

To the Rev. Dr. Clarke

300.87

With the best regards of the Author

THE

Canton China. Aug. 1881.

A. P. Happer

STATE RELIGION

OF

CHINA.

BY

INQUIRER.

Andrew Patton Happer, 1818-1894



SHANGHAI:
AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN MISSION PRESS.

1881.

Generated on 2020-10-12 14:10 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/nnc2.ark:/13960/t8sb9507f
Public Domain in the United States / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-us

300.87

THE STATE RELIGION OF CHINA.

BY INQUIRER.

1. *The Chinese Repository*. 20 Vols. Canton : 1832-51.
2. *The Chinese ; A general Description of China and its Inhabitants*. By John Francis Davis, Esq., F.R.S. London : 1840.
3. *China ; its State and Prospects*. By W. H. Medhurst, of the London Missionary Society. London : 1840.
4. *The Middle Kingdom ; A Survey of the Chinese Empire and its Inhabitants*. By S. Wells Williams. New York : 1847.
5. *Religion in China ; A brief account of the three Religions of the Chinese*. By Joseph Edkins, D.D. Second Edition. London : 1878.
6. *Confucianism and Taoism*. By Robert K. Douglas, of the British Museum, and Prof. of Chinese at King's College London. London : 1879.
7. *The Religions of China*. By James Legge, Professor of the Chinese Language and Literature in the University of Oxford. London : 1880.

EVERY thing connected with an ancient and populous Empire, is a matter of great interest to all students of the institutions that are found among the various nations of the world. It is a generally accepted proposition that no institution exerts so great an influence upon the character of a people as the prevailing religion.

These several works on the general history and institutions of China, have devoted some chapters to the special consideration of the religions of this people ; while the other volumes are exclusively occupied with this subject. It is not my purpose at this time to consider the three religions of China. I restrict myself to the consideration of *The State Religion* of this kingdom. It would appear to most persons, that, when the religion of a people is set forth in a series of Books, which have come down from the earliest ages of that people ; that, when there is a ritual for the regulation of the services which are established by Imperial authority ; and, when this religion is open to the observation and study of all its ceremonies and worship, which are thus authoritatively prescribed, there would be no difference of

Generated on 2020-10-12 14:10 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/nnc2 ark:/13960/t8sb9507f / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-us
Public Domain in the United States

opinion, among the students of their history, in regard to the fundamentals of this system of worship. It is, however, a matter of history that widely different views have been entertained in regard thereto; and that a long continued discussion was maintained, by those who thus held different views, during the whole of the 17th century, on such *essential points* of this religion as the following, viz.; To what object, or Being, is the Imperial worship offered, and what is the nature of the rites which are observed in honor of the sage Confucius, and deceased Parents, by the Chinese officers, scholars and people. The exact points thus discussed during the 17th century may be best stated in the language of the Historians of that period. The Protestant writer Mosheim, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, states them thus. "This controversy may be all embraced under two heads. (1). The Chinese call the supreme god whom they worship, Tien and Shang-ti; that is, in their language, Heaven. The Jesuits transferred this name to the God of Christians; whence it seemed to follow, that they thought there was *no difference* between the chief god of the Chinese, and the infinitely perfect God of the Christians; or that the Chinese had the same ideas of their Tien or Heaven as the Christians have of God. The first question therefore is whether the Chinese understand by the words specified, the visible material heavens, or the Lord of heaven; that eternal and all perfect *Being* whose throne is in the heavens; that is, such a God as Christianity presents for our worship. The Jesuits maintain the latter opinion. (2). The second question is, whether those honors, which the Chinese are required to pay to the souls of their deceased ancestors, and all the literati to Confucius, the oracle of the nation, are civil honors, or religious; whether they are sacrifices, or, only regulations established for state purposes. The Jesuits say that the Chinese do not offer religious worship to the souls of their ancestors, nor to Confucius; and hence they conclude that it is allowable for Christians to observe these sacred rites of their country." Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, New York 1844, Vol. II. pp. 253-254. These points are stated by the Roman Catholic Historian M. L. Abbe Huc in his "Christianity in China, &c.," as follows: "Father Ricci thought Tien or Heaven, as conceived by the educated classes, was not the material and visible one, but the true God, the Lord of Heaven, the Supreme Being, invisible and spiritual, of infinite perfection, the Creator and Preserver of all things; the only God, in fact. He was also persuaded that the sacrifices offered to ancestors were purely of a civil nature, and had nothing whatever of a religious or idolatrous signification." Vol. II. pp. 225-29. Father Longobardi, who was selected by Father Ricci to succeed him in the administration

of the Jesuit Mission, "looked at all these Chinese customs from a very different point of view. The esteem that he had felt for the talents and virtue of Father Ricci had induced him, before, to suspend his judgments; but when he found himself placed at the head of the mission, he considered it his duty to examine this important question with greater attention. He set himself seriously therefore to his study of the works of Confucius, and of his most celebrated commentators, and consulted such of the literary men as could throw light upon the subject, and in whom he could place confidence. Father Longobardi wrote a book on the subject, in which it was examined to the bottom; and in which he came to the conclusion, that the Chinese, in reality, recognized no divinity but Heaven, and the general effect that it had upon the beings of the universe; and the customs of China appeared to Longobardi, and the missionaries that took his side, as an idolatry utterly incompatible with the sanctity of Christianity." pp. 229-30. The dissension on this subject, which was known by the designation "the question of the Rites," commenced amongst the Jesuit missionaries *themselves*, about the year 1610, before the arrival of missionaries of the other orders. Jesuits of talents and learning were found on opposite sides in this discussion. "We have already said that from the very commencement of the Society of Jesus in China, there had arisen among them differences of opinion from which had originated two schools, that of Father Ricci who was disposed to allow the widest toleration of the rites of the Chinese; and that of Father Longobardi, who saw nothing but superstition in the worship paid to Heaven, to Confucius, and their ancestors." Vol. III. p. 2. On the arrival of the Missionaries of the Dominicans and Franciscans "they did not join the school of Father Ricci which had been considerably in the majority, but they reinforced that of Father Longobardi." p. 3. It was in 1633 that some of these orders arrived in Fohkien from Manila. When the missionaries from the French Society of Foreign Missions arrived in China in 1684 they also, after due examination of the subject, concurred in the views of Longobardi.

This controversy between some of the Jesuits on the one side, and others of the Jesuits, supported by the Dominicans, (who were considered the ablest theologians of the Catholic church in that century), Franciscans, and the French missionaries, (some of whom were Doctors of the Sorbonne), on the other side, continued from 1610 to 1704. In 1699, Pope Innocent XII. appointed "a Congregation" composed of several cardinals and other learned men to investigate the subject thoroughly, in order that a *final* decision might be given in a matter which had been so long under discussion and concerning

which temporizing decisions had hitherto been given. This Congregation had presented to it the views of both parties fully; and most of the written papers and books, which the discussion had called forth during the ninety years of its continuance, were laid before it for examination.

After a long protracted consideration of the subject, and a full examination of all the books and writings in reference to it, which were submitted to them, the Congregation presented its report to Pope Clement XI, (who had succeeded Innocent XII.) in Nov. 1704. In accordance with the conclusions arrived at by the Congregation, and the reasons therefore given in the report, Clement XI. issued his decree of 1704 as follows:—"It was with this view, that, on the 20th Nov., 1704, we confirmed and approved by apostolic authority the answers given by the Congregation of our venerable brothers the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church (committed and deputed by the same authority to be Inquisitors General against heresy throughout the Christian republic) touching this same affair of China. After a long examination begun under our predecessor Innocent XII, of happy memory, and after the arguments on both sides had been heard, as well as the sentiments of a great number of theologians and other qualified persons.

The decisions given in their answers are the following:—"That since in China, the most high and good God cannot be named by the names given to him in Europe, we must, to express our idea of him, employ the words Tien Tchou, that is to say the Lord of Heaven, now for a long period received and approved by the missionaries and the faithful in Christ; but that the names "Tien" Heaven [in the Latin *coelum*], and Shangti, Sovereign Emperor, must be absolutely rejected. That for this reason it must not be permitted that tablets bearing the Chinese inscription "King Tien," adore Heaven, should be placed in Christian churches nor retained there for the future, should they have been previously so placed." Vol. III. pp. 409-10. This answer was evidently given in consequence of the proofs supplied to the Commission for investigating the subject that Tien, as the object the Chinese worship, is the visible Heaven or sky regarded as a god. It was thus forbidden to be used to designate the true God, because of the liability that those who had been *accustomed* to use it in this way, would, if it was used in speaking of the God of the Christians, suppose that the true God was the same as deified Heaven. That this was a proper consideration on which to base their decision must be evident to every reflecting mind. For it is a most universal law of the association of ideas in the use of words, that the *same name* or designa-

tion refers to the *same person* or object. The strength and clearness of their conviction in the minds of the congregation that Heaven meant the deified sky are manifest from the fact that the decision required the removal of an inscription "Adore Heaven" which had been given by the Emperor Kang Hi to the church recently erected in Peking, which removal would of course give great offence to the Emperor Kang Hi who had presented it.

This decree of the Pope is, therefore, not to be regarded as one that is to be accepted because of Papal authority. But the conclusions arrived at in this report and embodied in the Pope's Bull commend themselves to the acceptance of the Christian world, by the most weighty considerations that can influence the judgment of mankind. The Congregation was composed of competent and able men. Both parties were fairly and fully heard. Time enough was taken by the members to become acquainted with the whole subject in all its details and bearings. During these ninety years of discussion the Jesuits, who pursued the temporizing policy to secure the easy introduction of Christianity, had basked in the sunshine of Imperial favor; they had been at court all the time, casting cannon for the Emperor, surveying the empire and making maps of all the provinces, acting as his ambassadors in important embassies, filling offices of state, correcting his astronomical tables and preparing astronomical instruments, &c., &c.; some of them were made grandees of the state, and their ancestors were ennobled with great ceremony and parade as if they were Chinese. While the members of the other party, whether of the Society of Jesus, or connected with the other Orders, had been banished from Court and many of them had endured persecution. These latter were, in all respects, fully equal to their opponents in Chinese learning, and *much their superiors* in devotedness and zeal as Christian Missionaries. If the decision was in favor of the temporizing policy of the Ricci school, a continuance of Imperial favor might be expected; and a consequent rapid spread of Roman Catholicism. But if the decision was against that policy then the Imperial displeasure would be manifested, the missionaries would all be driven away from the capital, and the Christians persecuted. This decision was given against the course hitherto pursued by most of the Jesuit missionaries in China, and in which they were supported by the main body of the Society of Jesus in Europe, when that Society was at the time of its greatest prestige and influence. The success, under such circumstances, by the school of Longobardi, is an illustration of the truth of the adage "Truth is mighty and will prevail." A decision arrived at after such a complete investigation of the subject, and in the face of such trying and

disastrous consequences, has a high claim to be regarded as one given from a deep conviction of its justice and righteousness for if the decision had been given with a view to promote the worldly success and outward enlargement of the missions in China, it would have been just the opposite from what it was. This decision was not only accepted by all the missionaries of the Roman Catholic and Greek Church, but by all the early Protestant missionaries, as the Rev. Drs. Morrison, Milne, Medhurst, Bridgeman, Abeel, Boone and others, after full examination of the question by themselves; and also by other sinologists as the Hon. J. R. Morrison, Sir John Davis, and S. W. Williams, LL.D. The distinguished Lexicographer and Translator, Dr. Morrison, in the last year of his life, published, from the collected statutes of this Dynasty, a statement in Vol. III. page 49 of the *Chinese Repository*, a list of the objects of state worship. No missionary since his time has had a better opportunity of studying the subject than Dr. Morrison had. He had access to nearly all the publications of the Jesuits: he had a better Chinese Library than any one has had since. His linguistic studies in the preparation of his Dictionary, and in his work as Translator to the East India Company, and to the Embassy to Peking under Lord Amherst, all afforded him great facilities of investigation. He states that the whole number of objects worshipped are thirty, of which the first and chief is the Heaven or sky. They are divided into three classes. The imperial ritual prescribes the sacrifices that are to be offered to each class, and to each object of each class. In the first class there are four objects. These are entitled to receive the great Sacrifices. "The first of these is" Tien, the heaven or sky. This object is otherwise called the azure heavens; and the imperial concave expanse. The 2nd is the Earth; the 3rd is the Imperial Ancestors; the 4th are the gods of the land and the grain." The objects which receive the *medium* sacrifices are 5th, the sun; 6th, the moon; 7th, the manes of the Kings and Emperors of former ages; 8th, the ancient master Confucius; 9th, the Patron of agriculture; 10th, the ancient Patron of the manufacture of silk; 11th, the heaven-gods; 12th, the earth-gods; 13th, the god of the passing year. Those who receive the small sacrifice are 14th, the ancient Patron of the healing art and other benefactors of the race; 15th, the stars; 16th, the clouds; 17th, the rain; 18th, the wind; 19th, the thunder; 20th, the four great mountains of China; 21st, the four seas; 22nd, the four Rivers; 23rd, the famous hills; 24th, the great streams of water; 25th, military flags and banners; 26th, the god of the road where an army may pass; 27th, the god of cannon; 28th, the gods of the gates; 29th, the queen goddess of the ground; 30th, the north pole &c."

