

PREFACE.

The reader will notice that my approach to the religious phenomena is from the psychological point of view. In brief that method insists that the data of religion, be ~~they~~ ^{they} ideological, emotional, or even physical acts, such as rites and ceremonies, are forms of an individual or collective Consciousness. They are manifestations of a living personality. Their appearance, their nature, and their function, can not be understood apart from the ~~the~~ ^{being} and the environment which gave rise to them. We can as little abstract them from the living soul and have them preserve their vitality and freshness just as little as we can pluck out a flower from its root and soil, and prevent it from withering by keeping it in a vase. Both have been severed from the source of their life-principle, and therefore are doomed to die.

Now, my opposition to the intellectualistic interpretations of religion is due just to this defect. They have not only one-sidedly translated the manifold and complex forms of the religious life ^{into a ~~the~~ ^{the} mystic code}, but they also detach ^{them} from the soul of the people ~~which~~ ^{which} gave them birth and life. The mother ~~was~~ thus made childless and the child motherless. The foster-parents, no matter what comforts they may provide for their adopted-children yet (even if only ~~at~~ ^{periodically}), look upon these ^{as} ~~as~~ ^{only} adopted children, truths that ~~they~~ ^{they} borrowed from others, but ~~which~~ ^{which} ~~not~~ ^{they did} create ~~as~~ ^{as} themselves.

When such truths however, are embraced and incorporated into the life activity of the people that adopted them, to the extent that they become part and parcel of their entire make-up, then and only then do they become part of their Self, their Soul. They become then children of their own spirit and flesh of their own flesh. That phenomenon may be compared to the surgical operation, which we call the "transfusion of blood", wherein the blood of one individual is incorporated into the veins of another individual, ^{at time} ~~this~~ blood becomes identical in structure and function to that blood into which it entered. But then that assimilative truth is not merely

intellectual. It becomes an experience that galvanizes our entire being, ~~our~~ emotional and social as well as our mental nature. From that moment it becomes understood only when it is considered in connection with ~~the~~ soul that incorporated it.

The anthropological and the historical views of religion, too, have committed this same fallacy. They took up only the visible or physical details of religion, studied and classified them, without paying regard to the psychic motives of the people who practiced them. The thoughts, the feelings, the aims, ^{that lie} ~~though~~ inarticulate and incrustated ^{lie} in back of them, were ignored. They endeavored to learn what religion meant in the near as well as the remote past by excavating primitive totems, Assyrian temples, and Egyptian mummies. Were they to have continued their excavations, and cut ⁱⁿ these externals into the hearts of those crude men--they would have discerned a grain of that element which bears no little resemblance to that which actuates and characterizes our present day religious behaviour. If this psychologic method would be pursued, religion would not be looked upon as a fetish, as a jumble of rites, ^{and} ceremonies. These would be seen to be the concomitant materializations of a form of consciousness. For human nature, despite its evolutionary and expansive characters has a certain constancy about it. Its highest stage of development lies in its seeds. Its growth means the bringing out into actuality the potentialities which lie dormant in those seeds. The ideas and ideals of latter mankind come ^{not} ^{out} of the air. They come out of our hearts. They were always there. ~~We~~ were unconsciousness of them. Circumstances, physical and psychical slowly cleared the way for their appearance. Our spiritual natures are not a recent and adventitious increment. They lie ingrained in our hearts and souls. These are the elements that make up our Spiritual Self. Their visibility, lucidity and lustre determine the degree of development of our consciousness. It is to this consciousness that an examination of the externals must lead. For these mental elements prompt those visible seeds.

To examine the latter without regard to the former, the psychological state, is like describing a mother's grief at the death of her child, by the chemical constituency of the tears she sheds. The anthropological treatment gave us a devitalized picture of religion, it showed us the object of our search - but it was ^{religion} enbalm^d, without any life whatsoever. These treatments ~~existed~~ dampened the religious ardor of our men and women.

Religion, they were told, was a mere ^{plot} locus-pocus, had no meaning, no aim. A few definitions of religion, given by these adherents to the anthropological method will illustrate that fact. "By religion," Frazer says, "I understand a propitiation or conciliation of Powers, superior to men, which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and human life."

To Sergi, "religion is a pathological manifestation of the protective function, a sort of deviation of the normal function, a deviation caused by ignorance of natural causes and their effects." To another, religion is a body of scruples which act as an obstacle to the free exercise of our faculties."

When these scholars did ~~ix~~ interpret the rites of religions, they attributed them exclusively to the element of fear. Religion was ~~the~~ man's attempt to avoid the treachery and wrath of the gods. Religious worship, in the form of sacrifices and offerings, appear now merely as bribes, attempts to appease the terrors of the spirit.

This is the impression that these sciences of religion left. They were certainly not conducive towards a rightful estimate of the past religions ^{were they} ~~not~~ conducive to stimulate us to a more intensive participation ~~and the~~ present religious life. When we consider this, ^{in addition} to the effects of the spread of the knowledge of the physical sciences, with their materialistic ~~own~~ and their mechanistic uniformity and regularity, with their emphasis on the inductive and the empirical methods, ^{I wonder not why} ~~made~~ it appears to the thinking Jews, especially to our young college students, that the era of religion is passing to the limbo of the Past, that in time it will universally be looked upon as an aberration that ~~xxx~~ once illusioned the minds

~~was~~ ^{become the}

of men. Their pent-up spirituality ~~was~~ ^{become the} translated into purely *materialistic* channels. To these young men, I wish especially to present Judaism from the pragmatic point of view. I do this, not because I see in Pragmatism Judaism's double, There are parallels between Judaism and Pragmatism, but there are also differences. I wish to approach and evaluate Judaism from the Pragmatic point of view, because I do not wish to base it on credos and beliefs. This is done, not because the writer does not possess such connections based on faith, or because he feels such beliefs can be entirely dispensed with but because he feels the nature of the young students, after sniffing his first waft of knowledge ^{to}, to think of the universe as ^a totally rational and consistent and empiric thing. Observe the facts of nature, he says, learn the rules of logic, and you will master Creation. Beliefs and dogmas are repugnant to him. We must approach him in the proper manner, if we wish to keep him religiously as well as racially in the fold. The best method of winning him over to Judaism while he is in this "Sturm und Drang" period, it seems to me, is to present to him Judaism pragmatically, by showing him the value of its life, its openness, its aspirations, its vision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. Episodes in the Cultural Career of Judaism.
2. What is Pragmatism.
3. Experience in Pragmatism.
4. Pragmatism Reality.
5. Pragmatic Truth.
6. Pragmatic Ethics.
- ✓ 7. The Element of Experience in Judaism.
- ✓ 8. Jewish Realities.
9. Jewish Truths.
10. Jewish Ethics.

5 chapters to be added:

3 on the God Conception
2 on the Religious Life

EPISODES ~~AND~~ THE CULTURAL HISTORY OF JUDAISM.

The Israelites, having been released from Egypt, were pictured by the Biblical writer to have encamped before the Bhrouded Baal. On the eve of commencing their journey through the vast desert as a people, they must have wistfully gazed into that Sealed Mystery, into that silent Sphinx, for a prognostication as to the result of that perilous adventure. That gigantic mass of matter, tho temporal, gave them a vague feeling of eternity. Would they but survive this arid desert, would they be but sure of ^{their} existence, even if just to touch the soil of the Promised Land, was perhaps the unuttered wish of their hearts. Now that people has trodden the path of four thousand years of history, a history full of arid stretches save an oasis here and there, and in spite of all obstacles still exists with an unparalleled spiritual virility. They themselves, now became a Living Sphinx, the Miracle of Ages, the unsolved Riddle, from whom the passing caravan of nations implore the secret of its Being. "Why art thou, Oh Israel, like the Phoenix, ever renascent, and immortal?"

One answer to this question is, it seems to me, contained in the fact that they have not hesitated to eat of the fruit of every tree of knowledge and yet ^{more so} or because of this they have continued to live. They have passed through varied cultures and have shown the aptitude to absorb and to reject discriminately and judiciously. They were like the harp of David, from whose strings every breeze brought forth sounds of divine paeans. (1)

I propose to give, as an introduction to the main thesis, a bird's-eye view of the cultural history of Judaism. By Judaism I mean both the faith and its exponents. To me they are as indissoluble as matter and spirit is in our empirical world. Judaism is the soul of the

Jewish people. Separate them and neither will exist (as they are today).

I propose to present this survey of the cultural career of Judaism from the evolutionary point of view. The historical method in other sciences has amply proven to us the value and importance of the genetic study. In fact, we feel that without such a treatment we are not able to fully comprehend the object investigated. Such a method, although it may not explain to us the ultimate why and how, nevertheless it gives us a clearer description ~~of~~ ^{of} WHAT the thing is.

The phenomena we call Judaism has been enriched and its perspective enhanced by the founders and disciples of the school of "Jüdische Wissenschaft". Through their critical research, they have cast light upon much of Rabbinic Lore and upon many Jewish institutions and ceremonies. They, however, stopped short. The field to which they confined their critical investigations was Rabbinic and Mediaeval literature. The Bible, however, they left untouched. ^{to they want} ~~Hither will we go~~ but no further. The Bible was the sanctum sanctorum, into which no ~~one~~ ^{one} should enter. Higher Criticism, with a subliminal bias, ^{this} supplied us with a critical knowledge of the preceding stage of Judaism. With the results of both of these schools we are able to see Judaism -- as a seed, as a stalk, and as a rich and luxuriant plant. Judaism is now seen not as a ready made religion, donated to a desert people in the same supernatural fashion as was their manna. It looms now as a process, the evolution and the reaction of a living and growing people to an ever changing cultural environment. It is the soul of a vital organism, Israel.

Now a vital organism thrives by what we call in Biology Metabolism. Its life is a process, in which old tissues are constantly displaced by new ones. Anabolism or Assimilation is the name given to the constructive part of the process, the part which results in the building of the nutritive substance into the complex living substance. Katabolism is the name given to the destructive end of the process,

that which decomposes and oxidizes the protoplasm into simple and dead matter. Anabolism and Katabolism go on simultaneously but with varying proportions depending on the nature of the organism and its environment.

Now the Jewish people, in their march through the various civilizations, at times ~~instinctively~~ and at times consciously, has adhered to the laws of such an intellectual metabolism. They, especially in their incipient or formative periods, made many cultural elements as their own acquisitions. They assimilated and modified them in the course of time or rejected them either by discarding or ignoring them. In this way they were able to adapt themselves to the changing cultural environments. They had to storm the heavens for their Torsh. They had to be spiritually and intellectually on the alert, giving heed to the Past and Future and at the same time live in the present.

The Isrselites dawn upon the horizon of history as a nomadic people or tribe. The facts of their early period has to be sifted through a maze of hypotheses as to their origin, numbers and character. Here we find Judaism, if we may call it so, in a pastoral garb, differing very little from the religion of the other Beduin tribes. Yet even here we are told by some scholars that this people (or Judah-tribe) had to adjust themselves and adopted a new deity, that of the Kenites, with whom they now came in contact. 2

The next scene of their activity is in Cansan. Here the shepherd tribes came in contact with a confirmed and dominating agricultural people, rooted to the soil which sustained them. That soil held an important place in their creed and in their ritual. Their religion was a distinctively agricultural religion thile those of the new comers was a shepherd faith. Basl and JHWH were vieing for supremacy. This contact had its good and its baneful effects. It raised them from a lower stage of civilization. It increased their needs, opened to them a new source of sustenance, new implements and methods. The opposition on theix part of the older inhabitants helped to unify them into a nation.

They (especially the northern Israelites), however, for the present had to compensate for it by a surrender of their imported desert-virtues, such as their desert-freedom and morality. It is the loss of these virtues that makes the prophets so bitter against the new civilization and harp back to their former state in the desert which they so idealized.

The situation becomes more acute as the Israelitish people became commercial and thereby gained a new access to the cultures of foreign peoples. A commercial people makes alliances with its traders. These in ancient times meant not only an economic but a cultural and religious rapprochement; the stress was further accentuated as Assyria and Babylonia, each in turn began to invade and dominate Palestine physically and culturally. The civilization became much more complex and ornate. The spiritual struggle of that people was a mighty one. At times it seemed that they were on the cross roads with but one alternative. In this period the Israelitish people had absorbed a great deal. ⁽²⁾ It took over the Babylonian Cosmogony and changed it to the monotheistic story of Creation. The taboo of the seventh day was transformed into the Sabbath, a day of rest and inner joy. The whole Priestly code bears traces of this civilization. Here we begin to find the tendency of a cultural katabolism much stronger.

With the victory of Cyrus, Judaism began to feel the breeze of a new culture. Judea now became a Persian province and remained such until the end of the Arsacid rule. Even after this date they were in touch with it. The extent of their copen¹etration can be seen from the legends attributing Jewish ancestors to Persian figures. Here Judaism met a more systematic theology. We find direct Persian allusions in the Bible. Deutero-Isaiah's statement that God is the author of light and darkness is very significant. It represents the reaction of Judaism to Persian dualism, which divided the Cosmos and its forces between Ormuzd, the God of light and Ahriman the God of evil and darkness. The monotheism of JHWH was strengthened by this contact. There is present in Parseism the universal strain that compares to a certain degree to the teachings of the Prophets. Their

faith was to be promulgated throughout the world in accordance with the teachings of Zoroaster. Their sages too dreamed of an "AVESTA", a utopia in the end of days when Ormuzd would vanquish his rival Ahriman, when the dead would be resurrected and evil be no more. We find in the Zend Avesta parallels to Creation and the Deluge stories, to the three sons of Noah, to Moses and to the Revelation. The Magian Laws of purification bear a marked and striking resemblance to the Levitical code even in details. The analogies between Judaism and Zoroastrianism in their angelology and eschatology, as well as other resemblances, has set many scholars theorizing as to who borrowed from whom. Most scholars maintain that Judaism was influenced by Persian thought while Darmester thinks that Judaism did the influencing. No matter with what school we may side as to who was the original possessor, we must admit that there was a commingling of cultures and that each reacted vigorously to the other. The character of the Pahlavi literature, its striking similarities in doctrines and sayings to those in the Talmud, its hostile references to Jews and to Judaism shows that the cultural clash persisted even to this late day. The very mode as well as some of the content of the Talmudic Law is the product of this environment. (31)

The next wave that dashed against that irresistible bar was Greek culture. Judaism wrestled with the angel of Hellas. At times it appeared a veritable vendetta. In Hellenism Judaism was confronted with an attractive philosophy of life, with a different outlook upon the world and things. Hellenism possessed grace and outer refinement. Judaism regarded the inner things of life as paramount. It cultivated the beauty of the spirit. The victorious campaign of Alexander linked the east and west. The triumph of the sword was followed by that of the word. In eastern Palestine Hellenism took a firm hold. Even the names of places were Hellenized. (41) The Greek language became the vernacular. This is evidenced from the number of Greek words that made their way into Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic. (51) The Greek influence was present everywhere, extending from the organization of the state to the ordinary life of the people. It now became necessary to

6

translate the Bible into the Greek, which resulted with the Septuagint. That period was prolific in Jewish literary activities. Through the Apocrypha and the pseudo epigrapha, Plato and other Greek philosophers were infiltrated into Jewish thought. Nor was Judaism contented to remain the beneficiary only. It gave as well as it took. The universal aspect was given a great deal of emphasis, the monotheistic doctrine was made the salient feature of Judaism. The Septuagint, the Sibylline writings, the allegorical interpretations aimed to present Judaism in a favourable and acceptable form to refined and cultured Greeks. Alexandrian Jews declared themselves to be Palestinians in religion and Hellenes in language. (6) Moses was turned into a Museus. He was accredited with having founded the Egyptian religion. It was the fear of the spread of Judaism that made certain Greek authors and historians treat Jews and Judaism so vilely and with such vituperation, just as Antiochus' tyranny and forced accentuation of Greek culture had made the Jewish people recoil from even the finer elements of Hellenism. The reaction set in with the reassertion of nationalism and the autonomy of Judaism by the Maccabean and Bar Cochba revolutions. The fact that Christianity began to adopt and utilize the Graeco-Judaistic notions of the Logos and Universalism as a proof for Christianity made the later Rabbis still more hostile to Greek culture. Then we find them freely sacrificing the wisdom of Hellas for Judaism. (7) The use of Greek and the Apocrypha became now prohibited. (8) The day on which the Septuagint was translated the Rabbis say was a day of darkness. (9)

The scene now shifts to a new country and a new culture. We find Judaism in the center of a rich and flourishing Arabic civilization. Babylon as the seat of Jewish knowledge gave place to Moslem Spain. Mohammedanism had succeeded where hitherto Christianity failed. Its faith did not necessarily imply the suppression of the free exercise of the intellect and the love of inquiry. On the contrary they mobilized this knowledge as aids to religion. Hellenic culture was freely absorbed. Plato and Aristotle became the possession of Arabic philosophers (Averroes)

Poetry was in full bloom. Natural Science, medicine, astronomy were part of the intellectual program of the day. Arabic figures and astronomical tables were in universal use. The age was rationalistic and their faith dogmatic, there consequently arose a problem as to the reconciliation of Reason and Revelation. A religious philosophy consequently sprang up.

In the midst of this intellectual buzz the Jews were fortunate to have lived. Having received from their Ishmaelitic cousins equality of opportunity, they participated vitally in the political and social life of the day. We find eminent Jewish physicians attending on kaliphs and caring for princes. We find a Chasdai Ibn Shaprut in the court of Cordova and a Samuel Ibn Nagdela as vizier of the king of Granada. We see them holding ranking positions in the field of commerce and trade. But most of all we see them applying themselves assiduously to the task of mastering the learning of the age. We behold a line of Hebrew grammarians and philologists in the persons of Menachem ben Saruk, Judah Chayug, Judah ibn Janaeh and David Kimchi; a series of poets in Dunash ibn Lebrat, Solomon ibn Gabirol and Judah Halevi. A galaxy of Jewish philosophers beginning with Israeli and ending with Albo saliently stand out.

Now here too Jewish intellectual life received its impress and impetus from the intellectual life of their non-Jewish brethren. Hebrew philology followed the philological achievement of the Arabs. The technical terms of Hebrew grammar were patterned after their models. The Arabic poetry (Harizi) had no little influence on the Hebrew of that age. It was shown that even the Zionides of Halevi sing to the *tune* of an Arabic Kassidi. Jewish philosophers imitate the Mutekallimun, the Arabic Neo Platonists and Aristotleans. Even the code of Maimonides is said to be arranged after a Mohammedian fukaha and Arabism are profusely found in it.

The Jews here too gave as well as they took. They gave not only to the Arabs but to that Christian world that suffered them. They were the channels through which Hellenic culture, with its Arabic coating was transmitted to

western Europe. The works of Kimchi had a great deal of influence on Christian as well as Jewish Biblical students. Gabirol was the first to introduce Graeco-Arabic philosophy into mediaeval Christian circles. Mainonides' 'Dulaluth al-Hairin' was translated into Latin and had a tremendous effect on Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, as well as the other scholastics.

Judaism in this period received a philosophic aspect. The time demanded and it became a religious philosophy. They absorbed a great deal but they completely digested and Judaized these additions to such an extent that they sang with fervour and emotion these philosophies (Yigdal for example) in the Synagogue.

The Moor was driven out of Spain. The great bulk of the Jews were now in Christian lands and we now have a new episode in the cultural history of Judaism. I need not dilate on the genesis of Christianity, and inform the reader that it was a limb cut from the body of Judaism, although it never was a help to it. The early Christians were Jews believing in Jesus as a Messiah, first in the political then in the religious sense of the word. It was shown in the last few decades the utter impossibility to get a clear and comprehensive knowledge of the New Testament unless we have the Haggadic literature of the Rebbis as a background. For it is from this literature that most of them were taken. The part played by the Old Testament in the dogmatic, ritual, and devotional life of Christians cannot be overestimated. In fact the Church was seized with such terror at the dependence of Christianity on Judaism as its spiritual mainspring that they went out of their way to create differences and thereby give Christianity the semblance of autonomy. This was the motive of the transfer of the Sabbath day to Sunday, of their conscious efforts not to have Easter coincide with Passover.

We have seen that the Jews of Spain and Egypt were the intermediaries between Arabic civilization, which contained the philosophies of Plato,

Aristotle and Neo-Platonism, and the Christian Scholastics.

