Life*

[From Louis Pojman, *Philosophy: The Quest for Truth*, 2nd edition (Wadsworth Publ.) Lois Hope Walker is a pseudonym for an author who wishes to remain anonymous.]

SEVERAL YEARS AGO during a class break, I was discussing the significance of religion in our society with a few students in the college lounge. I, at that time an agnostic, was conceding to a devout Christian that it would be nice if theism were true, for then the world would not be simply a matter of chance and necessity, a sad tale with a sadder ending. Instead, “the world would be personal, a gift from our heavenly Father, who provides a basis for meaning and purpose.”

A mature woman from another class, whom I knew to be an atheist, overheard my remarks, charged through a group of coffee drinkers and angrily snapped at me, “That is the most disgusting thing I’ve ever heard!” I inquired why she thought this, and she replied, “Religion keeps humans from growing up. We don’t need a big Daddy in the sky. We need to grow up and become our own parents.”

I recalled Nietzsche’s dictum that now that “God is dead,” now that we have killed the Holy One, we must ourselves become gods to seem worthy of the deed. The atheist woman was prizing autonomy over meaning and claiming that religion did just the opposite.

In other words, she held two theses:

- (1) It is more important to be free or autonomous than to have a grand meaning or purpose to life.
- (2) Religion provides a grand meaning or purpose to life, but it does not allow humans to be free or autonomous.

I’ve thought a lot about that woman’s response over the years. I think that she is wrong on both counts. In this essay I will defend religion against her two theses and try to show that meaning and autonomy are both necessary or important ingredients for an ideal existence and that they are compatible within a religious framework.

Let me begin with the first thesis, that it is more important to be free than that there be meaning in life. First let us define our terms. By “autonomy” I mean self-governing, the ability to make choices on the basis of good reasons rather than being coerced by threats or forces from without.

By “meaning” in life I mean that life has a purpose. There is some intrinsic rationale or plan to it. Now this purpose can be good, bad, or indifferent. An example of something with a bad purpose is the activity of poisoning a reservoir on which a community depends for its sustenance. An example of something with an indifferent purpose might be pacing back and forth to pass the time of day (it is arguable that this is bad or good depending on the options and context, and if you think that then either choose your own example or dismiss the category of indifferent purpose). An example of a good purpose is digging a well in order to provide water to a community in need of water.

Now it seems to be the case that, as a value, autonomy is superior to indifferent and bad purposes, since it has positive value but these other two categories do not.

Autonomy may be more valuable to us than some good purposes, but it does not seem to be superior to all good purposes. While it may be more valuable to be free than to have this or that incidental purpose in life, freedom cannot really be understood apart from the notion of purposiveness. To be free is to be able to do some act *A*, when you want to, in order to reach some goal *G*. So the two ideas are related.

But the atheist woman meant more than this. She meant that if she had to choose whether to have free will or to live in a world that had a governing providential hand, she would choose the former. But this seems to make two mistakes. (1) It makes autonomy into an unjustified absolute and (2) it creates a false dilemma.

(1) Consider two situations: In situation A you are as free as you are now (say you have 100 units of autonomy—call these units “autonotoms”) but are deeply miserable because you are locked in a large and interesting room which is being slowly filled with poisonous gas. You can do whatever you want for five more minutes but then you will be dead. In situation B, however, you have only 95 autonotoms (that is, there are a few things that you are unable to do in this world—say commit adultery or kill your neighbor) but the room is being filled with sunshine and fresh air. Which world would you choose? I would choose situation B, for autonomy, it seems to me, is not the only value in the universe, nor is it always the overriding value. I think most of us would be willing to give up a few autonotoms for an enormous increase in happiness. And I think that a world with a good purpose would be one in which we would be willing to give up a few bits of freedom. If we were told that we could eliminate poverty, crime, and great suffering in the world by each sacrificing one autonotom, wouldn’t we do this?

If so, then autonomy is not an absolute which always overrides every other value. It is one important value among others.

I turn to the atheist’s second thesis, that religion always holds purpose as superior to autonomy. I think that this is a misunderstanding of what the best types of religion try to do. As Jesus said in John 8:32, “Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free.” Rather than seeing freedom and meaning as opposites, theism sees them as inextricably bound together. Since it claims to offer us the truth about the world, and since having true beliefs is important in reaching one’s goals, it follows that our autonomy is actually heightened in having the truth about the purpose of life. If we know why we are here and what the options in our destiny really are, we will be able to choose more intelligently than the blind who lead the blind in ignorance.