Sir John Davis in his work on China copies from this statement and accepts this statement, thus extracted from the collected statutes, of the objects of state worship as correct.

The Rev. Dr. Medhurst, in the chapter of his book which relates to religion, while he does not refer specifically to the state religion says: "There are, in the works of Confucius some allusions to heaven, as the presiding power of nature, and to fate as the determiner of all things; but he does not appear to attribute originality to the one, nor rationality to the other; and thus his system remains destitute of the main truth, which lies at the basis of all truth, viz: the existence of a self-existent, eternal and all wise God." p. 186. "This expression "equal to heaven" is oft repeated by the Chinese with reference to Confucius; and there can be no doubt that they mean thereby to place their favorite sage on a level with the powers of nature, and in fact to deify him." p. 152-3.

Dr. Williams in his work, which has come to be considered as the standard work on China, pp. 233-4 of Vol. II. accepts the statement as translated by Dr. Morrison in regard to the objects of state worship, as the *official* and *authoritative* statement.

Thus it appears that the decision of the Congregation which was appointed to consider the question of rites was accepted as correct by Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics and Protestant Missionaries and Historians till 1852. In his Book "The notions of the Chinese concerning God and spirits," the Rev. Dr. Legge expressed himself as follows: after quoting some of the prayers and odes which were used at the sacrifice offered to Heaven at the winter solstice, as given in the collected statutes of the Ming dynasty, he says, "Let the descriptions which are contained in these sacred songs be considered without prejudice, and I am not apprehensive as to the answer which will be made to the question 'Who is he whom the Chinese thus worship?' I am confident the Christian world will agree with me in saying 'This God is our God.'" And in his recent letter to Prof. Müller, he says "My own view in opposition to Inquirer is that Tien is the name, not of the chief god of the Chinese, but the name by which they speak of Him, who is the one Supreme Being over all. I maintain that when they use the name in this way, they do not think of the material heavens at all." See *Chinese Recorder* 1881, p. 39. Thus Dr. Legge expresses his views. As I understand his language, he holds the same view in reference to the object worshipped as the Ricci school. He defended this view in his book on "The Notions of the Chinese" &c. He has reproduced and defended this opinion in the Book quoted at the head of this article. It is my purpose to confine the discussion

in the remaining pages of this paper to these points, viz, what Being or object is worshipped by the Emperor of China under the designation of Heaven; and second, is their worship monotheistic? For in connection with the opinion that by Heaven is meant the true God, Dr. Legge holds the opinion that the worship by the Chinese Emperor is monotheistic. As the view of the second question will help to arrive at a conclusion on the first question, I will consider the latter question first.

At p. 16 of his Book on the Religions of China, Dr. Legge says "Five thousand years ago the Chinese were monotheists;" at p. 23 the heading of a paragraph reads "The Shu King and its evidence concerning the worship of Yao and Shun is a monotheism, with an inferior worship of spirits." At p. 51 "*The original monotheism of the Chinese remains in the state worship of to-day.*" In opposition to these statements I will show that the Chinese are Polytheistic, and that in their state religion they worship a plurality of objects. It is here necessary to define the terms in use. Monotheism is defined in Webster's Dictionary thus "The doctrine or belief in the existence of one God only." In Chambers' Dictionary it is defined thus "The belief in only one God." Polytheism is thus defined by Webster quoting Stillingfleet "The doctrine of a plurality of gods, or invisible beings, superior to man and having an agency in the government of the world." A distinguished writer in Johnson's Cyclopaedia defines polytheism thus, "Polytheism distributes the perfections and functions of the infinite God among many limited gods." Vol. II. p. 587. Let us see what the Chinese themselves say in regard to this matter. The ritual of this dynasty, as established by Imperial authority as quoted above says, there are *thirty persons or things*, that are to be sacrificed to. Sacrifice is considered the highest act of worship. Of these, *four* are entitled to *equal honors*, and receive the *great sacrifice*. The worship of these many objects has come down from the very earliest times. The inauguration of Shun, who succeeded Yao "took place in the temple of the accomplished ancestor." This implies the existence of ancestral worship at that time. Then, after his accession to the throne, "He sacrificed specially, but with the ordinary forms to Shang-ti; sacrificed to the six objects of Honor; offered the appropriate sacrifices to the hills and rivers, and extended his worship to the host of the shin." The Shu King, as quoted by Dr. Legge in his Lectures p. 24 reads "Thereafter in his tours of inspection, he sacrificed, "presenting a burnt sacrifice to Heaven, and sacrificed in order to the hills and rivers." On his return therefrom "he went to the temple of the Cultivated Ancestor, and offered a single bullock."

p. 25. Notwithstanding these explicit statements of the authorized Ritual, and of the Shu King as to the plurality of objects which are worshipped, Dr. Legge appears to hold to a *monotheism* different from that implied by the meaning of the word as given above. He says "The Shu King, and its evidence concerning the worship of Yao and Shun as a *monotheism*, with an *inferior* worship of spirits." It is not clear what is his meaning in this sentence; but it would appear that he holds that where there is the worship of a chief Power with a worship to *subordinate* objects it is still a *monotheism*, especially if he withholds the name gods from the subordinate objects. This view of the meaning of *monotheism* is of course different from the definition given above from recognised authorities. It is also the fact that in every heathen nation, the gods which have been worshipped have been of different classes and positions. Among the Greeks and Romans there were the Celestial, the Terrestrial, and Infernal gods; gods of the sea, and of the land, of the hills and the rivers; the greater and the less gods. The Lares and Penates of the Romans were included among the gods. But I will now proceed to show that there are four persons or things in their Pantheon that are entitled to the same honor and sacrifice. They are Heaven, Earth, the Imperial Ancestors and the gods of the land and of the grain. The Imperial statutes explicitly so state it. In the letter to Prof. Müller see *Chinese Recorder* for 1880, p. 175, I have quoted from the Book of Rites a passage in which it is stated that the sacrifice to Earth is made equal to that to Heaven, "because the merit of Earth is equal to that of Heaven." But not only is it said that the Imperial Ancestors receive the *great* sacrifice as Heaven and Earth do, but they are the *joint* and *equal* recipients of the sacrifice offered to Heaven at the Winter Solstice and to Earth at the Summer Solstice. The tablets of the Imperial Ancestors are placed on the *highest* platform of the altar in immediate proximity to the tablet to Heaven, while the tablets of the secondary recipients are placed on the platform next below. The *equality* of the ancestors with Heaven is indicated by the place the characters for them occupy on the page of the ritual. They are placed on a level with that of Heaven. This is also stated formally in the language used in reference thereto. They are said to *p'ei* Heaven 配天 *i.e.* "to be the mate or equal of Heaven in receiving the sacrifices." Dr. Morrison in his Dictionary defines the expression *p'ei hiang* "an equal enjoyment of sacrificial rites with Heaven and Earth." Dr. Legge at page 211 of the Shu King says: "*p'ei Shang-ti* 配上帝 has two meanings. It is spoken of the *virtue* of a Sovereign, so admirable in the present or the past, that he can be described as the mate of

Shang-ti; as a sovereign on earth, the one correlate of the Supreme Sovereign above. It is spoken, also, of the *honours* of a departed sovereign, *exalted to association with Shang-ti* in the great sacrificial services rendered to Him by the reigning Emperor." It is to this last use of the word that Dr. Morrison refers. This equality of the Imperial ancestors is constantly referred to at the time of the offering of the sacrifices. Again at p. 478 Dr. Legge says: "P'ei Tien declares the fact of their being associated with Heaven in the sacrifices to it. In the present dynasty all its departed Emperors are so honored at the great sacrificial services." In the Shi King at p. 576 Ode 7, he writes thus, this is "an ode appropriate to a sacrifice to King Wan, *associated with Heaven*, in the hall of audience. We must suppose that the princes are all assembled at the royal court, and that the king receives them in the famous hall. A sacrifice is there presented by him to Shang-ti, and *with him is associated* King Wan, the two (viz., Heaven and King Wan) being the fountain from which, and the channel through which, the Sovereignty had come to the House of Chow." At p. 330 of the Shu King, we find this narrative, "Two years after the conquest of the Shang dynasty, the King (*i.e.* King Woo) fell ill, and was quite disconsolate. The two dukes said 'let us reverently consult the tortoise concerning the King;' but the duke of Chow said, 'you may not so distress our former King.' He then took the business on himself, and made three altars on the same cleared space.* * * The convex symbols were put on *their altars*, and he himself held his mace, while he addressed the Kings T'ae, Ke and Wan. The grand historian, *by his order*, wrote on tablets the prayer to the following effect:—A. B. your chief descendant is suffering a severe and dangerous sickness; if you three Kings have in heaven the charge of watching over him, *Heaven's* great son, let me, Tan, be a substitute for his person.* * * Oh do not let the Heaven-conferred appointment fall to the ground [*i.e.* by his death] and all our former kings will also have a perpetual reliance and resort. I will now seek for your orders from the great tortoise. If you grant *what I request*, I will take these symbols and this mace, and return and wait for the issue. If you do not grant it, I will put them by. The King then divined by the three tortoises, and all were favorable. He took a key, opened and looked at the *oracular* responses which were also favorable. He said according to the form of the prognostic, the King will take no injury. I, who am but a child, have got *his appointment renewed by the three kings*, by whom a long futurity has been consulted for. I have to wait the issue. They can provide for our one man." This passage throws great light on this whole subject. The appoint-

ment of the Ruler or King is constantly spoken of as made by Heaven; here the *renewal* of the appointment is ascribed to those ancestors the three kings. This shows what is meant by their association with Heaven in managing the affairs of the Empire. The recovering of the King is also ascribed to them. If this narrative does not bring to us the statement of divine worship rendered to the souls of the deceased kings, then language cannot convey the idea. In Livy's History, book 1. chap. 32, as quoted by Dr. Medhurst in his "Inquiry &c.," page 75, we have an example of prayer addressed to the deified Romulus, designated Quirinus, in conjunction with other gods. The statement reads thus "Audi, Jupiter et tu Juno, Quirine, Diique omnes coelestes, vosque terrestres, vosque inferni audite." Was this praying to these various gods together with a deified mortal, the founder of the city of Rome, the worship of *many gods*, even though Jupiter was the chief god and the patron god of Rome? The general consent of historians so considers it. For the same reasons which lead to this conclusion in reference to the Roman worship, this joint worship of Heaven, the Earth and the imperial ancestors must be regarded as a worship of a plurality of gods by the Chinese. The distinguished Emperor Kang Hi, the most enlightened one that ever occupied the throne of China, in his will and testament, ascribed all the prosperity of his long and prosperous reign to the "invisible help of Heaven, Earth, his Ancestors and the gods of the land and the grain."* Each Emperor of this dynasty as he ascended the throne announced his ascension to the throne to "Heaven, Earth, the Imperial Ancestors, and to the gods of the land and grain."† (See pamphlet on "Shang-ti" by Inquirer, p. 33). How widely different is all this from the *monotheism* of Western nations. Their Rulers say "By the grace of God, Emperor, &c." The national anthem sounds clear "God save the Queen," and the other declaration "In God we trust, &c." No, no, according to the common and generally *accepted* use of language the Imperial worship of China is *not* monotheistic but *polytheistic*. It cannot be compared with the monotheism of Mohammedism any more than it can be with that of Christianity.

