

good company of standard exegetes they would have heard of the life behind the mite, and have learned even in my humble Sunday-school that the "mite" was an expression of a subjective life, and an evidence of subjective worth of character; surely these gentlemen must recall the comment on the widow's action made at the time, "she hath cast in more than they all." Did the mite remain always the mite? Nay brethren, but from the first it was not so.

I value your paper. I take it, read it, pay for it, keep it, bind it, lend it, when I move all back numbers move with me, I furnish lists of likely subscribers, etc., and I do this because it instructs and informs me and helps to keep me out of certain ruts of thought; but give us a square deal in *The Open Court* before the ever enlarging tribunal of your select readers.

REV. W. B. EVALT.

GRACE EPISCOPAL CHURCH, BROOKFIELD, MO.

P. S. On page 612 it is stated that the word *ἐκθυμία* is often found in the New Testament,—never, the word is *ἐπιθυμία*.

---

#### IN ANSWER TO MR. EVALT.

*To the Editor of The Open Court:*

I thank you for the opportunity of placing beside the criticism of Mr. Evalt, my reply, which I trust will to some extent make clearer the points which he raises.

In so far as my critic has given a side of the subject which I did not propose to myself to touch, all must feel grateful. The great difference between us seems chiefly to be one of emphasis. One important part, however, has either not been clearly expressed on my part or misunderstood by him. He says of me that I seem to think the "absence of a definite terminology is a distinct evidence of the superiority both in their ethical standards and national character" of the Hindu compared to the Christian. My words were really as follows: "Christian critics who narrowly desire to make all non-Christian nations conform to their own moral standard must here be reminded that the ethical standard of the Upanishads *if not the same is by no means inferior to their own.*" This is not quite the same as saying that it is "superior."

My mention of the Christian revivalist who covers sea and land to bring about "cases" of conviction of sin, was not intended as only having reference to his peculiar type of religion. Rather, do I receive him as an extreme and therefore clearly defined example of a rather large class of Christian teachers, who make much ado about the "sins" of an age, that is already—thanks to a more natural view of this strange thing we call life—modifying its views about sin and inquiring with Burns "why they do it." I yet think that it is significant of much between the Christian religion and the religion of the Upanishads that this latter draws our attention far more to the individual determinism and potentiality for godliness than does the religion that yet speaks of us as "miserable sinners."

As for the question of the "widow's mite," I fail to see how my critic could have so misunderstood me. Whatever acquaintance Professor Deussen and myself have had with "standard exegetes," it is certain that neither of us is ignorant of the subjective value of an action. The confusion may have arisen in consequence of my not distinguishing more clearly between what

I call "organized Christianity" and real Christianity. I am sure that Mr. Evalt laments as every good man does, that the Christianity of the Churches *does* give such importance to the objective value of an action. It is not *we* who say that "the widow's mite is never anything more than a mite," it is "organized Christianity," that is saying so, by its conduct, that is, by its deference to the rich and its indifference to the poor. It is the \$10,000.00 gift that is praised by the "religious" weeklies, the mite is forgotten. I therefore support the words of Professor Deussen. The correction *ἐπιθυμία* to *ἐπιθυμία* is, of course, due to a misprint. In closing I would like to say that I am glad the matter has been brought up, for the emphasis thus given to it may create a greater interest in these things of the soul. Every one who can come into the open court of courteous discussion on religion is a great gain, especially if he is more concerned about what is right than who is right.

EDWIN A. RUMBALL.

---

### THE SUPERPERSONAL GOD.

IN COMMENT ON A COMMUNICATION FROM PÈRE HYACINTHE LOYSON.

Father Hyacinthe Loyson, in a letter of September, 1907, writes with reference to conversations we had at Paris on various philosophical subjects and especially on the problem of God, as follows:

"My God is superpersonal like yours, like the En-Sof of the Cabbala which I have been studying a little lately; but this God is at the same time the Heavenly Father of the Gospel, the inmost ear which hears the inarticulate language of the soul, the inmost mouth which speaks to it in an inarticulate language,—inarticulate also but the more profound and the more efficacious because it is inarticulate."

In comment on Father Hyacinthe's remark I would say that I gladly grant that his further description of God does not contradict my conception of Him, and I have insisted at various times that God is not only the world-order such as we formulate it in great outlines as natural laws, but also and mainly what in Biblical language we would call "The Still Small Voice." It is He that speaks to us in the most intimate sentiments of religious feelings, inarticulate though these feelings may be. I still hold the idea that God can be understood from the standpoint of a scientific investigation, but I also grant that to the unscientific man a scientific formula is unmeaning, and he would naturally be more satisfied with the hazy picture of his inarticulate sentiment because that to him is the realy, and the scientific formula, as it has been boiled down in the alembic of a logical analysis, is to him a foreign and meaningless jumble of words. I would at the same time insist that the still small voice is powerful not only in the heart of a devotee; it is not purely a subjective sentiment, but there is something real corresponding to it in the objective universe. There is a feature in the destiny of the evolution of life that tenderly preserves the finer and nobler aspirations, which naturally gives the impression that a fatherly care guides and protects mankind.

The scientific way of looking at things is after all one method only of treating our experiences. We claim that there is nothing that cannot be subjected to it, and it is the only way of reaching the standpoint of a higher conception which will enable us to rise above the standpoint of sentimentality. Culture based upon science affords a foundation for a man that will enable