

Chapter 1 : Pythagoras - Wikipedia

Our Lord Himself asked that this Feast-day honoring His Sacred Heart be established in the Church's calendar (even specifying the day as the Friday following the octave of Corpus Christi), as a last effort of His love for mankind, by which He would reveal to us the treasures of His Heart.

He styles himself Jude 1: He does not call himself an apostle, but supposes that the terms which he uses would sufficiently identify him, and would be a sufficient reason for his addressing his brethren in the manner in which he does in this epistle. There were two of the name of James among the apostles, Lk 6: There were also two of the name of Judas, or Jude; but there is no difficulty in determining which of them was the author of this epistle, for the other had the surname of Iscariot, and was the traitor. In the catalogue of the apostles given by Matthew Mt It was not uncommon for persons to have two or more names. The title which he assumes, "brother of James," was evidently chosen because the James referred to was well-known, and because the fact that he was his brother would be a sufficient designation of himself, and of his right to address Christians in this manner. The name of the elder James, who was slain by Herod, Acts The other James-- "James the Less," or "James the Just"-- was still living; was a prominent man in Jerusalem; and was, besides, known as "the brother of the Lord Jesus;" and the fact of relationship to that James would sufficiently designate the writer. There can be little doubt, therefore, that this is the James here intended. In regard to his character and influence, see Intro. If the author of this epistle was the brother of that James, it was sufficient to refer to that fact, without mentioning that he was an apostle, in order to give to his epistle authority, and to settle its canonical character. Of Jude little is known. His name is found in the list of the apostles, but, besides that, it is but once mentioned in the Gospels. The only thing that is preserved of him in the Evangelists, is a question which he put to the Saviour, on the eve of his crucifixion. The Saviour had said, in his parting address to his disciples, "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him. To this question the Saviour gave him a kind and satisfactory answer, and that is the last that is said of him in the Gospels. Of his subsequent life we know little. Paulinus says that he preached in Lybia, and that his body remained there. Jerome affirms, that after the ascension he was sent to Edessa, to king Abgarus; and the modern Greeks say that he preached in that city, and throughout Mesopotamia, and in Judea, Samaria, Idumea, Syria, and principally in Armenia and Persia. Nothing certainly can be known in reference to the field of his labours, or to the place and circumstances of his death. On the question whether the Thaddeus who first preached the gospel in Syria was the same person as Jude, see Michaelis, Introduction iv. If this epistle was written by the apostle Jude, the brother of James and of our Lord, there can be no doubt of its canonical authority, and its claim to a place in the New Testament. It is true that he does not call himself an apostle, but simply mentions himself as "a servant of Jesus Christ, and a brother of James. At the same time, as the relation of James to our Lord was well understood, Gal 1: After the act of the traitor, and the reproach which he had brought upon that name, it is probable that he would prefer to designate himself by some other appellation than one which had such associations connected with it. It may be added, also, that in several of his epistles Paul himself does not make use of the name apostle, Php 1: Great honour would be attached to that relationship, and it is possible that the reason why it was not referred to by James and Jude was an apprehension that it might produce jealousy, as if they claimed some special pre-eminence over their brethren. For the evidence of the canonical authority of this epistle, the reader is referred to Lardner, vol. Michaelis, chiefly on the internal evidence, supposes that it is not an inspired production. There were indeed, at first, doubts about its being inspired, as there were respecting the epistle of James, and the second epistle of Peter, but those doubts were ultimately removed, and it was received as a canonical epistle. Origen calls it a production full of heavenly grace. Eusebius says that his predecessors were divided in opinion respecting it, and that it was not ranked among the universally-acknowledged writings. It was not universally received among the Syrians, and is not found in the Peschite, the oldest Syriac version of the Scriptures. In the time of Jerome, however, it came to be ranked among the other sacred Scriptures as of Divine authority. The principal grounds of doubt in regard to the

canonical authority of the epistle, arose from the supposed fact that the author has quoted two apocryphal writings, Jud 1: The consideration of this objection will be more appropriate in the Notes on those verses, for it obviously depends much on the true interpretation of these passages. I shall, therefore, reserve what I have to say on that point to the exposition of those verses. Those who are disposed to examine it at length, may consult Hug, Intro. Witsius supposed that it was addressed to Christians everywhere; Hammond, that it was addressed to Jewish Christians alone, who were scattered abroad, and that its design was to secure them against the errors of the Gnostics; Benson, that it was directed to Jewish believers, especially to those of the western dispersion; Lardner, that it was written to all, without distinction, who had embraced the gospel. The principal argument for supposing that it was addressed to Jewish converts is, that the apostle refers mainly for proof to Hebrew writings, but this might be sufficiently accounted for by the fact that the writer himself was of Jewish origin. The only way of determining anything on this point is from the epistle itself. The inscription is, "To them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called," Jude 1: From this it would appear evident that he had no particular classes of Christians in his eye, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin, but that he designed the epistle for the general use of all who had embraced the Christian religion. The errors which he combats in the epistle were evidently wide-spread, and were of such a nature that it was proper to warn all Christians against them. They might, it is true, be more prevalent in some quarters than in others, but still they were so common that Christians everywhere should be put on their guard against them. The design for which Jude wrote the epistle he has himself stated, Jude 1: It was with reference to the "common salvation"-- the doctrines pertaining to salvation which were held by all Christians, and to show them the reasons for "contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. There were teachers of error abroad. They were insinuating and artful men--men who had crept in unawares, and who, while they professed to hold the Christian doctrine, were really undermining its faith, and spreading corruption through the church. The purpose, therefore, of the epistle is to put those to whom it was written on their guard against the corrupt teachings of these men, and to encourage them to stand up manfully for the great principles of Christian truth. Who these errorists were, it is not easy now to determine. The leading charge against them, both by Jude and Peter, 2Pet 2: By this denial, however, we are not to suppose that they literally and professedly denied that Jesus was the Christ, but that they held doctrines which amounted to a denial of him in fact. For the general characteristics of these teachers, see Intro. At this distance of time, and with our imperfect knowledge of the characteristics of the early erroneous sects in the church, it is difficult to determine precisely who they were. It has been a common opinion, that reference is had by Peter and Jude to the sect of the Nicolaitanes; and this Opinion, Hug remarks, is "neither improbable nor incompatible with the expressions of the two apostles, so far as we have any certain knowledge concerning this sect. It is not possible to ascertain with certainty the time when the epistle was written. There are no marks of time in it by which that can be known, nor is there any account among the early Christian writers which determines this. Benson supposes that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, a few weeks or months after the second epistle of Peter; Mill, that it was written about A. All this, it is manifest, is mostly conjecture. There are only two things, it seems to me, in the epistle, which can be regarded as any indication of the time. One is the striking resemblance to the second epistle of Peter, referring clearly to the same kind of errors, and warning those whom he addressed against the arts of the same kind of teachers, thus showing that it was written at about the same time as that epistle; and the other is, that it seems to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, for, as Michaelis has well remarked, "As the author has mentioned Jude 1: As there is reason to suppose that the second epistle of Peter was written about A. ONE of the most remarkable things respecting this epistle, is its resemblance to the second chapter of the second epistle of Peter--a similarity so striking as to make it quite certain that one of these writers had seen the epistle of the other, and copied from it; or rather, perhaps, adopted the language of the other as expressing his own views. It is evident, that substantially the same class of teachers is referred to by both; that they held the same errors, and were guilty of the same corrupt and dangerous practices and that the two apostles describing them, made use of the same expressions, and employed the same arguments against them. They refer to the same facts in history, and to the same arguments from tradition; and if either of them quoted an apocryphal book, both have done it. On the

resemblance, compare the following place: It is not such a resemblance as would be likely to occur in two authors, if they had been writing in a wholly independent manner. In regard to this resemblance, there is but one of three ways in which it can be accounted for: As to the first of these solutions, that the Holy Spirit inspired them both to say the same thing, it may be observed that no one can deny that this is possible, but is by no means probable. No other instance of the kind occurs in the Bible, and the supposition would not be in accordance with what seems to have been a law in inspiration, that the sacred writers were allowed to express themselves according to the bent of their own genius. As to the second of these suppositions, that they both copied from a common document, which is now lost, it may be observed, that this is wholly without evidence. That such a thing was possible, there can be no doubt, but the supposition should not be adopted without necessity. If there had been such an original inspired document, it would probably have been preserved; or there would have been, in one or both of those who copied from it, some such allusion to it that it would have been possible to verify the supposition. The remaining way of accounting for the resemblance, therefore, is to suppose that one of them had seen the epistle of the other, and adopted the same line of argument, and many of the same expressions. This will account for all the facts in the case, and can be supposed to be true without doing violence to any just view of their inspiration. A question still arises, however, whether Peter or Jude is the original writer from which the other has copied. This question it is impossible to determine with certainty, and it is of little importance. If the common opinion which is stated above be correct, that Peter wrote his epistle first, of course that determines the matter. But that is not absolutely certain, nor is there any method by which it can be determined. Hug adopts the other opinion, and supposes that Jude was the original writer. His reasons for this opinion are substantially these: That there is little probability that Jude, in so brief an epistle as his, consisting of only twenty-five verses, would have made use of foreign aid. That the style and phraseology of Jude is simple, unlaboured, and without ornament; while that of Peter is artificial, and wears the appearance of embellishment and amplification; that the simple language of Jude seems to have been moulded by Peter into a more elegant form, and is embellished with participles, and even with rhetorical flourishes. That there is allusion in both epistles 2Pet 2: It could not be supposed that every reader would be acquainted with the fact alluded to by Peter; it was not stated in the sacred books of the Jews, and it seems probable that there must have been some book to which they had access, where the information was more full. Jude, however, as the original writer, stated it more at length, and having done this, a bare allusion to it by Peter was all that was necessary. Jude states the matter definitely, and expressly mentions the dispute of Michael with the devil about the body of Moses. But the language of Peter is so general and indefinite, that we could not know what he meant unless we had Jude in our possession. It must be admitted that these considerations have much weight, though they are not absolutely conclusive. It should be added, that whichever supposition is adopted, the fact that one has expressed substantially the same sentiments as the other, and in nearly the same language, is no reason for rejecting either, any more than the coincidence between the Gospels is a reason for concluding that only one of them can be an inspired document. There might have been good reasons why the same warnings and counsels should have proceeded from two inspired men. THE inscription and salutation, Jude 1: A statement of the reasons why the epistle was written, Jude 1: The author felt it to be necessary to write to them, because certain plausible errorists had crept in among them, and there was danger that their faith would be subverted. A reference to past facts, showing that men who embraced error, and who followed corrupt and licentious practices, would be punished, Jude 1: He refers particularly to the unbelieving Hebrews whom God had delivered out of Egypt; to the apostate angels; and to the corrupt inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah. The object in this is to warn them from following the examples of those who would certainly lead them to destruction.