At page 30 of the "Lectures" Dr. Legge attempts to explain away the statement of the Classics that the Chinese regard Heaven and Earth as two divinities, quoting a passage from the Shu at p. 233 as follows:—"Its first Sovereign (b.c. 1122) in a Great Declaration made to his adherents when he had taken the

* 仰荷天地宗廟社稷默佑，見康熙上諭。

† 謹祭告天地宗廟社稷，見道光登極詔又道光皇太后六旬萬壽詔又同治上兩宮皇太后尊號詔。

field against the last Ruler of Yin, said "Heaven and Earth is the Parent (lit. the father and the mother) of all creatures, and of all creatures, man is the most intelligent. The sincerely intelligent (among men) becomes the great sovereign, and the great sovereign is the Parent (lit. the father and mother) of the people. But now, Shaw, the King of Shang, does not reverence Heaven above, and inflicts calamities on the people below." Heaven and Earth pass immediately, you perceive, into the one name Heaven; notwithstanding the dualistic form of the expression, it is only *one* that is the parent of all." In a note he adds "Heaven and Earth is no more plural than is the sovereign who is also the father and mother of the people." This must appear to all readers as very *special pleading* in advocacy of an opinion. Heaven and Earth nominatives to a verb in the singular, &c., &c. But let us see how the Chinese understand the matter; whether they consider Heaven and Earth are two distinct gods or only one. At p. 280 of Chi. Clas., Vol. i., we read: "When the completely sincere man is able to assist the transforming and nourishing powers of Heaven and Earth, he may with Heaven and Earth form a ternion."* The function of Heaven, as one of the Parents of all things, is stated to be that of transforming: the function of Earth is nourishing. The man who can assist them in their functions forms with Heaven and Earth a trio. According to common arithmetic it requires *two* and one to make three. But according to Dr. Legge's reasoning as above given—that Heaven and Earth are only one,—*one* and *one* make three, a conclusion from which the Prof. of Mathematics in Oxford, would probably dissent. The explanation to this passage of "The Mean" reads: "The sincere man, with Heaven and Earth, stands even and makes *three*. Heaven's place is above, Earth's place is below, the sincere man's place is between; therefore it is said they stand even and make three."† The distinct duality of Heaven and Earth as two objects of worship is clearly expressed in an ode which is sung during the sacrifice to Earth at the summer solstice, which reads thus: "The brilliant flags follow the cloudy way; the flying dragon mounts the high heaven; the virtues and actions of Earth are perfect; by thy care over all within the four seas there are no troubles; the Compeer of the Imperial Arch, thou art [one of] the Two great Ones; thou dost keep in peace the people of the Earth below."‡

* 則可以與天地參矣，四書中庸。
 † 註解與天地參謂與天地竝立爲三也，天位上，地位下，至誠位中，故曰竝立爲三，見味根錄。
 ‡ 靈旗兮雲路，遵飛龍兮高旻，陰儀粹兮德純，眷四海兮祇樂無塵，配皇穹兮兩大，綏下土兮蒸民，見大清祭地祇章。

Having thus proved, by these incontrovertible proofs, that the worship of the state religion of China is polytheistic, I proceed to consider what Being or object is referred to in this worship by the designation Tien or Heaven. Dr. Legge says in his letter to Prof. Müller (see *Chinese Recorder* for 1881, p. 38) "let the reader of this letter be aware that all he was entitled to say in giving an account of my belief as to Thien was, that the Being indicated by that name was the true God." And again at p. 39 he says "My own view is,—that Thien is the name, not of the chief god of the Chinese, but the name by which they speak of *Him*, who is the One Supreme Being over all. I maintain that when they use the name in this way, they do not think of the 'material Heavens' at all." Here I join issue with the learned Doctor fair and square, and say that when they speak of the Ruling Power by the designation Heaven, they *always* think of the visible Heavens deified, and of *nothing else*. That this is what they think of and refer to, I will prove by their own statements and declarations. But before proceeding to quote these statements, there are some points that I wish to refer to as preliminary to a full and clear understanding of the matter. First, I remark that Dr. Legge's opinion is very improbable from the fact that no other nation, of either ancient or modern times, since the dispersion of mankind, have had the knowledge of the true God except as they have received it from the Revelation given to men in the S. S. of the Old and New Testaments. These Scriptures state that, at the time of Abraham, all nations had become idolaters having lost the knowledge of the true God. St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans explains how this sad result came to pass. "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." Rom. i. : 21-23.

The opinion which I maintain, that Tien refers to deified Heaven, is supported by this fact. In other lands the word for Heaven in three several languages has been used to designate a controlling Power, an object of worship. This use of the word Heaven has existed among the Hindus, the Babylonians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Egyptians, &c. In the history and mythology of all these nations the word Heaven has been understood to designate the material Heaven as the object of worship. It is only in the lands where the Revelation, which has been given to men in the S. S., has changed the former use of the language, that Heaven has come to be used as a *symbol* of the

Spiritual Being, who is the Creator and Preserver of Heaven and of all things.

I wish all my readers to bear in mind that this is not a discussion of the so-called "term question." While I prefer to use Shin, in connection with the distinctive name Jehovah, in making known the true God to this people, many of those who prefer to use Shang-ti for that purpose, agree with me in the matter now under discussion. One of the most earnest and able advocates of the use of Shang-ti, in teaching the Chinese the knowledge of the true God, says "Shang-ti is the word we find in the language for the Highest. It is *not* the Jehovah of the Jews, nor the Theos of the Greeks, nor the God of English Christians; and at the same time, it is not the Jove of the Romans, or the Baal of the Canaanites, or the Great Spirit of the Red Indians." p. 56. And again "Confucius, on the other hand, did not initiate the practice of calling Heaven personified Shang-ti. The usage came down with the language from unfathomable antiquity. Heaven, Ti and Shang-ti were used almost synonymously in the old *Ballads* which he recited, and which he cherished as perhaps the most precious heritage of antiquity." (See "*The Question of Terms Simplified*, by Rev. John Chalmers," LL.D., p. 58.) From these quotations it appears that Dr. Chalmers agrees with me on both points of this controversy, viz., that Heaven in the Chinese Classics means the visible heavens deified; for "Heaven personified" is the same as Heaven regarded as a god, and in this also, that Shang-ti is *not* the Jehovah of the Jews nor the God of Christians.

Another point which I advert to is this. The matter to be considered is what *being* or *object* is referred to by the designation Heaven. In connection with this, it is to be considered what is the relation of the term Shang-ti to this object or being. Dr. Legge, in the Index of Chinese Characters and Phrases in Shu King, under the word Thien, says "The most common use of Heaven is for the supreme governing *Power*. It is employed in this way more than 150 times." It is used in this way also about 100 times in the Shi King. Dr. Legge says in the preface to the Sacred Books of China, Oxford, 1879: "The term Heaven, Thien, is used *everywhere* in the Chinese Classics for the Supreme *Power*, ruling and governing all the affairs of men with an omnipotent and omniscient righteousness and goodness." p. xxiv. In his Lectures he says "The application of Thien must have been to the visible sky, but all along the course of history it has been used as we use Heaven, where we intend the ruling Power, whose providence embraces all. p. 8. In his letter to Prof. Müller he says, "My own view is, that Thien is the name by which they speak of Him who is

the One Supreme Being over all." *Chinese Recorder*, p. 39. From these quotations it appears that Dr. Legge and I agree that Heaven is the name, *the distinctive name* of the Being who exercises the chief power, and who is referred to in the Sacred Books of China. Heaven is also the distinctive name of the Being referred to in the Imperial ritual and the worship of the state religion. The sacrifices are designated the sacrifices to Tien or Heaven. The altar is called the Altar to Heaven. The Emperor from his being appointed by this Power is styled the Son of Heaven. The throne as being assigned to him by this Power is designated the Heaven-conferred seat. The punishment of a bad ruler by displacing him, is spoken of as the Heaven-appointed punishment. I hope my readers will excuse this enlargement upon this point which appears so self evident and so universally admitted, because it is one of very *great importance*. See further proofs in letter to Prof. Müller, *Chinese Recorder*, 1880, pp. 166-7.

The next point to this, is to state what is the relation of the designations Ti and Shang-ti to the Being who is styled Heaven. Kang Hi's Dictionary and the Book of History defines it thus, "Shang-ti is Heaven."* The Fung-shen Book says "Shang-ti is *another name* for Heaven."† In the commentaries on the Classics these definitions are repeated very frequently—sometimes in one form, and sometimes in the other. "Shang-ti is Heaven." "Shang-ti and Heaven are one and the same." "Shang-ti is another name for Heaven." In his Lectures, at p. 10, Dr. Legge says "Heaven is styled Shang-ti, and as frequently Ti alone, without the Shang." Throughout the Shu and the Shih, the ancient Books of History and Poetry, the names Thien, Ti and Shang-ti are constantly *interchanged*, in the course of the same chapter or paragraph, often in the same sentence. Dr. Chalmers says "Confucius did not initiate the practice of calling Heaven personified *Shang-ti*. The usage *came down* with the language from unfathomable antiquity." "Terms Simplified," p. 58. Dr. Medhurst says, "Ti or Shang-ti is said to be synonymous with Heaven." See Inquiry, p. 19. I concur entirely in this general *consensus* of the usage of Shang-ti as another name for or the synonym of Heaven. Heaven is the name of the Being, and Ti and Shang-ti are used as other names to designate that Being. I call attention to the fact that it is not once intimated in any book, or stated by any native or foreign authority that Heaven is another name for Shang-ti.

* 上帝、天也、見康熙字典又見史記正義。

† 上帝者、天之別名也、見封禪書宗祀文王於明堂以配上帝句註。

This usage of the words may be shewn by a familiar illustration. During the time that the late distinguished prelate, the Right Rev. Dr. Samuel Wilberforce was the Bishop of Oxford, the name of the prelate was Dr. Wilberforce. In all his diocese the Bishop was the synonym, or another name for Dr. Wilberforce, and everywhere the Bishop of Oxford referred *distinctively* to Dr. Wilberforce. Hence Dr. Wilberforce, the Bishop, and the Bishop of Oxford could be, and they were, used *interchangeably*, often in the same chapter, or paragraph, and even the same sentence. It could be said during his incumbency, that "the Bishop of Oxford spoke in the House on this question with that fervent energy which Dr. Wilberforce knows so well how to put into his speeches; and we need not say the Bishop was listened to with the greatest attention." Whatever duties or official acts Dr. Wilberforce might engage in or perform, in speaking of them, the name Bishop might everywhere be used instead of his proper name; as, the Bishop ordained Mr. Blank as a Deacon; the Bishop ordained Mr. Blank as a Priest; the Bishop suspended Mr. Blank from being a Priest for immoral conduct. In all such sentences this title is used referring to Dr. Wilberforce. In using this name nothing could be said to be done by the Bishop which would not apply if the proper name Dr. Wilberforce was used instead of the synonym. It could *not* be said under the circumstances referred to, that, the Bishop ordained Dr. Wilberforce; the Bishop officiated at the marriage of Dr. Wilberforce. Because it could not be said that Dr. Wilberforce ordained Dr. Wilberforce, meaning himself. From this illustration it is evident that the name Bishop, or the Bishop of Oxford, referred only to Dr. Wilberforce, and that it had no application, during his incumbency, to any one except Dr. Wilberforce. Nor could the Bishop be understood to have any separate existence or position, separate or independent of the designated person Dr. Wilberforce. So in the other case, Heaven is the proper name of the Being referred to in the Classics, and the Imperial worship; and Ti and Shang-ti are used in speaking of, and referring to, that Being. When they are thus used, in the Classics and the rituals, they have no other use or application but to designate Heaven, as "another name for Heaven." I have dwelt thus long on this point because, notwithstanding the general consent in stating the fact, that "Heaven is styled Shang-ti," as Dr. Legge expresses it, and Shang-ti is another name for Heaven as others say, yet, it is often spoken of and referred to, as if Shang-ti is some Being different from and entirely independent of the Being or object named Heaven.

I wish to make one more preliminary remark, and then I will

enter directly on the discussion of the main question. In considering the ancient writings we are to inquire what was the *meaning of the words* in the passages under consideration, by the writers thereof; not what ideas do they suggest to readers now, or what meaning can be put into them. The writers would only have used the words to express the ideas that were in their own minds—to express the views of that subject which were known to themselves. What were the prevailing views and opinions at the time of the writing may be learned, of course, from the history of the times, from the statements made by commentators, and by the ideas which are embodied in the ceremonies and representations referring to the matter. It is the place of those who would know these views to learn them from these sources, and so to get at the meaning of the words as used by the writer and not to seek to put into the language of ancient writers such ideas of the matter as may be present in their own minds from other sources.

I now proceed to establish my main proposition, which is, that in the Chinese Classics, and in the Rituals and the state worship, where Heaven is used as a designation of the chief Power, the *visible Heaven*, regarded as a god, is the object *always* referred to. In all the Classics and Rituals, prayers and hymns, Heaven is spoken of by many synonyms, as, the “Sky,”* as the “Canopied Azure”† indicating both its shape and color, the “High Canopy,”‡ the “Imperial Canopy,”§ the “Azure Canopy,”§ the “Azure Above,”¶ the “Glorious Azure.”** The altar to Heaven is made high and round expressly to represent Heaven. The building, in which the tablet to Heaven is deposited for safe keeping, is designated the “Circular Hall of the Imperial Canopy.”†† The jade stone gem which is presented at the time of the sacrifice to Heaven, is required to be “round and azure to resemble Heaven.” The imposing building, in the northern part of the grounds connected with the altar to Heaven, in which prayer is offered to Heaven for a fruitful year, is dome-shaped and azure in color to resemble heaven. “Heaven is said to cover, while earth contains all things; and therefore the merit of earth is equal to that of Heaven.” The one corresponds to the other. Heaven covers what the earth contains. Beyond all contradictions it is the visible Heaven which covers what the earth contains.