It is claimed that the Kabbalistic movement gave to Protestantism that mystical touch that made it rebel against the cold rationalistic shackles of Scholasticism. "Just as Catholicism had sought to temper divine mysteries by the rationalism of Mainonides so Protestantism in its turn modified its rationalistic tendencies by a resort to the mysticism of the Kabbala."⁽¹⁰⁾ Whether that ecstatic religiosity was gotten from the Kabbala or from Neo-Platonism which was now accessible to Christianity, one thing we are sure of, that there was some mutual influence or contact between both religions. We find mystical tendencies in Christianity similar to the Kabbalistic movements and we can also discern traces of Christian doctrines in some parts of the Zohar.

That Spinoza wielded a tremendous influence in the philosophical firmament, from Leibnitz to Hegel, the history of modern philosophy records. Hegelianism transferred the substance of Spinoza to ~~the~~ Idee and his Pantheism to his own 'Panlogismus'. Now Spinoza's saturation of Jewish thought, his indebtedness to Crescas was already shown. We have here ⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ Jewish thought indirectly influencing the philosophy of Europe.

The influence of Jewish phenomena on receptive Christianity or vice versa is only one aspect of the tale. The influence was not always one of mutual attraction. On the contrary there was a spirit of hostility between them. A thought or book at times had to be smuggled into the other camp and then only it spread clandestinely. There was an intellectual snipping although no open bombardment. The political and economic position of the Jew deteriorated in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. Christian torment displaced Moslem toleration. They were constantly told to go and when they were permitted to stay they were degraded with a yellow badge and a forced confinement in squalid ghetto. What was needed to keep the fires of religion burning in this storm was not cold philosophy, but rather the heart. Philosophy was looked upon with suspicion. Mysticism and Obscurantism now ran wild with these mediæval Eldads and Medads.

Christian hostility made the Jew withdraw within his own spiritual domain. The Jewish Law and literature was minutely analyzed and amplified. The Talmud, the Hagada, the codes and the Responsa became the only curricula of Jewish study. Secular or non-Jewish culture were considered profane, unworthy of energy and time. Jewry was encompassed in a spiritual as well as a physical wall.

And even in this period there was no complete and absolute cultural separatism. Thoughts and mental attitudes are infectious. They, without our notice creep into our life. Many a ceremony and custom in Judaism received, if it was not actually imported, added significance due to its contact with Christianity; examples of such are the Kadish, the lighting of lights for the dead. The Kol Nidre melody, some tell us, was a Christian hymn Judeised. The Chad Gadya (חַד גַּדְיָה) was a German folk song which received a Jewish color. Even the Schulchan Aruch cannot be thoroughly understood in places unless we take into account the current mediæval superstitions. Some practices of Jewish life as well as some beliefs, differing with those entertained by the mass of Christians were brought out in bolder relief, as a pretext and a contrast. This period, though beautiful for its spiritual intensity, its moral fervour and its religious unswervability, presents an unattractive view because of its narrowness of range and vision. It is the period of Jewish mediævalism.

Scholasticism had to give way to the undermining influence of modern thought. The Ptolemaean astronomy with its geo and anthropocentric theology had to be discarded in the face of the Copernician world view, and the discovery of America, the reclamation of the Humanities, the revival of interest in man for man's sake, so Jewish mediævalism had to give way, though many centuries too late, to the solving influence of modern culture. The paque walls of the ghetto were beginning to crumble, the sun's rays were beginning to enter that place of enforced intellectual thralldom. Individuals caught the breath of the open and fresh air and the ghetto was now to them stifling. Mendelssohn and the Haskala movement was directed to

encourage secular learning, the cultivation of a higher aesthetic taste, and the appreciation of foreign classics, until now considered profane. The sudden dash of light was for many dazzling and they were blinded, yey even the children of the pioneers of the enlightenment. The gap between mediaeval Judaism and modern culture was still unabridged. Judaism, if it was to survive, needed a reinterpretation. It had to be put in the cultural milieu of the age. Reform Judaism came in at this critical movement. It sincerely aimed to be a 'Modern Guide to the Perplexed.' Until Samuel Hirsh (1815-1889) the movement merely meant a decorization of the Synagogue and the service. With him it received a distinct theology based on the current ~~of~~ philosophy.

The dominant figure in Germany at that time was Hegel (1770-1831). That Aristotle was to Maimonides, Hegel was to the religious thought of the Reform movement. Now if Hegel through Spinoza was influenced indirectly by Jewish thought he paid more than double to Judaism that followed him. For the Judaism of the Reform school was deeply and directly influenced by his philosophy. Its outstanding doctrines, yey even its method bear Hegelian traces. "They (the Reformers) had to familiarize themselves with the non-Jewish positions and postulates and at the same time show how through the centuries from the very earliest to the latest voice of Judaism, the main contention of the church had been strenuously rejected. But for all this most of the liberal teachers were not theologians. Some of them were well trained philosophers. They in order to controvert the pet undervaluations of Judaism in which the builders of the system to which they gave adherence indulged, would reconstruct Judaism in terms of the school and system which they had espoused. My father, Samuel Hirsch is a Hegelian. His presentation is moulded by the system just because his work is intended to tear down the artificial structure erected by the head of the school in which Judaism is assigned a place in the cellar and Christianity as the absolute religion is given a seat on the throne in regal chamber." (12)

Now I shall give a brief presentation of Hegel's system and philosophy and trace the influence of each of his doctrines on the thought of Reform Judaism.

Hegel is a transcendental Idealist in that he believes in the primacy of Spirit; the ultimate reality to him is thought. Logic is the essence of all Existence. Hegel is famous as a synthetic philosopher. He attempted to construct a unified system, which he identified with the objective reality of things, on ultra rationalistic basis. His synthesis of this world of reality he achieved through the dialectic method. Things proceed and develop in triad processes. A phenomenon occurs, then there proceeds another phenomenon contrary to the first and finally there is a union through a compromise. In the intellectual world we see a suggestion arise, then there comes on its heels another one which brands this one as false and finally there is a reconciliation. The triadic process of evolution is ^{always} characterized by ^{such} a thesis, antithesis and synthesis. From this there follows most of the other Hegelian axioms e.g. his principle of negation, that is, that the same posits the other etc.

With this triadic process, Hegel attempts to explain the Universe thusly. The world of Nature, which represents the objectification of the All Encompassing Mind, the Absolute, is governed by general laws of thought. "Nature must be regarded as a system of stages in which one necessarily proceeds from the other.... not however in such a way that one is produced by the other but in the inner idea which constituted the ground of Nature." His 'geistes philosophie' represents the next step in the dialectic development. The transition from Nature to Spiritual Beings is affected by the annulling of the externality in which the absolute idea appears in it. Thus we have all existence, after undergoing through the spiritual life of the individual subject and of the objective mind of society, reduced to a Spiritual Monism, an Absolute Mind, God, in which we have a higher unity of subject and object. We have here a oneness characterized by sameness, a 'block universe'. His system, it is seen,

is a conceptual one. Logic breeds categories. The particulars are absorbed into the universals. These are the most, the only realities. In part, a particular cannot be known unless the whole, the universal, is known or given. These universals are aspects of the divine mind, in which contrariness are identical, and ^{which} all is included. What is salient in this philosophy is his monism, his higher Oneness. The human ~~mind~~ ^{craves} and yearns for simplicity and unity. 'One' has a charm for him. One church, one faith, one empire (Une lois, un roi, un fois) has inspired the middle ages. That vision of one Christendom enraptured thousands of crusaders to their daring exploits. Similarly this philosophic romanticism of Hegel had captivated the thinkers of the nineteenth century. His higher synthesis of the many into a sublime and transcendent oneness, into that supreme monism, had a magnetic charm that, until James, seemed well nigh impregnable.

The Reformers, aiming to present Judaism in a garb that would attract the thinking men and women of that century, seized upon the monotheistic tendency of Judaism and made it the most prominent feature of the religion. That element afforded them a splendid opportunity to boost their faith intellectually. The monotheistic character, in the time when polytheism and Christian mythology possessed credence and literalness, was a virile and vital doctrine. Now however, it was conjured up and given a foremost place, in order to show the intellectual compatibility of Judaism and Hegelianism the dominant philosophy of the age. No other feature of Judaism could have been utilized that would blend so well with Hegelian monism as was this monotheistic and universal aspect of Judaism.

The next element of Hegelian thought that influenced another doctrine of Reform Judaism was his philosophy of History. To Hegel we have seen, the phenomenal world of nature is the product of mind; first developing into a world of extension (nature) and then proceeding to an annulment of its externality and finally passing into the absolute mind.

History too was to him such an unfolding of the absolute mind. Through the dialectic process of social and political phenomena the Infinite was revealing Himself. Every nation represented a partial but progressive manifestation of the Universal Spirit. Greece, Rome and Israel were phases of that series having their consummation in the German Nation, the **Absolute Chosen People**. Now the founders of Reform Judaism claimed for Israel what Hegel claimed for the German nation. The difference being that while he spoke in philosophical parlance, they spoke in theological terms. According to them it was Israel who was endowed with a divine task. And ²¹ that was, that he should carry the message of the true and one God to all the ²¹ peoples of the earth. He was to be a light unto the nations. The vicissitudes of his history, especially the dispersion, ²¹ were providential.

Furthermore Hegel claimed for Christianity finality. Religion was thinking the **Absolute**. It was an act of cognition. To Hegel there was an objective Truth, comprehensible by the finite mind. For the finite implied to him the infinite. Christianity stood at the summit of the natural and positive religions, as THE ABSOLUTE RELIGION. Now what was claimed by Hegel for Christianity, the reformers implied to Judaism. ²¹ Without the notion of a universal or absolute religion, the theory of mission being of the Germans or the Jews, falls to the ground. If you have any- ²¹ thing of a completed nature such as an absolute Truth, or Faith then ²¹ you have the ²¹ corollary of an implied mission. It is inconceivable to think of ²¹ Religion as the expression of a people ~~of a people~~ OR of an individual's inner being and have the concept of an evangelistic duty. You can transfer Truth but you cannot pour in a personality. The concept of a 'mission' ²¹ as well as the emphasis on monotheism is also an attempt to refute Hegel's notion that Israel is a particular people of a particular God.

Hegel's attribution of a mission to the German people imposed no energetic programme of propaganda or reform; on the contrary in spite of their mission to introduce the "freedom of the spirit" Hegel strenuously opposed

individual freedom in the realm of politics. The State was the Entity in and for which all individuals lived. His philosophy was not dynamic in the sense that it encouraged vigorous action in the realization of its preachment. He opposed political and social reforms, for what is the use of active reforms. The dialectic flow of thesis, antithesis and synthesis was to come anyway. "The essential nature of freedom, which involved in it absolute necessity is to be displayed as coming to a consciousness of itself-- and thereby realizing its existence." The mission of Reform Judaism too was characterized by this religious supineness. We have a world-mission; we need not get frantic about it; it is bound to come of itself.

The vigorous opposition that Reform Judaism had manifested toward Zionism, their repudiation of being a national entity, was prompted not only in answer to Hegel's notion that Israel was indissolubly bound up with the particular land, Palestine, but was a direct consequence of his political philosophy. Of course there was in back of this the desire to fit themselves completely, as far the new definition of Judaism permitted, to the political state of their residence. But they demand that the state be super-individual, all-absorbing **WHOLE**ism, to which the individuals must unreservedly submit themselves, ~~This~~ was the State as pictured by Hegel. This also is ^{the} sequence of his philosophy of the Absolute Oneness of the universe and from the principle that "the same cannot exist in many relations". To say that we have two concepts, two relations of one thing would imply that 'what is in the one' means 'as such' something distinct from 'what is in the other'. ^{all or nothing} ~~more~~. ~~is~~ his (Hegel's) one idea. He would concur to Mill's ironical saying of Newton that we should not think of Newton as both an Englishman and a mathematician.

The Hegelian philosophy, though it emphasized development and evolution yet discouraged the progress that comes from self initiation. It was a system that taught all is and will be well-- why the worry. That was left to the absolute God and to the Absolute State. A philosophy of that sort was pointed out by Dewey and others, led to spiritual and political imperialism of Germany. It was autocratic in the highest sense.

The forces of Democracy however, were making headway in western Europe and America. The state they conceived not as Idol to whose vain glory they had to offer their whole being, their cherished freedom. Its power was derived from those whom it governed and it was made for them and not they for it. This is one reason why Hegelians did not gain the general popularity amongst western thinkers. (16)

Secondly Hegelianism onesidedly stressed the conceptualistic element. The Absolute Mind was to him the heart of Reality. Only through logic and abstract thinking could we soar and commune with this Universal Spirit. The path to Reality was through the confusing chimera of his dialectics. Religion was cognizing the Absolute.

Now conceptualistic aptitude is a sport that can be but enjoyed by the intellectual elite. If the true nature of Religion was a la Farel, the masses, to whom religion is vital and vivifying would be left out in the cold. But what would Hegel care for the myriads of individuals. They are mere particulars. Schleiermacher saw this defect and was the first to put religion on a surer foundation. Conceptualism of Hegel however received its mortal wound from the modern psychology and the philosophies of James and Bergson. The historical study of Religion has shown that it was not Logic that drove the primitive, the ancient nor the mediseval man to his God. Psychology has shown that even today man does not seek shelter under the wings of religion through a process of ratiocination but through a series of psychic experiences. Conceptualism is

16

was shown inadequate not only to explain the religious phenomena but even the physical phenomena.

The psychology of Behaviorism has entirely shattered the notion of a spiritual entity, such as Soul or Mind. Democracy, Pragmatism and Vitalism have made Hegelian dialectics a curio.

Now what is the reaction of modern Judaism to these intellectual currents of today. Are we to continue to define Judaism in the conceptual formula on the belief in One God and to justify our individuality on the ground that we are teacher of a Higher Truth. Modern Jewry is giving a cold reception to these logical abstraction. They have been touched by the spirit of the age, and they want living coals. They want a religion of life not of a church or of a Temple, of Synagogue.

Judaism denatured by Hegelianism, though not without good cause or sincere aim must be re-examined and reinterpreted in modern phraseology. Can that be done? To show the reconcilability of Judaism with the Pragmatic aspect of Modern Thought is the aim of this paper.

17

II

WHAT IS PRAGMATISM?

Pragmatism presents a host of obstacles to the one who attempts to put it into the mould of a definition. This difficulty is not the result of a weakness inherent in pragmatism. It is a consequence of its strength, of its richness, and of its genuine realness. Just as the world which Pragmatism tries to understand and master is varying and variegated, so pragmatism is manifold in trait and treatment.

It has been pointed out by a critic of the pragmatic movement that the word pragmatism has been used by its advocates in no less than 13 meanings. James was loath to put his philosophy into a completed system. In fact, his writings are interspersed with contradictory statements. His whole philosophy is inspired by the pluralistic passion - yet he was not withheld from saying, in one place, "if you can gather philosophic conclusions of any kind, monistic or pluralistic, from the particulars of life, I will say as I now do say, with the cheerfulness of hearts, 'Ring out, ring out my mournful rhymes, but ring the fuller minstrel in'".

Similar examples of the apparent inconsistencies may be selected in other problems with which pragmatism tries to deal. It is possible that James was unconscious of these cross currents of his thought, and perhaps he was aware of their presence, and yet did not reconcile them because life itself was not without its paradoxes.

Mathew Arnold says, "A philosopher's real power over mankind resides not in his metaphysical formulas, but in the spirit and tendencies which have led him to adopt those formulae". If that

7

be the criteria for the value and validity of a philosophy, then Pragmatism deserves a high place in the history of thought, modern especially, for it leaves us not in the dark as to its tendencies and temperament. Its direction is definite and concrete, as is that of the most rigid and most absolute or completed philosophy.

Pragmatism is characterized by a doctrine of truth, by its empirical method, and by its futuristic outlook. Pragmatism may be called a reform movement in philosophy. It breathes the spirit of the age. It has caught the vision of Democracy. It comes girdled with the method of science, with the viewpoint of evolution, and with the discoveries of psychology. It commences with a confession of what is characteristic of man. Man cannot jump out of his skin, it says. We are made and come into being through the forces of heredity and environment -- with a Will. We are psychic individuals. Our life is an expression thereof. We make our physical selections not entirely in accord with recognized standards of value or taste. Similarly we choose our intellectual attachments also because of an inner though subconscious push. Our logic bears the impress of our taste, just as our neckties do. We cling to Rationalistic interpretation of things when we are tender minded and we take to Empiricism because we are tough minded.

The scientist's claim of neutrality, that he is steering clear of biases for impersonal facts, is the result of a passion as much as the votive offering of the religionist. This fact is a contribution of psychology and the most truthful thing a searcher of truth can do is to acknowledge its truth. It is this conviction that makes James say, "If a certain formula for expressing the nature of ~~the~~ world violates my moral demand, I shall feel as free to throw it overboard, or at least to doubt, as if it dis-

appointed my demand for uniformity of sequence, for example; the one demand being, so far as I can see, quite as subjective and emotional as the other is".

Pragmatism then makes another radical assertion given to it by Biology and Functional Psychology. The mind, the latter sciences have shown us, is not an entity different in nature and function from the body. The mind is an organ of the body, the product of a multitude of chance variations. In the struggle for existence, the life of the intellect originated from ^Lpractical exigencies of the organism. Needs produced thought, attempts for adaptation, and these thoughts were not self-centered and self inclusive. The Egyptian's farmer's incessant quarrels over land boundaries gave birth to geometry. The animal when hungry learns to open the latch, which will give him access to food. Cognition did not spring from an undiluted love for truth, for the Intellect, we have seen, was the servant of the Will.

Now, says Dewey, if mind is the servant of the body, then the criteria to logic is its biological value. It means a Darwinization of logic, for Life was before Truth. In this we have the seeds of the pragmatic doctrine of Truth. Pragmatism thereby presents a program of action and a criteria for its evaluation. It asks us to focus our gaze on life and its enhancement. It emphasizes the particular value of all our doings, physical as well as mental. Its test for Truth and Theory is its cash value for the individual claiming it and for the collective progress of the race.

How does it increase our capacities for greater truth? How does it help us to meet and overcome the difficulties that lie in our path? Where does this doctrine steer us? How will it facilitate us in grasping and making brute nature conform to itself? These are some of the tests that the pragmatist puts before he makes his decision/

That orientation makes a tremendous difference in philosophy. The philosopher now cannot rise on the wings of abstraction to a philosophic other worldliness. He is thrown off the peak whose top is ~~covered~~ ^{enveloped} in clouds of speculation. He is now in the midst of the stream of life. His paramount duty, if he wishes to survive, is now to swim, to duck the splashes of the breaking waves, to relax in the intervals of these watery ~~ambushes~~ ^{ambushes}

Life presents, too, a problem, a mystery, ^{for} the solution of which we crave and strive. "The Sphinx is seated in the soul of each man and though we endeavor to be deaf their penetrating sounds, more subtle than the Siren's song, will search us out and ask -- What then art thou? And to her riddles we may not gainsay an answer: It was no false myth that symbolized the mystery of life in the figure of the Stranger whose cold embrace constricts the warm glow of life and stifles by degrees the voice of Hope."

Philosophy must make a complete turn from the philosophy that was so much in vogue in the last century. It must cease racking its brains for a knowledge of First Causes and Ultimates, whether the world is composed of matter or spirit, etc. Blowing bubbles, physical or metaphysical, is a pastime becoming urchins but not serious men.

These are sterile for the present and insignificant for the future. "We have the whole butt and being of it in our hands, and the healthy thing for philosophy is to leave off grubbing underground for what effects effectuation or what makes action act and try to solve the concrete questions of where effectuation in this world is located, of which things are true causal agents there and of what the more remote effects consist."

"The worth and interest of the world consist not in its elements, be these elements of things or be they the conjunction of things; it

exists rather in the dramatic outcome of the whole process and in the meaning of the successive stages which the elements work out."

We now come to the second characteristic of pragmatism, and that is its Method. We have seen that what the pragmatist shuns is fancy. He demands facts. He is an empiricist with reservations. He stands midway between the Transcendental idealist and the Naturalist. The intellectualistic world of Hegel was as unreal and preposterous to him as the supernatural heaven of Scholasticism. The dialectic method swarming with concepts taken rigidly and absolutely was to him illusory, incapable of conveying the world in its fleeting and mobile reality. He sees no justification for the desire to avoid the reality of the world's changeableness and fly into the cold and marble arms of an Absolute. Like Don Quixote, they are carried away by their imaginations. By making life here in this world a mere appearance, ^{the life} /they unfold to us is still more unreal. It is an intellectual phantasmagoria. The pragmatist brands their picture as extravagant, their method as vicious. It is a dreamland that paralyzes insight and action. The Mediaevalist Heaven - with a God sitting on an exalted throne and angels hovering on each side of Him - was translated by them with an equally romantic picture of a Transcendental World of an Absolute studded with Universals.