Chapter 2 : The Sacred Heart of Jesus

PARADISE LOST Sixth Book The Argument. Raphael continues to relate how Michael and Gabriel were sent forth to battle against Satan and his Angels.

Things of Sacred Power Things of sacred power associated with Judeo-Christian history as recorded in the Bible and in various apocryphal texts have enraptured believers for centuries. Ararat , that some travel agencies include participation in expeditions to search for the ark as part of tour packages to Turkey. Several ark sightings on Mt. Ararat occurred during the twentieth century. Ararat reported seeing half the hull of some sort of ship poking out above surface of a lake. It was reported to be the same size as the Ark. In the s, former NASA astronaut James Irwin participated in expeditions up the mountain, but he found only the remnants of abandoned skis. As described in the Old Testament book of Exodus , the Ark of the Covenant, a wooden chest covered with gold, is said to contain such sacred relics as the tablets of law from God that Moses 14th-13th century b. The ark possessed super-natural powers and served as a means through which God could express his will to the Israelites. It was last known to have rested in the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem , but ever since Babylonian forces conquered the city in b. Interest in the Ark of the Covenant has inspired generations of those who would recover the sacred relic. In medieval times the Knights Templar supposedly came into possession of the ark. A whole mythology has been built around the legendary Holy Grail , said to be the drinking vessel of Jesus at the Last Supper before his crucifixion and resurrection. The legend of the grail has been perpetuated through literature since the twelfth century, particularly in tales involving knights of Camelot who served the legendary King Arthur of Britain. Through the inspirational recounting of the various quests, Christian teachings and virtues are presented. In modern times, the Holy Grail persists as a symbol of an ultimate achievement, a higher order of being for which people search. Another thing of sacred power that has inspired generations of Christians is the Shroud of Turin , which is discussed in an earlier chapter. The Bible mentions a "clean linen cloth" Matthew Several cloths purported to be the one mentioned in the Bible have been made public through the centuries. The Shroud of Turin is a linen cloth that bears the image of a bearded, crucified man. The claims that the image on the Shroud of Turin was that of Jesus were first made public in the fourteenth century. The Shroud has been controversial ever since- embraced as authentic by believers, and written off as a forgery by skeptics. Each time evidence seems to weigh heavily against the authenticity of the Shroud, a new finding renews the controversy and inspires believers. Nevertheless, when Christian crusaders discovered the lance in the Church of St. Peter in Antioch during the First Crusade in , they used it as a symbol to rally their forces and defeat the Saracens. From that time onward, European monarchs coveted the Holy Lance as a sign that their reigns would be far-reaching and long-lasting. Fortunately, the power of the Spear of Destiny ebbed when it fell into the possession of the Nazis and their leader, Adolf Hitler - This section will examine these objects of sacred power and discuss why they have been deemed so precious and holy by believers down through the centuries. Delving Deeper Bernstein, Henrietta. The Ark of the Covenant, the Holy Grail. Marina del Ray, Calif.: DeVorss Publications, Goodrich, Norma. The Sign and the Seal. From Ritual to Romance. According to the Bible, the ark was last known to have rested in the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem. Whether it was destroyed, stolen, moved, or remained hidden after Babylonian forces conquered the city and leveled the temple in b. Another mystery concerning the ark is its contents. The ark is said to contain numerous sacred relics, including the tablets of law from God that Moses 14th-13th century b. Additionally, the ark possessed a supernatural power that awed and overwhelmed those who viewed it, and it served also as a means through which God could express his will. The idea of the ark was expressed by God to the Israelites and was then made into a material object by skilled craftsmen in about b. They built a chest about 2 cubits in length and 1 cubits in height or about 3 feet, 9 inches in length, 2 feet, 3 inches in height using setim acacia wood overlaid with the purest gold. The outside of the ark had a gold rim and four golden rings, one on each corner of the chest. Two poles made of setim and covered with gold ran through the gold rings on either side; the poles were used to lift the ark and were never removed from the rings. The ark had a cover of gold on which two cherubim faced each other, each with wings spread. The oracle word, or

commands of God would issue from the ark from a cloud between the two cherubim Exodus The ark originally provided safety to the Israelites in their journey to the Promised Land. The power of the ark was manifested several times and enemies were scattered. When priests carrying the ark stepped into the River Jordan, the water stopped flowing and all the Israelites were able to cross. At the battle of Jericho the ark was carried by a procession around the walls of the city for seven days, after which the walls came down and the Israelites won the battle. After losing a series of battles with the Philistines, the Israelites brought the ark to a battle site, hoping for inspiration and wanting to strike fear into the Philistines. However, the Philistines won the battle and secured possession of the ark. The Philistines viewed their capture of the ark as a victory over the Israelites and their God. The ark was treated as a trophy, but several disasters fell upon the Philistines, including the rapid spread of a plague and an invasion of mice wherever the ark was placed. The Philistines eventually built a cart on which they placed the ark and representations of their afflictions; they yoked two cows to the cart and set it forth. The cart made its way to the territory of Israel, where the ark came into the possession of the Bethsames. A large number of Bethsames fell dead when they failed to show respect for the ark. Later, when David d. Along the way, however, a cart carrying the ark was jostled and the ark began sliding off. The ark was then housed at a nearby site outside the city, where it was the object of veneration for several months before the journey to Jerusalem was completed. Eventually, the ark was placed in the new Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem. It was occasionally taken away from the temple for a battle or ceremony, but soon the ark was not allowed to leave the temple. As decades passed, the sacredness and powers of the ark were largely forgotten. It was either destroyed along with the city or, as suggested in Kings 4: Some biblical scholars theorize that those Israelites still faithful to God were forewarned about the fall of Jerusalem and moved the ark to safety. Jeremiah is said to have moved the ark to a cave on Mt. Sinai, the mountain in Egypt where Moses first spoke with God. The Talmud , the ancient, authoritative history of the Hebrews , indicates that the ark was kept in a secret area of the Temple of Solomon and survived the destruction and pillaging of Jerusalem. The Temple of Solomon was rebuilt on its original foundation after the Babylon Captivity. One account has the illegitimate son of Solomon and Sheba stealing the ark about b. Other stories have the ark being transported during a Hebrew migration to Abyssinia Ethiopia that preceded the Babylonian Captivity. There, according to that version, the ark remained on an island in Lake Tana. With the spread of Christianity throughout the Roman world by c. Later, during the sixteenth century, fierce battles were waged by invading Muslim armies on the Christian empire of Abyssinia, causing much destruction, including the razing of monasteries on the island Tana Kirkos, where the ark was believed to have been kept. A cathedral was built after the Muslim armies retreated, and there, according to this legend, the ark remains safe. Interest in the Ark of the Covenant has recurred through the centuries. In contemporary times, interest in the ark was renewed with the film Raiders of the Lost Ark, where it is the object of a search just prior to World War II 45 between Nazi forces and an American archaeologist named Indiana Jones. The ark is found and, as in the Bible, its power kills literally melts all of those who do not pay it proper respect. In the film, as in the Old Testament , the presence of the ark brings destruction to the wicked and to the vain. In Raiders of the Lost Ark, the relic eventually ends up in an undistinguished crate in an overstuffed U. In December , Rev. Marina del Rey, Calif.: The Sign and the Seal: The Quest for the Lost Ark of the Covenant. The cross as a Christian amulet dates back to the fourth century, when the Roman emperor Constantine d. That act symbolized the conversion of Rome to a Christian empire. But amulets with crosses date back to Mesopotamia and Egypt, and served as a symbol long before associations of the cross with the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Native Americans already had amulets with crosses by the time of first contact with Europeans. European adventurers, beginning with Christopher Columbus 67 , assumed that Christians had arrived previously when they saw the crosses on Native Americans , but they were really viewing a people who invested belief in the power of a universal symbol. Crosses and circles are among the symbols and figures worn for protection and prosperity by humans since the earliest times. Such crosses often signified the four directions, the four forces earth , water, air, and fire , and, when enclosed in a circle, the oneness of life. Delving Deeper Bracken, Thomas. Good Luck Symbols and Talismans: People, Places, and Customs. Chelsea House Publishers, Amulets, Talismans, and Fetishes. Jonathan David Publishers, The word "grail" may have originated from "garalis," which derives

from the medieval Latin word "cratalis" a mixing bowl. Garalis became "greal" in medieval French, "grail" in English. Another possible origin for the word is based on the writings of a Christian monk named Helinandus, who served the Cistercian order as a chronicler and died around

Chapter 3 : Confucius (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Jesus' Deity - in His Own Words ; Jesus Christ: The Word ; The Word of God ; The Scriptural Reason for Baptism ; The Precious Blood of Christ ; History's Most.

