

shih to undo his shoes, which the latter considered a great humiliation. Another day, Kao-Li-shih, hearing T'ai Chen Fei constantly humming the song, said: 'At first you seemed to dislike Li Po intensely, what has made you change your mind?' T'ai Chen Fei was startled by the question, and replied (as she really disliked Li Po): 'How is it that those Hanlin scholars insult people so?' Li-shih replied: 'In comparing you with Fei Yen, surely he has insulted you greatly.' T'ai Chen Fei thought that truly this was the case. It seemed that the Emperor had many times desired to confer upon Li Po an official title, but had always been prevented by the influence of the palace women. (And so intrigues were renewed against Li which bade fair to cost him his life.) But Li, in the course of his travels, had once visited Ping Chow, and there made the acquaintance of a local ruler of Fen Yang, at that time serving with the troops, and him he had rescued from a certain punishment, and greatly encouraged, so much so that he himself came near being involved in the same trouble. This man had now accomplished some meritorious work for which the Emperor was to reward him with certain dignities, but he came forward and asked that his reward should be the ransom of Li Po. To this the Emperor acceded, being thus enabled to save the poet. Such was Li Po's knowledge of men, and such was the ruler of Fen Yang's manner of requiting a kindness shown him."]

Cloud-like her garments, and her face a flower.
Spring zephyrs waft their fragrance through her bower.
Surely I saw her on Chun-yu's magic mount,
Or 'neath the glistening moon on Yao-tai tower.

A garland she, dew-drenched, rich, fragrant, fair.
Sadly the Wu-shan maids with her compare.
In what Han palace could you find her like?
'T was art that rounded Fei Yen's beauty rare.

Imperial flower and kingdom-conquering queen,
Both by the Emperor's smiling eyes are seen.
Ill-will, that wind-like blows, be far from here.
See; on the Chen Hsiang latticed fence they lean.

Note.—"Chun Yu mount," the hill of jade; "Yao tai tower," the jewelled tower; "Wu shan," the fairies' hill (all fabled, not real, places inhabited by beautiful women); "Han," the Han Dynasty, one of the emperors of which had a favorite named Fei Yen; "Chen Hsiang pavilion," a pavilion in the palace grounds at Chang-an, the T'ang capital.

"EVOLUTION OF THE DIVINE."

BY DR. JAMES G. TOWNSEND.

In addition to those incisive comments made by Dr. Carus on Mr. A. E. Bartlett's most suggestive study of a great theme, may I be permitted to add a few words of commendation and criticism? (See Mr. Bartlett's article in the June issue, and the editorial discussion entitled "The God-Problem.")

In the assertion that the mind must work in the circle of the "infinite and the eternal" Mr. Bartlett has made a brave plea for the sufficiency of the intellect to find a solution of the problems which confront it. "The universe

must submit itself to the critical review of the human intellect." He certainly is not in sympathy with that conventionalism which maintains that all the great religious generalizations have been made, all the fundamental things said. Indeed the knowledge we coordinate, the questions we ask, the ideas we conceive, the problems we assail are greater, nobler than any in the past.

Mr. Bartlett's theory is that the integrated soul of all, which Fechner calls "God," makes constant effort "to realize an ideal personality." And he says: "This ideal personality, which is the goal of evolution must also be looked upon as the potential *cause* of evolution." This looks very much like reasoning in a circle. And how does Mr. Bartlett know that the universe has sprung from a fundamental "force-entity"? And how can an unconscious, unintelligent "force-entity" have the passion for the "unfolding of an ideal personality"? And the question might be asked: Was there a time in the past eternity when this "force-entity" began to be?

Mr. Bartlett contends that this "force-entity" is possessed of "latent feeling, will and thought," and proves it by the "beneficence of nature," the prevalence of august moral laws, and the affirmation "that the creative essence hears our petitions because our aspirations invariably set in motion forces that gradually work out in our character the results for which we long" (a sentence that ought to be written everywhere in gold).

Now these contentions may be true, but if they are not the baldest anthropomorphism I do not know where to find it.