The pragmatist method is empirical. Life is real because we experience it. We see and we hear, as well as we think. Whatever Experience had made real, the mind cannot declare unreal. The mind and its classification are ours with the aid of which we may steer through the ocean of impressions. They are labels, but not substitutes for realities. Pragmatism, because of its empiricism, wishes to wade through the muddy particulars, for what catches our eye is not the sameness of the stream, but the whiteness of the breaking crests of the particular and concrete waves.

6

But just as it opposes the extravagance of the idealistic interpretation, so it rejects the narrowness of the naturalistic commentary. For while the one tries to reduce all reality to spiritual sameness, the latter wishes to reduce to a physical sameness, to mere atomic collisions and combinations. Pragmatism seeks "to unite the empirical tendency of the former ^{the} (Naturalist) with ^{the latter} (the Idealist's) recognition of the problems that lie outside the field of positive sciences. They (Pragmatism and Realism) accept neither the finality of physical fact nor the validity of the ideal of the absolute."

"Reality, the pragmatist says, is complex, kaleidoscopic in its nature. No one interpretation will exhaust it. In the stream of life are experiences that we brand physical and psychic."

"Everything real must be experiencesable somewhere and every kind of thing experienced must somewhere be real."

Pragmatism (at least that of James and Schiller) include amongst the real things, religious and mystical, feelings which the naturalist would discard and brand as the by-product of an over-heated head.

The pragmatic method differs with the naturalistic or materialistic one in that it refuses to give a chilling prophecy of our world which is so interwoven with the fate of our ideals and hopes. It explains not the higher by the lower, but reversely. The Humanist sees in this phenomenal sweep, in back of this evolutionistic travail, a purpose, a goal. This the pragmatist accepts because of the value that such an interpretation possesses.

The third aspect of pragmatism is its forward gaze, which I like to name its Futurism. While Mediaeval philosophy looked to authority and to the past as the oracles of the true and the good, while Rationalism made the Laws of Reason and the Categories the acid test for what is right, while Empiricism limited itself to the present

and to the sensible, Pragmatism made its criteria the future significance of a thing the test for its acceptance. Its question is: What will be born therefrom? A theory or belief is true not only because of its workability in the present, but because of its promise. Pragmatism shows us that the world is at our feet. We may trample over it and reduce it to a thing contemptible, or we may lift it up and transform it to a thing desired or admired.

Pragmatism because of this emphasis may truly be called an ethical philosophy. Look how it dispenses with that speculative quibble as to the nature of the Ultimates, which like a vampire has sucked the mental vitality of the greatest of our metaphysicians. "Thus if no future detail of experience or conduct is to be deduced from our hypothesis, the debate between Materialism and Theism becomes quite idle and insignificant. Matter and God, in that event, mean exactly the same thing -- the power, namely, neither more nor less than ~~it~~ ^{we} can make ^{it} this completed world -- and the wise man is he who in such a case would turn his back on a supererogatory discussion."

Such a discussion has no fruits for the future as well as for the present. But most of our philosophical debates have, say the pragmatists, a positive or conjectural bearing on the future, no matter how remote the future may be. That knowledge and significance presents, therefore, an indispensable testimony for its rightful evaluation and validation. Facts and Future, therefore are the balances for the pragmatist.

It is these tendencies that I wish to signal out and compare to the similar tendencies in Judaism. Pragmatism though it was compared by Papini to a corridor in a hotel, which leads to various rooms, whose occupants may be of diverse natures and beliefs, and I may add, means, has a distinct metaphysical tendency. It may lead to a room where the occupant may be kneeling to the image of

the Virgin, and to another room whose occupant may be reading religiously a volume of Ingersoll, or Buchner. Nevertheless, pragmatism has certain affinities and as I hope I have shown, certain salient features. It has an epistemology all of its own. That epistemology which makes experience the source of reality gives pragmatism its method. Its doctrine of Truth is novel, original and radical. Its Metaphysics, though not unique of pragmatism, yet it seems to me is indispensable to it. I feel that were it not for its notion of a world which is continually Becoming, manifold in its complexity, and constant ⁱⁿ changesability, a world which is a continual process of change in which we participate and which we help to promote, then its theory of Truth and Ethics would become impossible and meaningless. For, with a static and completed world, what is left to man but to bow down to the inexorable demands of its Being and make the best of it? Pragmatism has therefore ^{a metaphysics,} an Epistemology, a Truth, and an Ethics.

Pragmatism is not a new philosophy in the sense of presenting a novel discovery in theory or in method. It may be found in the philosophy of Protagoras and the Socratic school. Traces of it may be discerned in the methodology of Aristotle. Scholastic philosophy with its supernatural orientation and contemplated tendency disregarded it. It received great consideration in the moral field at the hands of Kant. Positivism was near its borders. James, the man who gave it renewed vigor and life, liked to picture John Stuart Mills as the founder of the Neo-pragmatic school. He sees it in the philosophies of Hume, Locke, and others. He mentions these because they were in accord with his empirical method to a great degree. He does not mention Kant as a forerunner, though the pragmatic motive is evident in his Critique of Practical Reason, because the latter's system was radically different from his own. Kant was an idealist whose rationalism was instrumental in producing the perverted philosophy of Hegelianism.

James received his inspiration from the French philosopher Renouvier and from the American thinker J. S. Pierce. He freely acknowledges his great indebtedness to the latter's writings. The pragmatic school today divides itself into three branches. They are the schools of James and Schiller type; secondly, that of the Functional Psychologist; and thirdly, that of the Instrumentalists. They all differ as to the need and notion of God. James and Schiller have God in their system. He is ^afinite and humanistic Being. ¹⁰The Functional Psychologist God is a mere symbol of all our supreme values, of our moral and social life. The Instrumentalists omit him entirely. To them the question of the existence of a God, even finite and humanistic, transforms itself to the question whether this world bears any relation to our moral ends.

For my discussion here I shall omit the Instrumentalists, but occupy myself mostly with the James and Schiller school and touch incidentally upon the views of those of the Functional Psychologists.

In contrasting Judaism and pragmatism, I shall not go into a minute analysis of their details. The aim of this paper is to show that there is a striking similarity ^{intendenz} between Judaism and pragmatism. Pragmatism brings to surface many elements which are for ^{certain} certain/Judaistic notions. For example, its attitude to Free Will and immortality could be utilized advantageously to reinforce similar notions in Judaism. I, however, shall not emphasize these because they are incidental in both systems. Of course I shall not pass them by without attributing to them their deserved place in the system of thought. For my purpose, I shall but utilize the uniqueness of outlook and vision on the part of the pragmatic school as to its epistemology, metaphysics, and ethics.

III

EXPERIENCE IN PRAGMATISM

We have seen that Pragmatism's cynosure is Life. Living possesses a deeper significance than does speculation. For him Experience opens up the only vista to Reality. It therefore should form the field of study for the philosopher. "The only thing that shall be debatable among philosophers shall be things definable in terms drawn from Experience." By Experience the Pragmatist does not mean a sort of sublimated and metaphysical hyle, like the "Absolute Experience" of Royce and Bradley. Such an hypothesis would contradict the very essence of Pragmatism. It would merely mean the substitution of a new name for an old fallacy. By Experience the Pragmatist has in mind the usual connotation, a feeling of having lived through an event, of having absorbed in consciousness the impression of things, of having reacted to the particular circumstance. It means "the intercourse of a living being with a physical and social environment", whose Reality it admits, *gay* feels. It is a knowledge by acquaintance instead of a knowledge by description. It designates primarily the most concrete, immediate and individualized thing possible. It is our own induplicable present moment, our actual total *erlebniss* just as we live it in all its richness and uniqueness. I feel that I am attempting the impossible in trying to convey through words and generalities the meaning of Experience. Experience cannot be rendered real through a formula. It must be felt and not taught or expressed. James is aware of this eluciveness and he therefore defines Experience additively, "as a field of consciousness, plus an attitude in regard to these objects plus a sense of self to which this attitude belongs". Its poignant reality and its ineffableness is well expressed by the Danish thinker when he said, "Mein jetzt and hier ist der letzte angelpunkt für alle wirklichkeit, also alle erkenntniss."

Reality to Pragmatism is not a homogeneous mass. It is a kaleidoscope, whose motley of colors are constantly changing. It is a

pluralism irreducible to any monism, be it Matter, Spirit, Monads etc. Our experience therefore to be understood must have its definite and concrete context. "What is immediately given in the single and particular instance is always something pooled and mutual, something with no dark spot, no point of ignorance. No one elementary bit of reality is eclipsed from the next bits of view, if only we take reality sensibly and in small enough pulses, and by us it has to taken pulse-wise, for our span of consciousness is too short to grasp the larger collectivity of things except nominally and abstractly." Experience must be considered in time, place and in relation to a knower, then "such an experience", in the words of Santanyana, "has variety, scenery and ^acertain vital rhythm; its story might be told in dithyrambic verse. It moves wholly by inspiration; every event is providential; every act unpremeditated." The content of such Experience to Pragmatism consists of a consciousness of material things, intellectual categories that connect these things and religious or psychic influences.

Pragmatism rejects the epistemology of the Empiricist and the Idealist. The former appeals to him provincial in that ~~he~~ refuses but to talk in the dialect, so to speak, of his locality while the ~~latter~~ mutters an Esperanto, understandable to no earthly inhabitent. Empiricism is too inadequate while Idealism is too extravagant. He proceeds to examine their theories of Knowledge more closely.

Empiricism's Epistemology too is based on Experience. To them Reality is within the domain of the perceptual. The world is a world of substances which produce diverse sensations when they come in contact with sentient beings. Imbued with the scientific spirit, and with experimental method they swooped down upon the universe of things and analyzed its make-up into its different sense data. The world they chopped up into its elemental components. Here they came face to face with what they thought was incapable of a solution. If this world of Being consists of these discreet and fragmentary sensations,

what then gives us this sense of harmony and wholeness? What God or goblin integrates this empirical multiplicity? This same problem faced the sensationalist's psychology when they dissected the experiences of mental life introspectively to its elementary data. How shall they explain unless they posit, as the Rationalists do, through their a priorism, a soul, a God.

To James their difficulty was self imposed. This dilemma does not exist. In breaking up the world into fragmentary potsherds, they were violating their own method and theory. For we experience directly that unity (not oneness) and continuity of the flux. We experience the mosaic as a whole as much as we do the pieces. Our consciousness of Reality is a continuous current in which the ripples succeed one another and pass continuously into one another without break. We experience not discreet atoms. "The relations between things conjunctive as well as disjunctive (the connections as well as the separations) are just as much matters of direct particular experience, neither more so nor less so than the things themselves." James here makes the categories that hold phenomena together not inferior to the phenomena themselves. As for their apparent difference in nature, that question he has shown to be fruitless and futile. To him they both (Matter and Spirit) have an equal place, for both are in the stream of experience. What is perceptual is homogeneous with what is conceptual. Ideas and things are "consubstantial".

Fragmatism registers another objection against the empirical school in that it deviated from Common Sense. It mistook its theoretic overgrowth for Reality itself. It reduced Being to blank and primary qualities. The secondary qualities, those particular features that give it concreteness and richness they cast aside. It forgot that these categories were short cuts which aim to take us successfully and quickly from one part of experience to the other. The scientist, however, of the type of Mach, Ostwald and Duhm, are

4

beginning to see the light and the true steering function of scientific hypothesis.

The deterministic interpretation of Science forms another reason for James' disapproval. For to brand that artificial sequence of dead material phenomena as the expression of our truer being without regard to our psychic Self is a breach of the method of Experience. "I conclude then that real effectual causation as an ultimate nature, as a category if you like, of reality, is just what we feel it to be, just that kind of conjunction which our activity series reveal".

For to Pragmatism the Knower is ultimately bound up with the known. He is not a spectator of the phenomenal flux aiming to get a snapshot of it. He is of it and in it. He is truly a microcosm that mirrors as well as makes the macrocosm. "The directive presence of future possibilities in dealing with existing conditions is what is meant by knowing; that the self becomes a knower or mind when anticipation of future consequences operates as its stimulus."

Idealism is the next objective of Pragmatism's undermining barrage. Idealism because it attributes logical laws to the very heart of reality stresses Knowledge. Cognition is to the Idealist what experiencing is to the Pragmatist. The former pictured the reality of the universe as completed and monistic. To know, to get a glimpse at reality was merely to take a photograph of it. The mind was the camera. The Idealist having formed a mental image of reality mistook that image for reality itself. He beheld a multiverse. Like the Empiricist he too asked what the cohesive power that held these diverse elements together was. He answered the question by postulating a super-experiential Being. That gap was to him a direct manifestation and justification for his deus ex machina, the Absolute. His romanticism, his yearning for simplicity, his reverential awe made that Being into an Absolute Oneness. The universe became a 'block universe'. Its manifoldness was mere appearance. James makes that entire conceptualistic system totter when he says that "the parts of experience are

held together from next to next by relations that are themselves parts of experience. The directly apprehended universe needs, in short, no extraneous transempirical connective support, but possesses in its own right a concatenated structure". To James the sense of unity was just as immediate and direct as that of multiplicity. Both form parts of our experience. Idealism has prearranged pigeon holes, logical concepts into which it ruminates our experience, The Empiricist gave us a partial view of experience, the Idealist wishes to deny the reality of experience entirely. He asks us to take a living body, break it up, and collect all the bones in one group, all its flesh in another, and all the nerves in a third, and by doing this he tells us, we will behold the real, the living, the rational being. This conceptualistic method gives us a post mortem description of what is now unreal. It makes Experience less instead of more intelligible. To Hegel for example, the first step to a knowledge of God is the recognition of the unreality and meaninglessness of this world. But to James, however, "Experience merely as such does not come ticketed and labelled. We have first to discover what it is". "Then conceptualism summons life to justify itself into conceptual terms, it is like a challenge addressed in a foreign language to someone who is absorbed in his own business; it is irrelevant to him altogether and he may let it be unnoticed."

We have seen that for the Pragmatist the door to the Universe deeper reaches was experience and that experience was wide enough to include the whole train of things, the noetic clasp as well as the material thing itself. But Pragmatism does not stop here. Experience includes not only the physical and the noetic but also a psychic or religious experience. The latter is irreducible to any of the former. They are as real to the one who experiences them as the chemical reaction is to the scientist. In fact to James they are more

real for the scientist reacts to an atom of his experience while the religious man reacts to the whole of life. Religion to James in order to possess the greatest amount of ecstatic exaltation must be personal and it is to this aspect of religious experiences that his book "Varieties of Religious Experiences" is confined.

By religion James means the manner of a man's "total reaction upon life". His reaction may be involuntary and half unconsciously. It is not the "cosmic emotion" of the naturalist, who beholds the magnificent regularity of the universe. He at the moment when he experiences his theophony, so to speak, feels the barriers of his self vanish. He beholds a new universe. That revelation comes to him as an answer to his persistent, the unuttered question, "What is the character of that existence to which we belong".

James then with a sympathetic heart ~~and~~ keen mind and lucid pen delineates the varieties of experiences, its delicate nuances, its morose and despondent moods, its raptures, its regenerations. He pictures before us the Religion of **H**ealthy **M**indedness and the **R**eligion of the **S**ick **S**oul in its realistic and idealistic colors.

In back of all these experiences the individual felt himself "continuous with a wider self through which saving experience comes." At that moment we find (as James' theory explains, ~~those~~ phenomena) that our ordinary personality, through the intermediary of our subconscious self, comes in communion with the Universal Spirit-World. He feels then this visible world forms a part of a more spiritual universe and derives its deepest significance therefrom and that real duty is to adjust ourselves, through prayerful communion to this higher universe. That act is a means toward the end. It is a truly efficacious act by which the spiritual energy of this universe is brought to bear on the phenomenal world.

James is well aware of the physical and mental disturbance that usually precedes or accompanies a mystic or a saint. But these do not detract from the present value and vitality of the phenomena. "It is not by its roots and origins (whether one assigns them to the pathological conditions of the organism or to the revelation from on high) that one can judge of the value of religion in general, or of a given religion in particular, but only by its fruits, its consequence in the moral life of the individual and humanity". As for the objective existence of the object of their beliefs and aspirations, that cannot be affirmed, neither by the syllogism of transcendentalism nor be refuted by scientific laws of naturalism. It is a matter for the individual to decide, and that decision should be based on experience and value. When these are taken as the criteria, Religion becomes not a spiritual wild goose chase but the following of a veritable reality, a pillar of fire in ^{the} night of Distress and Despondency. That pursuit is real because it enriches and ennobles mankind. It ~~metamorphosized~~ ^{transformed} from a mere surfeiting beast to an aspiring angel. James in this point seems to have a long line of predecessors. It was Kierkegaard who termed idol worshiper him who prays to the true God mechanically and prefunctively while he who pours out his soul and heart in sincerity to a mere image prays to the true God.

Schleiermacher speaks of critical philosophy's denial of the objective reality of the religious goal and says that it did not thereby annul religion. For that pursuit still possesses religious value because it is the expression of an effective personal experience. Lange comes even closer, than Kierkegaard and Schleiermacher, to the Pragmatic attitude. He does not consider religious ideas as possessing a theoretical and objective significance. These to him are subjective supplements of empirical reality, born not from the necessity of the mind but from the

needs of the Spirit. They must be understood from the viewpoint of their value to human life and not from the viewpoint of their foundation and origin.

James goes further than they do. He does not unconditionally surrender to the claim of those drunk with their self-sufficiency of the scientific method. His epistemology which bases itself on the totality of experience, does not permit him to do that. He feels that he is treading on holy ground and he does not flee therefrom nor does he listlessly loiter therein. He admits that the objective and absolute **EXISTENCE** of religious phenomena will be impossible to solve scientifically. It will always be for the individual either to leave it open or else to accept it by an act of personal faith. To deny it categorically is unscientific, for that denies an hypothesis that cannot be proven as well as the other. To reject it therefore rashly is unsportsmanlike. For then he rejects a wager, where he has all to gain and nothing to lose.

"They (the lawless or supernatural intrusions into the organized world) ought to be forever intractable to intellectual methods, because they should not yet be organized enough in themselves to follow any laws". These are "resources in us that naturalism with its literal and legal virtue never reckons off, possibilities that take our breath away, of another kind of happiness and power, based on giving up our own will and letting something higher work for us, and these seem to show a world wider than either physics or philistine ethics can imagine." The sharp edge of intellectualism is too dull and is broken when it wishes to analyze these experiences. Science is myopic to survey them. Even psychology would never have inferred these religious experiences in advance. It could not suspect their existence, for they are discontinuous with the natural experience they succeed upon and invert their values. "In a word, the believer is

continuous, to his own consciousness, at any rate, with a wider self from which saving experiences flow in. Those who have such experiences distinctly enough and often enough to live in the light of them remain quite unmoved by criticism, from whatever quarter it may come, be it academic or scientific, or be it merely the voice of logical common sense. They have had their vision and they know-- that is enough-- that we inhabit an invisible spiritual environment from which help comes, our soul being mysteriously one with a larger soul whose instruments we are."

What James desires is to apply the empiric method not to deny but to study and classify these experiences of reality. "Let empiricism once become associated with religion as hitherto, through some strange misunderstanding, it had been associated with irreligion and I believe that a new era of religion as well as of philosophy will be ready to begin." It is for such a science of religion that he pleads in his "Varieties of Religious Experiences".

Now there is another feature of experience which shows its truthfulness, even in the Hegelian sense, of being a transcript of 'what is'. To take experience as a guide he did mean the surrender to the wind of caprice, to the wild impressions of the moment. Pragmatism is too keen an observer of human nature to make such an assertion. The past plays an eminent role in the present, even in epistemology. Even our mode of thinking is not a phenomena that comes into being ex nihilo. It is the bequest of our ancestors. "Our fundamental ways of thinking about things are discoveries of exceedingly remote ancestors, which have been able to preserve themselves throughout the experience of subsequent time".

We are snow flakes on the side of a mountain which cling to the snow ball of the Past-Knowledge that rolls over us. "If we do not feel both past and present in one field of feeling we feel them not all".

Every idea has an accumulated momentum, a mass of traditions, a history.

That does not mean that Pragmatism believes in a sort of an epistemological determinism, thereby ruling out novelty from mental life. Experience is not preordained. New circumstances are ever arising to which we react, therefore knowledge is perennially blooming. But the coming into being of new facts through the arise of new conditions do not annihilate the mental impression made by the old. They do not produce a tabula rasa and then write a new story thereon. There is a conservation of energy in this as well as in the physical domain. You cannot destroy ideas, experiences as well as things. They only remould old experience. For "new truths are the resultant of new experience and of old truths combined and mutually modifying one another." The new comes always "stewed in the sauce of the old".