I now quote various passages in proof of my position. In the Confucian Analects at p. 23, of Chi. Clas., Vol. 1., we have the oft quoted passage: “He who offends against Heaven has none to whom

* 蒼蒼者天。

§ 高穹。

† 穹蒼。

¶ 蒼穹。

‡ 上蒼。

** 皇穹。

|| 昊蒼。

†† 皇穹宇。

he can pray." The commentary reads: "Heaven means principle, that is, the *Azure Heaven*. That with which Heaven abides is principle; therefore we use principle to explain Heaven."* At p. 110 of the *Shi King* an officer seeing the desolation exclaims: "Oh distant and azure Heaven, by what man was this [brought about]?" The explanation says, "That azure Heaven. Looking at it from a distance it appears azure." He says, "I sorrowing over the Chow dynasty no man knows thereof. Though man does not know, Heaven cannot be deceived. There is nothing which that distant azure Heaven does not pity."† Here omniscience and universal compassion are ascribed to the azure sky. At p. 182 the text reads, "Oh thou distant and azure Heaven, when shall we be in our places again?" The explanation says, "The distant and azure Heaven considers the love of the people to be a virtue: when will you permit me to demit the duties of the King and return to the cultivation of the fields and the nourishing of my parents, &c."‡ Here also the love of the people and the appointing of Rulers are ascribed to the azure sky. At p. 200 we read, "Thou azure Heaven there, Thou art destroying our good men." The commentary reads, "That which is azure, the sky, makes happy the good and sends misery on the wicked—this is the constant principle. Why do you not protect our good people, but on the contrary destroy their life?"§ Here too divine power in punishing the wicked and rewarding the good is ascribed to the azure sky. At p. 311 we read, "Oh unpitying great Heaven."§ The word here translated "great" is as truly *descriptive* of Heaven as *azure* is. It is composed of the words for Heaven and sun and refers to the glorious and great appearance of heaven when the summer sun is shining. Kang Hi defines it thus, "In summer is

* 獲罪於天，無所禱也。四書論語。註解，天卽理也，卽蒼蒼之天，天所主在理，故以理訓之。見味根錄。

† 悠悠蒼天，此何人哉。詩國風。註解，悠悠，遠貌，蒼天者，據遠而視之，蒼蒼然也，言我憫周之意，均無人知，夫人雖不知，而天則不可欺也，悠悠蒼天，無物不體者也，見詩經衍義。

‡ 悠悠蒼天，曷其有所。詩國風。註解，悠悠蒼天，以愛民爲德者也，果何時使我釋此王事，於以耕田養親而得其所以乎，見詩經衍義。

§ 彼蒼者天，殲我良人。詩國風。註解，彼蒼者天，福善禍淫，此常理也，胡不佑我善良之人，而反殲其命乎，見詩經衍義。

§ 不弔昊天。詩小雅。註，弔，憫也，言不見憫恤於昊天也，見詩經衍義。

the glorious Heaven." The explanation says, its substance is great and wide and here means "that the original substance has a wide and great appearance." This designation of *great Heaven* was conferred upon Heaven by Great Shun B.C. 2255 and it continued to be the authorized designation till it was replaced by the title *Imperial*, or *Sovereign*, in A.D. 1538. At p. 325 we find the passage, "Great and wide Heaven! how is it you have contracted your kindness." The commentary says, "that wide and great Heaven regards the complete covering of things as a virtue, &c. How is it, you exercise no forethought nor care."* At p. 326 the text reads, "Compassionate Heaven," literally *Autumnal Heaven*, referring to the mild and soft appearance of the sky in the autumn, as if it looked with compassion on the decay of vegetable life. The explanation reads, "that mild and distant autumnal Heaven kindly covers and compassionates all the things which are below, &c."† At p. 348 the text reads, "Oh azure Heaven! Oh azure Heaven! Look on these proud men." "The azure Heaven makes happy and sends misery on the wicked, it does not forget this principle, &c."‡ At p. 523, the text reads, "I have no strength, I think of the concave Azure." The explanation says, "The concave Azure means Heaven. Concave speaks of its shape and azure of its color. It means that Heaven has sent desolation and disturbance, &c."§

In the passage on p. 316 of the Shi King where it reads "There is the great Shang-ti." The explanation reads, "Hwang means great, Shang-ti is the Heaven-god. Ching-tsze says, "On account of its form and substance it is designated Heaven; by reason of its lordship and rule it is designated Ruler."§ The words here translated "form and substance" are words which are used in describing man's body.

* 浩浩昊天，不駿其德。詩小雅。註解，浩浩，廣大也，昊，亦廣大之意，駿，大也，德，惠也，言彼浩浩昊天，以徧覆爲德者也，今乃不大其惠，而降此饑饉之災，以斬伐四國之人，徧覆之德安在哉。見詩經衍義。

† 旻天疾威，敷於下土。詩小雅。註解，旻，幽遠之意，敷，布也，言彼幽遠之旻天，本仁覆憫下者也，今則疾威敷布於下土。見詩經衍義。

‡ 蒼天蒼天，視彼驕人，矜此勞人。詩小雅。註解，蒼天蒼天，福善禍淫，不爽其理者也。見詩經衍義。

§ 靡有旅力，以念穹蒼。詩大雅。註解，旅與簪同，穹蒼，天也，穹言其形，蒼言其色。見詩經衍義。

§ 有皇上帝。註，皇大也，上帝，天之神也，程子曰，以其形體謂之天，以其主宰謂之帝。見詩經衍義。

The Rev. E. Faber, in *Chinese Recorder* for 1880, at p. 5, in a note, renders "the animated bodily organism" of men by these two words. If this is a correct rendering of these two words, and we adopt this form of expression instead of the one above given, the sentence would read: That the Heaven-god "on account of its animated bodily organism is styled Heaven." Dr. Williams in his Dictionary gives *person* as the equivalent of these two words. In connection with these various expressions used by the Chinese to express their conception of the matter, is it not evident that their conception is this; they conceive of the material Heaven as animated by a living intelligent spirit, and therefore a god of extensive power and rule, as its substance covers all things; and that this god by reason of its bodily form or substance is styled Heaven, and because it exercises lordship and rule it is called Ruler.

The taking of an oath is one of the most solemn acts in recognition of the overruling Power. It is very common for men to appeal to Heaven. The following sentence is one of several instances where in taking an oath the Sun is joined to Heaven. The joining of Sun to Heaven makes it clear that it is the visible Heaven. "They, weeping, pointed to the Heaven and the Sun, and mutually made oath, that living or dying they would not desert each other."* The following passage is very interesting and important because it makes clear that it refers to the visible Heaven, that which covers China, and that this Heaven was the special patron of the T'ang dynasty having given to it all within the four seas. "Heaven, because the T'ang dynasty was able to imitate its virtue, and its pious children and godly grand-children did not weary in revering and obeying, gave all which it covered to them. The four seas and nine provinces had no within or without, but all acknowledged them as Lord and themselves as servitors."†

A hand-book for readers of the Chinese Classics of the highest authority coming down from the third century, in the section which explains the word Heaven, has these remarks. An edition of the Spring and Autumn Classic says, "Heaven is conspicuous. It dwells on high and rules the below, for men it regulates and governs. Therefore the character T'ien is one and great."‡

In explanation of the designation Shang T'ien, the I Nga says,

- * 指天日涕泣,誓生死不相背負,見古文韓愈墓誌銘。
 † 天以唐克肖其德,聖子神孫,敬戒不怠,全付所覆,四海九州,罔有內外,悉主悉臣,見韓愈平淮西碑。
 ‡ 天之言顯也,居高理下,爲人經紀,故其字一大以鎮之,見爾雅釋天引春秋說題辭。

“to be above and take care of things below.” After many other remarks as to the varying modes of speaking of Heaven as the azure Heaven, the great Heaven, the autumnal Heaven, &c., it says “The azure Heaven is in reference to its substance, honoring Heaven and regarding it as a Ruler or Sovereign, then it is styled Imperial Heaven.”* In this sentence the word “Kiun” is used as a verb to regard as a Sovereign or Ruler; and because T’ien is so regarded it is styled Imperial Heaven. It also explains the expression to sacrifice to Heaven “to offer the burnt offering, at the great altar is styled sacrificing to Heaven.” The whole tenor of the book makes it evident, beyond all possibility of doubt, that the sacrifice is offered to the visible Heaven.

In the face of all these statements, the names of the object, its characteristics and functions, which might be added to indefinitely, it is hard to conceive of a more unwarranted and untenable statement than that made by Dr. Legge as quoted above, “I maintain that when they use the name in this way they do *not think* of the material Heavens *at all*.”

Let us see how Dr. Legge sets aside these statements of the Chinese writers, in which they express their meaning and thoughts in relation to the subject. At p. 200 of the Shi King where the Poet says “that which is azure, the sky,” Dr. Legge says, after giving this translation, “but we must understand the appeal is really to the Power dwelling in the Heavens.” At p. 316 he quotes the explanation “which is given by Ching E and which is accepted by Choo, and by *all subsequent writers*” thus: “With reference to its form we speak of Heaven, with reference to its lordship and rule we speak of Shang-ti.” Instead of accepting this general consent of writers as settling the question of what is their meaning in the use of the word, Dr. Legge says, “this meaning is *absurd*. We are as good judges of what is meant by Heaven as a name for the Supreme Power, as Ching was.” Thus Dr. Legge forgetting that the object of the inquiry is, to find out what was the idea which the Chinese wished to express, and not what was the *correct* doctrine about the matter, refuses to accept the statement of the best commentators of the Chinese Classics as to what was their understanding of the words of their own language; and declares his own competency to judge what the words meant. At p. 530 when discussing a clause in which his translation differed from that of a previous translator, he gives, as the reason for rejecting that of the other, that the meaning the other gave “is to my mind exceedingly

* 按詩傳云，蒼天以體言之，尊而君之，則稱皇天，元氣廣大，則稱昊天，仁覆闕下，則稱旻天，自上降監，則稱上天，據遠視之蒼蒼然，則稱蒼天，見爾雅釋天。

unnatural" and "therefore he *could not* translate the passage otherwise than he had done." The meaning the other translator gave was, that Heaven is the chief Ruler. On the same passage he expresses himself thus in his "Lectures" at page 65 in note K. "So I *must understand* the title," though *the literal* translation of it, which he gives, expresses a very different and indeed a quite opposite meaning to the one which he gives. The reason he *must understand* the title in his way, and not according to the literal rendering of it, is, because the literal translation gives a different meaning from what he thinks it ought to have. We leave our readers to form their own opinion on this point, how far a translator or annotator, who expresses himself as refusing to accept the statements of the Chinese as to their own sentiments and opinions, and who says he *must understand* the words in a sense that accord with his own previously-expressed opinion, can be accepted as a reliable interpreter of the books he translates.

To proceed with the discussion, I go further and say that the Chinese not only *always* think of the material Heaven as exercising the lordship and rule, but that they think of *no other Being* as doing so. While the late Dr. Hobson was resident at Canton, some objectors to Christianity sent to him a criticism on some Christian books, which criticisms Dr. Hobson sent to Dr. Legge. He publishes one passage of these objections at p. 38 of "Notions, &c.," which reads thus, "You [*i.e.* Christians] say, the azure Heaven has no ruling power. When we say "Thank Heaven" you require that we should write plainly the name and surname of the Being, or that we say Shang-ti, and then you will understand us. These are the views of a stupid man. No man who has read books [*i.e.* no literary person] would write thus. To explain summarily the word Heaven is used first as we speak of the Emperor, calling him his sacred Highness and not daring directly to speak out his name."* Here the point taken against Christian books is that they say "The azure heaven has no ruling power." The Chinese for azure heaven is the most explicit expression to designate the material heaven that can be used. In charging it against Christians that they say, the material heaven has no ruling power, the paper implies that the objectors held *that it had*, and they say "no literary man would write as the Christians had done on that point." With this agrees an incident which happened within my own cognizance. Some disputants came into a chapel and charged against the Christian speakers, that they were disloyal and unfilial, in that they did not

* 又說，蒼蒼之天，并無主宰之權，謝天者必要寫明何姓何名，上帝方得知之，此乃愚人之見，非讀書人爲也，夫天之一字，總而言之，如今之稱聖上，不敢直呼其名矣。

worship the national gods of China, mentioning Heaven and Earth, Rulers, Parents and Teachers. The Christians defended their positions explaining, that while they did not *worship* their Ruler, Parents or Teachers, yet, they honored them by following their teachings, showing them respect, and cherishing their memories, &c., &c. They said, since Heaven and Earth are mere dead matter, they, of course, did not worship them; but they worshipped the Lord and Creator of Heaven and Earth. At this expression, the objectors broke out into a furious passion saying there was no Lord of Heaven, that *Heaven* is the Lord and Ruler; and would not discuss the point further. Several of the Protestant missionaries in, and near Peking, who in preaching, use the term T'ien Chu for God, have told me that frequently after preaching, in conversation with some of the hearers, they would say, "yes, we believe as you do. We believe that *Heaven* is Lord," thus showing that they understood the words T'ien Chu, not as meaning Heaven's Lord, but Heaven is Lord; as Dr. Chalmers' translates that term in his letter in the *China Review* for Nov.-Dec., 1880. One of these missionaries also told me, that he had the same Chinese teacher in his employ for ten years. He was a man of good talents and literary acquirements. After he was thus under Christian influence for eight years he professed his faith in Christianity. He told the missionary that for six years of the time he was with him, in reading the Christian Scriptures and tracts, he understood T'ien Chu in the sense of *Heaven is Lord*.