Then all things are at risk. It is as when a conflagration has broken out on a great city, and no man knows what is safe, or where it will end. There is not a piece of science but its flank may be turned tomorrow; there is not any literary reputation, not the so-called eternal names of fame, that may not be revised and condemned. The very hopes of man, the thoughts of his heart, the religion of nations, the manners and morals of mankind are all at the mercy of a new generalization. Generalization is always the influx of the divinity into the mind. Hence the thrill that attends it. In nature every moment is new; the past is always swallowed and forgotten; the coming only is sacred. His appropriation of strong poets signals his fondness for the thrill of self-creation and his boredom with dull and dense theorists preoccupied only with the problem of mutual accountability. His German great grandfather Rauschenbusch was number six in a generational line of university-trained Lutheran pastors. However, his intellectual and spiritual attraction to Anabaptism and Pietism led to a rather scandalous conversion to the German Baptist Church in America. He almost became a Mennonite, and Anabaptist historian Herald Bender recognized him as one of the first truly fine scholars of Anabaptism in America. He became convinced that the messianism of the Anabaptists contained more of the future in their vision than the other Reformers. Yet he also worried that the Anabaptists over-stressed the doctrine of the church as an external, visible community in continuity with the apostolic church. He thus offered a counter-proposal: Walter Rauschenbusch was declared the father of the Social Gospel. Their son Richard was born in into a family circle of leftist politics and very progressive social hopes. He also knew the temptations and terrors of radical politics. He knew that Stalin had ordered the assassinations of Trotsky, Tresca, Frank and scores of other anti-totalitarian leftist leaders and intellectuals. Rorty has emerged as the most interesting and perhaps the most controversial public philosopher in America. It is necessary to first situate Rorty within the horizon of contemporary philosophy and critical theory. Most philosophy primers place Richard Rorty in a list of postmodern thinkers such Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault. He indeed shares their anti-foundationalist, anti-metaphysical, deconstructive ways. A pragmatist believes that human thinking and acting, from sophisticated theory to practical mechanics, are driven by the need to respond to problems: Thinking and acting are aimed at reducing tensions and solving problems. Our most basic needs for food and shelter, for example, are addressed through patterns and programs of farming and building that are considered good, true, and even lovely only if they satisfy and sustain us. Likewise, we are perplexed by both our deepest human longings and our most tragic losses, the primordial dialectic of death and desire. Thus, we tell stories, write poems, compose philosophies and theologies or construct theories to reduce the tensions and thus satisfy our complex need for meaning and understanding. When these narratives, theologies or theories fail to sustain us they are either rejected or revised. For the latter either are, or tend to become, consecrations of the status quo. The moral prophets of humanity have always been the poets even though they spoke in free verse or by parable. Following Dewey, Rorty contends that morality is a vocabulary and as such it is a poetic achievement, dependent upon the cultural sources from which it is composed, and thus always contingent. These critics generally embrace a strict correspondence theory of language in which philosophy is more like logic than poetics and theology is more like math propositions than metaphors. Rorty is disinterested in these tired language games. He is more interested in how every solitary soul and every social agent comes to consciousness within the context of the contingency of language, the contingency of ego or selfhood, and the contingency of historical communities. To better understand Rorty, let us consider these contingencies. Rorty reminds us that nature is mute without the narrative or lyrical interference of the human subject. He suggests that we must make a distinction between the claim that the world is out there and the claim that truth is out there. Truth cannot be out thereâ€”cannot exist independently of the human mindâ€”because sentences cannot so exist, or be out there. The world is out there, but descriptions of the world are not. Only descriptions of the world can be true or false. The world on its ownâ€”unaided by the describing activities of human

beingsâ€”cannot. We need not worship the corpses of their dead metaphors. Like Romantic poets, we can now claim that imagination, not mimetic reason, is the central human faculty. This will free us to develop a talent for speaking differently rather than for arguing well. Then we will discover that it is rhetorical innovation, not the old myth of the mind as the mirror of nature, which will indeed become the chief instrument of cultural and political change. Rorty believes Sigmund Freud has done for our conscience what Nietzsche has done for our language, namely, exhibit its entanglement in historical time and chance. Instead, Freud teaches us to think of our particular actions and idiosyncrasies in terms of our responses to or reactions against a constellation of past influences and present stresses. In this pragmatic and perspectival account of morality, the dynamics of self-creation and mutual accommodation are always contextualized. We may indeed suffer guilt and shame if we fail to meet the expectations of parental, pastoral or priestly figures in our life. But in this story of morality, the strong poet learns to condemn herself more for failure to break free of the past rather than for failure to live up to some standard considered universal or binding by her community of origin. If Freud were simply saying that conscience is the internalized voice of parents, church, synagogue and society, Rorty would not be so taken with his account of morality. After all, Plato, Kant and the man at the hardware store would all concede that the voices of our ancestors, though dead, still speak in identifiable ways in our hearts and minds. In addition to the destruction of the Oedipus complex a regressive degradation of the libido takes place, the super-ego becomes exceptionally severe and unkind, and the ego, in obedience to the super-ego, produces strong reactions in the shape of conscientiousness, pity and cleanliness. But here too obsessional neurosis is only overdoing the normal method of getting rid of the Oedipus complex. However, Freud is not referring to the narcissistic origins of evil here but rather to the narcissistic origins of compassion. What does this mean? Perhaps this disciple is driven by the love of Jesus and the neighbor, or perhaps he is driven by the imprint of an exceptionally severe and punishing super-ego, or perhaps, and most likely, he is driven by some of both in addition to any number private fantasies folded unevenly into public metaphors or moralities. This is the story of conscience, morality and selfhood that intrigues Rorty. In this account, morality is nothing to get too moralistic about as one tracks its plural, particular, and ambiguous sources. For Rorty, the understanding that all our behavior bears the marks of a blind impress is neither tragic nor terrible. In fact, following the Freudian narrative, he argues that it is neither necessary nor desirable to harmonize, synthesize or integrate a private ethic of self-creation and a public ethic of mutual accountability. Our private obsessions and public commitments need not be reconciled. Unless we choose to isolate ourselves geographically and culturally, we are formed and informed by overlapping communities of discourse and practice. Like the great poet of democracy, Walt Whitman, who declared that a multitude must be invited to speak not only in society but also in the soul, Richard Rorty thinks this is indeed very good for a liberal, democratic society. Rorty is not a communitarian. He is impatient with the excessive trend in the contemporary academy and society that celebrates group identity and identity politics. He is more interested in the politics of individuality. Emersonian stories use individual models to carve out a personal identity rather than turn to group mores to ask how the individual might find his plot and place in some collective identity. Rorty argues that too many spend too much time worrying about the wrong things: What is our relation to that culture? Our ancestors climbed up a ladder which we are now in a position to throw away. We can throw it away not because we have reached a final resting place, but because we have different problems to solve than those which perplexed our ancestors. He suggests that the most interesting intellectual becomes familiar with as many language games and vocabularies as possible through reading novels, poetry, ethnographies, journalism and criticism. In fact, he contends that literary criticism has become the presiding intellectual discipline for those seeking moral advice beyond the universalizing temptations of philosophy and the moralizing tone of theology. He may observe how one story displaces a prior narrative in one context yet in another context supplements it. Rorty suggests that nothing can serve as a criticism of the temptation to stop at a final vocabulary except another such vocabulary. On the contrary, a thinker like Rorty is deeply committed to social hopes. It is holding a final vocabulary with a certain lightness of being, recognizing it is a strategic rather than a static source of moral advice. This is because the ironist has been also impressed by other quite different vocabularies taken as final, which she has encountered in people of character, in books and in art. It has replaced the social pragmatism

and poetic hopes of Emerson, Whitman and Dewey with dense and rather dogmatic theory. Much like the political right it has allowed cultural-identity politics to replace real politics. In part, this is because such excessive attention to identity-politics or cultural-politics almost always encourages a kind of tribalism and a diminished sense of public hope or real social compassion. It is more than mere tribalism or high theory that contributes to this problem, however. It is a refusal, Rorty suspects, to separate private yearnings and public hopes. For example, he notes that there is something too desirous of a kind of authenticity, perfection and purity in the yearnings of self-creating ironists like Nietzsche, Sartre and Foucault to ever be embodied in social institutions. Thus, he proposes that such personal yearnings for authenticity might better be privatized. Otherwise, these ironists in their work of self-creation might be tempted to slip into a political attitude which suggests there is some theoretical social goal more important than avoiding cruelty. According to Rorty, there is none. This brings us back to one of his most controversial claims, the idea that our private obsessions and our public hopes need not be neatly reconciled. He refers to this as the question of Trotsky and wild orchids. Even as a boy Dick Rorty had a deep concern for social justice. Yet he was precocious kid and loved many things, including wild orchids. He learned to identify, by their Latin names, the forty species of orchids that could be found in the mountains of the northeast. This personal obsession with rare, beautiful flowers made him feel uneasy because he doubted that Trotsky would approve of such a passionate interest and involvement that did nothing to ease human suffering. So at age fifteen he escaped the bullies who beat him up on the playground of his high school and entered the so-called Hutchins College of the University of Chicago with a philosophical problem on his mind: This problem occupied him personally and professionally for the next twenty years and displayed itself in various thought experiments and proposals. Finally, he reached the conclusion for which he is now famous in some circles, infamous in others. We need not harmonize the personal and the public. This is not to suggest that at times the personal and the public cannot and do not come together in satisfying ways.

Chapter 4 : Trump And The Sacred - Social Matter

When we venerate the Sacred Heart of Jesus, we call to mind His exceeding great love for us, and are stimulated to return love for love. God made use of a French nun at Paray-le-Monial, named Margaret Mary Alacoque, to propagate this devotion.