Undoubtedly many of our chief men of science no longer believe evolution to be the senseless raging of blind mechanical forces; they admit there is in nature something more or less psychical, a consciousness, an "impulse of progress," a ceaseless striving, a passion to produce a more perfect form, a "higher personality," some ever nobler goal. And with this view, that there is in the universe a divine element groping after law, order, beauty, truth, Mr. Bartlett is in accord; and he is so far a pluralist that he admits the divine is susceptible of growth, and that the universe may rise to self-comprehension in the human personality. As Professor Jacks intimates, our reasoning, our philosophy, may be one of the methods in which the absolute "becomes conscious of itself."

Mr. Bartlett further affirms that "if nature is evolving God, God must be already involved in nature." This assertion is very much like the arguments of the Catholic priests who thought they had demolished evolution by the phrase, *minus nequit gignere plus*. But men of science said there are increments not in the original substance, and Mr. Bartlett seems to imply this in his peroration. And why may not God meet new conditions, and find new problems awaiting him for solution?

Mr. Bartlett seems to think that evil "is not a reality but only an imperfect stage in development"; and Dr. Carus thoughtfully says: "Life is everywhere struggle and struggle is impossible without exertion, without conflict, without competition, without wounds, without occasional defeats."

But neither of them, in my judgment (I have not had the privilege of seeing *God an Enquiry and a Solution*) touch the heart of the awful problem. For evil is more than "imperfection" or "struggle." It is a black, pitiless, absolute, irremediable, degrading reality. I mean even something worse than the Martinique volcanoes or the cruelties of nature. Think of the millions of innocent children whose childhood, which ought to be pure and happy, is blighted! Think of the millions of peasants who because of foul conditions

and ignorance have lived for thousands of years in huts and hovels ankle deep in unnamable filth! Think of the millions who to-day live in the slums of the great cities!

Across the white page of Mr. Bartlett's "beneficence of nature" are these *black lines* of cruelty, ignorance, injustice, pollution and crime! And according to "monism" the absolute cannot be surprised, cannot be ignorant, cannot be mistaken. Then God is involved, implicated in his creation. According to "monism" the universe, or God, is one great conclusive entity outside of which is nothing. So evil must be an essential part of God. What then becomes of the divine goodness?

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

These comments on Mr. Bartlett's article have been received just as the Editor is leaving for Europe to attend the Universal Races Congress at London, July 25-29. Although we have not time to read them carefully we notice the last paragraph, and thinking that by the general term "monism" Dr. Townsend means to refer to our own views, we wish to urge that according to our conception of monism God is not an entity. We object to Dr. Townsend's identification of God and the universe. We repeat what we have said before, that God is that something, whatever it may be in the world, in the universe, in existence, which directs, helps, governs, rules it, and by the existence of which it becomes an orderly whole. God is that feature of existence which makes law possible, which produces reason, and through the prevalence of which rational beings develop; which makes man a human being, gives to him all his ideals, his rationality, his aspirations and the potentiality of rising higher and higher. This God-conception may frequently be called monotheism, and it is quite different from the old pantheism which identifies the universe with God. God is not the sum total of things; God is the law, the order, the governing principle which makes it possible that from physical forces the higher powers of rational and moral life can develop.

THE RT. REV. HIKKADUVE SUMANGALA. OBITUARY.

The Anagarika Dharmapala informs us of the demise of the venerable Hikkaduve Sumangala, the Buddhist high priest of Ceylon, in these words:

"Universally respected by the millions of Buddhists in Asia for his immaculate character and almost superhuman learning, the great and illustrious Buddhist Chief Priest, His Holiness Hikkaduve Sumangala, leaving thousands of scholarly pupils and the whole Buddhist world to mourn him, departed this world in his eighty-sixth year, on the morning of April 30 at the Oriental University at Colombo, Ceylon.

"Till the day of his passing away the late high priest was in good health, and never for a moment lost the spirit of cheerfulness which was an innate characteristic in him. European and American Orientalists held him in the highest personal esteem. Throughout the world of Oriental scholars there was none to excel this great gifted, self-sacrificing scholar. For nearly sixty years he was engaged in disseminating knowledge throughout the Buddhist world. In 1873 the principal Buddhists of Colombo invited him to take the presidential chair of the Oriental College founded by them, and since then he has been its devoted head.