Now it will be asked of what significance to Judaism is Pragmatic epistemology, emphasizing the validity and veracity of experience, in its totality, its physical, intellectual and psychic aspects, in its accumulative propensity? To the answer of this question a coming chepter will be devoted.

PRAGMATISM'S REALITY.

Let us now proceed to a discussion of the Metaphysics of Pragmatism. We are confronted here with a question which to me seems possible of a double interpretation. The question is, has Pragmatism a definite Metaphysics, a theory of reality? You will recall that I mentioned the young Italian Pragmatist Papini's "corridor theory". That is, to him, Pragmatism was a mere vestibule leading to no philosophical creed. It was a sort of traffic policeman pointing the way to vehicles and pedestrians. It entered not as a judge to give a verdict, to inveterate disputes. It rather came in to call the attention of those philosophers deadlocked in their philosophical wrangle, that it was time for them to get out of that stuffy room filled with the smoke they emitted and take a walk in the fresh air. Take for example the question as to the ultimate nature of reality, whether it was matter or spirit. With what ease the Pragmatist discarded that insoluble quibble. He gave it a lease of life only as an aspect of the enigma whether the world possessed a design or is the result of blind forces which was a vital and momentous option. The old and hairsplitting analysis of these metaphysicians passes away and in its place we have a problem upon which our conduct, our ideals, our lives, are dependant.

Pragmatism possesses an attitude of neutrality towards the dogmas of the old philosophers. In fact it states no dogma at all. Pragmatism is usually associated with pluralism. Yet we find even here Pragmatism to be open in its decision. "This world", says James, "may in the last resort be a blocked universe; but on the other hand it may be a universe only strung along, not rounded in and closed. Reality may exist distributively just as it sensibly seems to, after all. On that possibility I do insist".

Another instance may be James' attitude to Theism. Although psychic phenomena are part of experiential things yet James does not state unequivocally and categorically that there is a God. That to him is left to the individual's conviction. It is a pure matter of faith. What will a belief or an idea do and not whether it is or is not so, is the Pragmatist's query. The Pragmatist does not, however, fly to the other, to the sylloptic extreme. He does not deny that there is an external reality beyond the thinker's self.

In spite of all these plausible possibilities, I maintain that Pragmatism has a definite metaphysical *anschaung*. I admit that it is not a completed, rigid, and petrified world picture reduced to an ultimate and transcendental form^{of} hypothetical entities of Science or to the trans-experiential 'dingen sich' of philosophy, but a world picture it nevertheless is. The denial of Pragmatism that reality is not completed and static is a dogma. Its world is one of change and multiplicity, plastic and pliable, one which we make and mold. This fact seems to me to be the pivot and crux of Pragmatism, without which many of the Pragmatic doctrines cannot be thoroughly understood or justified. Its doctrine of Truth, Epistemology and Ethics is an outgrowth of the mobility and fluidity of ~~its~~ pluralistic stream.

Let us examine more closely Pragmatism's skepticism of an ultimate reality, as it was traditionally understood. Orthodox Metaphysicians began their theme with an attempt to read the universe in terms of matter and spirit. From the Pragmatic point we have shown such discussion to be futile and stupid, for the latter wanted to penetrate the heart of reality by turning away from what is real. To Pragmatism Matter is known only as a group of attributes. Similarly what we term as Soul is revealed only ^{as} ~~for~~ an aggregate of ideas. "The fact of the bare cohesion itself is all that ~~the~~ notion of the

substance signifies. Behind that fact is nothing". To James 'Matter' and 'Spirit' is a **mirage**, a fruitless search. "The worth and interest of the world consist not in its elements, be these things or be they conjunctions of things, it exists rather in the dramatic outcome of the whole process and in the meaning which the elements work out in the successive stages". This question we saw therefore to be transformed into another which is more appealing to the human mind and heart.

Schiller goes beyond the territory allotted to the Pragmatist. He takes not experience for what it is. To him the universe is a Sphinx from which he wishes to exact the secret, how and from what it came to be. The materialistic and Idealistic interpretations of the universe are both one-sided and inevitably lead to subjectivism. He traces experiential things to a transcendental and monistic ultimate, to a sort of intelligent force centres. This he identifies with a God Spirit. In his scheme he has the transcendental ego which thinking of itself produces and holds together the Phenomenal Self. The phenomenal world is produced similarly by an interaction of God and the postulated Ego. To him infinity is impossible and meaningless. ~~He~~ therefore posits that cosmic processes to be in finite time. Now it seems to me that Schiller here has compromised to his intellectualistic propensity or influence. He has declared a truce between ^{the} Idealists and Materialists. He divided the kingdom of Existence into the Phenomenal and the Ultimate, the former he gave to the Materialists while the latter he gave to the Idealists. Him therefore I will omit from consideration in this chapter.

Pragmatism avoids translating Reality in terms of matter or spirit or any other entity because such a characterization would make Reality static. To him as to Bergson Reality is always on the go. It is a

process in which nothing is actualized. "In every series of real terms not only do the terms themselves and their associates and environment change but we change and their MEANING for us changes so that new kinds of sameness and types of causation continually come into view and appeal to our interests. Our earlier lines having grown irrelevant are then dropped". We are living in a world of continuous change, a world of perpetual becoming. That Nature is mobile, is the only constant fact that is burnt into our consciousness. There are no things but activities. States and substances are but the hypos-tatization of our efforts. Things are contractions of a flowing reality affected by our Memory or by our Imagination. The particular form that these contractions assume depends on the activity on which consciousness is bent and to serve which it has arisen.

Consciousness itself is not an entity, with a definite form. it is an experience, a mental activity, a feeling of tension, effort, opposition, defeat and triumph. Mental life as well as physical life is an absolute movement. It is a grasping, contracting and holding together of what is, in its absolute nature flowing.

And that flux is continuous. The stream of realities comes not by breaks and jolts. It is not a string of separable and unrelated episodes. "They run into one another continuously and seem to inter-penetrate. What in them is relation and what is matter is hard to discern. You feel no one of them as inwardly simple and no two as wholly without confluence. Where they touch there is no datum so small as not to show this mystery, if mystery it be. The tiniest feeling that we can possibly have comes with an earlier and a later part and with a sense of their continuous procession." "Every smaller state of consciousness, concretely taken overflows its own definition. Only concepts are self identical, only 'raison' deals with closed equations. Nature is but a name for excess; every point in her opens out and runs

5
into the more; and the only question, with reference to any point we may be considering is how far into the rest of nature we may have to go in order to get entirely beyond its overflow. In the pulse of inner life immediately present now in each of us is a little past, a little future, a little awareness of our own body, of each others persons, of these sublimities we are trying to talk about".

We come carried on the crest of the present and though the dome-like heaven puts before our eyes a beginning and a terminus in the form of the horizon we must feel that the current is an unending one, without absolute beginning nor end. "Each particular process to him who lives through it, defines itself by its origin and its goal; but to an observer with a wider mindspan who should live outside of it, that goal would appear but a provisional halting place and the subjectively felt activity would be seen to continue into objective activities that lie far beyond".

Pragmatism repudiates Idealism because to the latter Reality in its truest nature is not a process, spontaneous, continuous in its change and infinite in its complexity but is rather a stable and timeless state. This movement and change to them is a mere appearance. Reality at heart is immutable.

And to that conclusion they came because they endeavored by a series of concepts to convey what Reality is. Their attempt is comparable to that of a chemist who tries to construct a living person from his chemicals. In using the intellectualistic method they committed two mistakes. The first one is, that they identified the concept with Reality itself. A concept at best is but a symbol of the thing it stands for but not the thing itself. The concept or even the written word 'apple' is only a convenient substitute for the object or the aggregate of sensations with which it has become identified. The conceptualistic representation of the Universe and its realities is

like a menu card. A person cannot satisfy his hunger by reading the bill of fare.

Secondly the logical method is incapable of representing the essence of Reality which to Pragmatism is change. Here we have a swiftly rushing stream, seething with the foam of its waves which are incessantly breaking. The Idealist wishes to represent this continuous flow cinematographically, by a series of snapshots. Time and Motion elude the descriptions of the mathematician and the abstractions of the metaphysician. The broken dots of a mathematical curve and the logician's definition of motion as 'the occupancy of serially successive points of space at serially successive instants of time are both devoid of content of real change. The mystery of motion they do not explain. How does one get one point to the other. Such a method of representing Reality inevitably leads to the antinomies of Zeno.

"But all these abstract concepts are but as flowers gathered, they are only moments dipped out from the stream of time, snapshots taken as by a kinetoscopic camera, at a life that in its original coming is continuous."

James feels the utter impotency of this method to give us ~~an~~ experiential sense of ^{the} reality of change, or what Bergson calls 'durée réelle.' And with due recognition to its value in other fields, he emancipates himself from the coils of its hypnotic spell.

"For my part I have finally found myself compelled to give up the logic fairly, squarely and irrevocably. It has an imperishable use in human life, but that use is not to make us theoretically acquainted with the essential nature of reality".

I described Reality as an ever flowing stream. That figure is only half true. For in a stream the substance that flows is one - water. But Reality to Pragmatism is not a river with an equable flow of sameness.

Imagine a river with its eddies and ripples forming an undulated surface which refracts the white rays of the sun that strike it into its manifold and kaleidoscopic colors. The flowing current of variegated glistening ~~of~~ atoms would come nearer to the Pragmatist's picture of Reality. The flux of Reality is manifold in its diversity and complexity.


In this apparent world of 'manyness' the question arises is there not also a 'oneness'? This question the Pragmatist has to face and answer. To the Idealist this pluralism is an illusion, a dream. ~~He~~ insists that when you come down to the core of reality everything is present and co-implicated in everything else in one vast, instantaneous and perfect completeness. The visible many telescope in the mind of the Absolute, the One and Only Knower, before which all difference and evil disappear.

The Pragmatist opposes this absolute unity. He is unable to detect such an absolute and absorbing oneness. "Every bit of experience is a multum in parvo plurally related, that each relation is one aspect, character, or function, way of its being, taken or way of its taking something else and that a bit of reality when actively engaged in one of these relations simultaneously".

Let it not be thought that James claims absolutism for pluralism. He does not deny that there is unity in the Universe. He even admits that this may be present to a greater degree than we estimate. But this unity is one of concatenation rather than co-implication. "That there is more union in all these ways than openly appears is certainly true. That there may be one sovereign purpose, system, kind and story is a legitimate hypothesis. All I say here is that it is rash to affirm this dogmatically without better evidence than we possess at present."

Pragmatism posits for the future a closer unification. "Everything

makes strongly for the view that our world is incompletely unified teleologically and is still trying to get its unification better organized.

I shall not complete the Pragmatist account of Reality if I do not say a few words about the role we play in it, and about his promise concerning its destiny. The Universe in which we live and move is malleable. It is like the clay of the sculptor. We mould into the form we wish it to possess. It is in a state of fluidity. We are the vessel into which it enters and when it does so, it acquires the shape of the vessel into which it enters, that is, of ourselves. We receive our being in the midst of an ocean of sensations, relations and previous notions. From this maelstrom of perceptions and conceptions we build up our streams of reality. You will recall that I said Pragmatism starts out with a confession by attributing to each person a subconscious hobby, a will. Whether we admit it or not it is the dictates of that directive force that we mostly follow. In that rushing and turbulent world of manyness we select and emphasize some facts and thoughts more than we do others, depending on our interest. Reality depends on the visual and intellectual perspective into which we throw it. A six pointed figure  would be to the astronomer a star, to the mathematician a double triangle. To the one who got a three dollar raise 30 would be twentyseven plus three, while to the one who lost three dollars 30 would be thirtythree minus three. The Universe possesses facts of various sorts. It gives them to us as a client gives his case to his lawyer. We select and bring out certain elements in bolder relief.

"By our inclusion and omissions we trace the fields extent; by our emphasis we mark its foreground and its background; by our order we read it in this direction or in that. We receive in short the block of marble, but we carve the statue ourselves".

"We plunge forward into the field of fresh experience with the beliefs our ancestors and we have made already; these determine what we notice; what we notice determines what we do; what we do again determines what we experience; so from one thing to another, although the stubborn fact remains that there is a sensible flux, what is of it seems from first to last to be largely a matter of our own creation".

This view has been emphasized especially by Humanism. Let it not, however, be understood that Pragmatism denies the reality of anything except my own mental image, the reality of an objective world. Pragmatism even Humanism is far from joining the solipsistic school. "Subjective idealists therefore do not exist outside lunatic asylums and certain histories of philosophy". To him even reality though it is malleable is a resisting hyle. If reality was merely the fantasies of our own reveries then there would be nothing resisting. We experience an objective world for we are always colliding against something.

This world of Becoming that I have just pictured to you is not a world where change is routine like and predictable. It is not a policeman who is limited in his promenade to a definite block. Its history is the story of an adventurer bent to connote the interminable length and breadth of unexplored regions. The world is not a world with inexorable causes and effects. Its future is not determined either by Revelation nor Laws. We are here and we, experience tells us, are free. The world is therefore one full with new possibilities.

"Novelties in the world, the right to expect that in its deepest elements as well as in its surface phenomena, the future may not identically repeat and imitate the past".

The why of our apparent succession cannot be explained by causal concept. We commit the fallacy of "Post hoc ergo propter hoc". It is

a mere stop-gap, a loophole, which the future will have to explain.

Having a plastic and pliable universe, full of new possibilities, we can and we must endeavor to enhance and to perfect it. This duty will be further elaborated in the chapter on Ethics. Until we come to that let us for a moment take up the Pragmatic notion of Truth.

PRAGMATIC TRUTH.

Let us now turn to the Pragmatist's account of Truth. This phase of Pragmatism has been the target of the anti-pragmatic critics. In this short exposition of the subject I shall take into consideration, though briefly, their objections and James' answers, brought out by the many controversial articles.

Pragmatism cannot be thoroughly understood unless we have constantly in mind the philosophic background in which it appeared. I said Pragmatism was an attempt to institute a reform in the traditional philosophy. To understand the reform, the aim, the originality of the movement, we must therefore know the intellectual environment in which it was born.

Pragmatism came into being as a refutation of the transcendentalist's picture of Reality and consequently his notion of Truth. We have seen that the Idealist's world was woven by the loom of the mind, out of conceptualistic strands. The anatomy of his world was logical. It was therefore one of stability and simultaneity, a cognition of the absolute mind. Having reasoned away change as a mere apparition, so what was left was a world of Logic. Syllogisms and relations (undeveloped laws) were the essence of that completed Reality, having its full expression and consummation in that super-experiential Being, the Infinite.

In such an immutable and metaphysical world, relations are permanent and fixed. Truth, then, to them, is absolute and eternal. independent of our mental glimpses. It shoots beyond the vale of experience and lays bare Reality in its nakedness. Truth is the copy of what really is. Things are true when they correspond, when they agree with Reality, when they are what God means us to think. "Truth

is the system of propositions which have an unconditional claim to be recognized as valid." "Truth is a name for all those judgments which we find ourselves under obligation to make by a kind of imperative duty." This represents in brief some of the Idealist notions and definitions of Truth.

Now I have shown that concepts were mere symbols, signs for Reality, but never realities themselves. Psychologists have even shown that our percepts are such expedient substitutes and rarely are the images of the things themselves. If such is the case, how poor a means and method is at our disposal to picture reality through conceptual pigments. It is a pure gratuity to compare the relation ~~that~~ *our* conceptual world has to the world of Reality to a carbon copy. The latter resembles, corresponds, to the original copy, while the former has not the slightest similarity to its copy.

SEcondly, the pragmatist does not stamp the Idealist's definition of Truth as untrue. He merely asks for a further elucidation. He wants the Idealist to define "correspond" and "Reality". He demands that the Idealist step down from the pedestal of the Abstractionist and give him concrete examples. It is then that he has him cornered. For, to the Pragmatist, the Idealist has stopped too soon. His definition leaves us in the lurch in the world of practicalities. He wants to know concretely and explicitly what Truth is, what is its motive, how are we to know when Truths are true and valid, how are we to detect the 'categorical imperative,' so that we may follow it? All these pressing questions Idealism does not answer. We are left in mid ocean with a promise that there is somewhere a land full of treasures but without a map or magnet to guide us to it. T

The Idealist lives in a world of cloud^s. It is told of an Hegelian who wished fruit but rejected apples, cherries, etc., because they did not come up to the abstract notion of Fruit. It is this

attitude that makes us rave ~~and~~^{be} sentimentally fatuitous for sublimated universals, such as Justice, Generosity, and Goodness, and never to recognize them in the concrete.

It is not the place here to speak of the religious revolutions, or shall I call it revelations, the Protestant Reformation, which doomed religious absolutism and which spelled freedom of worship for millions. That forms an interesting story of itself. That same wind blew through our political structures and the result is the disintegration of the cosmopolitanism or imperialism into a world of free and ethnic entities. The only citadel that seemed impregnable was Science and Mathematics. Their sway, it was thought, was universal, eternal, and absolute, brooking no gainsay. The objects of Science were thought to be prehuman archetypes imprinted in the very form of Being. Until very recently the sciences were thought to be Truths that reproduced objective Reality without any taint of the scientist's Ego. As time went on and experiments leading to new theories were multiplied, this objective absolutism of Science and Mathematics began to wane. The main forms of our thinking were seen to be mere human habits. One Geometry and one Logic gave place to many geometries and many logics. Rahnian and Shobstoevskian geometry has equal place with that of Euclid. Diverse hypotheses concerning the universe, the elements, their affinities and reaction, exist side by side without any one of them claiming to be an absolute transcript of Reality. Scientific laws and formulations are now looked upon as being only a sort of conceptual shorthand and their permanence depends on their usefulness. There is no more absolutism in scientific thought ~~as~~ than there is in the political or religious thought.

The pragmatist is in the front lines of these rebels. He assimilated and adapted his theoretical attitude to these modern views. He defies the objectivity, the pretension for the infallibility, the lucidity of Truth with a capital T. I_t runs contrary to his nature,

to be the recipient of ^{actual} charity, be it from the hand of the Absolute or from a priori intuitions. He is made of a rugged nature. He prefers a forest and an ax rather than a completed mansion and a Morris chair. For him, "all this carnate Truth is static, impotent, and relatively spectral, full Truth being the Truth that energizes and does battle."

Pragmatism starts out ab initio with an affirmation that there is a Reality external to ~~itself~~. It assumes realities but it pre-judges nothing as to their constitution. "For him as for his critic, there can be no Truth if there is nothing to be true about. Ideas are so much flat, psychological surface, unless some mirrored matter gives them cognitive luster." But to the pragmatist that Reality is not an inert and sealed thing. It is a developing world. The Alpha and Omega of his Reality is Change. "Our whole notion of a standing Reality grows up in the form of an ideal limit to the series of successive termini to which our thoughts have led us and still are leading us."

Truth is to the pragmatist a process, just as Health and Wealth. They are collective names for activities connected with life. We must not hypostethize the activity and think it as an entity whose existence is independent of the process. "The Truth of an idea is not a stagnant property inherent in it. Truth happens to an idea. It becomes true, is made true, by events. Its verity is in fact an event, a process: The process, namely, of its verifying itself, its verIFICATION, its validity is the process of its validation."

Having presented the pragmatist's view of Reality as a flowing stream, full of ripples and wavelets, and that Truth, too, was a process in that stream of life, let us examine the characteristics, the function and the value of that process.

I hope I have succeeded in showing, in a previous chapter, that pragmatism emphasizes living. The theater of man is Life. In the school

of Life, man learned to think. He thought in order to be able better to obtain his food, to control and master his crude and rugged environment. Mental activity was focused on the here and now. It had a practical utility. Cognition had a vital function and found its corroboration in the successful outcome of that process. As man developed, his field of activity now became complex. It was now not merely a physical, but an intellectual environment. Thinking then increased and its functions increased. The world of impressions and motions were augmented by that world of conceptions which acted as the reserve energy for action."True ideas lead us into useful verbal and conceptual quarters, as well as directly up to useful, sensible termini. They lead to consistency, stability, and flowing human intercourse."

Now, this is the history of human cognition in general. Let us follow the procedure of the thought which ultimately becomes enshrined as a Truth. There is a disturbing situation, a need, a problem, that has or is willed to be removed. A Truth-claim is postulated in the form of a line of action. Now if the *modus agendi* brings about the desired result, it becomes verified as a Truth. Sometimes the processes may be purely intellectual and may be prompted by a will, a supposition, then it too becomes a Truth when it leads to no frustration or contradiction and becomes assimilated by the past Truths. "Any idea that helps us to deal whether practically or intellectually, with either the Reality or its belongings, that does not entangle our progress in frustrations that F.I.T.S., and adapts our life to Reality's whole setting, will agree sufficiently to meet the requirement. It will hold true of that Reality."