For against the rest of the contents of the "Lover of Truth" Philalethes, for so he has thought fit to entitle his work against us, it would be useless to take my stand at present; because they are not his own, but have been pilfered in the most shameless manner, not only I may say in respect of their ideas, but even of their words and syllables, from other authorities. Not but what these parts also of his treatise call for their refutation in due season; but to all intents and purposes they have, even in advance of any special work that might be written in answer to them, been upset and exposed beforehand in a work which in p. To this work of Origen I must refer those who in good faith and with genuine "love of truth" desire accurately to understand my own position. I will therefore ask you for the present to confine your attention to the comparison of Jesus Christ with Apollonius which is found in this treatise called the "Lover of Truth," without insisting on the necessity of our meeting the rest of his arguments, for these are pilfered from other people. We may reasonably confine our attention for the present to the history of Apollonius, because Hierocles, of all the writers who have ever attacked us, stands alone in selecting Apollonius, as he has recently done, for the purposes of comparison and contrast with our Saviour. II CHAP II Hierocles blames the deifying of Jesus I need not say with what admiring approval he attributes his thaumaturgic feats not to the tricks of wizardry, but to a divine and mysterious wisdom; and he believes they were truly what he supposes them to have been, though he advances no proof of this contention. Listen then to his very words: It was in order that you may be able to contrast our own accurate and well-established judgment on each point, with the easy credulity of the Christians. For whereas we reckon him who wrought such feats not a god, but only a man pleasing to the gods, they on the strength of a few miracles proclaim their Jesus a god. III Sources of Life of Apollonius Now Damis who spent so much of his time with Apollonius was a native of Assyria, where for the first time, on his own soil, he came into contact with him; and he wrote an account of his intercourse with the person in question from that time onwards. Maximus however wrote quite a short account of a portion only of his career. IV Inferior role accomplished by Apollonius If then we may be permitted to contrast the reckless and easy credulity which he goes out of his way to accuse us of, with the accurate and well-founded judgment on particular points of the "Lover of Truth," let us ask at once, not which of them was the more divine nor in what capacity one worked more wondrous and numerous miracles than the other; nor let us lay stress on the point that our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ was the only man of p. To look for such results in the case of Apollonius, or even to ask about them, is absurd. So we will merely examine the work of Philostratus, and by close scrutiny of it show that p. For such is his description of Philostratus the Athenian among others. In this way we shall easily appreciate the value of the rest of the authorities, who though, according to him, they were most highly educated, yet never by actual sifting of the facts, established them with any accuracy in the case of Apollonius. For when we have thoroughly examined these facts, we shall no doubt obtain a clear demonstration of the solidity and, as he imagines to himself, of the accuracy in detail of the condemnation which the "Lover of Truth," who has at the same time taken possession of the supreme courts all over the province, passes on Christians, and at the same time of what they are pleased to call our reckless and facile credulity, for we are accounted by them to be mere foolish and deluded mortals. V The laws of Nature Another controversialist, by way of beginning the affray, would without demur abuse and malign the man against whom he directed his arguments, on the ground that he was his enemy and adversary; I, however, my friend, used to regard the man of Tyana as having been, humanly speaking, a kind of sage, and I am still freely disposed to adhere to this p. If anyone wishes to class him with any philosopher you like, and to forget all the legends about him and not bore me with them, I am quite agreeable. Not so if anyone ventures, whether he be Damis the Assyrian, or Philostratus, or any other compiler or chronicler, to overleap the bounds of humanity and transcend philosophy, and while repelling the charge of wizardry in word, yet to bind it in act rather than in name upon

the man, using the mask of Pythagorean discipline to disguise what he really was. Do you ask me what I mean and what are my reasons for speaking thus? I will tell you. There are bounds of nature which prescribe and circumscribe the existence of the universe in respect of its beginnings and of its continuance and of its end, being limits and rules imposed on everything. By these this entire mechanism and edifice of the whole universe is constantly being brought to perfection; and they are arranged by unbreakable laws and indissoluble bonds, and they guard and observe the all-wise will of a Providence which dispenses and disposes all things. Now no one can change or alter the place and order of anything that has been once p. In this way then the mortal race of men, while provided with soul and body, is yet circumscribed by divine bounds. Consequently he can never traverse the air with his body, however much he scorns to linger upon the paths of earth, without instantly paying the penalty of his folly; nor by spiritual exaltation can he in his thinking attain to the unattainable, without falling back into the disease of melancholy. It is wisest then for him, on the one hand to transport his body along the ground with the feet given him for the purpose, and on the other hand to sustain his soul with education and philosophy. But he may well pray that some one may come to Possibility of a Saviour descending to earth. For the following is a valid example to use: It follows then that there is no reason to prevent a divine nature, being beneficent and inclined to save and take providential care of things to come, from associating itself with men, for this is allowed also by the rule of divine providence; for according to Plato God was good, and no good being can ever feel any jealousy of any thing. It follows that the controller of this universe, being good, will not care for our bodies alone, but much more for our souls, upon which he has conferred the privilege of immortality and free-will. On these then, as lord of the entire economy and of gifts of grace his bestowal of which will benefit our nature, he will, they being able to appreciate his bounty, bestow plenteously an illumination as it were of the light which streams from him, and will despatch the most intimate of his own messengers from time to time, for the salvation and succour of men here below. Of these messengers anyone so favoured by fortune, having cleansed his understanding and dissipated the mist of mortality, may well be described as truly divine, and as carrying in his soul the image of some great god. Surely so great a personality will stir up the entire human race, and illuminate the world of mankind more brightly than the sun, and will leave the effects of his eternal divinity for the contemplation of future ages, in no less a degree affording an example of the divine and inspired nature than creations of artists p. To this extent then human nature can participate in the super-human; but otherwise it cannot lawfully transcend its bounds, nor with its wingless body emulate the bird, nor being a man must one meddle with what appertains to demons. VII Was Apollonius a divine being? In what light then, this being so, do you envisage for us Apollonius, my good compiler? If as a divine being and superior to a philosopher, in a word as one superhuman in his nature, I would ask you to keep to this point of view throughout your history, and to point me out effects wrought by his divinity enduring to this day. For surely it is an absurdity that the works of carpenters and builders should last on ever so long after the craftsmen are dead, and raise as it were an immortal monument to the memory of their constructive ability; and yet that a human character claimed to be divine should, after shedding its glory upon mankind, finish in darkness its short-lived career, instead of displaying for ever its power and excellence. Instead of being so niggardly liberal to some one individual like Damis and to a few other short-lived men, it should surely make its coming among us the occasion of blessings, conferred on myriads not only of his contemporaries, but also of his posterity. If on the other hand you attribute to this man a mortal nature, take care lest by endowing him with gifts which transcend mortality, you convict yourself of fallacy and miscalculation. VIII But enough of this. His hero is introduced to us as a divine man, who assumes from birth the guise and personality of a demon of the sea. For he says that to his mother when she was about to bear her child, there appeared the figure of a demon of the sea, namely Proteus, who in the story of Homer ever changes his form. But she, in no way frightened, asked him what she would bring to birth; and he replied: But a little further on in the same history the represents Apollonius as using, in token of his being of a divine nature these very words to Damis himself: We learn, in a word, that he was born superior to mankind in p. Anyhow on one occasion after he had loosed himself from his bonds, his historian adds the remark: Naturally if he was so great as he is described in the above, he may be said "to have wooed philosophy in a more divine manner than Pythagoras, or Empedocles, or Plato. IX If Apollonius was divine

why did he need schooling? Well, we will not grudge him his natural and self-taught gift of understanding all languages. But if he possessed it, why was he taken to a school-master, and if he had never learnt any language whatever, why does his historian malign him and declare that, not by nature, but by dint of close study and application, he acquired the Attic dialect? For he tells us outright "that as he advanced in youth he displayed a knowledge of letters and great power of memory, and force of application, and that he spoke the Attic dialect. That he also diligently listened to the doctrines of Epicurus, because he did not despise even them, though he grasped the teachings of Pythagoras with a certain indescribable wisdom. X He knew the language of animals And after an interval our author again expresses his admiration at the ease with which Apollonius understood the language of animals, and he goes on to tell us the following: For the Arabians have a way of understanding without difficulty swans and other birds when they presage the future in the same way as oracles. And they get to understand the dumb animals by eating, so they say, some of them the heart and others the liver of dragons. We must therefore add to the teachers whom we have already enumerated the sages of Arabia who taught him his knowledge of augury; and this no doubt inspired him subsequently to foretell what the sparrow meant when he called his fellows to a meal, and so to impress the bystanders with the idea that he had worked a mighty miracle. And in the same way when he saw the freshly-slain lioness with her eight whelps by the side of the road which led into Assyria, he immediately conjectured from what he saw the length of their future stay in Persia, and made a prophecy thereof.

Chapter 5 : DIONYSUS (Dionysos) - Greek God of Wine & Festivity (Roman Bacchus)

p. p. I. CHAP. I Most of the Philalethes already answered by Origen So then, my dear friend, you find worthy of no little admiration the parallel 1 which, embellished with many marvels, this author has drawn between the man of Tyana and our own Saviour and teacher.

House Bill , Contested election case of Eugene C. The article below was taken from the book Subterranean Rome by Charles Didier, translated from the French and published in New York in Alberto Rivera escaped from the Jesuit Order in , and he describes his Jesuit oath in exactly the same way as it appears in this book. After reading this, ask yourself the question: The meaning of which is: It is just to exterminate or annihilate impious or heretical Kings, Governments, or Rulers. Upon the floor is a red cross at which the postulant or candidate kneels. The Superior hands him a small black crucifix, which he takes in his left hand and presses to his heart, and the Superior at the same time presents to him a dagger, which he grasps by the blade and holds the point against his heart, the Superior still holding it by the hilt, and thus addresses the postulant: My son, heretofore you have been taught to act the dissembler: Among the Reformers, to be a reformer; among the Huguenots, to be a Huguenot; among the Calvinists, to be a Calvinist; among other Protestants, generally to be a Protestant, and obtaining their confidence, to seek even to preach from their pulpits, and to denounce with all the vehemence in your nature our Holy Religion and the Pope; and even to descend so low as to become a Jew among Jews, that you might be enabled to gather together all information for the benefit of your Order as a faithful soldier of the Pope. You have been taught to insidiously plant the seeds of jealousy and hatred between communities, provinces, states that were at peace, and incite them to deeds of blood, involving them in war with each other, and to create revolutions and civil wars in countries that were independent and prosperous, cultivating the arts and the sciences and enjoying the blessings of peace. To take sides with the combatants and to act secretly with your brother Jesuit, who might be engaged on the other side, but openly opposed to that with which you might be connected, only that the Church might be the gainer in the end, in the conditions fixed in the treaties for peace and that the end justifies the means. You have received all your instructions heretofore as a novice, a neophyte, and have served as co-adjurer, confessor and priest, but you have not yet been invested with all that is necessary to command in the Army of Loyola in the service of the Pope. You must serve the proper time as the instrument and executioner as directed by your superiors; for none can command here who has not consecrated his labors with the blood of the heretic; for "without the shedding of blood no man can be saved. John the Baptist, the holy Apostles St. Paul and all the saints and sacred hosts of heaven, and to you, my ghostly father, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, founded by St. I do now renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or state named Protestants or Liberals, or obedience to any of the laws, magistrates or officers. I do further declare that the doctrine of the churches of England and Scotland, of the Calvinists, Huguenots and others of the name Protestants or Liberals to be damnable and they themselves damned who will not forsake the same. I do further promise and declare, that I will have no opinion or will of my own, or any mental reservation whatever, even as a corpse or cadaver perinde ac cadaver , but will unhesitatingly obey each and every command that I may receive from my superiors in the Militia of the Pope and of Jesus Christ. That I may go to any part of the world withersoever I may be sent, to the frozen regions of the North, the burning sands of the desert of Africa, or the jungles of India, to the centers of civilization of Europe, or to the wild haunts of the barbarous savages of America, without murmuring or repining, and will be submissive in all things whatsoever communicated to me. Pope Francis took this oath!! That when the same cannot be done openly, I will secretly use the poisoned cup, the strangulating cord, the steel of the poniard or the leaden bullet, regardless of the honor, rank, dignity, or authority of the person or persons, whatever may be their condition in life, either public or private, as I at any time may be directed so to do by any agent of the Pope or Superior of the Brotherhood of the Holy Faith, of the Society of Jesus. In confirmation of which, I hereby dedicate my life, my soul and all my corporal powers, and with this dagger which I now receive, I will subscribe my name written in my own blood, in testimony thereof; and should I prove false or weaken in my determination, may