From these repeated experiences it would appear that many of the Confucianists are so accustomed to think of Heaven as the Lord and Ruler, that their minds cannot readily accept of any other meaning of the words. It is a matter of history that the Emperor Kang Hi was greatly enraged because some of the Catholic missionaries referred the question of the rites in China to the Pope at Rome. If those, who have the opportunity of examining the full accounts of the discussion of this question, during the years 1680 to 1704, will do so, I venture to express the surmise, that it will be found that *one* great cause of Kang Hi's displeasure was this, the arrogance, as he considered it, of those who advocated the use of T'ien Chu in the sense of *Lord* of Heaven; thus claiming that the God of Christians is *the Lord* of the chief god of the Chinese state religion.

At p. 43 of his "Lectures" Dr. Legge refers to a change in the adjective prefixed to Heaven in the ritual, in the year A.D. 1538, by the then reigning Emperor of the Ming dynasty. The adjective used had hitherto been "great" or "glorious"; by this Emperor it was changed to "imperial." Before considering the meaning of this change I wish to con-

sider the circumstances when the first adjective of dignity or honor was conferred. It was conferred upon Heaven by the Emperor Shun soon after he ascended the throne. He was very unwilling to accede to the wishes of Yao and accept the honor; but his objections were overcome by observing the appearance of the stars. The conferring of this title is thus stated in the book called *The General Mirror of Gods and Genii*. Great Shun, having observed the regular arrangement of the seven regulators (*i.e.* the Sun, Moon, and five planets) knew that there was a decree of Heaven (in his favor). Thus having commenced to discharge the duties of the Son of Heaven, and to manage all the affairs, he sacrificed to Heaven and Earth at the Round Hillock; and at the sacrifice, he announced the reasons for undertaking the government. At that time, looking up to the azure heaven, its original substance so great and vast, he considered *is there not indeed* a Lord and Ruler to *manage the decrees*? Therefore he presented an honorable designation, styling it "Great Heaven, Ruler Above"; also styling it Heaven-Lord, the Great Ruler—designations corresponding to that of Heaven above."*

This is a very important passage, both because it refers to an act done by one of the first Emperors; and because it has criteria, which can be used to make clear its proper meaning. The passage refers to Heaven all through from beginning to end. The appearance of the sun and the stars is one of those "appearances" which Heaven uses to teach men its will. The Great Shun therefore uses this mode of getting instruction; and finding the appearances favorable he knew that the decree of Heaven had appointed him Emperor—and he therefore accepts the important trust. His objections being thus removed, he enters upon the duties pertaining to the "Son of Heaven." One of them is to sacrifice to Heaven at the Round Hillock; which is the name given to the altar to Heaven in the Ritual. When engaged in this duty he most naturally looks up to what? to a spiritual Being? no, but to the object to which he was offering sacrifice, the azure sky. What strikes his attention, or arouses his thoughts? Is it any thing pertaining to a spiritual Being? no, it is the vastness and greatness of the original *substance* of the azure sky, and when thus impressed with its greatness he thinks "is there not indeed a Lord and Ruler to manage the decrees?" referring apparently to the decree appointing him to be Emperor. This combination of two negatives in this sentence

* 大舜見七政齊平，知天命攸在，遂攝行天子之事，整理庶務，祭天地於圓丘，類告攝政之由，因仰思蒼蒼者天，元氣昊然廣大，豈無主宰司命，擬上尊號曰昊天上帝，又曰天主大帝，適符上天之號，見神仙鑑。

is an elegant, and at the same time, a *very positive* affirmative. There is *indeed* a Lord and Ruler to manage the decrees, viz., the azure Heaven. Therefore he presents an honorable designation to what? why most obviously to the object which he contemplated when he looked upward, and he gave to Heaven the designation great, which expressed the idea impressed upon his mind as he looked up to the great and vast sky. This word translated great is descriptive of the *visible* heaven. Kang Hi first defined it as "the appearance of the heaven in summer, representing its *substance* as *vast and large*, or again, the word means "the appearance of the original substance as wide and great."* The meaning of the word given as the honorable designation, clearly implies that it was given to the visible heaven, which is "the Ruler above." He conferred also another designation, viz., "Heaven-Lord, the Great Ruler"† both of which designations correspond to the former and common designation "Heaven above." I am well aware that other translations have been made of this passage; but I submit it to the consideration of sinologists that this translation is consistent with the grammatical construction of the pivotal clause of the passage, which I have italicized; and with both the antecedent and subsequent context. Heaven is the subject of consideration from the beginning to the end of the passage. And what is meant by Heaven is expressed in the specific and distinctive phrase "the azure sky." The title is prefixed to Heaven; and by this translation alone, is the meaning of the passage consistent throughout.

I now come to the time when the honorable designation thus given, and which continued in common use for nearly 3000 years was changed by Kea Tsing, of the Ming dynasty. This Emperor with great parade changed Haou to Hwang, *i.e.* Great Heaven to Imperial Heaven. Dr. Legge, in his "Lectures," and elsewhere, writes as if this was conferring an honorable designation upon Shang-ti, which is only another name for Heaven instead of upon *Heaven* itself. The very designation which was conferred by the Great Shun, indicates the *object* to which it was given, as is shown above; and, of course, when Kea Tsing changed the honorable designation he *continued* it to the same object. The honorable title was *not* conferred upon Shang-ti at all, for that title remained unchanged, while the prefix to Heaven was changed. The passage from I Nga says, "that regarding Heaven as

* 夏爲昊天，爾雅釋天。註，言氣皓旰，疏，昊者，元氣博大之貌。李巡云，夏萬物盛壯，其氣昊昊，故曰昊天。見康熙字典昊天字註解。

† 昊天上帝，又曰天主大帝。見神仙通鑑第四卷。

a Sovereign, therefore it was styled Imperial Heaven." It was to Heaven as the Ruler over all, that he gave the designation Imperial. Hence the translation which Dr. Legge gives of the four characters, Hwang Tien, Shang-ti, viz., "the Supreme God, dwelling in the Imperial Heaven" is utterly untenable. For, not only have we the admission of Dr. Legge himself that the literal translation of these four characters is "Imperial Heaven, Supreme God;" but we have the express statement of Chu Fu-tsze, in the Chow Book of Rites, when discussing about the term Ti being applied to the Rulers of the five parts of heaven, "that Haou Tien, Shang-ti is *Heaven*."* We have shown above that Heaven is the distinctive name of the Being worshipped, and that, as Dr. Legge himself says, it is Heaven which is styled Shang-ti; but by his translation he displaces Heaven from being the distinctive name of the Being, and puts Shang-ti, the synonym of Heaven, in its place. This is just as incongruous in this place, and as inconsistent with the fact that "Shang-ti is another name for Heaven," as it would be to say in regard to Dr. Wilberforce, in the illustration given above, "Oxford Bishop of Dr. Wilberforce." That would be a complete change of the proper relation of the words; for it is Dr. Wilberforce who is the Bishop of Oxford; and so it is Imperial Heaven who is the Ruler above. As in the one case we cannot say Oxford Bishop of Dr. Wilberforce, no more can we say in the other, the Supreme Ruler of the Imperial Heaven. That it was *Heaven* and not Shang-ti upon whom the honorable designation was conferred, may be made clear by another illustration. When a few years ago the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Lord Beaconsfield, wished to confer an honorable designation upon Queen Victoria, as the Ruler of India, he did not propose to honor *the ruler* of India by conferring a dignified title upon *the country* over which she ruled, and say "the Queen of *Imperial* India;" but he changed the title of the ruler *herself* making it to be "the *Empress* of India." Had the Prime Minister of England proposed that the designation should read "the Queen of *Imperial* India," he would have made himself the laughing stock of Europe. When the Emperor Kea Tsing, wishing to confer an honorable designation upon the chief Power makes it read "*Imperial* Heaven, Shang-ti," is it not *clear* that Heaven was the Being that he intended to honor, and that *therefore* the construction is "Imperial Heaven who is the Ruler above?" If the purpose had been to confer a title of honor upon Shang-ti, as Dr. Legge says it was, and he simply changed the prefix before Heaven, over which Shang-ti rules, making it read "Shang-ti of the *Imperial* Heaven"

* 昊天上帝是天、見周禮太宰朱子註。

instead of "Imperial Shang-ti," he would have subjected himself to ridicule among his own people. Moreover, we saw above, that the Great Shun conferred two separate designations, viz., "Haou Tien Shang-ti" and "Tien Chu Tai Ti." Every one will see that the two phrases are of the same construction, and, while Dr. Legge has translated the first four characters in regimen "Shang-ti of the great Heaven" the other four characters *do not admit* of that construction. We cannot say, The Great Ruler of the Heaven-Lord. Heaven is still the subject of remark. Heaven is Lord, and Heaven-Lord is the Great Ruler; and so, also, it is Imperial Heaven, in the phrase under discussion, who is the Ruler above. That this is the grammatical construction, I am happy to be able to cite Dr. Legge himself; see "Lectures," p. 65, note K., where referring to the translation, as given in the text in p. 40, he says "So I *must* understand the title Hwang Thien Shang-ti, *literally*, Sovereign Heaven, Supreme God." Now, every linguist knows that, in order to get the exact meaning of an author, we must take his *meaning according to the literal translation of his words*. We may vary the form of the expression to suit the idiom of the language into which any one is translating, provided we do not change the meaning from that which is given by the literal construction. But Dr. Legge, in this passage, not only departs from what he himself gives as the literal translation, but he changes the manner of expression so as to give a sense directly *the opposite* from that which the literal translation gives. The literal translation makes Heaven the subject of the verb, which is implied and states that Imperial Heaven is the Ruler above. Dr. Legge's translation makes Shang-ti the subject of this verb, and thus makes it to be "Supreme Ruler dwelling in the Imperial Heavens." The reason he gives for thus translating it is "So I must understand it," in order to maintain his view that the Being which was honored was Shang-ti, a Being separate from Heaven; which view, the considerations presented above show to be utterly untenable. The very word imperial or sovereign is incongruous if prefixed to Heaven as a name of a place, but it is entirely applicable to personified Heaven as exercising imperial sway and dominion.

Here I may properly notice Dr. Legge's strictures on my translation of this phrase made in his letter to Prof. Müller at p. 42. The passage, as he quotes it, is equally pertinent to my purpose. The object sacrificed to is Heaven; it is performed by the Son of Heaven. "Now when we designate the Heaven 'god,' we say Sovereign Heaven, the Ruler Above, the Great One, and we call its altar the Great Terrace." This translation is called for not only by the *literal* translation of the phrase, as Dr. Legge admits it to be, but by the *whole* connection

and meaning of the context. What is the object spoken of? It is Heaven. What is the epithet applied to it? Sovereign; which means supreme in power, possessing supreme dominion. How could this be applied to Heaven if, in this sentence, it was only a place? The Son of Heaven is to render service to Heaven as a god—or to Heaven *spiritualized*, as Dr. Legge prefers to say—but to *Heaven*; and that Heaven is styled “Imperial Heaven, the Ruler Above, the Great One.” It is Heaven which is “the Great One,” and it is Heaven’s altar that is called the Broad Terrace. Dr. Legge’s translation of this passage is as faulty in its theology as it is in its grammar, and its want of connection with the context. He says “it is the Spirit or soul of Heaven which is styled Shang-ti or God dwelling in the Sovereign Heaven.” As he says “Shang-ti is our God,” he thus makes his God to be the same as the soul of Heaven, from which assertion all Christians will dissent.