Indeed theistic religion (I have in mind Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, but this could apply to many forms of Hinduism and African religions as well) claims to place before us options of the greatest importance, so that if it is true the world is far better (infinitely better?) than if it is not.

Let me elaborate on this point. If theism is true and there is a benevolent supreme being governing the universe, the following eight theses are true:

1. We have a satisfying explanation of the origin and sustenance of the universe. We are the product not of chance and necessity or an impersonal Big Bang, but of a Heavenly Being who cares about us. As William James says, if religion is true, “the universe is no longer a mere *It* to us, but a *Thou* ... and any relation that may be possible from person to person might be possible here.” We can take comfort in knowing that the visible world is part of a more spiritual universe from which it draws its meaning and that there is, in spite of evil, an essential harmonious relation between our world and the transcendent reality.

2. Good will win out over evil—we're not fighting alone, but God is on our side in the battle. So, you and I are not fighting in vain—we'll win eventually. This thought of the ultimate victory of Goodness gives us confidence to go on in the fight against injustice and cruelty when others calculate that the odds against righteousness are too great to fight against.

3. God loves and cares for us—His love compels us (II Corinthians 5:7), so that we have a deeper motive for morally good actions, including high altruism. We live deeply moral lives because of deep gratitude to One who loves us and whom we love. Secularism lacks this sense of cosmic love, and it is, therefore, no accident that it fails to produce moral saints like Jesus, St. Francis, Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and Mother Teresa. You need special love to leave a world of comfort in order to go to a desolate island to minister to lepers, as Father Damian did.

4. We have an answer to the problem why be moral—it's clearly in your interest. Secular ethics has a severe problem with the question, Why be moral when it is not in your best interest, when you can profitably advance yourself by an egoistic act? But such a dilemma does not arise in religious ethics, for Evil really is bad for you and the Good good for you.

5. Cosmic Justice reigns in the universe. The scales are perfectly balanced so that everyone will get what he or she deserves, according to their moral merit. There is no moral luck (unless you interpret the grace which will finally prevail as a type of “luck”), but each will be judged according to how one has used one's talents (Matthew, chapter 25).

6. All persons are of equal worth. Since we have all been created in the image of God and are His children, we are all brothers and sisters. We are family and ought to treat each other benevolently as we would family members of equal worth. Indeed, modern secular moral and political systems often assume this equal worth of the individual without justifying it. But without the Parenthood of God it makes no sense to say that all persons are innately of equal value. From a perspective of intelligence and utility, Aristotle and Nietzsche are right, there are enormous inequalities, and why, shouldn't the superior persons use the baser types to their advantage? In this regard, secularism, in rejecting egalitarianism, seems to be living off of the interest of a religious capital which it has relinquished.

7. Grace and forgiveness—a happy ending—for all. All's well that ends well (the divine comedy). The moral guilt which we experience, even for the most heinous acts, can be removed, and we can be redeemed and given a new start. This is true moral liberation.

8. There is life after death. Death is not the end of the matter, but we shall live on, recognizing each other in a better world. We have eternity in our souls and are destined for a higher existence. (Of course, hell is a problem here which vitiates the whole idea somewhat, but many variations of theism [e.g., varieties of theistic Hinduism and the Christian theologians Origen (in the second century), F. Maurice, and Karl Barth] hold to universal salvation in the end. Hell is only a temporary school in moral education—I think that this is a plausible view.) So if Hebraic-Christian theism is true, the world is a friendly home in which we are all related as siblings in one family, destined to live forever in cosmic bliss in a reality in which good defeats evil.

If theism is false and secularism is true, then there is no obvious basis for human equality, no reason to treat all people with equal respect, no simple and clear answer to the question, Why be moral even when it is not 'in my best interest? no sense of harmony and purpose in the universe, but "Whirl has replaced Zeus and is king" (Sophocles).

Add to this the fact that theism doesn't deprive us of any autonomy that we have in nontheistic systems. We are equally free to choose the good or the evil whether or not God exists (assuming that the notions of good and evil make sense in a non-theistic universe)—then it seems clear that the world of the theist is far better and more satisfying to us than one in which God does not exist.