my brethren and fellow soldiers of the Militia of the Pope cut off my hands and my feet, and my throat from ear to ear, my belly opened and sulphur burned therein, with all the punishment that can be inflicted upon me on earth and my soul be tortured by demons in an eternal hell forever! In the first place, you, as a Brother Jesuit, will with another mutually make the ordinary sign of the cross as any ordinary Roman Catholic would; then one crosses his wrists, the palms of his hands open, and the other in answer crosses his feet, one above the other; the first points with forefinger of the right hand to the center of the palm of the left, the other with the forefinger of the left hand points to the center of the palm of the right; the first then with his right hand makes a circle around his head, touching it; the other then with the forefinger of his left hand touches the left side of his body just below his heart; the first then with his right hand draws it across the throat of the other, and the latter then with a dagger down the stomach and abdomen of the first. The first then says Iustus; and the other answers Necar; the first Reges. The other answers Impious. You will then give and receive with him the following questions and answers: Question "From whither do you come? Answer "The Holy faith. To be as a corpse without any opinion or will of my own, but to implicitly obey my Superiors in all things without hesitation or murmuring. He who will not accept him as the Vicar of Jesus and his Vice-regent on earth, let him be accursed and exterminated.

Chapter 6 : Why I Believed: Reflections of a Former Missionary

Sacred Games is an Indian web television thriller series based on Vikram Chandra's novel of the same name. It is the first Netflix original series in India, it is directed by Vikramaditya Motwane and Anurag Kashyap, who produced it under their banner Phantom Films.

The early works agreed by textual authorities to be relatively reliable sources of biographical material are: Many of the stories found in these three sources as well as the legends surrounding Confucius at the end of the 2nd century were included in a biography of Confucius by the Han dynasty court historian, Sima Qian c. 100 AD. Nothing of certainty is known of his mother; she may have been a daughter of the Yan family. Confucius was born in the walled town of Zhou in the state of Lu in or in according to the earliest sources that preserve such information about him. If the year of his birth was 551 BC, the date most scholars favor, then, since that year was a gengxu year according to the traditional system of cyclical designations for years, Confucius was born under the sign of the dog. There are many important figures in early Chinese history about whose youth we know even less. We do not know how Confucius himself was educated, but tradition has it that he studied ritual with the fictional Daoist Master Lao Dan, music with Chang Hong, and the lute with Music-master Xiang. In his middle age Confucius is supposed to have gathered about him a group of disciples whom he taught and also to have devoted himself to political matters in Lu. When he entered the Grand Temple he asked about everything. The first of these has to do with Duke Jing of Qi. These are strong signals that in the eyes of the authors of the Zuo zhuan, Confucius was by this time in his life established as a person of significance in Lu. Meng Xizi went on, however, and declared that what another Lu nobleman named Zang Sunhe had once said was true in the case of Confucius: In Duke Zhao of Lu moved against the head of the most powerful and the wealthiest of the families: According to Sima Qian, when Duke Zhao was first forced into exile, Confucius also went to Qi to serve as a retainer in the household of the nobleman Gao Zhaozi. He was no doubt commenting on politics in Qi where, as was also the case in Lu, power rested not in the hands of the ruler but instead in the hands of the powerful ministerial families who were supposed to serve him. And it seems that back home in Lu he was fairs poorly in locating employment. So noteworthy was this failure that a passage in the Analects comments on it: Be friendly toward your brothers and extend this to governing. Why must one be in office to govern? As noted earlier, what mattered to the Confucius of the Analects was not winning an official position but remaining faithful to the moral behavior he valued. The Zuo zhuan confirms that he held the post starting sometime around 500 BC. Given what one might expect a director of crime to do to enforce the law and impose corporal punishments on those found guilty of crime, it is odd to think that Confucius served in the role given his famous opposition to the use of fines and punishments, dismissing them as ineffective and counterproductive in governing people: Perhaps the claims that Confucius served as director of crime are fictional. Perhaps he did serve in the role and learned from the experience the ineffectiveness of punishment in maintaining order in society. Or perhaps the Analects passage is an interpolation, something Confucius himself never said, added by a branch of his school that wanted to represent their master as strongly opposed to legalistic measures in spite of his having served as a law enforcement officer in Lu. To formalize a peace agreement between Lu and Qi, the rulers of the two states met at Jiagu and signed an oath promising to abide by certain terms and conditions lest they be harshly dealt with by the gods and spirits. The Confucius of the Zuo zhuan is shown as adroit and skilful in dealing with these dangerous circumstances. However, the Meng family simply refused to tear down the walls that protected their family fortress at Cheng. Duke Ding led an army to lay siege to Cheng and level its walls but he failed to do so and his weakness and ineptitude were made all the more obvious by this failure. It seems rather that, at least according to the Zuo zhuan, his disciple Zi Lu, in the employ of the Ji family, played a more significant part. Whatever the case may be, in the stories that follow this dramatic tale, Confucius, along with Zi Lu and other disciples, departed Lu late in the year and went into exile. In the company of his disciples, Confucius travelled in the states of Wei, Song, Chen, Cai, and Chu, purportedly looking for a ruler who might employ him but meeting instead with indifference and, occasionally, severe hardship and danger. Later on, in the state of Song, Confucius just

barely escaped with his life from an attack by Marshal Huan, a formidable Song nobleman, who for unknown reasons was intent on killing him. Both passages are meant to suggest that Confucius found the duke lacking in virtue and learning. Followers fell ill and none was able to rise to his feet. Confucius is drawing the distinction when all were in straitened circumstances and as such his words should be read as a pointed reminder to Zi Lu and the other disciples traveling with him at the time that, in spite of the difficulties they were facing, they should adhere to the highest standards of ethical behavior. Either inspired by this story or informed by tales and traditions that are lost to us, a passage in the *Mozi*—a text that preserves a political and social philosophy greatly at odds with the teachings of Confucius and the *Ru* school—claims that Confucius, who had a reputation for being scrupulous about his meals, ate pork given him by Zi Lu even though he had reason to believe that Zi Lu had stolen it. While he had some interaction with the head of the Ji family as well as with the reigning Lu ruler, Duke Ai, Confucius appears to have spent the remainder of his life teaching, putting in order the *Book of Songs*, the *Book of Documents*, and other ancient classics, as well as editing the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, the court chronicle of Lu. Our best source for understanding Confucius and his thought is the *Analects*. While none of us comes to such an enterprise without deep-laid assumptions about necessary logical relations and compatibilities, we should at least hold before ourselves the constant injunction to mistrust all our unexamined preconceptions on these matters when dealing with comparative thought. Some have argued that these passages were originally more general prescriptions on how a gentleman should dress and behave that were relabelled as descriptions of Confucius. Traditionally, Book X has been regarded as providing an intimate portrait of Confucius and has been read as a biographical sketch. The following passages provide a few examples of why, more generally, it is difficult to glean from the *Analects* a genuinely biographical, let alone intimate, portrait of the Master. Confucius, at home in his native village, was simple and unassuming in manner, as though he did not trust himself to speak. But when in the ancestral temple or at Court he speaks readily, though always choosing his words with due caution. When the ruler is present he is wary, but not cramped. If he halts, it must never be in the middle of the gate, nor in going through does he ever tread on the threshold. He must change his food and also the place where he commonly sits. He does not object to his rice being thoroughly cleaned, nor to his meat being finely minced. By the fourth century, Confucius was recognized as a unique figure, a sage who was ignored but should have been recognized and become a king. Indeed chapters twenty-eight to thirty of the *Xunzi*, which some have argued were not the work of Xunzi but compilations by his disciples, look like an alternative, and considerably briefer, version of the *Analects*. Confucius and his followers also inspired considerable criticism from other thinkers. The anecdote quoted earlier from the *Mozi* is an example. The authors of the *Zhuangzi* took particular delight in parodying Confucius and the teachings conventionally associated with him. We can do little or nothing to alter our fated span of existence but we determine what we accomplish and what we are remembered for. Confucius represented his teachings as lessons transmitted from antiquity. Confucius pointed especially to the precedents established during the height of the royal Zhou roughly the first half of the first millennium BCE. Certainly his claim that there were antique precedents for his ideology had a tremendous influence on subsequent thinkers many of whom imitated these gestures. But we should not regard the contents of the *Analects* as consisting of old ideas. Much of what Confucius taught appears to have been original to him and to have represented a radical departure from the ideas and practices of his day. Confucius also claimed that he enjoyed a special and privileged relationship with Heaven and that, by the age of fifty, he had come to understand what Heaven had mandated for him and for mankind. Confucius was also careful to instruct his followers that they should never neglect the offerings due Heaven. Rather they show that Confucius revered and respected the spirits, thought that they should be worshipped with utmost sincerity, and taught that serving the spirits was a far more difficult and complicated matter than serving mere mortals. This meant being sure to avoid artful speech or an ingratiating manner that would create a false impression and lead to self-aggrandizement. For Confucius, such concern for others is demonstrated through the practice of forms of the Golden Rule: Central to all ethical teachings found in the *Analects* of Confucius is the notion that the social arena in which the tools for creating and maintaining harmonious relations are fashioned and employed is the extended family. Among the various ways in which social divisions could have been drawn, the most important were the vertical lines that bound