To resume the translation, “And the earth-god we designate Sovereign Earth, being the same as the yellow spirit of the Centre.” I readily admit that the phrase about the yellow spirit is in regimen, and the reason is obvious. As in their mythology there are *five* parts or places spoken of as earth, he wished to make it clear which one of the five was referred to. The statement that it was the central part which was animated by the yellow spirit is concurrent with my statement that the Chinese conceive of these objects of nature as animated by a living spirit; and hence the very common expression “The living Heaven and the living Earth.” But the construction of this intervening and explanatory sentence is very different from the sentence in relation to Heaven which precedes, and the sentence about the Earth which follows it. Heaven and Earth are spoken of as complete animated objects, by the name of the visible object; hence these sentences are not affected by the construction of the intervening sentence. For according to this construction alone would it be proper to style the Earth-god Sovereign *Earth*. “The altar [to earth], at the north of the city, has not yet any honorable designation. It is proper that orders be given to designate the Earth-god, Imperial Earth, the Sovereign Producer, and to call its altar the Broad Terrace.” For the Chinese text see above, p. 42. The object to which the Emperor was to pay the service due to a mother is the Earth, and hence the Earth is the subject referred to on the whole subsequent part of the passage, without any reference to its component parts, viz., the visible earth, or the animating spirit. According to the amount of the worship of Earth, as given in the Book of Rites, the names, by which it has been designated at different times, are these,

viz: the Earth-god, the divine or spiritual Sovereign, the Sovereign Earth. In the T'so-chuen, by Confucius, we read that, "The Earth is styled the Sovereign Earth." In the explanation to this remark it is said, "The earth is the Lord of all things, therefore it is styled Sovereign."* In the explanation of one of the minor odes it is said that the "Earth-god is able to produce all things." Since Earth is thus spoken of as, "the mother of all things" as "able to produce all things,"† it is very strange that Dr. Legge should speak of the use of the word "Producer" to translate K'i as a *mistranslation* of K'i. For further discussion of this point see *Chinese Recorder* 1880, p. 177.

At page 45 of the *Recorder*, in his letter to Prof. Müller, Dr. Legge gives the translation of an explanation by a celebrated Chinese scholar, of the eleventh century A.D., Khang I, thus:—"Kù Hsî says:—'Shang Ti is the Spirit of heaven. As *Khǎng* I says, "With reference to Its form, we speak of Heaven; with reference to Its lordship and rule, we speak of Ti."'" I invite the attention of sinologists to this translation. By this translation Dr. Legge makes Shang-ti to be the spirit or soul of heaven. But what does he make "Its" with a capital I, in the subsequent clauses refer to? As he prints the passage; Spirit with a capital S and heaven with a small h the obvious way of construing "Its" would be to refer it to Spirit, and the first clauses will read, "with reference to the Spirit's form we speak of Heaven." But how can we speak of the *form* of a Spirit? Hence that can not be the proper understanding. Then "Its" must refer to Shang-ti. And the clause will read, "With reference to Shang-ti's form we speak of Heaven." If then, with reference to Shang-ti's form, we speak of Heaven, what does that mean, but that *Heaven* is Shang-ti's *form*, i.e. that the visible Heaven is Shang-ti. And *this* is what all writers agree in saying, "that Shang-ti is another name for Heaven." But I would propose another translation, thus, "Shang-ti is the Heaven-god. With reference to Its (the god's) form we speak of Heaven; with reference to Its (the god's) lordship and rule we speak of Ti, Ruler." This translation makes the construction all plain, and it is in accord with all the other presentation of the subject, by the Chinese writers. So also with respect to the other passage quoted by him on the same page, which reads, Ti is "the honorable designation of lordship and rule. Hence Heaven is called Shang Ti." What is the obvious meaning of this passage? The writer defines Ti as all other Chinese writers do. It is a designation of lordship and rule. And *because* Heaven exercises lordship and rule, therefore *it* is

* 土正曰后土，左傳。註，土爲羣物主，故稱后，見左傳註。
† 社，五土之神，能生萬物者，見詩以社以方註。

called *The Ruler*. How can any one hereafter contend, that Ruler is not the proper translation of the word Ti, when it is used referring to Heaven as the chief Power?

I now refer to a very important passage which I quoted, without any remark, in the appendix to my "Letter to Prof. Müller," see *Chinese Recorder* for 1880, p. 187. "Ti is one of the names of Heaven. The reason why it is named Ti is that Ti means to judge. Since that Heaven is boundlessly impartial, does not distinguish between itself and others; that Heaven examines and judges with the utmost justice and intelligence; on these accounts, Heaven is styled Ti. The five Ti (*i.e.* the five ancient Emperors) had the same principles as these; they were able to examine and judge, therefore they had the designation Ti. Heaven and Ti are one. The lords of men can be designated Ti, but they *cannot* be designated Heaven, for Heaven is so designated because of its *substance*. The lords of men cannot be of the same substance as Heaven."* This important passage, as Dr. Legge tells us, to whom I am indebted for it, is quoted from a commentary on the Shu in an edition of the Classics published during the T'ang Dynasty. Here, as everywhere else, the subject of the passage is Heaven. Ti is one of the names of Heaven. And here is given a clear statement of the reasons why *Heaven* is styled Ti—because it, Heaven, exercises the function of examining and judging with justice and intelligence. As human Rulers exercise this function, among men in the same way, they may be, and are called Ti. But they cannot be called Heaven because the chief Power has its name Heaven from *its substance*. What words could more explicitly state that the Chief Power among the Chinese is the visible Heaven; for what other object is named Heaven because of its substance but the visible Heaven? The Bible makes known to us that God created all things, and we call him the Creator. The Bible also makes known that God exercises supreme control over all the works of his hands; and hence we style him the Supreme Ruler. As kings and princes exercise rule and lordship over their subjects, they are also designated rulers—rulers of men in contradistinction to the Supreme Ruler. This statement of the Chinese writer makes it clear, that the designation Ti, is common to the Ruler above, *i.e.* Heaven, and the Rulers on earth, because of *the resemblance* of the function exercised

* 帝者、天之一名、所以名帝、帝者諦也、言天蕩然無心、忘於物我、言公平通遠審諦、故謂之帝也、五帝道同於此、亦能審諦、故取其名、天之與帝、義爲一也、人主可得稱帝、不可得稱天者、以天隨體而立名、人主不可同天之體也、

by them in their respective positions. If Dr. Legge's translation is correct that Ti is God, then it would follow that human rulers are gods. But the Chinese have no such idea. What this passage makes clear is this; when human rulers practice justice and intelligence in the exercise of their function, as Heaven does in the exercise of a similar function, they may be called Ti, *i.e.* Rulers. There is not a trace of the meaning divine in the word.

The nature and character of the other objects, which are sacrificed to in the imperial or state worship, makes it clear that the object designated Heaven is the visible heaven deified. The other objects to which sacrifice is offered, as stated in the Imperial ritual, are the earth, the sun, moon and stars, the wind, the clouds, the rain and thunder. There is no doubt but that these words refer to the objects of nature so named. It is a rule of exposition, that the same principle of interpretation should be applied to all the same kind of words which occur in the same sentence and paragraphs of the same book. Heaven is of the same class of words as earth, sun and moon. Since then earth, sun and moon are by all understood in the Ritual to refer to these objects of nature, it follows according to this rule, that Heaven should also be understood to refer to this object of nature. It would be utterly incongruous to understand Heaven to refer to a spiritual Being when all the other words are understood to refer to the natural objects.

There are, however, some passages of the Shi King which have been understood as representing Shang-ti as a spiritual Being, before whom the spirits of good kings go and come. It is proper to consider these several passage. At page 428 of the Shi we find this passage "King Wan ascends and descends on the right and left of Shang-ti." These words have, to many persons re-called the words of our Lord in John's Gospel, Chap. 1: 51, "the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man;" and the vision of Jacob at Bethel. But let us see how the Chinese critics understand these words. In the native commentary the great authority Chu Fu-tsze explains them thus, "Because that King Wan's soul in Heaven, is ascending and descending, there is not a moment that he is not at Shang-ti's right and left. *Having virtue equal to (or united with), that of Heaven, he with it revolves, and with it proceeds with equal steps; therefore his descendants enjoyed the advantages of his blessing and obtained the empire.*"* In considering this sentence, we are to

* 文王陟降,在帝左右, 註解,蓋以文王之神,在天一升一降,無時不在神之左右,與天合德同運而並行者也,是以子孫蒙其福澤,而君有天下也, 見詩經衍義,

remember that Shang-ti is simply another name for Heaven. Hence the words "on the right and left of Shang-ti" means simply on the right and left of Heaven. This meaning of the phrase is made clear in the explanation where the words Heaven and Shang-ti are used interchangeably in the same sentence. Being "on the right and the left," is explained thus, King Wan having as a Ruler of men acted justly "his merit is equal with that of Heaven" and "he revolves with and proceeds with Heaven with even pace." The two words translated "revolves with and proceeds with" are those commonly used by Chinese writers in referring to the movement of Heaven and the heavenly bodies. Their use in this connection makes it evident that it is the visible heaven which is referred to. This explanation of the commentator *dissipates* all the idea, which some have entertained, that these words imply, that the Chinese had some such idea of Heaven as a place of happiness as the Bible reveals to us, with the souls of the good being in the presence of a Spiritual Being. Again at page 458 of the Shi it reads, "the three sovereigns were in Heaven." The three referred to are the Kings T'ae, Ke and Wan. They were three successive Kings of the same family, being grandfather, son and grandson respectively. At page 428 of the Shi it only spoke of King Wan being in Heaven. We have seen above how the master Chu understood the expression in reference to him. In the passage quoted in the early part of this paper from pages 352-4 of the Shu King, we have seen that Duke Chow regarded them as associated with Heaven in the administration of the Empire, therefore he prayed to them for the prolongation of the life of the King, his elder brother; and having obtained a favorable answer to his prayer said, "I have got his appointment renewed by the three Kings." The first appointment of this brother as King was by the decree of Heaven; the renewal thereof was from the three Kings. The explanation of the above passage from the Shi stated that it was from the virtue of King Wan that his descendants had the Empire. Does not all this teach that these deceased kings were *associated with* Heaven in the administration of the affairs of the kingdom? Yen Ts'an's explanation of the former passage of the Shi, as quoted by Dr. Legge at page 428, says, "King Wan's virtue was in accordance with Heaven. He ascended and descended, advanced and retired, as if he was always on the right and left of Shang-ti [*i.e.* Heaven], so that not a single movement of his was other than the action of Heaven. From this presentation of the ideas of Chinese writers, it would appear, that the translation of Chinese prepositions by "*in*" does not convey to English readers the meaning of the original; but that

"with" in the sense of "associated with" Heaven would better convey the idea that the Chinese have in regard to it. Dr. Legge, in his notes on the passage about the three Kings, on page 458, says, "The expression "in Heaven," simple enough to a Christian reader, is to the Chinese critics full of perplexity; and where their ideas are utterly confused, it is impossible they should express themselves clearly." Why is this expression "in Heaven" simple enough to Christian readers? It is because it is an expression which the Bible has made familiar to Christians as descriptive of the state of the righteous in happiness. But can any one, for a moment, suppose or maintain that the idea which is suggested to the mind of Christian readers, and which they derived from the Word of God, is the idea which the Chinese writers, who had no knowledge of that revelation, had in their minds? I think not. I think that the writers meant to express the ideas which were in their own minds, not those which are in the minds of Christian readers. Dr. Legge's remark, that the ideas of the Chinese are utterly confused as to the state of the dead in another world, is just what we might expect them to be; and these considerations preclude us from accepting the statements, which have been put forward in connection with these passages, as presenting the ideas held by the Chinese themselves.

But Dr. Legge rests his opinion, that Shang-ti designates a spiritual Being entirely apart from Heaven, on some passages from Chinese authors which I now proceed to consider successively. One of these is from "the Doctrine of the Mean." He prints it on the second page of his "Lectures" as a most incontrovertible proof of this opinion. It reads thus, "In the ceremonies at the altars of Heaven and Earth they served Shang-ti." In a former part of this article I have shown that by general consent of all writers, both Chinese and foreign, Shang-ti is but another name for Heaven; and that, as Shang-ti is the synonym of Heaven, we can always substitute Heaven for Shang-ti. When we do that in this passage it reads that "in these ceremonies at the altars of Heaven and Earth they served Heaven,"* which has been shown to be the visible Heaven. Hence the passage does not afford any proof to the proposition that Shang-ti is a spiritual Being apart from Heaven. It is stated in the Book of Rites by an accepted commentator that "to sacrifice to Shang-ti is to sacrifice to Heaven." But besides this what is the most generally received explanation of this passage by Chinese critics? Dr. Legge has given it in *Chi. Clas.*, Vol. 1, page 268, thus: "K'ang-hing took 郊 to be the sacrifice to Heaven, offered, at

* 郊社之禮,所以事上帝也。

the winter solstice, in the southern suburb (郊) of the imperial city; and 社 to be that offered to the Earth, at the summer solstice, in the northern. Choo He agrees with him. Both of them, however, add that after 上帝 we are to understand 后土, 'Sovereign Earth' * saying, that the omission of Sovereign Earth is an abbreviated text. This view is supported by the whole usage in regard to these sacrifices, as given in the Book of Rites, and in the ritual, where "shie" is constantly spoken of as the sacrifice to Earth, as *distinctively* as "kiau" is spoken of as the sacrifice to Heaven. See *Chinese Recorder*, 1880, p. 175. Other commentators say "that Sovereign Earth is included in Shang-ti, just as the wife is included in the husband," &c. To which others rejoin "why resort to any other explanation when the Master Choo says that it is an abbreviated text." The immediate context of the passage implies that Sovereign Earth is included. For from the earliest records as given in the Book of Rites, and continued in the Imperial Ritual of each successive dynasty to the present one, it has been the incumbent duty of each Emperor to sacrifice to Heaven, to Earth and to the Imperial ancestors. The immediate context reads thus, "By the ceremonies of the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth they served Shang-ti and by the ceremonies of the ancestral temple they sacrificed to their ancestors. He who understands the ceremonies of the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth, and the meaning of the several sacrifices to ancestors, would find the government of a kingdom as easy as to look into his palm." This context thus makes it clear that there was worship of Earth also.