Pragmatic Truth, is, it becomes now evident, realistic and not purely subjective. It contains what the Idealist has, that is, it bears a correspondence with Reality, and in addition is an adaptation to Reality. Truth also has a steering value through the ocean of

the sensational and ideational world. To pragmatism the verification process, which we call Truth, has also a satisfying asset, but that is not the determining aspect of Truth. It is this misconception that brought such a volley of criticisms upon pragmatism. To the pragmatist the element of satisfaction, that sentiment of Rationality which puts the knower in a state of epistemological equilibrium is indispensable, but he does not mean it to be all sufficient. "The pragmatist calls satisfactions indispensable for Truth building, but I have everywhere called them insufficient", says James, "unless Reality be also incidentally led to."

It is only in cases where two possibilities may obtain without collision with the facts of Reality that the subjective element plays a leading and justifiable role. Then each Truth verification usually has four stages. They are:

"1/ It might be true somewhere, not self-contradictory,

"2. It may be true even here and now,

"3. It is fit that it be true. It would be well if it were true, it ought to be true.

"4. It must be true."

It would be equally a misrepresentation if I did not also bring out the subjective element that enters into our Truth building. True, Pragmatism starts out with positing an objective Reality, but how do we get to know Reality? Is it not through the concrete experience of sensations and relations? Reality, objective and inseparable from our conception of it, is inexperiential, and therefore for us unreal. Reality is plastic and pliable. We help to mould it. It is incomplete, and ever developing. Truth, then, even if it be mere copying Reality, is not absolute and rigidly determined. It is flexible and concrete, as variant as are the flow of sensations, needs, and strivings, in the river of Life. "Truth here is a relation not of

our ideas to nonhuman realities, but of conceptual parts of our experience to sensational parts." There is no Truth ante rem, but Truth in rebus. "Truth we conceive to mean everywhere not duplication, but addition: not the constructing of inner copies of already complete realities, but rather the corroborating with realities so as to bring about a clearer result." "The idea itself, if it exists at all, is also a concrete event: so pragmatism insists that Truth in the singular is only a collective name for truths in the plural, these consisting always of a series of definite events and that what intellectualism calls THE Truth, the inherent truth of any one such series is only the abstract name for its truthfulness in act."

Truth is not imposed from without, but exposed from within, the 'categorical ought' lies in Experience. We follow the course of action not because it is a decree of the Absolute or the Soul but because such course is called for by circumstances. "All the sanctions of the law of Truth lie in the very texture of Experience. Absolute or no absolute, the concrete truth **FOR US** will always be that way of thinking in which our various experiences most profitably combine."

Although new truths arise as a response to situations, yet they have a past and a larger present with which they must reckon. Experience is a process that constantly presents new material for us to digest. In assimilating these and making them real, we take in consideration all the other phases of Reality, sensations and relations and also all our inherited traditions. The latter three are asked to vote on the admission of a new candidate. Any one of them, the third as well as the first two, may blackball it.

THE individual comes into self-consciousness with a stock of opinions, which through the social group he has inherited from the past. This forms his cultural apperception. "Their influence is absolutely controlling. Loyalty to them is the first principle." When a new

element arises which blends with that mass of opinions, it is quickly absorbed. Such usually slip in unnoticed. But many times new experiences bring us elements that contradict the Past and demand a rearrangement of it. It is then that we have a mighty struggle, for we are conservative. The truths of yesterday have been engraved on our souls, and we cannot wipe them off as we do the writing on a blackboard. New truths that demand a complete repudiation of past truths are immediately rejected as if by instinct. We then begin to substitute that by a more compromising and acceptable truth, and the resultant new truth is usually a fifty-fifty affair. "New truth is always a go-between, a smooth-over of transitions. It marries old opinion to new fact, so as ever to show a minimum of jolt, a maximum of continuity."

When a new truth becomes reconciled with a rearranged and perhaps modified Past, then it gradually is conceived to have been true even long ago. The truth is then projected into the Past. It is even antedated. "Though our discovery of any one of them (truths) may only date from now, we unhesitatingly say that it not only is, but was there, if by so saying, the Past appears connected more consistently with what we feel the present to be. This is historic truth. Moses wrote the Pentateuch, we think, because if he did not, all our religious habits will have to be undone. Julius Caesar was real, or we can never listen to history again....."

VII PRAGMATIC ETHICS.

Pragmatism I called an Ethical philosophy. There is no other system of thought that blends itself so well to an active and aspiring life program than does the pragmatic outlook. Every phase of pragmatism leads up to the ethical aspect which forms the crowning point of the entire system. Its epistemology with its emphasis on this, our experiential world, its metaphysics which lays before us reality, is its plasticity and its possibility, its doctrine of Truth, with its practicality, ~~instrument~~ and instrumentality. All have ethical implications. All these are progressive stages that find their culmination in its Ethics.

Pragmatism's outlook upon the world is a Melioristic one. The materialistic interpretation of the universe as the result of agitations of atoms, blind forces working mechanically, is one that makes our blood run cold. It promises a future that is ghastly and spectral. "The energies of our system will decay, the glory of the sun will be dimmed, and the earth, tideless and inert, will no longer tolerate the race which has for a moment disturbed its solitude. Man will go down into the pit, and all his thoughts will perish. The uneasy consciousness which in this obscure corner has for a brief space broken the contented silence of the universe, will be at rest. Matter will know itself no longer. 'Imperishable monuments' and 'immortal deeds,' death itself, and love stronger than death, will be as if they had not been. Nor will anything that is, be better or worse for all that the labor, genius, devotion, and suffering of man have striven through countless ages to effect." Such a cosmic exegesis must lead to Pessimism -- the consciousness that our ideals and reality are ~~xx~~ hostile to each other. Life then does not seem worth living and men seek the Schopenhauerean open door, -- Death.

Idealism -- on the other hand, goes to the other extreme. By
~~positing an i~~

2

positing an Absolute as the all encompassing and all sufficient and perfect Reality, Man is given an unending vacation. The destiny of Universe is in good and able hands. All is now and will continue to be well. The Absolute will realize his ideals and wishes even without our conscious efforts. The road is clear. We may ^{lie} ~~lie~~/down and sleep away and in our mental vision, dream the Absolute. Such an attitude is a moral anaesthetic and that spells death to physical and moral endeavor. Both imply determinism.

The pragmatist assumes the middle course. ~~It~~ is melioristic. The theater of man's activity and striving was this rugged earth which through experience we can see, both with ~~our~~ our physical and mental eye. Experience, being the mentor of Truth and Reality, has taught us that this world is not a bed of roses. It is a thicket full of thorns and briers. It cuts and lacerates those that pass by. It is a world full of pain, misery, poverty, suffering, death. Nature's claws are stained with the warm blood of her victim. Evil aboundeth where'er we turn. These to the pragmatist are facts and realities. To the Idealist they are ^{le} ineradicable/scenery necessary for the denouement of his Absolute. Pragmatism, despite its admission ~~that~~ the universe is one with evil ^{it}, does not offer you as a solution a physical annihilation, nor does it admonish you like Brahminism to passively melt your ego away into the great World-Spirit, nor does it counsel you to denature yourself with a hermit like life, nor to withdraw from this world of sin and strife to the monastic life of meditation. To him a concentration on another world, be it even a heaven, hallowed and haloed, is a dodging of an obligation to work and struggle. He urges you to stick to your post and never mind the bursting shells and shrapnel. His exhortation is to ^{fight} ~~fight~~ out.

But you may ask Why that recklessness and foolhardiness? Is it not equivalent to suicide -- to a meaningless martyrdom? No, says the pragmatist.

This world is not perfect but it can be made better. It is not a final edition. The cosmic drama is now being written and we are far from the *finis*.

The universe is not a rigid and completed block universe. It is in a state of fluidity, and it is composed of diverse and independent elements, possessing diverse values. We can separate them and sieve out those that we find to be harmful to us and retain and enhance those that are desirable and advantageous for our physical and higher selves. "~~Our~~ Our thoughts determine our acts and our acts ~~determine~~ the previous nature of the world". We are its composers. We are here with aims and aspirations, ideas and ideals and we can make this plastic mass of matter give echo to them.

We have seen that the recognition of evil in this world which is melioristic -- capable of improvement -- started the ethical ball of pragmatism a-rolling. It was the challenge for man to dare and do. This mundane world of struggle and suffering is a bracing atmosphere for man's moral activity. But how about his nature. Is this response a natural or externally compulsory? ^{To} Pragmatism-- man ~~is~~ is a creature that ~~cherishes~~ cherishes morals, ideals. It is ingrained in him. Man's inner nature /hungers for these no less than ~~he~~ does ~~for~~ his body for good. It is a fact -- a force we feel and experience and which must be satisfied. It is this feeling that makes James say, "If a certain formula for expressing the nature of this world violates my moral demand, I shall feel as free to throw it overboard, or at least to doubt, as if it disappointed my demand for uniformity of sequence, for example: the one demand being, so far as I can see, quite as subjective and emotional as the other is".

Now the track is clear, we are set - but what about the goal. What assurance have we that it is within reach? We are moral beings, but the universe harbours us - inhospitably. What assurance have we tomorrow that some new force will not spurt out of space and overturn the structure for which, with the sweat of our brow, we labored so much. Perhaps the universe at heart is, if not immoral, at least amoral; is indifferent to our strivings and our efforts. ^{This is} ~~It is~~ / implied by the materialistic interpretations thereof. Now what's the use, then, of it all, if it may ultimately be doomed? This ghastly alternative which tears

4

to tatters our moral needs and cravings and conduct demands that we interpret the universe theistically, that is, "The affirmation of an eternal moral order and the letting loose of hope".. Religion, to James, supplies the need because it primarily posits the belief that "the best things are the more eternal things, the overlapping things, the things in the universe that throw the last stone, so to speak, and say the final word."

James shows the indispensibility of that postulate from analysis of bodily behavior. The physiological machinery for human actions are divided into three departments, the sensory nerves, the reflex centers and cerebral cortex, and thirdly the motor nerves. The first conducts the sense impressions. The second department functions cognitively. It classifies them and transmits them to the motor nerves, to the department^{to} that reacts/the stimuli. Now the intellect here is seen to be merely a means to an end -- which is action. Our life, which is a life of moral action, we have seen, demands a religious interpretation of the phenomenal flux. The intellect, the central department of our psychical life, too, must accept that religious belief if it is to fulfill the essentially regulative function, of shaping our disordered sensory experience into a conception of the world which encourages all our ideals and striving. "If not a blind force runs things we may reasonably expect better issues."

Ethics and Religion are therefore inseparable and mutual^h supportable comrades.

"The capacity of the strenuous mood lies so deep down among our natural human possibilities that even if there were no metaphysical or traditional grounds for believing in a God, man would postulate one simply as a pretext for living hard and getting out of the game of existence its keenest possibilities of zest."

"In the interests of our own ideal of systematically unified moral truth, therefore, we, as would-be philosophers, must postulate a divine thinker, and pray for the victory of the religious cause."

5

If this world of change is at heart in sympathy with our ideals, if it is to be read theistically, then there must be back of its fleetingness and frightfulness a goal, some glimmer of a purpose.

This design is working itself out, not through the supernatural fulminations but through natural law. Evolutions present an upward curve. There is teleology discernible to Schiller even in our world of mechanical forces. James postulates such a design because of its cash value, because it stimulates moral fervour. To him, too, it is attained through natural procedures. "The aim of God is not merely, let us say, to make men and save them, but rather to get this done through the sole agency of nature's vast machinery."

As for the evident purposeless and immoral aspect of many of the natural phenomena, pragmatism offer~~ax~~ no whitewashing formula. It admits, as we have seen, the existence of evil, with all its reality and poignancy. It is here, and we, with our heroic efforts to minimize and eradicate it, are cooperating with God, whom pragmatism conceives, - I should rather say experiences, -- as Finite and humanistic -- without the metaphysical embellishments of scholastic theology.

"Evil will be overcome not by getting ~~it~~ aufgehoben in the Absolute, but by dropping it out altogether, throwing it overboard and getting beyond it, helping to make a universe that shall forget its very place and name."

We then are building a better stage for the future. We are undergoing martyrdom, but future humanity shall therefore be saved from worse and from equal suffering. "If I am to suffer shipwreck and will never reach port, I shall not abandon the venture. Others will have better fortune and succeed."

We may be like dogs in the laboratory who, being vivisected, are undergoing the excruciating agonies of the knife, who bark and shriek at their human execution^{ers}. But were those dogs to see the possible healing to the myriads that this martyrdom may give, the heroic in them would arise and they would submit to these tortures gladly.

6

"We may be ", says James in another place, "in the universe as dogs and cats are in our libraries, seeing the books and hearing the conversation, but having no inkling of the meaning of it.all."

Man's role is a noble one as well as ~~an~~ an heroic one. He is not merely a weather-vane that is at the mercy of every breeze, nor is he a puppet that dances to the will and whim of the Gods. He is free to act and to choose. "Man is essentially a being who chooses." Nothing is settled or known in advance. The pragmatist does not endeavor to prove this, because it, as well as determinism, is not capable of proof. We are free because we feel ourselves so. By an act of liberty we assert our liberty. It is only through retrospection that we think these acts to be fatalistic. But life "viewed from the outside, is pure chance, good or bad fortune; from the inside it is an act of spontaneity and of creative freedom." Man being free has an important role to play. It may be small, but yet is not insignificant. The utilization of that little potentiality in him may be of some good. Its neglect may result in a vast amount of harm. A thrombus in the statesman's ear may put an empire out of gear.

This in brief is pragmatism's picture of man's ethical ordeal in this hazardous universe. Man will venture the perils of unexplored lands and seas, for material acquisitions and discoveries. Why will he not do it for morality too?

Pragmatism is consistent in its ethics as in its epistemology in that it does not present a code of abstract ethics. It leaves that to the individual's circumstances. This does not mean that the ethical value we attribute to an act is subjective. Deeds have an intrinsic value, according to their expanding goodness and potentiality to satisfy the maximum aspirations of the doer, and those who are intimately bound up with him. "I cannot understand the willingness to act, no matter how we feel, without the belief that acts are really good or bad."

This, in brief, represents, not the ethics, but the ethical outlook of pragmatism. It is an outlook that stimulates and ennobles. It points to this world of experience. It prefers the stormy sea, its dashing waves, and the raging

wind, rather than a supernatural heaven or a hermit's seclusion, or the speculative sublimations. Pragmatism appeals to our chivalry. It arouses our spirit of adventure, our heroism and our challenge for sacrifice. It allies us with God, whose companion and co-worker we become.

The universe is in our hands; we can mould and enhance it. Our Past demands it, our natures crave it, the future looks to us. Unborn generations implore us. Who can be indifferent to such a vision? Who is it that will ^{send a} deaf ear to such a call?

EXPERIENCE AS THE BASIS OF JUDAISM.

Religion we defined as our reaction to life in the broadest and deepest sense. It is a striving, an activity, a process. When a wheel is racing its rounds, the spokes and the empty spaces between them are invisible. You do not seem them move. In fact, you do not see them at all. What we do see is but an apparently homogenous and stationary disc. Now when that wheel is in motion that disc is as real as are the spokes when it is stationary. But that reality is not the substance or object it impresses us it is. It is but the result of the wheel's swift motions. Similarly religion, substantively conceived, is like the concomitant disc produced by a Reality and Life that is constantly changing. Perhaps this simile will hold better. We say of an actor, of a singer, of a lecturer, that he displays personality in his work/ Now by personality we do not mean a substance to which we can point our finger, but rather a mode of activity with a unique touch.

Religion as a process, as a mode of life, cannot be looked upon as a segment of life. The whole can not be identified with a part. Nor can it be conceived as something we can dispense or do without on certain occasions, and certain periods. It is as ineradicable as is our breathing. The attempt to divorce one from the other will result in the death of both.

Judaism is such a phenomenon. It is a mode of living. It aims to pervade every nook and corner of life. That accounts for the abundance of its ceremonies. It is interesting to note that the early sources of Judaism, the Bible, the Talmud, have no definite term for religion, in the substantive sense. And even today to the old Jews who have not absorbed foreign concepts and labels, the word that designates that religious phenomenon is Jewishness (Yiddishkeit), which

2

connotes as best as a word can do the sense of motion and activity . Judaism to them is a strange name for that activity which is bound up with a concrete people and their doings. It is amusing how that term is satirically treated in the Yiddish press, at times, by avowedly religious Jews.

If religion is inseparable from life and is coterminous with every activity of life, it must then be based on experience, on our direct and confluent contact with things and events. It must be based on our consciousness of interaction between the ego and things external to it, be they physical or psychical, on the simultaneous feeling of the I in relation to concrete Time and concrete Space. For life is a chain of experiences. Experiences of desire, strain, effort, defeat, triumph, growth, change and adaptation are links thereof. It is from such experiences or knowledge-felt, that we get the facts and fire which keep the embers of our spiritual life burning. The experiences of raw immediacy that usually precede reflective thought and analysis stimulate seers and saints, preachers and prophets. They are the visions through which we may behold the divine.

Now Experience -- that intuitive (but not a priori) knowledge that constantly keeps our mental bag replete -- may be varied not only in content but in its mode of acquisition. A fact may become engraved in our consciousness through various media. We may have a purely pseudo-personal and individual experience. It is when the stimuli^{LS} which impinges on our mental life comes seemingly to the person without the aid and accretions due to its having passed through other sentient beings, there is a direct connection between the ego and the object. It is conveyed to him not through the wires of social conduction. Such psychic sensations are not continuous. They are violent. Like a flood they burst upon the individual, breaking through the mental barriers of his Ego. Such are the experiences of rare men, of spiritual gentiles,

3

of saints and mystics.

Then we have socialized experiences. They come to us bearing the integrated experiences of a group of which we are a part. We then are like drops of water in a large receptacle filled with such liquid. We are one and homogenous with the whole mass. If we ^{can} call ourselves individuals, then we move forward or upward in accordance with the motion and direction of the mass that surrounds us. Examples of such experiences fill our daily lives. They are continuous ripples and wavelets that are hardly discernible except in times of a storm, when they become a tempestuous ocean with raging and surging billows. Such experiences are current in times of national crises and commotions. That integrated and social experience that continually keeps the individual's mind going, is not not entirely the result and impress of the present life of the group. On the face of things there is the invisible working of the past. Just as the wind can move and perturb the surface of the ~~spring~~ ^{stream}, just so can the undercurrents affect it. These upward and forward forces are transmitted through the beliefs and actions of the group. From the unfathomable oceans of the present and past, experiences come constantly bubbling up, affecting the individual and the social group.

Let us now ask ourselves the question, What part does the element of experience play in Judaism? Is the tendency of Judaism such ~~that~~ that will tolerate and even cultivate such a method of ascertaining its realities?

Let me commence with an inquiry as to the role that group experiences play in Judaism/ Judaism, I hope I have shown, is not based on a superior conceptual creed, nor on a claim of a higher ^{ethical} system, nor on a peculiar cultural coloring, nor on spasms of charitableness. It is the modus vivendi of a particular people, it is their character, their soul. And just because it is incarnated in the doings and destiny of a certain people, and has not been devitalized into purely abstract and

cognitive doctrines, a sort of Procrustean bed upon which any one would
49, therefore it is more hospitable to experiential knowledge, for it
posits a living body, Israel, capable of receiving impressions and
giving reactions that possess a uniqueness. And the sphere of activity
of this growing and changing body it confined not to one local area,
nor to one period of time. We have therefore that which constitutes
experience, "a field of consciousness, plus an attitude in regard to
these objects, plus a sense of self to which this attitude belongs."