Of course, the problem is that we probably do not know if theism, let alone our particular religious version of it, is true. Here must use a Pascalean argument to press my third point that we may or, at least, it may be good to live *as if* theism is true. That is, unless you think that theism is so improbable that we should not even consider it as a candidate for truth, we should live in such a way as to allow the virtues of theism to inspire our lives and our culture. The theistic world view is so far superior to the secular that even though we might be agnostics or weak atheists—it is in our interest to live as though it were true, to consider each person as a child of God, of high value, to work as though God is working with us in the battle of Good over evil, and to build a society based on these ideas. It is good then to gamble on God. Religion gives us a purpose to life and a basis for morality that is too valuable to dismiss lightly. It is a heritage that we may use to build a better civilization and one which we neglect at our own peril.

* * *

Walter T. Stace, *There Is Meaning in Absurdity*

[Walter T. Stace, "Man against Darkness," *The Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1948.]

THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS OF AMERICA once issued a statement—in which they said that the chaotic and bewildered state of the modern world is due to man's loss of faith, his abandonment of God and religion. I agree with this statement though I do not accept the religious beliefs of most bishops. It is no doubt an oversimplification to speak of the cause of so complex a state of affairs as the tortured condition of the world today. Its causes are doubtless multitudinous. Yet allowing for some element of oversimplification, I say that the bishops' assertion is substantially true.

M. Jean-Paul Sartre, the French existentialist philosopher, labels himself an atheist. Yet his views seem to me plainly to support the statement of the bishops. So long as there was believed to be a God in the sky, he says, men could regard him as the source of their moral ideals. The universe, created and governed by a fatherly God, was a friendly habitation for man. We could be sure that, however great the evil in the world, good in the end would triumph and the forces of evil would be routed. With the disappearance of God from the sky all this has changed. Since the world is not ruled by a spiritual being, but rather by blind forces, there cannot be any ideals, moral or otherwise, in the universe outside us. Our ideals, therefore, must proceed only from our own minds; they are our own inventions. Thus the world which surrounds us is nothing but an immense spiritual emptiness. It is a dead universe. We do not live in a universe which is on the side of our values. It is completely indifferent to them.

Years ago Mr. Bertrand Russell, in his essay "A Free Man's Worship," said much the same thing.

Such in outline, but even more purposeless, more void of meaning, is the world which Science presents for our belief. Amid such a world, if anywhere, our ideals henceforward must find a home.... Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter rolls on its relentless way; for man, condemned today to lose his dearest, tomorrow himself to pass through the gate of darkness, it remains only to cherish, ere yet the blow falls, the lofty thoughts that enoble his little day; ... to worship at the shrine his own hands have built; ... to sustain alone, a weary but unyielding Atlas, the world that his own ideals have fashioned despite the trampling march of unconscious power.

It is true that Mr. Russell's personal attitude to the disappearance of religion is quite different from either that of M. Sartre or the bishops or myself. The bishops think it a calamity. So do I. M. Sartre finds it "very distressing." And he berates as shallow the attitude of those who think that without God the world can go on just the same as before, as if nothing had happened. This creates for mankind, he thinks, a terrible crisis. And in this I agree with him. Mr. Russell, on the other hand, seems to believe that religion has done more harm than good in the world, and that its disappearance will be a blessing. But his picture of the world, and of the modern mind, is the same as that of M. Sartre. He stresses the *purposelessness* of the universe, the facts that man's ideals are his own creations, that the universe outside him in no way supports them, that man is

alone and friendless in the world.

Mr. Russell notes that it is science which has produced this situation. There is no doubt that this is correct. But the way in which it has come about is not generally understood. There is a popular belief that some particular scientific discoveries or theories, such as the Darwinian theory of evolution, or the views of geologists about the age of the earth, or a series of such discoveries, have done the damage. It would be foolish to deny that these discoveries have had a great effect in undermining religious dogmas. But this account does not at all go to the root of the matter. Religion can probably outlive any scientific discoveries which could be made. It can accommodate itself to them. The root cause of the decay of faith has not been any particular discovery of science, but rather the general spirit of science and certain basic assumptions upon which modern science, from the seventeenth century onwards, has proceeded.