multigenerational lineages. And the most fundamental lessons to be learned by individuals within a lineage were what role their generational position had imposed on them and what obligations toward those senior or junior to them were associated with those roles. In the world of the Analects, the dynamics of social exchange and obligation primarily involved movement up and down along familial roles that were defined in terms of how they related to others within the same lineage. But the extended family was at the center of these other hierarchies and could be regarded as a microcosm of their workings. The Mohists shared with Confucius and his followers the goal of bringing about effective governance and a stable society, but they constructed their ethical system, not on the basis of social roles, but rather on the self or, to be more precise, the physical self that has cravings, needs, and ambitions. The Confucian emphasis on social role rather than on the self seems to involve, in comparison to the Mohist position, an exaggerated emphasis on social status and position and an excessive form of self-centeredness. While the Mohist love of self is also of course a form of self-interest, what distinguishes it from the Confucian position is that the Mohists regard self-love as a necessary means to an end, not the end in itself, which the Confucian pride of position and place appears to be. The Mohist program called for a process by which self-love was replaced by, or transformed into, impartial love—the unselfish and altruistic concern for others that would, in their reckoning, lead to an improved world untroubled by wars between states, conflict in communities, and strife within families. Confucius taught that the practice of altruism he thought necessary for social cohesion could be mastered only by those who have learned self-discipline. Learning self-restraint involves studying and mastering *li*, the ritual forms and rules of propriety through which one expresses respect for superiors and enacts his role in society in such a way that he himself is worthy of respect and admiration. A concern for propriety should inform everything that one says and does: Look at nothing in defiance of ritual, listen to nothing in defiance of ritual, speak of nothing in defiance of ritual, never stir hand or foot in defiance of ritual. Confucius and many of his followers teach that it is by experiencing desires that we learn the value of social strictures that make an ordered society possible. See Lunyu 2. Confucius taught, on the contrary, that if one did not possess a keen sense of the well-being and interests of others his ceremonial manners signified nothing. He sacrificed to the spirits as if the spirits were present. It seems apparent that in his own day, however, advocates of more legalistic methods were winning a large following among the ruling elite. Most troubling to Confucius was his perception that the political institutions of his day had completely broken down. He attributed this collapse to the fact that those who wielded power as well as those who occupied subordinate positions did so by making claim to titles for which they were not worthy. I should claim for myself only a title that is legitimately mine and when I possess such a title and participate in the various hierarchical relationships signified by that title, then I should live up to the meaning of the title that I claim for myself. Elsewhere in the Analects, Confucius says to his disciple Zilu that the first thing he would do in undertaking the administration of a state is *zhengming*. But for Xunzi the term referred to the proper use of language and how one should go about inventing new terms that were suitable to the age. Confucius believed that this sort of rectification had to begin at the very top of the government, because it was at the top that the discrepancy between names and actualities had originated. In a conversation with Ji Kangzi who had usurped power in Lu, Confucius advised: The moral character of the ruler is the wind; the moral character of those beneath him is the grass. He disparages those who have faith in natural understanding or intuition and argues that the only real understanding of a subject comes from long and careful study. Study, for Confucius, means finding a good teacher and imitating his words and deeds. A good teacher is someone older who is familiar with the ways of the past and the practices of the ancients. He never discourses at length on a subject. Instead he poses questions, cites passages from the classics, or uses apt analogies, and waits for his students to arrive at the right answers. Confucius finds himself in an age in which values are out of joint. Actions and behavior no longer correspond to the labels originally attached to them. Moral education is important to Confucius because it is the means by which one can rectify this situation and restore meaning to language and values to society. He believes that the most important lessons for obtaining such a moral education are to be found in the canonical Book of Songs, because many of its poems are both beautiful and good.

Chapter 7 : Things of Sacred Power | racedaydvl.com

Dionysos was a son of Zeus, King of the Gods, and Semele, a mortal princess of Thebes. The god was known as the "twice-born" for his mother was slain by the lightning-bolts of Zeus during the course of her pregnancy, but rescued by his father who carried him to term sown up inside his thigh.

Foreword by Guy P. Daniels has produced a powerful work that will give Christian readers much to think about. Reflections of a Former Missionary is an important book that should be widely read. As a former fundamentalist Christian missionary who devoted far more time and energy than most to serving that religion, he obviously remembers what it feels like to be fully immersed in belief. Fortunately, Daniels has retained plenty of sympathy for those who cannot yet see that the supernatural claims of Christianity cannot stand up to honest scrutiny. This brilliant book is not a vicious attack on Christians. It is a strong but polite plea for them to see and hear new ideas, to consider the possibility that their belief system might be a mistake. Daniels maintains a humble tone throughout the book. He does not blast believers with arrogant claims of intellectual superiority on the question of faith. He simply shares thoughts and questions about his journey through Christianity and escape from it. This is a powerful story and Daniels has many piercing ideas that are likely to carry considerable weight with believers because of his difficult work as a missionary in Africa. Daniels earned his stripes as a committed Christian. He went way beyond the easy life of a casual Christian sitting in a pew on Sunday mornings. He lived his Christianity; he made serious commitments and followed through with sacrifices for his religion. For someone like him to walk away from it, with great reluctance, humility, and no rage says a lot. It gives Daniels tremendous credibility. Daniels is well read and obviously knowledgeable about Christianity. Most importantly, however, he has retained a sense of respect and compassion for believers. Yes, he thinks they are wrong about their religious claims, but he has not turned his back on them as fellow humans. It is likely that many Christians will struggle to reconcile the wisdom and challenges found within Why I Believed with their own beliefs. Daniels walked the walk, believing and serving with far more sincerity and dedication than most believers do. I invite Christian readers to consider the possibility that my apostasy is a result not of divine or diabolical deception but of a simple weighing of the evidence. It might be that I am wrong. It might be that I have not sought God sufficiently or studied the Bible thoroughly enough or listened carefully enough to the many Christians who have admonished me. But the knowledge that billions of seekers have lived and died, calling out to God for some definitive revelation without ever receiving it, or receiving revelation that conflicts with the revelation others have found, contributes to my suspicion that there is no personal God who reveals himself to anyone. This is a book I will give to Christians because it is forceful and devastating to their irrational beliefs without belittling or mocking them. That Daniels is able to make such a powerful case against Christianity is impressive enough; that he is able to do it without drifting into attacks and name-calling makes Why I Believed an important book that should be read and discussed by both believers and nonbelievers. Wisdom and compassion shine through on many pages of this book. The author clearly wants nothing more than a more rational and peaceful world. He does not seem interested in battering believers with a heavy club of merciless skepticism. Most believers are not prepared to travel as far as I have from my former position as a fundamentalist believer. I implore such readers to consider a middle ground, one that acknowledges both the virtues and vices of the scriptures, as millions of moderate and liberal believers already do. Likewise, the world would be a better place if fundamentalist Christians could frankly acknowledge the good, the bad, and the ugly in their own scriptural tradition, whether or not they end up abandoning their faith outright. I love the honesty of Why I Believed. Daniels does not cherry pick by pointing out everything silly and negative about Christianity. In fact, he admits to missing some things about his days as a believer: I regret the loss of the almost automatic acceptance I enjoyed on the part of those who belonged with me to the same community of faith, the same church, the same missionary society. There is no sugarcoating the reality that secularists in general do not enjoy the same benefits of a warm community that committed believers typically do. I see the safety net and fellowship of the church, coupled with the lack thereof outside the church, as one of the most important impediments to the growth of free thought. Yes,

Christians are likely to struggle with this book and find their beliefs on shaky ground, for it packs a mighty combination punch of honesty, reason, and kindness. Harrison Preface What would you do if you had a sneaking suspicion, and then a growing fear, that your most cherished beliefs about God and the universe were built on sinking sand? What would you do if you wanted to know the truth about something but were devastated by what you learned upon further investigation—that, for example, your spouse was cheating on you, that your son was committing sex crimes, or that your trusted business partner was stealing from you? What if you came to realize that everything you sincerely believed and wanted to be true was false? What would you do? This book is the story of what happened as the foundation of my faith turned to quicksand beneath my feet. In this volume I present in some detail the problems I encountered with the claims of Christianity while serving as an evangelical missionary in Africa. I am well aware of the risks of undertaking this project. It might lead to alienation from friends, family, and coworkers. But, for reasons I explain later, it is a risk I must take. I mean no ill will against anyone who reads this book and disagrees with my conclusions. I struggled throughout to maintain a balance between respecting my readers and calling a spade a spade. It is not my intent to offend. This book is not a treatise on the factors that have contributed to the rise of religion in human history, nor is it an attempt to explain why religion retains its appeal for the majority of humanity today. These broader questions are explored in works such as *Breaking the Spell*: My effort is a more limited retrospective on the reasons for my particular brand of Christian belief, as best as I can recall them. A note on style: I hope to speak both to friends and family and to the Christian community at large. One reviewer considered the style overly formal and wordy for friends and family. Another reviewer insisted I keep it the way it is in order to convey fully the breadth and depth of my reasons for leaving the faith. For now, I have retained a somewhat formal approach, but I may consider an abbreviated, informal and lighter version in the future. Whether or not you agree with my conclusions, I trust we as a society can ultimately succeed in carrying out a civil discourse among those who see the world in very different ways. I certainly do not expect most of you to be swayed by reading a single book unless you are already entertaining doubts, but for those of you who do begin a journey away from faith, I trust it will be for you an adventure full of pleasant surprises, even when mixed with inevitable conflict and pain. I wish to thank the many freethinkers and heretics who have gone before me, some of whom risked or lost their lives as a result of their break with the prevailing religious establishment. Many writers, both historical and modern, have contributed to my thinking, but I especially wish to acknowledge the influence of Thomas Paine, Robert Ingersoll, and Robert M. Price at critical junctures in my journey. I also wish to thank a closet deist missionary physician who reviewed the manuscript and provided many helpful corrections and suggestions. In addition, I am grateful for the detailed feedback Norman E. Anderson provided on four key chapters. That said, all views expressed in this manuscript are my own, and I take responsibility for any errors. Finally, I wish to thank my wife Charlene, who has faithfully loved me and stayed by my side despite our differences, and who for the most part! I have been told that if I had embraced a slightly different brand of Christianity, I could have avoided coming down this path. It is not only Christians who wonder why I have left the faith—I, too, have been puzzled by these questions: What is it about my nature that has led me down this road, while the vast majority of believers never take this turn, even though at times they are troubled by doubt? Yet at some point it occurred to me that I had been looking at my experience from the wrong perspective. If I was justified in jumping ship, then a more appropriate question to ask was why I ever believed in the first place. And why did I remain a believer for as long as I did? Like many believers, I was aware of puzzles in the Christian faith even in my youth. Given all these difficulties and many more, why did I not leave the faith earlier in my youth when I first became aware of these issues? Many recognize problems and unanswered questions in their faith yet persist in believing as I did for years. This is no doubt due to overriding considerations that make belief appear attractive or true despite its difficulties. Throughout this book I will critically explore some of the most important reasons I delayed my exit from the faith. Many evangelicals cite these same factors as anchors for their faith. In short, I will use for my starting point not the problems and contradictions of Christianity per se, but the reasons most commonly advanced for believing. In so doing, I will also take the opportunity to demonstrate that many of these arguments turn out to be liabilities rather than assets for faith. My purpose for writing I am