The following ~~example~~^{contention} will bring out more lucidly my contention.
Christianity in its primitive period, with its communistic form of life,
living in mind (memory) and in body the life of the Messiah, was based
on an element of experience. The group and also the individuals FELT
the force of the life of Jesus. It was to them a psychic Experience.
and the Nicean Council
All their aspirations were based on it. But with Paul/a new factor
entered, which in time drowned the old experiential element of primitive
Christianity. This was the introduction of the dogmatic or cognitive
articles. By these I do not mean the doctrinal parts of Christianity,
which are common to most religious systems, such for example as the
Providence of God, Freedom or Immortality, etc. These are matters which
we may feel and be convinced of, and the mind may even corroborate them.
I refer to the credal elements of Christianity, such as the Trinity,
Resurrection, the supernatural character of Christ, etc., the elements
which do not come spontaneously within the purview of our experiential
natures but must be accepted on their authoritative or pseudo-transcendent
al character. Now these/^{very}elements Christianity has taken up and in -
tellectualized into a metaphysical theology and made them the very
ghiboleth of its Faith. Such was the character and criteria of
Christian allegiance during the Mediaeval times and plays even now a
great role in that Church, with the exception of Unitarians. Now
Christianity had to resort to these superexperiential dogmas not without
good reasons. Christianity beginning with Paul aspired for universal

dominion. It allied itself with the political state or empire, especially in times of Charlemagne, which also cherished that goal. It therefore had to drop the experiential elements which tend toward individuality of expression and to national disintegration. They depersonalized the voice of Faith into abstract and universal dogmas. With the universalization of Christianity, (which meant the reduction of Christianity to metaphysical articles of faith) and with the emphasis on the literal assent to these, rather than the life history of its founder, Christianity became unexperiential. The theology and not the history and ethics of a Jesus-life was the important and salient factor of Christianity up to very recent times. Judaism, on the contrary, though at times it sent forth universal strains based on ethical principles, yet never depersonalized its EGO. Israel was to cut a figure even then. It always manifested a Will to Live, as well as to Believe. One was indispensable to the other. And by living Judaism always meant acting and experiencing, rather than giving credal assent to doctrines. "Rabbinism", says Herford, "prescribes what a man shall DO, and defines his service of God in precise rules, while it leaves him perfectly unfettered in regard to what he shall BELIEVE. Such a thing as a doctrinal creed is foreign to Rabbinism, Maimonides notwithstanding. Historical Christianity prescribes what a man shall BELIEVE, and defines the true faith in precise creeds; while it leaves him perfectly unfettered in regard to what he shall DO, unfettered, that is, except by his own conscience. Christianity never set up a moral creed; she did not make sin a heresy, but heresy a sin." "Historical Christianity is based on the conception of orthodoxy, Rabbinism rests on the conception of what I venture to call orthopraxy. The one insists on Faith, and gives liberty of Works; the other insists on Works and gives liberty of Faith."

Secondly, Judaism is an historical religion. It is not based exclusively on the noetic or dogmatic principles, but is intimately

6

associated with the life of a people. It came not fulminating out of cracked heavens, but developed just as the people developed. It has therefore a history just as the people has a history, and that history is a continuous one, where the Past flows into the Present. The group lives not only the present, but also the past. Into the Jewish consciousness the individual's and the group's experience not only of today but even of yesterday are confluent. In no other religion does history, the experience of the past, play such an important part. The Bible is to the Jew is just such a record of experiences of his people. The importance that was given to the Pentateuch was because that, more than any other part, contained those experiences. It was not because it was the sanctum sanctorum of Jewish doctrine. Later authorities have shown to us how perfectly flexible and under exigencies how unbinding these doctrines and laws may be.

Another instance which illustrates the part that history plays in Judaism can be seen from the meaning that was attached to the various festivals. With the exception of New Year and Day of Atonement, most of our festivals and holidays have been given an historical background. They have been plucked from their naturalistic environment which was now incapable of stirring the deep emotions of Israel because they now lived no longer in such an environment. They were associated with an historical event, with an experience that had a tremendous and most powerful effect upon the making and moulding of Israel and its Personality, Judaism. That event was the Exodus. The aim of these festivals, therefore, ~~were~~ not to teach us a doctrine, a Truth, but to make us feel the Past, to impress upon us the fact that we are but a link in that long chain of people and of events. So strong and vital is this experience of the Past in Judaism that Judah Halevi, in his *Kusari*, bases Judaism on the experiential phenomena of our ancestors.

7

Whether these events happened exactly as they are described (Passover) or even happened at all, or (Shevuoth) bears very little as to their significance. Their worth is not determined by their taking place in time and space, just as the worth of following a life and idealism of a Jew to the Christian is not diminished by his non-existence. The reality of these events to us is their reality to the Jewish Mind, to Historical Judaism. They have a subsistential truth and a pragmatic value.

I have hitherto spoken of experiences that came to the individual as a result of his Jewish historic consciousness. But are these all the experiences that one leading a Jewish life is possible of having? How about the emotional outbursts, the exalted ecstasies that the individual may derive from a deeper introspection of his inner self, or that one may derive from a communion with the mysteries of nature, or with the spirit in which the Cosmos moves?

Judaism as a religious phenomenon we have seen was of human evolution. It was made by man and for man. To Judaism the divine and the human is synonymous. Therefore, it is amenable to human characteristics and propensities. Nothing that is humanly divine is foreign to it. The above mentioned psychic experiences of the individual are deeply rooted in all souls, and Jews are not exempt from such raptures and experiences.

Judaism abounds with religious geniuses, men who have experienced the heart of Reality, who have seen the Invisible, who have heard His voice and have felt His unfailing support. It has its seers, its saints and its mystics, as well as any other religious phenomena.

But someone may say, How about Judaism's rigid emphasis on law and ceremony? Does it not by such a ritualistic routine crush the Soul and dampen the Spirit?

In answer to these antinomian attacks on Judaism, I wish to point to Jewish history; That history, the character and the temperaments of

it s makers will refute these biased misconceptions of Judaism. To say that Jewish law and life is rigid, is, we shall see in a later chapter, a vile misrepresentation. Jewish law is as flexible and elastic as Judaism itself. Had it not been so, Judaism would now be a thing of the past instead of being a vital and pulsating religion.

Jewish ceremonial life is an attempt to religionize life. It received its impetus in the people's desire to democratize the Priesthood. The religious functions that marked the Priest were to become the duties of every individual. The whole nation instead of a few were to be a holy people and the kingdom of Priests. A close and impartial examination of Jewish history will show that in the long run Jewish ceremonialism succeeded in sanctifying the life of the Jew. "It is an honest effort to apply the principle of the service of God to the smallest detail and acts of life." For the Jew made a religious act of the eating of bread, the washing of the hands, the donning of a new garment; even the performance of the necessary physical functions of man which Christianity thought were base. Judaism raised to the status of holiness.

To say that Jewish law and life necessarily crush the Soul and warp the human heart is to repeat a platitude which is as false as it is shallow. It displays an utter ignorance of Jewish life and law. The heart of a Bachya was susceptible to the higher experiences and sublime emotions in spite of his insistence on the 'duties of the limbs'. Safed, the very center of legalism, was the hotbed of mysticism. Joseph Cairo, the man who wrote that much maligned "Schulchan Aruch", was capable of communing with a higher spirit (Magid) as was any saint of Christianity or even as those recorded in James' Varieties of Religious Experience.

On the contrary, Jewish ceremonial life was to some a stimulus for higher experiences. It brought to them the realization of the divine in the every dayness of life. It aroused the slumbering spirit of man to a consciousness of higher things and higher existences. Those that followed it mechanically, their hearts in most cases were dried out

9

even before. And to those whose hearts were filled with emotion, the law merely put symmetry and rhythm in its outflow.

JEWISH REALITIES.

I have tried in the chapter on the Cultural History of Judaism to give a longitudinal view of Judaism. I presented episodes or stages in the perennial life-career of that religion. In doing this to a living phenomenon, I fell victim to the shortcomings of the "descriptive method". You have seen Judaism ~~kinoto-~~scopically. It was as if I showed it to you in an album, where the first page contained a picture thereof, at its infancy, and every succeeding page contained a likeness thereof taken at a later period. You have not, however, thereby experienced the thrill of its motion, its direction, its aspirations, its 'elan vital. That one can feel only if he plunges himself into its very stream, meeting the waves of the Past and floating with billows of the Present, into the sea of unseen Future.

In examining ~~this~~ Reality - the pragmatist penetrated into the heart of things, and endeavored to see what is the nature of his metaphysical Reality. Was this Reality stable? Was there a common denominator in back of this manifold existence? Was it matter; was it intellect? These were some of the questions that he asked.

Let us now examine Judaism cross-sectionally, so to speak. Let us in this way try to find out what is its essence. Let us ask ourselves the query, What is the element which differentiates Judaism, which gives it its uniqueness, its realness?

The kaleidoscopic forms which Judaism has assumed in the past, its responsiveness to every cultural breeze, its aptitude to adaptability, the recognition that it is evolutionary and ~~not~~ a religion revealed in toto, in a completed form, to be bequeathed to posterity to emulate, must stimulate us to a deeper analysis of the religious reality of Judaism. Is there in back of these manifold forms a Real Form, of which these are its imitations or representations?

2
The following represent some of the answers to these questions. They are philosophies of Judaism. The foremost one in popularity and prestige is the Conceptualistic Interpretation of Judaism. This divides itself into two, though not independent, phases, (a) the theological and (b) the ethical, phase.

The theological group define Judaism in terms of beliefs and doctrines. To them Judaism consists of a specific creed, beginning with the monotheistic notion of God and ending with Immortality. The belief that is mostly stressed and which to them stands out ^{in bold relief} is Monotheism. That to them represents ~~to them~~ the 'raison d'etre' of Judaism. Christianity, they affirm, still believes in the Trinity, and it devolves upon them to maintain their religious separateness on that account. They may fortify this stand by mobilizing a few more conceptualistic doctrines, seemingly characteristic of Judaism. But the monotheistic argument represents their main line of attack and defense.

Now, I hold, that such a reading of Judaism is only partially true, and is today insufficient and unpragmatic as ^{such} ~~the~~ basis of Jewish Life. The notion of the superiority of the Jewish God conception, as the rock upon which modern Judaism rests, is, ~~it seems to me~~, ^{an assertion} ~~not a totally impartial~~ on. Philosophical categories and concepts, yea even religious doctrines, are cosmopolitan. Jews intellectually are like other peoples, and their thoughts and creeds have common human characteristics. To build, then, a religion with a hoary past and a vital present, on a quasi-cognitive superiority, is ^{like} ~~building~~ ^{a dwelling on a frozen river.} ~~which is the coming, spring, with its bright and sunny days must down~~

The attempt to base Judaism on the superiority of its God conception must be modified in face of our critical knowledge of Jewish history and religion. JHWH, to the masses, was in the first period of his evolution, similar to the deities of the surrounding peoples. He was similarly conceived and perceived, worshipped and appeased. The only difference, when such a difference took a crystallized form, was the name.

The monotheistic character was a later evolution. It came after the exile. And even then the notion was not undiluted with a nationalistic feature. For the selection of Israel still meant to the multitude a particular predilection that God had for Israel, his chosen people. It was only the religious genius who towered far above the provincialism and egotism of the rabble, ~~who~~ gave the idea of the selection of Israel ~~and~~ ethical and universal application. Only to them was ^{Israel} ~~he~~ the servant of God, to teach and to bring a new era into the world, unto all of His children.

Let me make a jump to Mediaeval times for further illustration of my contention. Maimonides gave us a picture of a highly metaphysical (though pragmatic) God, ^{One who was} lofty, sublime, and transcendent. Yet at that very period there was a vast number of Jews who entertained vigorously and fervently the notion of a corporeal deity, the measurement of whose height (~~אין~~ ^{אין}) afforded them a lot of intellectual and casuistic sport.

The adherents ~~to~~ the conceptualistic characterization of God are wont to formulate the whole content of Judaism into the Shema. That sentence represents to them the crux of Judaism. But when we strip this of its legendary romanticism and examine it on its pure rationality, (with their own implements), we find it to be contentless, & 'One' is too abstract to have any ^{definite} meaning. It degenerates to a mere Pythagorean number worship. Besides, 'God is One' may not be read as to imply Monotheism. It may imply Monolatry. It was this feeling, perhaps, which made Leon De Modena criticise and oppose the selection and elevation of the Shema as the fundamental idea of Judaism. Judaism cannot tolerate itself to be sublimated to a mere symbol, a sort of 'in hoc signo vinco'. Unity and Oneness, I claim, is an imagery, as liable to petrification as any physical image.

The monotheistic apology for Judaism is insufficient today to claim the loyalty of Jews to Jewish demands. In ancient times when belief ~~was~~ in amoral gods, dwelling in pantheons, was current, and even in the nascent and ^{adolescent} ~~infant~~ periods of Christianity, when the theological credo played such a great role and put before

the individual a 'forced and momentous option', then the emphasis on the monotheistic tendency of Judaism in contradistinction to Christian Trinitarianism was a valid claim for a person's religious affiliation, but today to whom but to ministers and Sunday school teachers does this mean anything ^{academic or} but a mere ~~theological~~ quibble.

Christianity adheres today to the Trinitarian notion only nominally.

One need only pick up any recent book on modern Christianity and he will find that this notion is allegorically interpreted. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are to them not physical entities but psychical manifestations of one God. These are Wisdom, Will and Feeling., the indispensable factors of a Personality.

Besides, if this noetic feature is the sheer foundation of Judaism today why do not its professors join Unitarianism? And yet, they do not do it, which to me refutes as nothing else does, their assumption or presumption that Judaism's lease of life is based entirely on a superior noetic element.

Just as the essence and uniqueness of Judaism can be defined in theological or intellectualistic terms, so can it not be characterized solely by attributing to it a difference in ethics. If by ethics we understand abstract principles, then such principles have no reality until they receive a concrete context in life. Justice and Goodness torn out of the particular circumstance are categorical imperatives, that sound nice but are indiscernible, ~~mere platitudes.~~ (and it is an empty honor to fight for them) He who runs after these runs after a bubble that is but filled with air. 2

Secondly, ethical principles have now become common property for all religions, and even for the non-religious. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that ethics has emancipated itself from any particularistic religion. Just as men have shown that they could be unethical despite their theistic beliefs, so men have shown that they could be ethical despite their atheistic professions. Any man who claims alliance with such and such a faith because of its ethical propensities, even if that were true, would be like the man who married in order to enjoy the vacation of a honeymoon. A religion especially one of the character of Judaism cannot be reduced to a few

5

vapid ethical abstractions, nor to ^apale, flabby and sentimental ebullitions of good heartedness (which is ^{specious argument} so much in vogue today).

We now come to a reading of the phenomena of Judaism, which is antipodal to those we have just enumerated. I shall call this the Materialistic Interpretation of Judaism. While the former tried to reduce Judaism to an extraordinary (to some supernatural) ^moetic quality, this tries to define Judaism in sheer physical terms. To the others (the Intellectualists) the corporate and separate persistence of Jewry was justified only as a means to an end, which was the promulgation and dissemination of the ideational elements of Judaism. These turn the thing around and make the means the end. They translate Judaism into ethical terms alone. They interpret every phase of it in terms of nationalism. To them Judaism is an epiphenomenon that in itself has no value except to keep the physical body of the Jewish nation intact.

Akin to those are those who try to give to Judaism a cultural version. They perhaps feel that the materialistic interpretation makes of Jewry a valley of dry bones. They try to give it a spark of animation. But they feel themselves repelled from jumping over to the theological group. They attribute therefore to Jewry a peculiar culture, a minor part of which is what they term the Jewish Church. This to them is not the fundamentally distinguishing or justifying feature of the Jewish phenomena. THAT is the Hebraic Culture.

My criticism to this materialistic interpretation is the same that I would give to one who tried to prove that we live to eat or that thought is merely cerebral vibrations. The nationalistic factor is present, but it is not the preponderating one in the making of Judaism. They attempt to explain the higher forms exclusively by the lower forms. And this method, recent thought has shown to be inadequate even in science. "The atoms of the physicist may indeed be implied in the organization of the conscious beings, but in a

6

subordinate capacity; a living organism exhibits actions which cannot be formulated by the laws of physics alone; man is material, but he is also a great deal more, to-wit, alive, psychical and moral, etc."

The Culturists seem to me too hazy. They are not specific. What do they mean by Culture? How did the culture of Jews differ from that of their neighbors, say the Babylonians, the Persians, the Hellenes, etc? Is it not evident that the term Jewish Culture is but a stop gap for a future explanation -- "wo das begrieffe fehlt dann stellt sich ein wort an."

Let me not be understood as having put the absolute lie to all these philosophies. A philosophy, especially if it assumes a rigid system, usually is narrow and one sided. Their authors are predisposed to see and select only certain phases and to build up a reality of these chunks of beings. That is just what these interpretations have done. They selected out of the ~~varied~~ ^{many} rich and manifold aspects of Judaism certain phenomena to the exclusion of all the others. They are like those metaphysicians who saw Reality but as sensations (Empiricists), or like those to whom Reality was but abstract relations (Idealists). The theological, ethical, national and cultural interpretations of Judaism remind one of the four blind men who tried to describe an elephant, after they have each touched one part of his body; the one who felt his tail described him as a rope, the one who touched his leg described him as a pole, etc.

The above interpretations are manifestations of a vital organism, of a living and changing personality, which cannot be reduced into physical or intellectual terms. A particular man cannot be defined by his stature or by his trade or by his mental endowments alone. He is an individuality, manifold in physical appearance, intellectual capacities, and moral and psychic aspirations. He is a whole, a totality, ~~but~~ constantly changes, grows and expands.

I have shown in the previous chapter that Judaism is constantly on the go, that it is not a congealed and static river, that description pictures it to be, but is a flowing stream. Its Reality is Change, not capricious change where the present and past are divorced but one which is gradual and evolutionary. Judaism is pluralistic, it cannot be labeled by one tag. Jews believe in One God, but that alone is not Judaism. Judaism and God may be compared to a sun's ray striking a glassy prism. The white rays strike the prism just as they do any other object. But only through that prism have we that white ray changed to all the colors of the spectrum. The credit for that metamorphosis is not due to the ray or to the prism alone, but to their mutual interaction. Similarly Judaism represents the reaction of a perennially living people to a rich and varied Life. It is the resultant experience of a complex and integrated social group, having memories, traditions and aspirations, when in contact with a ^{particular} physical, social, cultural and psychic environment.

This definition is comprehensive and open. It has no seal. It ends with a plus sign. ^{experience} That that resultant/or consciousness will be in the future is not and cannot be predicted. It is a process and even its past cannot be defined by an anatomized picture of a cross-section thereof, nor can it be defined by the generality of a common denominator. It is Israel plus its Soul; and both of these are ever growing, changing and multiplying.

JEWISH TRUTHS.

We have examined what we termed Jewish Realities, and we saw that they were manifold and varied, but always centering about a self. We have also investigated the method of attainment of these realities by that experiential Self. We now come to an analysis of the validity of these Jewish Realities. Having denied that Judaism can be reduced to a program of cognition or to an ethical code, but that it is closely bound up with the activities of life, we are naturally confronted with the questions, What are the earmarks of Jewish Truths in the religious sense? What are their natures, their aim, their validity or sanction? This question becomes more acute when in addition to our notion of the plasticity of Judaism we view it genetically as having an origin (though not absolute) and a history that extends to the present day, over a period of thousands of years.

There was a time and there are people who conceive Judaism as a fixed and perfect set of religious doctrines given to Israel on Sinai. All later Truth ^{is} ~~was~~ merely a commentary to the original text, and is true in proportion to its resemblance or identity to the Original. Higher Criticism has refuted this belief. It showed that what we considered the product of a ^{is} ~~was~~ Sinaiic Revelation ~~was~~ the accumulation of nearly a thousand years of human thinking and writing. The Pentateuch which was considered homogenous they showed conclusively, despite our disagreement as to the details of date and text-assignment, to consist of various strata, the literary product of different generations, at widely different times and under different civilizations. This view represented a radical departure from traditional opinions. To the orthodox it then seemed fraught with greatest dangers for religion. It meant the undermining of the very structure of his faith, but after a study of

2
the results of Higher Criticism we come to the conclusion that the fear that those theologians displayed was merely due to the heat of the moment. Higher Criticism is not as inimical to the religious structure as it was thought to be. In the first place, Rationalism and Empiricism already have shown the unlikelihood of a supernatural revelation on Sinai. The Biblical account of that revelation, if it happened at all, must have occurred as a natural phenomenon, they told us. With this view already established, Higher Criticism came in ^{with} its information as to the composite character and authorship of the Bible, especially the Pentateuch. In that respect, Higher Criticism was destructive. But its destructiveness was only a partial aspect of it. ^{Then,} It proved to us that the whole Pentateuch ~~was~~ not the product of the desert period. But it could not deny that some of it, even a small section of it, bears nomadic earmarks. The ball from which the thread of Judaism was to have unwound was merely reduced in size but not exterminated. For we find that ^{at} the root of it there is a crude and simple nomadic Decalogue.