It was Galileo and Newton—notwithstanding that Newton himself was a deeply religious man—who destroyed the old comfortable picture of a friendly universe governed by spiritual values. And this was effected, not by Newton's discovery of the law of gravitation nor by any of Galileo's brilliant investigations, but by the general picture of the world which these men and others of their time made the basis of the science, not only of their own day, but of all succeeding generations down to the present. That is why the century immediately following Newton, the eighteenth century, was notoriously an age of religious skepticism. Skepticism did not have to wait for the discoveries of Darwin and the geologists in the nineteenth century. It flooded the world immediately after the age of the rise of science. Neither the Copernican hypothesis nor any of Newton's or Galileo's particular discoveries were the real causes. Religious faith might well have accommodated itself to the new astronomy. The real turning point between the medieval age of faith and the modern age of unbelief came when the scientists of the seventeenth century turned their backs upon what used to be called "final causes." The final cause of a thing or event meant the purpose which it was supposed to serve in the universe, its cosmic purpose. What lay back of this was the presupposition that there is a cosmic order or plan and that everything which exists could in the last analysis be explained in terms of its place in this cosmic plan, that is, in terms of its purpose.

Plato and Aristotle believed this, and so did the whole medieval Christian world. For instance, if it were true that the sun and the moon were created and exist for the purpose of giving light to man, then this fact would explain why the sun and the moon exist. We might not be able to discover the purpose of everything, but everything must have a purpose. Belief in final causes thus amounted to a belief that the world is governed by purposes, presumably the purposes of some overruling mind. This belief was not the invention of Christianity. It was basic to the whole of Western civilization, whether in the ancient pagan world or in Christendom, from the time of Socrates to the rise of science in the seventeenth century.

The founders of modern science—for instance, Galileo, Kepler, and Newton—were mostly pious men who did not doubt God's purposes. Nevertheless they took the revolutionary step of consciously and deliberately expelling the idea of purpose as controlling nature from their new science of nature. They did this on the ground that inquiry into purposes is useless for what science aims at: namely, the prediction and control of events. To predict an eclipse, what you have to know is not its purpose but its causes. Hence science from the seventeenth century onwards became exclusively an inquiry into causes. The conception of purpose in the world was ignored and frowned on. This, though silent ignore and almost unnoticed, was the greatest revolution in human history, far outweighing in importance any of the political revolutions whose thunder has reverberated through the world.

For it came about in this way that for the past three hundred years there has been growing up in men's minds, dominated as they are by science, a new imaginative picture of the world. The world, according to this new picture, is purposeless, senseless, meaningless. Nature is nothing but matter in motion. The motions of matter are governed, not by any purpose, but by blind forces and laws. Nature in this view, says Whitehead—to whose writings I am indebted in this part of my essay—is “merely the hurrying of material, endlessly, meaninglessly.” You can draw a sharp line across the history of Europe dividing it into two epochs of very unequal length. The line passes through the lifetime of Galileo. European man before Galileo—whether ancient pagan or more recent Christian—thought of the world as controlled by plan and purpose. After Galileo European man thinks of it as utterly purposeless. This is the great revolution of which I spoke.

It is this which has killed religion. Religion could survive the discoveries that the sun, not the earth, is the center; that men are descended from simian ancestors; that the earth is hundreds of millions of years old. These discoveries may render out of date some of the details of older theological dogmas, may force their restatement in new intellectual frameworks. But they do not touch the essence of the religious vision itself, which is the faith that there is plan and purpose in the world, that the world is a moral order, that in the end all things are for the best. This faith may express itself through many different intellectual dogmas, those of Christianity, of Hinduism, of Islam. All and any of these intellectual dogmas may be destroyed without destroying the essential religious spirit. But that spirit cannot survive destruction of belief in a plan and purpose of the world, for that is the very heart of it. Religion can get on with any sort of astronomy, geology, biology, physics. But it cannot get on with a purposeless and meaningless universe. If the scheme of things is purposeless and meaningless, then the life of man is purposeless and meaningless too. Everything is futile, all effort is in the end worthless. A man may, of course, still pursue disconnected ends, money, fame, art, science, and may gain pleasure from them. But his life is hollow at the center. Hence the dissatisfied, disillusioned, restless, spirit of modern man.

The picture of a meaningless world, and a meaningless human life is, I think, the basic theme of much modern art and literature. Certainly it is the basic theme of modern philosophy. According to the most characteristic philosophies of the modern period from Hume in the eighteenth century to the so-called positivists of today, the world is just what it is, and that is the end of all inquiry. There is no *reason* for its being what it is. Everything might just as well have been quite different, and there would have been no reason for that either. When you have stated what things are, what things the world contains, there is nothing more which could be said, even by an omniscient being. To ask any question about *why* things are thus, or what purpose their being so serves, is to ask a senseless question, because they serve no purpose at all. For instance, there is for modern philosophy no such thing as the ancient problem of evil. For this once famous question presupposes that pain and misery, though they seem so inexplicable and irrational to us, must ultimately subserve some rational purpose, must have their places in the cosmic plan. But this is nonsense. There is no such overruling rationality in the universe. Belief in the ultimate irrationality of everything is the quintessence of what is called the modern mind.