not naive enough to expect that most who read this book will abandon the faith they hold dear, but I do hope to convince my readers that many of us who walk away have not done so out of a rebellious, juvenile whim, but rather out of a careful weighing of the reasons for and against our former faith. Our decision, far from being "sad," as many of my friends and family perceive it, represents a move from unquestioning acceptance of tradition to a spirit of openness and adventure that pursues the evidence wherever it leads. We left in pursuit of truth. Many books have been written along these lines, a number of which contributed to my own journey away from faith. So do I have something significant to add to what these books have already offered? My desire is to present the seldom-heard perspective of one whose life was formerly defined for decades by his commitment to Jesus and who continues to live successfully with family and friends who retain that commitment. This book brings together in one place the most important factors contributing to my particular journey away from faith. My reasons for taking up this cause are quite personal. The great majority of my family members, both immediate and extended, are committed evangelical Christians, and I have no desire to sever my family ties over our religious differences. This puts me in a bind: If I could patch things up by forcing myself to believe again, I would do so in a heartbeat. Unfortunately I have tried that several times, only to be besieged again by doubt, and have come to the conclusion that attempting to will myself to believe that which in my heart I do not believe is futile. In this struggle I am not alone; millions of others have passed through the valley of the shadow of doubt, finding themselves unable to return to the pastures of faith, despite repeated appeals to God to restore their faith. We have prayed more times than we can count, "I do believe; help me overcome my unbelief! This book is my effort to undertake option d , the others having proven unviable or unsatisfactory.

Chapter 8 : 'Hearts on Fire' - The Solemnity of the most Sacred Heart of Jesus | Pathways to God

During the lifetime of the Prophet Joseph Smith, the story of his First Vision was told in print several times, by him (in , , , and), or by others who had heard his account and retold it (in , , , and).

Published on 20 Mar Introduction This novena is for the nine days leading to the Feast of the Sacred Heart, which falls this year on Friday 8th June. You may pray the novena privately, in your family, in a parish group or with your neighbours or friends. Read the Scripture passage on the image and the meditation slowly, pausing when something strikes you. A short prayer follows, which takes up the theme of the day, and you end with the Novena Prayer. So, what does this feast mean to us today? We are made for love. How we all long to love and to be loved. What could show it? Above their bed was this lovely little statue of a rather fat-bellied man, with rosy cheeks and the biggest of smiles. It was, of course, an image of the Cross. A Heart For Us Reflection: Jesus came on earth for us, lived, suffered and died for us; intercedes today with his Father for us. Lord Jesus, I thank you that you gave your life for me. Help me to live for you and for others. End with the Novena Prayer: Lord Jesus Christ, your heart was moved with love for the men and women who came for help in their need. You healed the sick, you fed the hungry, you forgave sinners, you cried over Jerusalem. Above all, you showed to those who were prepared to listen the way to true life, for you are the Way the Truth and the Life. Lord, your heart is still moved today by your people and their many needs. Open our hearts to hear your word, to accept your love, and to respond to your call. In particular, I beg you to grant me the favour I ask during this novena make you request silently , provided that it will contribute to my own eternal good and to the building up of your Kingdom of justice, peace and love here on earth. Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, I place all my trust in you. A Forgiving Heart Reflection: After all Jesus has been through: We can only sit or kneel in silence letting gratitude well up from within. Lord Jesus, I am too small, too weak to grasp your love. I am overwhelmed by your love that transformed evil by goodness. A goodness strong enough to defeat the spiral of violence. Help us, Lord, weak as we are, to unite our efforts to yours, so that so much that is good and joyful in life is not lost. A Docile Heart Reflection: How inspiring that Jesus himself is docile to the Holy Spirit. No, he waits to be led, to be inspired by the Holy Spirit. That involved getting up before dawn and going off to lonely places to be alone with his Father so that silence in his heart could be in tune with the Holy Spirit. We too have received the Holy Spirit to guide our decisions. It is good to take time with the Lord and to ask for guidance to see whether the Spirit brings a sense of peace. Lord, enlighten our minds to make good decisions, free from resistance, fear and self-preoccupation. May all we do give glory to God and be of service to others. A Childlike Heart Reflection: These words of Jesus may have fallen on deaf ears! Some did not understand that the dependency of children on their parents mirrored the dependency of us all on God. The Lord awaits our free response. There is no forcing, only a love that beckons and that never tires. Lord, all I am and have is your gift. Help me learn from the spontaneity of children. Lord, grant me a childlike heart to allow you a free hand to create ever new possibilities for me even as I age. A Peace-Giving Heart Reflection: What relief and joy these words must have given to the eleven having deserted him during the Passion. Words that freed them from their guilt at having left him. Jesus gently restores them to his friendship. Now that Jesus has forgiven them, they too can forgive themselves and be forgiving to others. Admission of our own failings is the beginning of compassion. Jesus, Prince of Peace, I do want to be at peace: Jesus give me the courage to be a peace maker. A Union of Hearts Reflection: Mary with her feminine sensitivity knows that Jesus would not want their hosts to be embarrassed. Whatever her Son does will be best; she trusts him unreservedly. She is not to be disappointed. What he does is beyond anything she could have dreamed of. Mary, my mother, attune my heart to the heart of your Son. Open my heart to the needs of others. O Sacred Heart of Jesus, I place my trust in you. A Merciful Heart Reflection: This story is more about the prodigal Father than the prodigal son! Jesus reveals what his father is like. Which of us has not gone our own way or misused our gifts? Our heavenly Father is continually watching out for us, longing for our return, so he can clasp us in his arms. Lord Jesus, may I never doubt your patience with me. Give me the courage to experience the joy of receiving your forgiveness in the Sacrament of Reconciliation. A Unifying Heart Reflection: Rows in families, fallings out

between friends, prejudice between groups, wars between nations are all signs of the absence of the Spirit. How much pain people endure today! The Spirit works to reconcile and build bridges but through the patience of others who seek to build up the community locally or nationally. Lord, in our world of fragile relations where prejudice easily substitutes for knowledge, grant us the courage to welcome the outsider and to move beyond peer pressure. Help us to be ready to receive the Spirit at work. A Welcoming Heart Reflection: We still welcome others with that little word: Rest, yes, but friendship unlike any other. Be still and imagine the Lord calling your name and saying to you:

Chapter 9 : Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus

The wise man trusts in his wisdom, the strong man in his strength, the rich man in his riches; but this trusting in God is the most foolish thing in the world." The reasons of it are -- Verse 6.