Higher Criticism has undermined the notion of a local and spontaneous revelation of the Law. It, however, has brought fresh light to the notion of the unity and continuity of Jewish Traditions, so much emphasized by later authorities. It has shown us that Judaism is the result of the growing evolution of the Jewish people and that Jewish phenomena as such are the product of a progressive revelation. Higher Criticism has shown us that ^{the} Judaism pictured in the Bible has undergone four stages in development, beginning with a religion of Nomadism and going through Agriculturalism, Prophetism, and Legalism. We, however, behold at the same time that this change was a continuous one, without breaks or jolts. For we have evidence of intermediary stages between each of the above phases of early Judaism, for example, C1 and C11 are found between the nomadic and the agricultural stage; we find some prophetic writings occur between the agricultural and prophetic periods, and we have Deuteronomy, which is classed between prophetism and legalism.

The error is constantly ~~being~~ made when we create gaps and chasms between the various phases of Judaism's evolution, especially between the prophetic and the legal periods. But in reality the succeeding stage is a direct outgrowth of the preceding. Legalism is an attempt to instil the ideals of righteousness and holiness preached by the Prophets into the concrete life of the people. We now also see more clearly the identity in content and direction of the Biblical and post-Biblical literature, that they form one continuous chain. Prophetism and Legalism, Biblical and Rabbinic Judaism, are artificial labels. They come within the stream of Judaism. The Torah now is a name not of a piece of Jewish Reality, but of the entire and unending process, for the Written Law and the Oral Law come from the same source. Higher Criticism showed us the workings of that evolution. It brought to light ^{the} Law of this unending revelation.

Let me briefly describe it. Jewish Law, by which I mean all that the word Torah connotes, such as doctrines, ethics, ceremonies, etc., commences as far as we can trace, with a statement, a code, which at and around the period of its authorship was the authoritative expression of Jewish allegiance. It was the canonized Bible of that period. Around this as a nucleus interpretations accumulated, which were aimed to fit in that static code to the changed conditions and situations. As time went on this nucleus plus the exegesis that grew about it, was written down as the New Covenant. And this entire new bulk was projected into the past as having been the Truth of antiquity. For example, we have as a beginning the Nomadic Decalogue. In due time changes have taken place in Jewish life. The Israelites entered a new environment. Adjustments were necessary. Modifications, compromises, and reinterpretations of the old was made and written down. The degree of the rearrangement of the old varied in proportion to the character and intensity of the new environment. So we begin

4

to have instead of a Nomadic Code, the agricultural documents of J. and E. The process starts anew, and the result is the D. Code, followed the P. Code, by the Canon, then by the Mishna, by the Talmud, by the Shulchan Aruch, the She'loth and Teshubath, and the recognized decisions of Rabbinical Assemblages. All the recent additions are then projected into the Past, to the very root of the tree. The Rabbis attribute the validity and sanction of a recent law to the Sinaitic Revelation (*ה'אמר אל משה*). One Rabbi goes as far as to say that the (*עריב*) was observed by Abraham.

Now these doctors of the Talmud neither deceived themselves nor did they deceive others. This tendency represents to them an honest reading of the religious evolution of Judaism. Judaism was to them a process of development and that constant growth was accomplished through interpretation, modification, and augmentation, of the Original Sinaitic Law. "Behold now", say they, "how the voice of Sinai goes forth to all in Israel, attuned to the capacity of each; appealing to the sages according to their wisdom; to the virile according to their strength; to the young according to their aspiring youthfulness; and to the children and babes according to their innocence; again even to the women according to their motherhood." They even go as far as saying that what is uttered by a scholar was given on Sinai and therefore has a binding validity.

and see

When we study post-Biblical history/^{and see} what a tremendous emphasis was made on the legitimacy and authority of the Oral Interpretation, We are confronted with a phenomenon that was unique, I believe, in the history of religious development. The Oral Law made the previous codified religious law plastic. It kept the door open for constant change, and progress. The struggle between Phariseism and ^{and the} Sadducees, between the Rabbinate and the Karaites, between the Reformers and the Orthodox, who insisted that anything new was forbidden by the Torah

(אין איהן איהן איהן), was no mere sectarian squabble. It was a struggle for freedom, progress, for life. Just as the ancient Biblical writers refused to have their God and their Judaism become petrified in an image, so did they refuse to have their Judaism sealed and completed in a code.

They felt that life was continually changing and that Judaism, if it was to be a religion of life, was to be consonant with the changing ~~of~~ times and conditions. New laws, sometimes more lax and sometimes more stern, had to be woven out of the old fabric to cope with new and diverse situations. Some doctrines were ignored, even left to the limbo of oblivion. Some were restored or promulgated and given prominence, depending on the needs of the time and the environment. Such changes were insignificant when things were normal and then they were imperceptibly absorbed in the Jewish mind and in Jewish practice. But in times of crises, the changes were radical. An example of such a crisis was the period following the destruction of the Temple and the loss of nationality. Jewry was put on a new and radically different status, and Judaism therefore through the influence of Jochanan Ben Zakkai, assumed a different mien and demeanor.

But that was a cataclysmic moment in Jewish history. ~~In~~ the ordinary sequence of events changes are gradual and confluent. Novelty is instituted but these had to conform to the spirit of the old. Just as the new element or change had to be prompted by a need, by the physical, intellectual or spiritual environment, so it had to pass muster the already accumulated store of Jewish truths. In normal times when the new was utterly at a sword's point with the old, then it was rejected. If its need was great there was a compromise between it and the old. The rapprochement was made possible either through a rearrangement of the past truth or a modification of the new truth, or through both. When such took place it became not a recent Jewish truth

6
but one that was present even in the past. It was projected to Sinai, as the Oral Law, which was concomitant with the Written Law.

Now some one may rightly ask, If Jewish Truth is not what the pragmatist would call ante rem, fixed and final, after which our utterances and our ideas must be patterned, but is a process, one that is constantly evolving and constantly changing, what element in it then makes it true? What the criteria by which we may recognize its Jewish truthfulness?

You will recall that I identified Judaism with the life of the Jewish people, that I called it its personality and soul. I refused to reduce Judaism to merely physical or nationalistic terms and was equally stern against sublimating it to a doctrinal or noetic program. Judaism included both, for the life of a people as well as that of an individual, is a complex phenomenon and cannot be dispensed with one label. The immediate aim and tendency of living beings is to live. And by living I do not mean merely eating and drinking. I have reference also to the higher strivings, to the life of the spirit as well as to the body. This conatus for life, for an individualized life, a people, as well as an individual, possesses. The Jewish people had and still does possess that vital impulse. That needs no excuse, nor justification. We are, because we are, and we shall be Jews because we will to be Jews.

The will to live in face of conditions that would have crushed the body and spirit of any people has left the Jewish people unscathed. That will was so indomitable that Christian as well as Jew accounted for it only on a theological or supernatural basis (Of course their versions differed. To the Christian the Jew providentially persists as a witness to his Christ, while to the Jew he is because he was divinely selected to perform a mission.) Whether we Jews accept the theological explanation or not, the fact exists that we are alive and we wish to continue to live as Jews. We may be instruments in His

vine hand, working out a sublime and unforeseen Purpose. That is un-
over and secondary. What we primarily feel is that urge for life and
is that that we must satisfy and give expression to. Our duty is
therefore to preserve and promote ourselves. It is to help us to enrich
our collective life, our collective experiences, and our collective
function, in the physical, social, intellectual, and religious domains
of existence. For Judaism we have seen is inseparable from the Jewish
people.

Life is not a yacht trip. The waters may become turbulent, the
winds raging, and the vessel may at any time dash against merciless rocks,
even in smooth sailing, when the sea is quiet, the rising and the falling
of the waves make it necessary that we be always at our oars. If this
is the case with an individual, how much more with a people, and especially
with a people whose life is so precarious and whose path is so varied and
intricate as is that of the Jewish people?

Now through this labyrinth of darkness, of hate and of mis under-
standing we have to pass, not skulkingly but erectly. To help us to
accomplish this, all our powers are to be concentrated; our bodies, our
minds, our hearts, our souls, are to function in this direction. They
are to guide us and what they evolve has a value, as it helps us to steer
safely from place to place. Jewish ideas and practices, as they are
evolved, become true, as they help us to live as a people and to correlate
our lives with the life of humanity. Jewish ideas and practices come
in response to a need. There is a maladjustment, physical or psychical.
These new elements come not as truths established but as a truth-claim,
which become verified or discarded according to the success or failure
of their mission.

When they remove the need, help us to overcome the obstacle and
satisfy us, then they become a truth and are given a place in the company
of past truths. But they become true not because of an intrinsic property

or because they are a copy of Sinaitic Truth, but because of their function, because of their utility, in helping Israel to Live, and Believe.

ETHICAL TENDENCIES OF JUDAISM.

Judaism, I said, is not a code of ethics, in the sense that it cannot be reduced to a ^{definite} list of fixed commandments. It can neither be anatomized and identified with a few vague and sentimental platitudes, nor with a few categorical yes or nos, do and don'ts. By this I do not wish to infer that there are no ethical implications in Judaism. On the contrary, the strain of Judaism has a distinctly ethical tone and tendency. But we cannot reduce Judaism to its moral modes and say This is Judaism, just as we cannot reduce a piece of music by stating the key in which it was written, or by enumerating the number of cadenzes that it possesses.

With this in mind, I wish to devote this chapter to an analysis and description of the ethical trend of Judaism. The moral drift of Judaism seems to me to have such a striking resemblance and parallelism to that of pragmatism that I am inclined to call Jewish ethics pragmatic, and James' ethical outlook Jewish. Religion in both tendencies serves as an invigorating force to a life of idealism. In both, ethics is focalized in this world of brute reality. Both have that humanitarian and forward gaze. The world of Judaism as well as of pragmatism is melioristic.

I shall bring out these similarities more clearly by a more detailed description as to the history and nature of Jewish ethics.

Judaism, I said, was born in the vast and open stretches of the desert, and in an environment that was nomadic. The organization of society was then simple and primitive. The unit of organization in the desert was the clan or tribe. There was a social importance attached to every individual. He lived for the group. His interest was in the social welfare, in which he was a participator. The precariousness of life, the dangers of frequent hostilities, the hardships

w

of obtaining food and shelter , impressed primitive society with this need of mutual aid and cooperation. Their deity was even conceived as the father of the tribe. He was their protector, not only from external foes, but from those individuals of the group whose actions were inimical to the stability and the welfare of the tribe. God, to them, was a vital process, exhibited in the life of the group. He was the guardian of group customs and the group morality, both of which had then a social aim. The God of the tribe was a God of morality, as morality was then understood. In that primitive and nomadic society human life was valuable because it was scarce and very needful. There was attached to individuals a worth, physical and moral. Any one who dared to murder his life was at the disposal of his nearest kin. And it was their filial duty, divinely sanctioned, that they avenge their king's blood. The deity was a deity of Justice. Every individual had an equal status, In this social structure we have the seeds from which grew up that social and ethical religion of the Prophets.

Against the glitter and tinsel of Canaanitish civilization, with its ornate and excessive ritualism, with its tyranny and cruelty, there stood out in the minds of these seers the desert life in its idealized equality and simplicity. These features appealed to their minds because of their intrinsic moral worth. The God of the desert dweller was intimately associated with life. He was the giver of food and life (*יהוה אלהים*). He was the preserver of the social order and the guardian of justice. The prophets took up these elements and spiritualized them. The motif and technique of that religious life were highly spiritualized and refined at the hands of the Prophets. God, instead of being tribal, became now the universal Father of mankind. Instead of inhabiting a stone, a tree, a mountain, a stream, or a shrine, he now was conceived to pervade the whole and vast universe. He was interested in the social

welfare. But His relation to Israel and to mankind was purely an ethical one. The approach to Him was not conceived now to be through physical or ritualistic means.

Thus we have in the Judaism of the Prophets a religion of a highly socialized character. God was the ideal embodiment of the highest value in the way of social organization and control. He was the zenith of man's highest ethical aspirations. Religion to them was not a private and personal relation between a man and some supernatural power dwelling in far off invisible regions. It was not a religion which could become fixed and amicably adjusted through sacrifices. These to them were inefficient means for a contact with the Divine.

God was enshrined in this visible earth, ~~yes~~ in the very hearts of men. This world was the sphere and influence of His habitat. Men through their social life could reveal or conceal Him. He was the God of Justice and of Righteousness, the Father of all, - the widow and the slave, as well as the master. Human life and human character were equally sacred to Him. The life of social and moral service and conduct was the content of religion. This social and ethical vision was further augmented by later Judaism in that life and its concreteness was so spiritualized through a religious behaviorism. The empirical and practical functions of life were touched by the divine. Everything was included in the program and purview of Judaism:

Judaism^{David} concentrated its attention and effort in this world. On the whole, it manifested an unflinching constancy to this attitude, an attitude bequeathed to them by the Prophets. It focalized itself on the here and now, Even at^a times when asceticism and other-worldliness was the order of the day. (They compromised at times with this tradition, but that was the result of their spiritual discomfiture, because of the agony of soul and torment of body that made them look heavenward and hope for a time and place where their persecution and suffering would cease, for the temper of their oppressors was such that they did

4

hope for their alleviation here, at their hands.) It was this conviction, that life in all its phases was sacred, that made Judaism look askance at celibacy and self-castigation. The line of demarkation between things secular and things holy vanished with Rabbinism. Life in all its phases ^{and needs} was divine, and its improvement was sanctioned by God. Laws of health, sanitation, eugenics, social betterment, and the expansion of functions and values, the administration of justice, the regulation of excessive profiteering, the protection of the laborer, the insistence of the moral equality of every man, were all part of the program of Judaism. Nothing that was human ^{or social} was foreign to Judaism, for Judaism was a religion of life. Its stage was this real and experiential world. Judaism considered awry a life of spiritual somnambulism, a life of other-worldliness.

Judaism concentrated its attention and effort in improving and saving man in this world. It always wished to live in the world of Reality, the world that can be felt and experienced. Like pragmatism it therefore admitted that Evil was real, was present in the very domain of God. He created it. The problem of suffering therefore was a perennial one. The writer of the Eden story tried to account for it. Moses, Jeremiah, Job, the Psalmists, the Rabbis, beheld its spectral and ghastly presence. Israel in its vicissitudes, in its torments and tortures, in its persecutions and pogroms, experienced the sting of this enigma. They did not reason away evil and say that in reality all is well. The serpent's sting and the sword's gash was to them one of the grimmest realities. The mystery of evil they asserted was insoluble. It was to them, however, not a hopeless situation, for if all was not well, it could be made better. And it became our duty to work and strive for that end. Man, say the Rabbis, is the co-worker of God. They turned their back to the metaphysical Why of evil and put their shoulder to what ought to be.

Judaism dreamed of an ideal world, of a millenium, wherein justice, oppression, and hate would be replaced by a world ruled by Righteousness, equity; where men would be united by bonds of brotherhood, where even brute nature would conform to our inner ideals; and where the lion and the lamb would reside beside each other in peace. The Messianic longing of Israel, distorted as it may have been at times, is the persistence of that dream and vision. The world is wicked, nature is cruel, but it is not doomed to such an eternal fate. It is plastic and malleable. We are here commissioned by its very Maker to remould it into a better and more perfect form. The world was made for man (*אדם בצלם אלהים*) in the sense that he is able to put his impress upon it. It is melioristic. We must therefore not throw up our hands in frustration, nor dose away with the confidence that the good is inevitable. It all depends on us. Our future and the world's future is in our hands; therefore the establishment of the kingdom of heaven HERE must be our aim, our inspiration, our goal. For that is His aim, and His design. (Isaiah 45:18)

Man to Judaism is not depraved by any original sin. He is a moral being possessing in him a spark of the divine. He was made in the image of God. The impulse for good, social as well as moral, is ineradicable from his nature. That good, as well as his truth, is neither fixed nor defined. It is expanding and growing as man himself is expanding and growing. His ethical nature is dynamic and it would therefore be harmful as well as erroneous to put that into a fossilized creed or code.

Man, to Judaism, is free. That is the *sine qua non* of his morality. He is neither a puppet dancing to the tune of a mechanical victrola, nor is he a messenger boy who must run the errands of a metaphysical monster. He is always at the cross-roads. Before him lie two paths, the path of Life and the path of Death. He has the power to

follow either. He is counseled but not forced to pursue the good. The divine admonition is "And thou shalt choose life". He is thereby assured that God is not indifferent to the moral outcome of his striving. His ideals are God's too. There is a power that is superior to ourselves, but embraces us, that makes for Righteousness. That power is the God of theism . He is our assurance that all our work will not be in vain; He is the galvanizing force for our spiritual and ethical strivings. He is the light to our eyes and the staff to our hands.

(Set. 6 & 7)
WHAT IS RELIGION?

I shall make no attempt in this chapter to give an absolute definition of the Religious Phenomena. One need merely to peruse the past attempts in this direction to be struck by their colossal failures. I refer not only to the disparaging descriptions of Religion on the part of our anthropological students, but even to the myopic characterization of the other schools. For neither ^{do} the definitions of Hegel, Müller, Flint, Tylor, or Tiele, which emphasize the ideational character of religion, nor those of Kant, Martineau, or J. E. Newman, which stress the ethical phase, nor even those of Schleiermacher, Everett, or McTaggart, which make the emotional tendency the predominant feature, ~~do~~ ^{do} ~~re~~ religion the justice which it deserves. They are all one-sided; they forget that religion is a complex phenomena with currents and cross-currents of various temperatures and velocities, flowing at times in various directions. They entered into a rich botanical garden with colored spectacles. All the flowers appeared to them to be of one color, the color of their spectacles. Yes, even the atmosphere ~~xxx~~ Reality, itself, possessed that taint.

No uniform or closed definition of religion is possible because Religion is not made of one stuff. It treats ^{of} Reality, Man, and the World and these we shall see rebel against being put into one category. I shall therefore characterize Religion rather inclusively. Instead of presenting a formal definition, I will present a point of view. That point of view will be psychologic. Its postulate will be that every religious phenomenon is the result of a mental or spiritual state which must manifest itself in the life activities and strivings of a particular people.

Religion from this point of view, may be termed as ~~total~~ Man's total experience, including his beliefs, feelings, and actions wherein he lives in relation with what he estimates to be divine, that is the supremely worthwhile power which is controlling in the world. Briefly, it represents man's entire reaction to life. Now man we know, is one of the most complex and complicated organisms. He is neither the automaton of materialistic science

the simple spiritual Lilliputian of transcendental philosophy. He is living with a structural nature that is pluralistic. He is flesh and spirit. He acts as well as he is acted upon. He thinks, feels, strives, and struggles. He is a multum in parvo. He is a bundle of sensations and responses that are diverse in nature and aspect. He is a being capable of intellectual, emotional, ethical and social reactions.

Now when I say Life, I also mean Life in its broadest and deepest sense, we not merely reference to our narrow economic existence. Important as may be, man doth not live by bread alone. He has instincts, passions, emotions, longings, and aspirations, that constitute the salt of life. As he climbed up the cosmic ladder, there stretched before his eyes a richer and wider panorama. Life to him expanded and multiplied, and just as his world increased in magnitude and manifoldness, so his faculties and functions increased. He began to react to a larger social, physical and spiritual environment. As he advanced, the world of his experience transcended his particular, its abode, and its limited deity. From distant lands there came in the heart-throb of other peoples, of Humanity. The world of mind superseded the world of matter. The Infinite Cosmos now overawed him. All these elements I include in that Ocean of Life.

Religion, I said, was Man's total reaction to all of Life. It is the content of Man's communion with the All. It is not the ~~resultant~~ but the process of that copenetration. Religion ~~now~~ is not a substance that can be transferred, dropped, or accepted. It may be compared to fire. Fire is not a substance, the sort of phlegiston, we once thought it to be. It is a process, a manifestation of an intense form of energy. Rub two stones and we have that fire--first detected in the form of heat, then light. Both are ~~not~~ things but are processes of combustion, mere forms of energy. Religion is the inevitable product of the ^{contact} ~~xxx~~ of our Self with Life.

The nature of the religious process is not simple and uniform, just as the cosmic currents, which we meet and to which we react, are not sim-

ple and uniform. Religion is as varied and variegated as the life we lead. It embraces the intellectual, ethical, social, political, and economic spheres.

Now let us ask ourself the question, What is the pragmatic value of the religious life? When the religious pursuit represented the imposed command and demand of a Supernatural Being, that thundered threats and ^{OFFERED} trests, then the rewards and punishments were the incentive for a religious life. Now, however, these have ceased to be motives for our religious activities, and examination therefore as to the value of such phenomena, tho they may be indispensable, is not out of place.