It is true that, parallel with these philosophies which are typical of the modern mind, preaching the meaninglessness of the world, there has run a line of idealistic philosophies whose contention is that the world is after all spiritual in nature and that moral ideals and values are inherent in its structure. But most of these idealisms were simply philosophical expressions of romanticism, which was itself no more than an unsuccessful counterattack of the religious against the scientific view of things. They perished, along with romanticism in literature and art, about the beginning of the present century, though of course they still have a few adherents. At the bottom these idealistic systems of thought were rationalizations of man's wishful thinking. They were born of the refusal of men to admit the cosmic darkness. They were comforting illusions within the warm glow of which the more tender-minded intellectuals sought to shelter themselves from the icy winds of the universe. They lasted a little while. But they are shattered now, and we return once more to the vision of a purposeless world.

Along with the ruin of the religious vision there went the ruin of moral principles and indeed of all values. If there is a cosmic purpose, if there is in the nature of things a drive towards goodness, then our moral systems will derive their validity from this. But if our moral rules do not proceed from something outside us in the nature of the universe—whether we say it is God or simply the universe itself—then they must be our own inventions. Thus it came to be believed that moral rules must be merely an expression of our own likes and dislikes. But likes and dislikes are notoriously variable. What pleases one man, people, or culture displeases another. Therefore morals are wholly relative. This obvious conclusion from the idea of a purposeless world made its appearance in Europe immediately after the rise of science, for instance in the philosophy of Hobbes. Hobbes saw at once that if there is no purpose in the world there are no values either. "Good and evil," he writes, "are names that signify our appetites and aversions; which in different tempers, customs, and doctrines of men are

different.... Every man calleth that which pleaseth him, good; and that which displeaseth him, evil."

This doctrine of the relativity of morals, though it has recently received an impetus from the studies of anthropologists, was thus really implicit in the whole scientific mentality. It is disastrous for morals because it destroys their entire traditional foundation. That is why philosophers who see the danger signals, from the time at least of Kant, have been trying to give to morals a new foundation, that is, a secular or non-religious foundation. This attempt may very well be intellectually successful. Such a foundation, independent of the religious view of the world, might well be found. But the question is whether it can ever be a *practical* success, that is, whether apart from its logical validity and its influence with intellectuals, it can ever replace among the masses of men the lost religious foundation. On that question hangs perhaps the future of civilization. But meanwhile disaster is overtaking us.

The widespread belief in "ethical relativity" among philosophers, psychologists, ethnologists, and sociologists is the theoretical counterpart of the repudiation of principle which we see all around us, especially in international affairs, the field in which morals have always had the weakest foothold. No one any longer effectively believes in moral principles except as the private prejudices either of individual men or of nations or cultures. This is the inevitable consequence of the doctrine of ethical relativity, which in turn is the inevitable consequence of believing in a purposeless world.

Another characteristic of our spiritual state is loss of belief in the freedom of the will. This also is a fruit of the scientific spirit, though not of any particular scientific discovery. Science has been built up on the basis of determinism, which is the belief that every event is completely determined by a chain of causes and is therefore theoretically predictable beforehand. It is true that recent physics seems to challenge this. But so far, as its practical consequences are concerned, the damage has long ago been done. A man's actions, it was argued, are as much events in the natural world as is an eclipse of the sun. It follows that men's actions are as theoretically predictable as an eclipse. But if it is certain now that John Smith will murder Joseph Jones at 2:15 P.M. on January 1, 2000 A.D., what possible meaning can it have to say that when that time comes John Smith will be *free* to choose whether he will commit the murder or not? And if he is not free, how can he be held responsible?