But as so much stress is laid upon the fact, that the above passage from the Doctrine of the Mean, is from a work which passed under the immediate care of Confucius himself, the great sage of China, let us see what we can learn from other books that had his editorial supervision, if not compilation. The Spring and Autumn Classic is credited to him. In the part styled the Tsó Tseuen we find this passage, "Tsun's great officer thrice bowed and kneeled and said, 'The Prince treads the Sovereign Earth and wears the Imperial Heaven; Imperial Heaven and Sovereign Earth certainly hears the King's words.'† The word rendered "wears," is used in speaking of wearing a hat. What form of expression could more explicitly say, that it is the animated Heaven and Earth which heard the words of the King, than to speak of the Earth as that upon which he treads, and of the Heaven as that which covers his head as a hat? The

* 朱註、郊祭天、社祭地、不言后土者、省文也、見四書註、

† 晉大夫三拜稽首曰、君履后土而戴夏天、皇天后土、實聞君之言、見左傳、

circumstances under which these words were spoken were these. Two countries were at war. The victor took the conquered king captive. When the captive king came into the presence of the victor, he was followed by a high officer, who manifested great sorrow at the unfortunate fate of his chief. The victor consoled him by promising to liberate his king. The officer therefore kneeled before the generous victor giving him thanks, and to remind him of the sanctity of his promise, he spoke these words. When afterwards the victor's officers urged him not to liberate this captive, the victor said, "Heaven and Earth have agreed thereto with me." The commentary says, "Tsun's great officer having said that Imperial Heaven and Sovereign Earth had heard the Prince's words indicated that Heaven and Earth were witnesses, and therefore were with me joint consenters to the engagement."* In this same book we find the passage "Earth is styled Sovereign" on which the commentator remarks "Earth is called the Lord of all things therefore it is styled Sovereign." And again we read, "The good Ruler rewards the good and punishes the bad, he nourishes the people as children, covering them as Heaven does, containing them as Earth does."† And again, "When Heaven reverses the seasons it is a calamity; when Earth reverses the things it is a distress. The meaning of the expression, 'Heaven reverses the seasons and Earth the things,' is that Heaven fails to manifest its covering benevolence and Earth its containing goodness; therefore it is said to be a calamity."‡ These passages from the Classic which is said to have been compiled by himself, manifest that Confucius held the same sentiments as did his countrymen, and that he regarded Heaven and Earth as the chief divinities of the country.

At page 43 of his "Lectures," Dr. Legge heads a paragraph thus, "Prayers to Shang-ti at a special solstitial sacrifice in A.D. 1538." We have seen above that the sacrifice at the winter solstice is to Heaven. As Shang-ti is another name for Heaven these prayers are of course addressed to Heaven. They are in praise of Heaven and they contain ascriptions of power and rule to Heaven. But Dr. Legge appears to forget this essential point, and writes as if Shang-ti was some Being separate from Heaven. To make this matter clear I present further testimony on that point. At page 478 of the Shu

- * 天地以要我，左傳 疏 晉諸大夫謂皇天后土，實聞君之言，是指天地為証以與我相要約也，見左傳箋疏。
 † 夏君將賞善而刑淫，養民如子，蓋之如天，容之如地，見左傳。
 ‡ 天反時為災，地反物為妖，左傳 疏，天反時，地反物，是乃變易天地覆載之常理，故曰災妖，見左傳箋疏。

King we read, "When T'ang, the successful, had secured the favoring decree he had with him Yin, making his virtue like that of great Heaven. T'ae Mow had E Chih and Chin Hoo, through whom his virtue was made to affect Shang-ti." This is an example where in the immediate context Shang-ti is used as another name for Heaven. In explanation of this usage the commentator on this passage says, "When we speak of its [*i.e.* Heaven] covering all things we call it Heaven; when we speak of its ruling and governing we call it Ti, Ruler. In the books, whether it is styled Heaven or Ruler, the one or the other is used according to *that which is referred to*, and these designations are alike honorable."* At page 10 of his "Lectures" Dr. Legge says, "Heaven is styled Shang-ti." But at page 34 he writes as if Shang-ti was some other Being; quoting from Dr. Edkins' Book at p. 18 thus, "I, the son of Heaven, of the Great Pure Dynasty, humbly, as a subject, dare to make the announcement to Imperial Heaven and Sovereign Earth. Throughout the vast world Shang-ti looks on all without partiality." Shang-ti is here only another name for Heaven to which he was making the announcement of his accession to the throne of China. It is Heaven which looks on all with impartiality and from which he had received the appointment.

Bearing this usage of the words in mind, we come to consider the odes which are sung at the time of the sacrifice to Heaven, as quoted by Dr. Legge from the "Collected Statutes of the Ming Dynasty." I shall take the first one, the translation of which is given in the "Lectures," at p. 48. thus, "When Ti, the Lord, had so decreed, He called into existence the three powers, heaven, earth and man. Between heaven and earth, He separately disposed of men and things all overspread by the heavens. I, his small servant, beg his decree to enlighten me his vassal, so may I forever appear before Him in the empyrean."† In considering this ode, I remark first that it is an ode addressed to Heaven, therefore Heaven is the object or Being addressed. In the first sentence therefore Ti is but the synonym of Heaven. Hwang, which is translated, the Lord, by Dr. Legge, is the honorable designation which was conferred upon Heaven by the Emperor at this very time and which is here applied to Ti as the other name of Heaven, but placed after the noun Ti for rhythm; in plain prose it should therefore read Imperial Ti and not "Ti, the

* 時則有若伊尹格於上帝、時則有若伊陟臣扈格於上帝、
註、自其稱天、或稱帝、各隨所稱、非有重輕也、見書經監本註、

† 帝皇立命、用光帝陪、庶永配於皇穹、中分民物、惟天徧該、小臣請命、

Lord." To make decrees is the prerogative of Heaven, hence this sentence is addressing Heaven as the maker of decrees, or the Decreeer. There are two other designations of the Power addressed in the ode, viz., Heaven which covers all things, and the Imperial Canopy, of which more anon. But the word on which the meaning of the passage turns is the one Dr. Legge translates "called into existence." Let us examine this word to see if this is the correct meaning of it. Dr. Legge gives two references as authority for so translating it. But these are both foreign authorities, viz., Williams' Dictionary, and "its use by those who translated the Bible into Chinese to translate *bara*, to create, either alone or in connection with another word." Using Dr. Young's Analytical Concordance for reference to the passages in which *bara* is found, I have failed to find any instance in which this word "shau" is used alone as a translation of *bara*. I have examined the three most generally known translations, viz., that made by the late Rev. Dr. Medhurst and others, the one known as Bridgman and Culbertson's, and the Mandarin version made by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Schereschewsky. In two passages, viz., Is. xliii: 1 and xliii: 7, I find it in combination with another word used to translate *bara*, but the meaning to "bring into existence" is in the other word which means to *make*. I prefer to get the meaning of Chinese words from Chinese dictionaries, and from their use in standard Chinese writings. Kang Hi defines this word by *ch'i*, a word which means, "the beginning; to begin, there, was, at that time;" without any element of the idea "to bring into existence." This word is found several times in the Shu King both by itself and in combination with other words. Let us examine these passages to see what is the manner in which it is used in these passages. At page 383 of the Shu, it is used in combination with the word to make—shau tsaou, which Dr. Legge translates "laid the *first beginnings* of the empire," making it a noun "the beginnings." At page 179, Dr. Legge translates this word "from the first." At page 162, he translates it "commenced," but in a note he says that it would be better to understand a verb and render shau by *ch'i first*, ascended the throne;" and with this rendering, the native commentary agrees. At page 195, where it is joined to the verb *sin*, Dr. Legge renders it "began;" but the native critics render it, by "*first*" which gives a better sense, thus "first corrected the bonds which hold men together." At page 38 Dr. Legge translates this word "instituted." This passage is the *very* one to which Kang Hi's Dictionary refers as one in which it has the meaning "*first*." The native critics so render it supplying the word to *divide*, and making the passage to read thus, "Shun *first* divided it

[the country] into twelve provinces," which any one who examines the passage will see is a better rendering than to say "Shun instituted the division of the empire into twelve provinces." Thus Kang Hi's Dictionary and these passages from the Shu give the meaning of shau to be "first," "in the beginning." This is also the meaning of the word as given in the Imperial Thesaurus. Following these authorities in the meaning of this word, and the example of the critics on the Shu text in supplying a verb after it, this sentence will read, "At the first, there were the three powers," [Heaven, Earth and Man]. This rendering of this passage agrees entirely with the views of the Chinese writers on cosmogony. For if any one will consult the article in the Jan.-Feb. No. for 1881 of *The China Review*, where the views of native and foreign writers are given on cosmogony, it will be seen that there is not one, except these passages quoted from Dr. Legge, that ascribes the creation of Heaven, Earth and Man to a spiritual Being. Dr. Medhurst, who is not referred to in that article, and "whose attainments in Chinese were prodigious," as Dr. Legge says, and to whom, "in token of his admiration of the depth and extent of his acquaintance with the Chinese language and literature," he dedicated one of his pamphlets, says, "the words tsaou hwa here translated 'production and change' are not to be rendered creation and transformation; for the Chinese have no idea of creation, as we understand it, viz., *the bringing the world into existence.*" I therefore say, that Dr. Legge has no support, either from the Chinese dictionaries, or the usage of the language by Chinese writers, nor the views of the Chinese on cosmogony, for translating the word shau "called into existence;" and I claim the translation I give, "at the first there were the three powers," is supported by the correct principles of interpretation; that it is in entire accord with the views that prevail among the Chinese, and which are commonly expressed by them in regard to the existence of Heaven, Earth and Man.* The remaining clauses of the ode I translate thus, "In the between, men and things were disposed, ah! with Heaven covering all. Thy small servant begs a decree to glorify Ti's associates, so that they may forever be associated with the Imperial Canopy." We have seen above that imperial ancestors are associates with Heaven in receiving the sacrifice to Heaven. Hence, I understand the word pei (陪), not as

* To translate the word shau "to call into existence" would make the sentence read that Heaven called *itself* into existence; for Heaven is one of "the three powers." Such a meaning is absurd and finds no support in any Chinese writings.

尊而君之則稱皇天、見爾雅釋天疏查康熙字典皇字
便知
惟皇上帝、書湯誥傳註、皇、大、上帝、天也、見康熙字典
皇字註解、

ERRATA.—The two Chinese sentences of the foot of page 38 are misplaced. The first belongs to the word “Hwang,” the second in the fifth line from the foot of page 36; and the other to the word “Heaven,” in the second line from the foot of the same page.

Page 27, in line 18th from the foot change the comma after the word “verb” to the place after “implied.”

Page 28, in second line from the foot, for “amount” read “account.”

Page 38, in the eleventh line from the foot supply the word “that” after the word claim, thus—I claim that, etc.

Dr. Legge does to mean the Emperor, who was offering the sacrifice, but to mean the deceased Emperors, who were *mates* of Heaven, or Ti, in receiving the sacrifice: and the meaning is that they receiving the decree of Heaven, would thereby *forever* be associated with Heaven, here styled the "Imperial Canopy." This understanding of the passage is required by the usual meaning of the words. The Emperor when offering the sacrifice to Heaven could not designate himself as the mate of Ti; nor would he ask for himself the honor of being forever associated with the Imperial Canopy. We have seen above that this is the meaning of *pei* (配). Dr. Legge, in a note to this passage, in his letter to Prof. Müller, *Chi. Rec.*, p. 41, lays great stress on the fact that the preposition *yu* is found before the words Imperial Canopy. It is true that *yu* sometimes means *in*, as to place. It is also used in the sense of *with*, as to comparison with, or to be associated *with*. It is also used in cases where in English we would not translate it at all, as in the example given by Premare in his Grammar 問於我 "he asked me." The prefixing of the honorable designation *Imperial* to Canopy, the *very* designation which was conferred upon the Heaven at this time, makes it evident that it was not with heaven as a place, that the ancestors were to be associated, but with personified Heaven, the recipient of the sacrifice. The Chinese say, "honoring Heaven and regarding it as a Sovereign, therefore it is styled Imperial Heaven." In this ode we have Ti hwang; Ti I explain as the other name of Heaven. At p. 185, of the Shu King, we have the phrase "Hwang Shang-ti" which one of the commentators explains thus, "hwang is great, Shang-ti is Heaven."