Religion we said represents the interaction of the whole of man with the whole of Life. It gives us a totalized experience of Reality. Our atomic and diverse experiences are coordinated and unified. We see before us a vision of the All. Our fragmentary experiences have been transformed from a mere jumble of shells and stones into a beautiful and harmonious Mosaic. Our experiential world is transformed from Chaos into one of Order and Purpose. Even we become parts of that Cosmic Symphony. We may call that integration of our experiences Nature, or God, Depending on the sentiments that the All-Inclusive evokes in us. It may arouse in our breasts the "cosmic emotion" of ~~and~~ Haeckel, or Büchner, or it may stir within us the sentiments of love and worship, ^{of Bachya or Bedevi} wherein the All is changed from being an IT to a THOU. One who is conscious and who feels with and responds to us.

Now in the Religious life, this All-Comprehensive ~~and~~ Experience---GOD, becomes the cynosure of our Life. He is our Supreme Interest. All our interests revolve about Him, just as the satellites in the firmament revolve about the sun. Such a view or attitude to things satisfies a legitimate craving on the part of man. It is an attitude that he experiences in the normal course of life. The intensity of that experience may vary, depending on the psychic nature of the individual or group, and the circumstances that ~~give~~ it goes thru. The seeds and roots of such experiences are there and it is the natural course that they should bud and luxuriate. It would however be contrary to our nature to extirpate or even stunt its further growth. It would demand

exertion and strained effort and would occasion a ^{feeling of} restlessness, loneliness and unhappiness. ~~on the part of man.~~

Secondly, the religious attitude is prone to give us a healthier and truer picture of Reality. The world is a Babel of conflicting and confusing interests. Man is like a ship in the mid-ocean. Any billow may come along and carry him off to an unknown fate. Religion lifts him up to higher regions, whence he may survey life in its entire perspective. He sees then the big things and the small things in their rightful proportions. Once a man has been on those Pisgah heights and has seen the Promised Land, he can not mistake the ideal of life--our Supreme Interest--either in a life of welter of materialism or in Epicurean/sensualism nor even in a life of aesthetic intoxication.

Thirdly, the religious attitude and life is the best means for an all-around development of man's faculties. Religion attempts to embrace all of existence. ^{Thereby} it tends to widen man's sphere. His cosmos broadens and his consciousness of things widens. Man is an intellectual, ethical, emotional, and psychic being, with a distinct individuality. Modern science tends to suppress his ego, to depersonalize him, and make of him an ephemeral aggregate of sensations, a bubble of air, to burst on the surface of the cosmic whirlpool. Religion acts in the reverse manner. Religion in the past before specialization became such a mania, satisfied all our cravings. ~~And~~ even today, despite the fact that the religious domain, which embraced all our interests, has been broken up and many states within ~~its~~ empire were given autonomy and independence, yet religion still has jurisdiction over the psychic ~~part~~ phase of man. Religion even in its modern and limited sense, as affording an outlet and satisfaction to man's psychic experiences, develops a source of happiness and joy and sensitiveness ^{to} toward a wider and richer universe. It opens our eyes not merely the world of matter, but also to the world of spirit, God.

Pragmatism, we have seen, looks with disdainful contempt upon Icarian speculations. Hegelian dialectics are to them a form of vicious intellectualism. Philosophy and Religion must be like Antheos. It must always touch the earth. Otherwise it will perish.

The God of Pragmatism, naturally, bears the impress of that attitude. He is conceived as an ethical, psychical, social, ~~and~~ not as a metaphysical being. The God of Hegel, James, calls a "metaphysical monster" "the absolute block whose parts have no free play, the pure plethora of necessary being with all the oxygen of possibility suffocated out of its being. He plucks the ornamental feathers out of His cap, these scholastic attributes of aseity necessity, simplicity, perseity, immutability, etc. These have no bearing on our life, no pragmatic value. The medieval definition of God, "Deus est ens, a se, extra et supra omni genus, necessarium, unum, infinite perfectum, simplex, immutabile, immensum, aeternum, intellegens" is to them a pretentious sham, that means less than nothing. These adjectives have not only no magnetic force of attracting man to his Supreme Ideal but on the contrary they produce a feeling of foreignness in man, as to God's relation to Him. God is transcendental but cold.

To Pragmatism, God is a vital and pragmatic force. He is the guarantor that our ideal world will be eternal, that our sublime ethical aspirations the now in the maelstrom of confusion, will come out victoriously, that our suffering and torture are not in vain, but represent the throes of a better world and a happier humanity. This God that Pragmatism posits, this pillar of our ethical edifice, is finite. He struggles and fights, He is encompassed by an environment which He tries to master and transform. He is arrayed in battle against His enemies. God to them--as long as He is ethical in nature and solicitude--the He possess not Omnipotence and Omnipresence, is a good and fitting God for man. "The religious person is wholly satisfied if he feels it ^(Higher Presence) as a part of the Universe, so long as it is the most ideal part as well as the most profound and so long as it has sufficient

affinities with his own moral nature." "Having an environment, being in time, and working out a history just like ourselves, He escapes from the foreignness from all that is human, of the static timeless perfect Absolute." "I now say that the notion of the one breed foreignness, and that of the many breeds intimacy." "Such a God possesses an intimacy with man. He dwells not in imperceivable and incomprehensible regions. He descends into the dust and degradation of our own life. He is our sympathetic helper and companion."

Secondly, in addition to this social and ethical aspect of the Pragmatic God notion, He is postulated as being a Spiritual entity, a Psychic Being, a Higher Consciousness, with which our ordinary personalities come in contact, thru what psychology calls our 'subconscious self.' Distinct experiences testify to the unexpected intervention in our so-called natural world of a supernatural and divine reality, the same in essence as that which is best in us but infinitely superior." "For my own part", says James, "I find in some of these abnormal or supernormal facts (of divided human personalities, shown by the investigations of Drs. Janet, Freud, Prince, Sides) strangest suggestions in favor of a superior co-conscious being possible. "The conscious person is continuous with a wider self thru which saving experience come."

The problem to which James now directed his attention was whether this spirit-world or Higher Consciousness, is a monistic one or a pluralistic one. The same problem faced the pragmatist when he discussed the world of matter. The Universe appeared to him a multi-verse, irreducible to any simple and ultimate entity, be it matter or spirit. True it was unified but that unity was one of concatenation rather than qualitative identification. Secondly, there was much discord (lack of unity) rampant in the physical world--so the unity that we postulated of this world was a potential one rather than actual. It was an ideal, a Hope, a Goal toward which our evolving world was striving.

Now James reasons similarly when he analyzes the spiritual phenomena that envelops us. He sees here too evidence of multiplicity and diversity. These, what I call concentric spirits, may however not be discreet and fully independent. They too possess a certain conjunctive character. He sees an example of it in the psychologic phenomenon of the compounding of Consciousness, where a spiritual entity ^{may be} is an independent self and at the same time part of a larger consciousness. He here is inclined toward Fechnerian panpsychism--whose universe is a series of graded spirits--each separate and included in the next higher spirit. The Man-Soul the possessing autonomy is part of the Earth-Soul, and that a part of the soul of the larger planet, etc. He however leaves this just as he left the problem of monism in the physical world an open question. "The outlines of the superhuman consciousness thus made probable must remain however very vague and the number of functionally distinct selves it comports and carries has to be left entirely problematic. It may be polytheistic or it may be monotheistically conceived."

Now before I proceed to a consideration of the Jewish God notion, I wish to discuss ~~xxx~~ briefly certain phases of the God-conception, enumerated above, that is the notions of Infinity and Unity.

The concept of Infinity--seems to me, to include all the other concepts such as omnipresence, omnipotence, eternity, perfection, etc. The latter are offshoots of the former. At any rate they are kindred to it. For what will be true of the superlativeness of the concept of infinity will be true of others also.

Infinity is a concept that is not pictureable. We can not visualize with the eye of our mind infinity completed. It is unimaginable even to our memory. We may call this a pure concept. But we can not evade the fact that this pure concept is unique even in that sphere. Causation too is a pure concept ~~xxx~~ a denizen of that same world--yet we can find instances in the phenomenal world which typifies and illustrates that concept. But not so with the notion of Infinity.

The infinite to us means even noetically the maximum finite conceivable. It is like a rubber band (with an elasticity) that ~~it~~ will never snap. This word infinite connotes not a definite size or intensity of a physical or spiritual object but rather a continuous and unending process. It connotes a flow, a persistent extension, what Bergson would call duration, but not a static and specially completed ~~moment~~. The confusion of this mobile character of infinite with static things will plunge one into continuous antinomies. It was this static notion of infinity that made the problem of Creation in time, so paradoxical to the Jewish Mediaevals, (see Gadie, Maimonⁱ and Arabic philosophers) We can not be with one foot on the static band ^{with} and the other in the boat which is flowing down the stream of time.

Now God I termed the All Inclusive. Evolution has impressed us with the fact that our mind and consequently the world of our Experience is constantly growing and expanding. It showed us a vista of Universes that is continuously unfolding or creating itself. As we advance and our universe becomes larger, our All, our God becomes, or rather is seen by us to be larger. Our notion of Him widens and increases. Now if we term him Finite we are making him ^{concluded} static. We are putting a fence about him. Our God notion becomes petrified. He becomes an image without life and possibility.

Secondly, the conception of God as Infinite though it does not convey to us a positive and completed conception of Him possesses pragmatic advantages. The word infinite stirs within us a certain amount of mysticism. We apprehend it not by ratiocination, but we experience it and its direction intuitively. It becomes a stimulus for a mystical feeling and in that respect it has a ^{high} ~~valuable~~ value as a spiritual stimulant.

Furthermore, to say that God is finite is to say that he is limited in power. A time may come then when His resources will dwindle. What assurance have we in this world of strife and storm, that the morrow may not give birth to an event, a circumstance that may shatter and demolish our ideals. Our religion, our God, who was to protect and guarantee us

of the victorious consummation of our hopes and aspirations, may before
cataclysmic
that event be impotent. He may be like a hut in the midst of a destructive
cyclone. It may offer shelter and protection in normal weather but before
the raging wind it is of no account. These in Brief are some of the reasons
why I wish to conceive God as an Infinite Being.

Now let me proceed to the next aspect of the problem, the question
of the ~~One~~ and the ~~Many~~. James has enumerated the various kinds of unity,
and has shown that each implies a notion of the many. To this extent, he
is right. In the world of sense we can find no absolute unity or absolutely
discreet/multiplicity. Man and stone, e. g., possess a unity of being in the
same realm, if not possessing some mutuality of function and structure. No
two things can be mentioned that will have absolutely no relationship what
soever. Monism and Pluralism are abstractions like matter and spirit. They
are the sides of a coin. It is only thru a philosophic figment that we
disjoin them.

Now, Pragmatism, as long as it pleads for ~~the~~ admission of pluralism, ~~as~~
to be wedded to monism, presents a legitimate request. But when they
demand the rejection of the ~~monistic~~ view and the enthronement of the reverse
notion, then it is like the child with the spoiled stomach that cries for
green apples. In fact in the psychical world, unity and multiplicity are
inapplicable. There they may be an alien dialect.

Bergson describes this difference excellently when he states "Life
tho compared to an impetus is in reality of the psychological order, and
it is of the essence of the psychical. To enfold a confused plurality of in
terpenetrating terms. In space and in space only, is distinct multiplicity
possible; a point is absolutely external to another point. But pure and
empty unity also, is met with only in space; it is that of a mathematical
point. Abstract unity and abstract multiplicity are determinations of
space or categories of the understanding, whichever we will, spatiality
and intellectuality being welded on each other. But what is of psychical
nature cannot correspond with space, nor enter perfectly into the cate-

gories of the understanding. Is my own person, at a given moment, one or manifold? If I declare it one, inner voices arise and protest - those of sensations, feelings, ideas, among which my individuality is distributed. But, if I make it distinctly manifold, my consciousness rebels quite as strongly; it affirms that my sensations, my feelings, my thoughts are abstractions which I effect on myself, and that each of my states implies all the others. I am then a unity that is multiple, and a multiplicity that is one; but unity and multiplicity are only views of my personality taken by an understanding that directs its categories at me; I enter neither into one nor into the other nor into both at once; altho both, united may give a fair imitation of the mutual interpenetration and continuity that I find at the base of my own self. Such is my inner life, and such also is life in general."

If unity and multiplicity hold in the spiritual things then I am inclined toward unity - even of the absolute kind. As for its apparent pluralism - ~~is~~ is secondary to its nature. It is a phenomenon that arise only when the Spirit or Consciousness is broken up and analyzed. Let me illustrate this with the color of whiteness. A pure ray of whiteness is a unity an absolute, oneness, a monism characterized by sameness. That is its primary and strongest impression. It is only when we break it up that we get a pluralism. Then only does it decompose to the many colors of the spectrum.

Now, we have two alternatives, either we may withhold this problem from God and the Psychic World and declare them irrelevant. In that case, God becomes unknown--that is structurally. Or we may select these labels in which case it becomes more logical, yea, more empirical to incline toward monism--or unity. Just what course Judaism took will be the subject of the next chapter.

THE GOD OF JUDAISM.

In this chapter I shall consider the Jewish God notion not historically but rather from a philosophically-critical point of view. I shall not attempt to trace the stages of its evolution, the particular emphasis and contribution that it received as Israel marched through the various cultures of the Past. I shall merely dwell on the nature and tendency that characterized it throughout its upward course.

Let me preface my analysis by showing the two types of God-concepts that are usually found. These I will name the Pragmatic ~~not~~ in its technical sense, ^{of King Fritsch and myself} and the Philosophic God notions. The former is the God of dynamic religions, those faiths that present to their adherents a program of life, including acts as well as beliefs. The God of philosophy is usually an abstract principle or entity, which forms the ground-work of a conceptual system, and by which a rational picture of the world of Being (or Becoming) is ~~gained~~. The pragmatic and philosophic god concepts are not mutually exclusive, both may be found dwelling together. The pragmatic notion is usually primary, for religion comes to satisfy a practical need. It is only later as religion becomes more intellectualistic, that the personal and conscious God of Religion, who offers assistance, and demands obligations, becomes converted into a God of Philosophy—abstract, transcendental and impersonal. It is then that an interest is aroused into the structural of God. Is he Matter, Spirit, or any other substance?, is the ~~question~~ ^{question} of devotees. In the pragmatic stage, the interest of the worshippers is not focussed on the structural essence of God, but rather on His activities, the kind of demands He makes, and what obligations are due Him on the part of the worshippers. Here the social, the ethical and the practical phases of religion predominate.

In Judaism the God-notion has a distinctly pragmatic tendency. We have seen in a previous chapter that in its earlier period, its Deity was conceived of as the God of the tribe, the Guardian of its social and ethical ~~order~~.

order. The *sine qua non* of its religious life was the doing of deeds that would be pleasing in His eyes, and be beneficial to them. They troubled themselves very little about God's substantial nature.

Judaism in the main, adhered closely to this pragmatic tradition. The early as well as the late documents of the Bible, affirm nothing of God's substantial nature. (*יהוה אלוהים* does not mean that God is spirit but that He is divine power or energy.) The writers refuse to think or speak of God in terms of ^{the} stuff of which He is made. It is this attitude in addition to other reasons, that makes these writers so hostile toward the material representation of God in the form of effigies. For if God's essence is not to be disclosed, then perhaps His form, His appearance, His image too is to be kept hidden. When Moses is pictured as requesting of God information as to His identity and nature, God informs him not ~~who~~ or what He is, but rather that He exists. (*אני ה' אשר אנוכי*) They describe God not by statements as to His substantial essence but rather by the nature of His work and of His wishes. ^{now} Moses ^{now} requests not to behold God's face, but to be informed of God's ways.

הודיעני את דרכיך The prophets too they rose to heights from which they could behold divine visions of God's glory and majesty, yet their interest too was not ^a philosophical, but a pragmatic one. God was to them the Supreme, the One and Only ruler of the Universe; yet they never indulged in any philosophical discussions as to the nature of His oneness. God was One, was their fearless and fervent message. But that had not a philosophic but an ethical implication. That was the motive and the end of their calling, their teaching, yes, their life.

~~xxxx~~ In Rabbinic literature we find this tendency prevalent also. The Rabbis in commenting on the tragic death of Aaron's two sons, say that they met this fate because they haughtily strove to behold God with their eyes. They base this comment on the passage in Exodus XXIV 10, 11. God is pictured not by what He is constitutionally but by what He does. ^{to} At times their minds give way ~~their~~ ^{to} extravagant fancy, which pictures God, as studying the Torah,

teaching the children, and weeping over Israel's sorrow. We are told what He does for practical and ~~many~~ ethical reasons, so that we may be able to emulate and imitate His deeds. We are to be merciful because God is merciful.

לֵב יִצְחָק מִן הַקּוֹל הַזֶּה וְהָאֵלֹהִים אֵף אֵלֶּה הֵם חַיִּים וְחַיִּים

As for His structural nature, nothing positive is stated. Here we behold the beginning of that philosophical reticence as to the essence of God which characterizes even the philosophical period of Jewish thought. When a precentor (in the recitation of the Amidah) tried to pile up encomiums on God he met with the displeasure and ~~stern~~ rebuke of a rabbi, who informed him that had not Moses attributed to God the three epithets, "the great, mighty and awe-inspiring", he would have omitted even those three. ל. 33^b

This is the attitude that underlies the Jewish philosophers' position in regard to affirming positive attributes of God. Such attributes they say do not suffice of God. They limit Him, and therefore should be omitted. It was already Saadia who divided these attributes into those that endeavor to tell us about the essence of God and those that tell us about His acts. The former resolve themselves into the asseveration of God's unity and the latter into an assertion of His Power. in nature and in history. Maimonides expresses this more emphatically "Man, he says, can not know God qualitatively (סבול) His essence is beyond the ken of human comprehension. God can but

be apprehended by His works." To Albo too, the ability of man to comprehend what God is, would lift man to the very position of God. We see a greater disinclination on the part of Jewish Mediaeval philosophers to disavow anthropomorphic expressions of God than the anthropopathic expression, because the former it seems to me, dwells more on the essence of God, while the latter seems to imply more a knowledge of the actions of God, to which Judaism is not so antagonistic. The former tell us what God is, while the latter tell us more what God does.

This brief resume has borne out the contention that the God conception of Judaism has a pragmatic emphasis. Judaism's orientation is this world, its interest is in this life. Its God is the source and map of Life.

4

He is termed as the God who delights in Life (*Q'ha Yeha*). What He is in philosophically, Judaism is frank and modest enough to confess it does not know. What God does and desires of man that it affirms in no equivocal words. In that answer it is vitally interested. Its ethics, its strivings, its life depend on it. As regards the philosophical essence of God, Judaism to a certain degree borders on Agnosticism. It declares that, so far, God's essence is beyond the ken of human understanding. He is the Unknown, but unlike agnosticism God is not Unknowable for all times. What powers and potentialities the human mind may assume in the future, or to what extent God may be revealed in power, or even in essence, no one can tell. Unknown, yet we may perceive him thru his creations. Our very negotiations ^{also} to a certain extent give us a glimpse of God.

Into the Holy of Holies of His essence we cannot enter, but enveloping the Temple of the Unknown is the Shechina, the Living Glory. That we may behold everywhere, in the sky above us, and in the earth beneath. Every breeze, every wave, and every green blade of grass brings us a message of Him. The chirping of the birds, the roaring of the beasts and the chanting of men testify to His divine presence, to His supreme power and sublime purpose.

THE PRAGMATIC ASPECT OF ISRAEL'S MISSION.RELIGIONTotal Reaction of Men to Life.

In the center of that Life is God

The Past (Tradition); the Present (Humanity and the Cosmos) and the Future (Messianic Vision) are elements to which he must be conscious and react. These must pervade his Life - in every detail.

JUDAISM

Implies a collective effort to a life of Religious Idealism
Holiness and Righteousness.

The Priestly and the Prophetic elements in Judaism.

Character of our Mission in Pre-Christian Era - a life of active and aggressive Idealism.

Character of our Mission - in Christian Era - a life of collective and exemplary Religious Idealism. (See Kohler Mission Today - C. C. A. R. 1919)

This implies a certain amount of Separatism, not necessarily a nationalistic Separatism - but a religious uniqueness.

PRAGMATIC VALUE OF SUCH A PROFESSION-

Our mission one of Service.

Such a determined life will bring out our Religious Potentials - our Noblesse Oblige.

Future and not the Past will and can prove truth of our claim

If we will to be of Service to the world we shall be of Service. Our Past a help to our Determination.