It is true that the whole of this argument can be shown by a competent philosopher to be a tissue of fallacies—or at least I claim that it can. But the point is that the analysis required to show this is much too subtle to be understood by the average entirely unphilosophical man. Because of this, the argument against free will is generally swallowed whole by the unphilosophical. Hence the thought that man is not free, that he is the helpless plaything of forces over which he has no control, has deeply penetrated the modern mind. We hear of economic determinism, cultural determinism, historical determinism. We are not responsible for what we do because our glands

control us, or because we are the products of environment or heredity. Not moral self-control, but the doctor, the psychiatrist, the educationist, must save us from doing evil. Pills and injections in the future are to do what Christ and the prophets have failed to do. Of course I do not mean to deny that doctors and educationists can and must help. And I do not mean in any way to belittle their efforts. But I do wish to draw attention to the weakening of moral controls, the greater or less repudiation of personal responsibility which, in the popular thinking of the day, result from these tendencies of thought.

What, then, is to be done? Where are we to look for salvation from the evils of our time? All the remedies I have seen suggested so far are, in my opinion, useless. Let us look at some of them.

Philosophers and intellectuals generally can, I believe, genuinely do something to help. But it is extremely little. What philosophers can do is to show that neither the relativity of morals nor the denial of free will really follows from the grounds which have been supposed to support them. They can also try to discover a genuine secular basis for morals to replace the religious basis which has disappeared. Some of us are trying to do these things. But in the first place philosophers unfortunately are not agreed about these matters, and their disputes are utterly confusing to the non-philosophers. And in the second place their influence is practically negligible because their analyses necessarily take place at a level on which the masses are totally unable to follow them.

The bishops, of course, propose as remedy a return to belief in God and in the doctrines of the Christian religion. Others think that a new religion is what is needed. Those who make these proposals fail to realize that the crisis in man's spiritual condition is something unique in history for which there is no sort of analogy in the past. They are thinking perhaps of the collapse of the ancient Greek and Roman religions. The vacuum then created was easily filled by Christianity, and it might have been filled by Mithraism if Christianity had not appeared. By analogy they think that Christianity might now be replaced by a new religion, or even that Christianity itself, if revivified, might bring back health to men's lives.

But I believe that there is no analogy at all between our present state and that of the European peoples at the time of the fall of paganism. Men had at that time lost their belief only in particular dogmas, particular embodiments of the religious view of the world. It had no doubt become incredible that Zeus and the other gods were living on the top of Mount Olympus. You could go to the top and find no trace of them. But the imaginative picture of a world governed by purpose, a world driving towards the good which is the inner spirit of religion-had at that time received no serious shock. It had merely to re-embody itself in new dogmas, those of Christianity or some other religion. Religion itself was not dead in the world, only a particular form of it.

But now the situation is quite different. It is not merely that particular dogmas, like that of the virgin birth, are unacceptable to the modern mind. That is true, but it constitutes a very superficial diagnosis of the present situation of religion. Modern skepticism is of a wholly different order from that of the intellectuals of the ancient world. It has attacked and destroyed not merely the outward forms of the religious spirit, its particularized dogmas, but the very essence of that spirit itself, belief in a meaningful and purposeful world. For the founding of a new religion a new Jesus Christ or Buddha would have to appear, in itself a most unlikely event and one for which in any case we cannot afford to sit and wait. But even if a new prophet and a new religion did appear, we may predict that they would fall in the modern world. No one for long would believe in them, for modern men have lost the vision, basic to all religion, of an ordered plan and purpose of the world. They have before their minds the picture of a purposeless universe, and such a world-picture must be fatal to any religion at all, not merely to Christianity.

We must not be misled by occasional appearances of a revival of the religious spirit. Men, we are told, in their disgust and disillusionment at the emptiness of their lives, are turning once more to religion, or are searching for a new message. It may be so. We must expect such wistful yearnings of the spirit. We must expect men to wish back again the light that is gone, and to try to bring it back. But however they may wish and try, the light will not shine again—not at least in the civilization to which we belong.

Another remedy commonly proposed is that we should turn to science itself, or the scientific spirit, for our salvation. Mr. Russell and Professor Dewey both made this proposal, though in somewhat different ways. Professor Dewey seemed to believe that discoveries in sociology, the application of scientific method to social and political problems, will rescue us. This seems to me to be utterly naive. It is not likely that science, which is basically the cause of our spiritual troubles, is likely also to produce the cure for them. Also it lies in the nature of science that, though it can teach us the best means for achieving our ends, it can never tell us what ends to pursue. It cannot give us any ideals. And our trouble is about ideals and ends, not about the means for reaching them.

No civilization can live without ideals, or to put it in another way, without a firm faith in moral ideas. Our ideals and moral ideas have in the past been rooted in religion. But the religious basis of our ideals has been undermined, and the superstructure of ideals is plainly tottering. None of the commonly suggested remedies on examination is likely to succeed. It would therefore look as if the early death of our civilization were inevitable.