I therefore present the following as the correct translation of this difficult ode:—"Imperial Ruler, the Decree-er ah! At the first, there were the three powers. In the between, men and things were disposed, ah! Heaven covering all. Thy small servant asks a decree to glorify Ti's associates [*i.e.* the deceased ancestors], so that they may forever be associated with the Imperial Canopy." I ask for it an impartial examination as I claim that it is consistent with every principle of grammar and mythology that is connected with the meaning thereof.

In the prayer which was presented at the same time with the ode, we have the same word *shau* (肇) occur in connection with a verb. "I look up to Thee, mysterious Changer ah! Thou, Imperial great Canopy, this is the time when *first* the masculine energies go forth ah!"* According to the Chinese philosophy, the masculine principle, which is connected with Heaven, or as others would understand it, the principle of light, *first* goes forth at the winter solstice. This is the

* 仰惟玄造兮，於皇昊穹，時當肇陽兮。

reason why the sacrifice to Heaven is offered at that time. The transformation of nature which is effected by the going forth of the masculine energies is ascribed to Heaven, hence the name here applied to Heaven, mysterious Changer or Transformer. We also find the same designation here applied to Heaven as occurs in the ode, "Imperial great Canopy," thus applying the former designation *great* to it as well as the newly conferred one *Imperial*. The meaning I give to "shau" *first*, gives the proper meaning to this clause of the prayer and thus evidences that it is the correct meaning. The use of the word "yang" as a verb is not very common, but the sense requires it, and Kang Hi defines "yang" as sometimes a verb with the sense of "to spread out."

The other odes which Dr. Legge quotes from the Statutes of the Ming dynasty, also derive much of their theistic meaning from the coloring imparted to them by their Christian translator. When translated into English without such coloring they accord with the statement made by the late Rev. Dr. Medhurst that the Chinese had no idea of a creation out of nothing. The ode which is on the 46th page of the "Lectures" may read thus "Of old, in the beginning, there was the great chaos, without form and dark. The five elements had not begun to revolve, nor the sun and moon to shine. In the midst thereof there existed, ah, neither form nor sound. Thou, Spiritual or divine, Sovereign [*i.e.* Heaven] came forth as a Sovereign; and first, the grosser parts were separated from the purer. Heaven, Earth and Man existed or were established. All things continued to be reproduced."* The word which Dr. Legge translates "madest," in the sentence "madest Heaven," is the same which in a preceding sentence says "in the void nothing [existed]." There is nothing to indicate that the existence of Heaven, Earth and Man is ascribed to the creating power of Heaven to whom the ode is addressed. It merely asserts the fact of the existence of Heaven, Earth and Man.

The ode which is given on page 47 is also to Heaven and may read thus: "Ti arranged the yin and yang, ah. The production and change proceeded. The Shin, [*i.e.* Heaven] produced the sun, moon and five planets, ah, and their light was pure and beautiful. The round covered and the square contained, and all things were happy. I, servant, presume reverently to thank, ah. Worshipping I offer to Ti the designation, Sovereign."† The characters "tsau hwa," which

* 於昔洪荒之初兮，混濛五行未運兮，兩曜未明，其中挺立
 兮，有無容聲，神皇出御兮，始判濁清，立天立地人兮，羣
 物生

† 帝闢陰陽兮，造化張神生七政兮，精華光圓覆方軌兮，兆
 物康，臣敢祇報兮，拜薦帝曰皇。

Dr. Legge translates "making work," Dr. Medhurst says "should not be translated creation and transformation. The Chinese do not mean by it the original formation of all things, but the constant production of things observable every day." But apart from all question of translation, or how far some idea of creation may have existed among the Chinese, I remark that whatever is said in these odes is written in reference to Heaven to which the sacrifice at that time was offered; and the ascription of any of the works or attributes of the true God to it does not make it to be the true God. Idolatry consists in the ascription of the attributes, worship or works which belong to God only to any other object or Being.

I translate the designation Shang-ti "the Ruler Above," for the following reasons: Ti is explained Ruler by all the Chinese dictionaries and commentators. It is also translated Ruler by all Western translations for these three hundred years; as into Latin, Imperator or Dominator; into French, Empereur, and into English, Ruler. It is also translated Ruler by the Manchu translators, who translated the Chinese Classics into Manchu. The examples of this meaning of the word Ti are found throughout this article, and in the letter to Prof. Max Müller, and in the pamphlet on Shang-ti. That the prefix Shang is properly rendered *above*, I maintain for these reasons: Heaven and Earth are correlates, the one of the other. The one is above, the other is below. Hence the current expression "Heaven is above and Earth is below."* The early and long continued usage is to designate Heaven as *Shang T'ien*—the Heaven *above*. Dr. Legge often so translates this expression. In assigning different parts of nature to the care of different Beings it was not the idea of the Chinese to consider any one as supreme; but that each one should discharge the function which was assigned to it; hence the expression *Shang T'ien* simply referred to the *location* of Heaven as above—above the Earth and all other things. Since Ti is the synonym of, or another name for, Heaven, when Shang is prefixed to Ti, it has properly the same meaning, and simply refers to its locality. Again Heaven and Earth are constantly referred to as *equal*, as the *two* great objects. They are said to be *equal* in merit, *equal* in the sacrifice offered to them. They are said conjointly to produce all things. While Heaven, or Ti, is said to rule all things, Earth is said to nourish all things. It would therefore be incongruous with this usage, to translate *Shang T'ien* otherwise than as Heaven above. And so when Shang is prefixed to Ti it is congruous to translate it there also by the word above, the Ruler above. The fact that Ti alone is as often used as the synonym

* 上有天,下有地。

of Heaven as Shang-ti is, shows that there is no special significance in the prefix Shang, it is simply used in reference to its location. To this agree the express words of the Chinese Commentator on the Chau Book of Rites. "Heaven and Ti are one, Heaven speaks of its substance and Ti speaks of its lordship."* In explanation of the phrase, "Great Heaven, The Ruler above" as it occurs in the text, the Commentator says, "By reason of the greatness of its substance, it is called great Heaven; because *the seat of its lordship is above*, therefore it is called The Ruler above."† The translation of this term by Supreme Ruler would appear to have been given by those missionaries of the Society of Jesus who contended that Heaven meant the true God, and therefore its synonym meant the Supreme Ruler. And thus from its being similar to the phrase Supreme Ruler in English, which is used by many in speaking of God it has become a current, though incorrect, translation of the Chinese term Shang-ti.

There is another use of the words Ti and Shang-ti, besides their use as another name for Heaven, to which I have not yet adverted. Sometimes they are used in referring to the soul, or the spiritual part of the animated Heaven, as in these passages: "Ti is the Ruler of Heaven. The lord and Ruler of Heaven is designated Ti. The lord and ruler of the body is called the heart."‡ In this passage the idea is evidently to speak of the animated Heaven as composed of the visible Heaven and the animating soul or spirit. As the soul, which animates the human body, is styled the lord and ruler of the body, so the soul of Heaven, here styled Ti, is in that sense the Lord and Ruler of Heaven. But this does not conflict with the statement that the animated Heaven is the Lord and Ruler of *all things*, any more than the fact that the soul of man is the *ruler* of the body conflicts with the statement, that God gave to man "dominion over all the creatures." And this statement that Ti, when used in speaking of the soul of Heaven, is the Lord of Heaven does not support Dr. Legge's statement that Ti when used as another name for Heaven is the Lord of Heaven. For when we say, the soul guides and rules the actions of the body, we do not mean, that the soul is a separate and independent Being from the body, nor do we mean that it is the ruler of the body as Jehovah is the Lord and Ruler of Heaven and Earth and all things.

* 天與帝一也,天言其體,帝言其主,周禮以禋祀昊天上帝句註見十八卷程子註。

† 以其氣之浩浩,故曰昊天,以其主位乎上,故曰上帝,見周禮鄭氏鏐註解卷同上。

‡ 帝者,天之宰也,天之主宰曰帝,身之主宰曰心。

Here is another example of this use of the word. "Heaven and Ti are one. The starry appearance is not Heaven, therefore Heaven cannot be sought in the appearance. To seek Heaven in the appearance differs in what respect from this, viz., to know that man has form, color, mien and appearance, and *not* to know there is the more honorable part, the ruling soul."* This passage refers to Heaven as animated by an intelligent soul, just as man's body is animated by a living soul. But it does not mean that the visible Heaven is no part of the chief Power designated Heaven, any more than it means that the body is no part of man.

I have met with this expression in a prayer offered by the Emperor Tien Hing of Northern Wei dynasty, A.D. 398. Having prepared the sacrifice he prayed thus, "The Emperor, thy servant, Kwei, using the blackish bull, clearly states to *the soul* of Imperial Heaven and Sovereign Earth. Heaven Above has sent down the decree, &c."† In this passage then is a clear and distinct reference to the two component parts of the animated Heaven and Earth, viz., the substance or visible part, and the spirit or soul of each. But it is also clear that the visible object is that to which the sacrifice is offered, while it is also made plain that it is the intelligent soul, which animates the object, that understands the prayer of the worshipper. Just as in worshipping an idol, the worshipper bows before the *visible image*, but he supposes it is the intelligent soul animating the image that receives his prayer. It is also clear in this passage that it is the visible objects that are styled Imperial Heaven, and Sovereign Earth; for the spiritual part is called their soul; just as it is the *images* of the respective idols the goddess of mercy and the war-god that are called Kwáng-yin and Kwan-ti. The Chinese word *ling* in this passage refers to the same part of Heaven-god that Ti does in the other passages.

I have thus presented from Chinese authors their testimony, as to what object is meant when they speak of a ruling power by the word Heaven. The testimony is uniform and the same. Everywhere it is the visible Heaven which is referred to. In recapitulation, I only refer to the two honorable designations which were conferred by Imperial authority. They have continued in use more than 3000 years. The title "great" is stated to have been conferred "in reference

* 天帝一也，星象非天，天固不可，以象求也，以象祭天，是
 異於知人之元，有形色，而不知有君之尊也，
 † 魏太祖曰：皇帝臣珪，敢用玄牡，昭告於皇天，禮
 祝命，乃眷我祖宗，世王幽都。見魏書禮志。

to the greatness of its substance;" the reason for conferring the title Imperial is thus stated, "honoring Heaven and regarding it as a Sovereign, therefore it is styled Imperial Heaven." I have collected nearly a thousand passages in which a ruling power is designated Heaven. In many passages it is spoken of by some one of the many appearances of shape or color which Heaven presents at various times. I have, in this paper, referred to a number of the passages, which have been brought forward, as suggesting the idea of a Spiritual Being to man's minds. I have shown that such passages are not understood in that sense by the Chinese themselves. I have shown that when they refer to a spirit or soul connected with Heaven they refer to an intelligent soul animating the visible Heaven, as the soul animates the body of man. Their conception of the greatness and power of Heaven as a ruling power is taken from its visible greatness as high, and wide and covering all things; its virtue and moral attributes are conceived of, or ascribed to it largely from considering the blessings and mercies which come to mankind from heaven, as the *means* or second cause thereof; as its covering all things on the earth, its sending the rain and the sunshine, and fruitful seasons. Judgments come to mankind from it, as famine, destructive storms, drought and floods. Hence in the state religion the Emperor offers sacrifices and prayers to Heaven, at the altar to Heaven, to obtain the blessings which it confers upon mankind, and to avert the calamities which it sends upon the wicked. In this discussion I have had no other object than to present *fairly* and clearly what the Chinese themselves say in regard to the matter. I have printed the Chinese text of the passages I have quoted, that all who are interested in the subject may judge of the faithfulness of the translation presented. I am, by this repeated examination of the subject, more fully convinced that the opinion, in regard to the object worshipped in the state religion of China under the designation Heaven, *being the visible Heaven* deified, which has been held so long, and by so many writers of all creeds, is most certainly *correct*. I leave those who have read these pages to form their own opinions in regard to the matter. I feel assured that, with the spread of the Gospel, this the most ancient form of idolatry will perish from off the earth, with all other forms of idolatry, and that the one living and true God, who is indeed the Ruler over all, will be worshipped in the place of Heaven, by the Ruler of this people.