He was depicted as either an older, bearded god or an effeminate, long-haired youth. His attributes included the thyrsos a pine-cone tipped staff , a drinking cup and a crown of ivy. He was usually accompanied by a troop of Satyrs and Mainades wild female devotees. Bound by oath, the god was forced to comply and she was consumed by the heat of his lightning-bolts. Zeus recovered their unborn child from her body, sewed him up in his own thigh, and carried him to term. As punishment, the god inflicted him with madness causing him to murder his wife and son and mutilate himself with an axe. However, some shepherds, upon drinking the wine, thought they had been poisoned and killed him. The sorrowful god then set him amongst the stars as the constellation Bootes. The god infested their ship with phantoms of creeping vines and wild beasts, and in terror the men leapt overboard and were transformed into dolphins. His other attributes included a drinking-cup kantharos , fruiting grapevines and a panther. The god was usually clothed in a long robe chiton and cloak himation and crowned with a wreath of ivy-leaves. Below are some examples of his attributes as depicted in ancient Greek art: Pine-cone staff thyrsos ; 2. The god rode on the back of a panther or drove a chariot drawn by a pair of the beasts. His sacred plants were the grapevine, ivy, bindweed prickly ivy and pine tree. Devotees of the god wore wreaths of ivy and carried pine-cone tipped staffs. COM This site contains a total of 14 pages describing the god, including general descriptions, mythology, and cult. The content is outlined in the Index of Dionysus Pages left column or below. Cicero De Natura Deorum 3. The god was known as the "twice-born" for his mother was slain by the lightning-bolts of Zeus during the course of her pregnancy, but rescued by his father who carried him to term sown up inside his thigh. He married Ariadne, daughter of King Minos of Krete Crete , and their sons became kings and princes of the best wine-producing regions in ancient Greece. He is also called both by Greeks and Romans Bacchus Bakchos , that is, the noisy or riotous god, which was originally a mere epithet or surname of Dionysus, but does not occur till after the time of Herodotus. Ammon there entrusted the child to Nysa, the daughter of Aristaeus, and Athena likewise undertook to protect the boy. Others again represent him as a son of Zeus by Persephone or Iris, or describe him simply as a son of Lethe, or of Indus. The same diversity of opinions prevails in regard to the native place of the god, which in the common tradition is Thebes, while in others we find India, Libya, Crete, Dracanium in Samos, Naxos, Elis, Eleutherae, or Teos, mentioned as his birthplace. It is owing to this diversity in the traditions that ancient writers were driven to the supposition that there were originally several divinities which were afterwards identified under the one name of Dionysus. The common story, which makes Dionysus a son of Semele by Zeus, runs as follows: Hera, jealous of Semele, visited her in the disguise of a friend, or an old woman, and persuaded her to request Zeus to appear to her in the same glory and majesty in which he was accustomed to approach his own wife Hera. When all entreaties to desist from this request were fruitless, Zeus at length complied, and appeared to her in thunder and lightning. Semele was terrified and overpowered by the sight, and being seized by the fire, she gave premature birth to a child. Zeus, or according to others, Hermes Apollon. Mastaura , who took the child to Ino and Athamas at Orchomenos, and persuaded them to bring him up as a girl. Hera was now urged on by her jealousy to throw Ino and Athamas into a state of madness, and Zeus, in order to save his child, changed him into a ram, and carried him to the nymphs of mount Nysa, who brought him up in a cave, and were afterwards rewarded for it by Zeus, by being placed as Hyades among the stars. The inhabitants of Brasiae, in Laconia, according to Pausanias iii. The chest was carried by the wind and waves to the coast of Brasiae. Semele was found dead, and was solemnly buried, but Dionysus was brought up by Ino, who happened at the time to be at Brasiae. The plain of Brasiae was, for this reason, afterwards called the garden of Dionysus. The traditions about the education of Dionysus, as well as about the personages who undertook it, differ as much as those about his parentage and birthplace. Mystis, moreover, is said to have instructed him in the mysteries Nonn. On mount Nysa, Bromie and Bacche too are called his nurses. Mount Nysa, from which the god was believed to have derived his name, was not only in Thrace and Libya, but

mountains of the same name are found in different parts of the ancient world where he was worshipped, and where he was believed to have introduced the cultivation of the vine. Hermes, however, is mixed up with most of the stories about the infancy of Dionysus, and he was often represented in works of art, in connexion with the infant god. When Dionysus had grown up, Hera threw him also into a state of madness, in which he wandered about through many countries of the earth. A tradition in Hyginus Poet. One of two asses he met there carried him across the water, and the grateful god placed both animals among the stars, and asses henceforth remained sacred to Dionysus. According to the common tradition, Dionysus first wandered through Egypt, where he was hospitably received by king Proteus. He now traversed all Asia. When he arrived at the Euphrates, he built a bridge to cross the river, but a tiger sent to him by Zeus carried him across the river Tigris. The most famous part of his wanderings in Asia is his expedition to India, which is said to have lasted three, or, according to some, even 52 years. He did not in those distant regions meet with a kindly reception everywhere, for Myrrhanus and Deriades, with his three chiefs Blemys, Orontes, and Oruandes, fought against him. But Dionysus and the host of Pans, Satyrs, and Bacchic women, by whom he was accompanied, conquered his enemies, taught the Indians the cultivation of the vine and of various fruits, and the worship of the gods; he also founded towns among them, gave them laws, and left behind him pillars and monuments in the happy land which he had thus conquered and civilized, and the inhabitants worshipped him as a god. Dionysus also visited Phrygia and the goddess Cybele or Rhea, who purified him and taught him the mysteries, which according to Apollodorus iii. With the assistance of his companions, he drove the Amazons from Ephesus to Samos, and there killed a great number of them on a spot which was, from that occurrence, called Panaema. According to another legend, he united with the Amazons to fight against Cronus and the Titans, who had expelled Ammon from his dominions. He is even said to have gone to Iberia, which, on leaving, he entrusted to the government of Pan. On his passage through Thrace he was ill received by Lycurgus, king of the Edones, and leaped into the sea to seek refuge with Thetis, whom he afterwards rewarded for her kind reception with a golden urn, a present of Hephaestus. All the host of Bacchantic women and Satyrs, who had accompanied him, were taken prisoners by Lycurgus, but the women were soon set free again. The country of the Edones thereupon ceased to bear fruit, and Lycurgus became mad and killed his own son, whom he mistook for a vine, or, according to others Serv. When this was done, his madness ceased, but the country still remained barren, and Dionysus declared that it would remain so till Lycurgus died. The Edones, in despair, took their king and put him in chains, and Dionysus had him torn to pieces by horses. After then proceeding through Thrace without meeting with any further resistance, he returned to Thebes, where he compelled the women to quit their houses, and to celebrate Bacchic festivals on mount Cithaeron, or Parnassus. Pentheus, who then ruled at Thebes, endeavoured to check the riotous proceedings, and went out to the mountains to seek the Bacchic women; but his own mother, Agave, in her Bacchic fury, mistook him for an animal, and tore him to pieces. After Dionysus had thus proved to the Thebans that he was a god, he went to Argos. As the people there also refused to acknowledge him, he made the women mad to such a degree, that they killed their own babes and devoured their flesh. According to another statement, Dionysus with a host of women came from the islands of the Aegean to Argos, but was conquered by Perseus, who slew many of the women. Afterwards, however, Dionysus and Perseus became reconciled, and the Argives adopted the worship of the god, and built temples to him. One of these was called the temple of Dionysus Cresius, because the god was believed to have buried on that spot Ariadne, his beloved, who was a Cretan. The last feat of Dionysus was performed on a voyage from Icaria to Naxos. He hired a ship which belonged to Tyrrhenian pirates; but the men, instead of landing at Naxos, passed by and steered towards Asia to sell him there. The god, however, on perceiving this, changed the mast and oars into serpents, and himself into a lion; he filled the vessel with ivy and the sound of flutes, so that the sailors, who were seized with madness, leaped into the sea, where they were metamorphosed into dolphins. In all his wanderings and travels the god had rewarded those who had received him kindly and adopted his worship: After he had thus gradually established his divine nature throughout the world, he led his mother out of Hades, called her Thyone, and rose with her into Olympus. The place, where he had come forth with Semele from Hades, was shown by the Troezenians in the temple of Artemis Soteira Paus. There is also a mystical story, that the body of Dionysus was cut up and thrown into a

cauldron by the Titans, and that he was restored and cured by Rhea or Demeter. Various mythological beings are described as the offspring of Dionysus; but among the women, both mortal and immortal, who won his love, none is more famous in ancient history than Ariadne. The extraordinary mixture of traditions which we have here had occasion to notice, and which might still be considerably increased, seems evidently to be made up out of the traditions of different times and countries, referring to analogous divinities, and transferred to the Greek Dionysus. We may, however, remark at once, that all traditions which have reference to a mystic worship of Dionysus, are of a comparatively late origin, that is, they belong to the period subsequent to that in which the Homeric poems were composed; for in those poems Dionysus does not appear as one of the great divinities, and the story of his birth by Zeus and the Bacchic orgies are not alluded to in any way: Dionysus is there simply described as the god who teaches man the preparation of wine, whence he is called the "drunken god" *mainomenos*, and the sober king Lycurgus will not, for this reason, tolerate him in his kingdom. As the cultivation of the vine spread in Greece, the worship of Dionysus likewise spread further; the mystic worship was developed by the Orphici, though it probably originated in the transfer of Phrygian and Lydian modes of worship to that of Dionysus. As far as the nature and origin of the god Dionysus is concerned, he appears in all traditions as the representative of some power of nature, whereas Apollo is mainly an ethical deity. Dionysus is the productive, overflowing and intoxicating power of nature, which carries man away from his usual quiet and sober mode of living. Wine is the most natural and appropriate symbol of that power, and it is therefore called "the fruit of Dionysus. Dionysus is, therefore, the god of wine, the inventor and teacher of its cultivation, the giver of joy, and the disperser of grief and sorrow. As the god of wine, he is also both an inspired and an inspiring god, that is, a god who has the power of revealing the future to man by oracles. Thus, it is said, that he had as great a share in the Delphic oracle as Apollo Eurip. The notion of his being the cultivator and protector of the vine was easily extended to that of his being the protector of trees in general, which is alluded to in various epithets and surnames given him by the poets of antiquity Paus. This character is still further developed in the notion of his being the promoter of civilization, a law-giver, and a lover of peace. As the Greek drama had grown out of the dithyrambic choruses at the festivals of Dionysus, he was also regarded as the god of tragic art, and as the protector of theatres. In later times, he was worshipped also as a *theos chthonios*, which may have arisen from his resemblance to Demeter, or have been the result of an amalgamation of Phrygian and Lydian forms of worship with those of the ancient Greeks. The orgiastic worship of Dionysus seems to have been first established in Thrace, and to have thence spread southward to mounts Helicon and Parnassus, to Thebes, Naxos, and throughout Greece, Sicily, and Italy, though some writers derived it from Egypt. Respecting his festivals and the mode of their celebration, and especially the introduction and suppression of his worship at Rome, see Dict. In the earliest times the Graces, or Charites, were the companions of Dionysus Pind. This circumstance is of great interest, and points out the great change which took place in the course of time in the mode of his worship, for afterwards we find him accompanied in his expeditions and travels by Bacchantic women. Sileni, Pans, satyrs, centaurs, and other beings of a like kind, are also the constant companions of the god. The temples and statues of Dionysus were very numerous in the ancient world. Among the sacrifices which were offered to him in the earliest times, human sacrifices are also mentioned. Subsequently, however, this barbarous custom was softened down into a symbolic scourging, or animals were substituted for men, as at Potniae. The animal most commonly sacrificed to Dionysus was a ram. Among the things sacred to him, we may notice the vine, ivy, laurel, and asphodel; the dolphin, serpent, tiger, lynx, panther, and ass; but he hated the sight of an owl.