Of course we know that it is perfectly possible for individual men, very highly educated men, philosophers, scientists, intellectuals in general, to live moral lives without any religious convictions. But the question is whether a whole civilization, a whole family of peoples, composed almost entirely of relatively uneducated men and

women, can do this. It follows, of course, that if we could make the vast majority of men as highly educated as the very few are now, we might save the situation. And we are already moving slowly in that direction through the techniques of mass education. But the critical question seems to concern the time-lag. Perhaps in a hundred years most of the population will, at the present rate, be sufficiently highly educated and civilized to combine high ideals with an absence of religion. But long before we reach any such stage, the collapse of our civilization may have come about. How are we to live through the intervening period?

I am sure that the first thing we have to do is to face the truth, however bleak it may be, and then next we have to learn to live with it. Let me say a word about each of these two points. What I am urging as regards the first is complete honesty. Those who wish to resurrect Christian dogmas are not, of course, consciously dishonest. But they have that kind of unconscious dishonesty which consists in lulling oneself with opiates and dreams. Those who talk of a new religion are merely hoping for a new opiate. Both alike refuse to face the truth that there is, in the universe outside man, no spirituality no regard for values, no friend in the sky, no help or comfort for man of any sort. To be perfectly honest in the admission of this fact, not to seek shelter in new or old illusions, not to indulge in wishful dreams about this matter, this is the first thing we shall have to do.

I do not urge this course out of any special regard for the sanctity of truth in the abstract. It is not self-evident to me that truth is the supreme value to which all else must be sacrificed. Might not the discoverer of a truth which would be fatal to mankind be justified in suppressing it, even in reaching men a falsehood? Is truth more valuable than goodness and beauty and happiness. To think so is to invent yet another absolute, another religious delusion in which Truth with a capital T is substituted for God. The reason why we must now boldly and honestly face the truth that the universe is non-spiritual and indifferent to goodness, beauty, happiness, or truth is not that it would be wicked to suppress it, but simply that it is too late to do so, so that in the end we cannot do anything else but face it. Yet we stand on the brink, dreading the icy plunge. We need courage. We need honesty.

Now about the other point, the necessity of learning to live with the truth. This means learning to live virtuously and happily, or at least contentedly, without illusions. And this is going to be extremely difficult because what we have now begun dimly to perceive is that human life in the past, or at least human happiness, has almost wholly depended upon illusions. It has been said that man lives by truth, and that the truth will make us free. Nearly the opposite seems to me to be the case. Mankind has managed to live only by means of lies, and the truth may very well destroy us. If one were a Bergsonian one might believe that nature deliberately puts illusions into our souls in order to induce us to go on living.

The illusions by which men have lived seem to be of two kinds. First, there is what one may perhaps call the Great Illusion—I mean the religious illusion that the

universe is moral and good, that it follows a wise and noble plan, that is gradually generating some supreme value, that goodness is bound to triumph in it. Secondly, there is a whole host of minor illusions on which human happiness nourishes itself. How much of human happiness notoriously comes from the illusions of the lover about his beloved? Then again we work and strive because of the illusions connected with fame, glory, power, or money. Banners of all kinds, flags, emblems, insignia, ceremonials, and rituals are invariably symbols of some illusion or other. The British Empire, the connection between mother country and dominions, used to be partly kept going by illusions surrounding the notion of kingship. Or think of the vast amount of human happiness which is derived from the illusion of supposing that if some nonsense syllable, such as "sir" or "count" or "lord" is pronounced in conjunction with our names, we belong to a superior order of people.

There is plenty of evidence that human happiness is almost wholly based upon illusions of one kind or another. But the scientific spirit, or the spirit of truth, is the enemy of illusions and therefore the enemy of human happiness. That is why it is going to be so difficult to live with the truth. There is no reason why we should have to give up the host of minor illusions which tender life supportable. There is no reason why the lover should be scientific about the loved one. Even the illusions of fame and glory may persist. But without the Great Illusion, the illusion of a good, kindly, and purposeful universe, we shall *have* to learn to live. And to ask this is really no more than to ask that we become genuinely civilized beings and not merely sham civilized beings.

I can best explain the difference by a reminiscence. I remember a fellow student in my college days, an ardent Christian, who told me that if he did not believe in a future life, in heaven and hell, he would rape, murder, steal and be a drunkard. That is what I call being a sham civilized being. On the other hand, not only could a Huxley, a John Stuart Mill, a David Hume, live great and fine lives without any religion, but a great many others of us, quite obscure persons, can at least live decent lives without it. To be genuinely civilized means to be able to walk straightly and to live honorably without the props and crutches of one or another of the childish dreams which have so far supported men. That such a life not likely to be ecstatically happy I will not claim. But that it can be lived in quiet content, accepting resignedly what cannot be helped, not expecting the impossible, and being thankful for small mercies, this I would maintain. That it will be difficult for men in general to learn this lesson I do not deny. But that it will be impossible I would not admit since so many have learned it already.

Man has not yet grown up. He is not adult. Like a child he cries for the moon and lives in a world of fantasies. And the race as a whole has perhaps reached the great crisis of its life. Can it grow up as a race in the same sense as individual men grow up? Can man put away childish things and adolescent dreams? Can he grasp the real world as it actually is, stark and bleak, without its romantic or religious halo, and still retain his ideals, striving for great ends and noble achievements? If he can, all may yet be well.

If he cannot, he will probably sink back into the savagery and brutality from which he came, taking a humble place once more among the lower animals.

* * *

Rupert Brooke, *The Great Lover*

I have been so great a lover: filled my days
 So proudly with the splendour of Love's praise,
 The pain, the calm, and the astonishment,
 Desire illimitable, and still content,
 And all dear names men use, to cheat despair,
 For the perplexed and viewless streams that bear
 Our hearts at random down the dark of life.
 Now, ere the unthinking silence on that strife
 Steals down, I would cheat drowsy Death so far,
 My night shall be remembered for a star
 That outshone all the suns of all men's days.
 Shall I not crown them with immortal praise
 Whom I have loved, who have given me, dared with me
 High secrets, and in darkness knelt to see
 The inenarrable godhead of delight?
 Love is a flame; — we have beaconed the world's night.
 A city: — and we have built it, these and I.
 An emperor. — we have taught the world to die.
So, for their sakes I loved, ere I go hence,
 And the high cause of Love's magnificence,
 And to keep loyalties young, I'll write those names
 Golden for ever, eagles, crying flames,
 And set them as a banner, that men may know,
 To dare the generations, burn, and blow
 Out on the wind of Time, shining and streaming

These I have loved:

White plates and cups, clean-gleaming,
Ringed with blue lines; and feathery, faery dust;
Wet roofs, beneath the lamp-light; the strong crust
Of friendly bread; and many-tasting food;
Rainbows; and the blue bitter smoke of wood;
And radiant raindrops couching in cool flowers;
And flowers themselves, that sway through sunny hours,
Dreaming of moths that drink them under the moon;
Then, the cool kindliness of sheets, that soon
Smooth away trouble; and the rough male kiss
Of blankets; grainy wood; live hair that is
Shining and free; blue-massing clouds; the keen
Unpassioned beauty of a great machine;
The benison of hot water; furs to touch;
The good smell of old clothes; and other such
The comfortable smell of friendly fingers,
Hair's fragrance, and the musty reek that lingers
About dead leaves and last year's ferns . . . Dear names
And thousand others throng to me! Royal flames;
Sweet water's dimpling laugh from tap or spring;
Holes in the ground; and voices that do sing:
Voices in laughter, too; and body's pain,
Soon turned to peace; and the deep-panting train;
Firm sands; the little dulling edge of foam
That browns and dwindle as the wave goes home;
And washen stones, gay for an hour; the cold
Graveness of iron; moist black earthen mould;
Sleep; and high places; footprints in the dew;
And oaks; and brown horse-chestnuts, glossy-new;

And new-peeled sticks; and shining pools on grass; —
All these have been my loves. And these shall pass.
Whatever passes not, in the great hour,
Nor all my passion, all my prayers, have power
To hold them with me through the gate of Death.
They'll play deserter, turn with traitor breath,
Break the high bond we made, and sell Love's trust
And sacramented covenant to the dust.

— Oh, never a doubt but, somewhere, I shall wake,
And give what's left of love again, and make
New friends, now strangers But the best I've known,
Stays here, and changes, breaks, grows old, is blown
About the winds of the world, and fades from brains
Of living men, and dies. Nothing remains.

O dear my loves, O faithless, once again
This one last gift I give: that after men
Shall know, and later lovers, far-removed
Praise you, 'All these were lovely'; say, 'He loved.'

* * *