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THE QUESTION OF TERMS
SIMPLIFIED.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

It has long appeared to me that the question of terms for God and Spirit in Chinese has been rendered ten-fold more complicated and difficult of settlement than it need be by the manner in which almost every writer has treated it. I by no means plead innocent in this respect. I have felt the temptation to discuss irrelevent topics, and raise side issues, to take advantage of a neighbour’s slip at one point, and run off into a dense fog at another, to play in fact at the game of terms, instead of simply trying to elucidate the question in the interests of truth.

Suggestions. At the outset I would throw out a few suggestions for our guidance, the propriety of which will be universally apparent. 1. Let us not raise side issues as if this momentous question were merely a game to be played out between you and me. I am nothing, and my party is nothing, in comparison with the truth in the matter before us. 2. Let us not settle the question by playing off one of our opponents against another, or by quoting one.
against himself. The *argumentum ad hominem* has been exhausted. We all err at times. 3. Let us not charge each other with dishonesty, or wilful blindness. It is not becoming. "Charity covereth a multitude of sins."

*Simplification.* The following are some of the ways in which it seems possible to simplify the Question of Terms. 1. A knowledge of "dead languages" is not necessary. Of course I do not mean that an extensive acquaintance with languages ancient and modern, and with Comparative Philology, would not be helpful, but to insist upon such qualifications is only to put off the settlement of the question indefinitely. 2. It is not necessary to read up Egyptian, Babylonian, Greek, Roman, and all other mythologies and cosmogonies. Whether Chinese notions and speech run parallel or contrary to those of any other nation on certain points may be left to be settled afterwards. 3. We may for the most part steer clear of the higher metaphysics, of ontology and the like, which only a small portion of mankind can enter upon with any satisfaction. 4. Questions as to the grammatical character of the word "God" in our mother-tongue, whether it is generic or particular, absolute or relative, which have puzzled the wisest heads, and still puzzle them, may be left alone. 5. The merits of the question do not turn upon the amount or prevalence of sound theological knowledge among the heathen Chinese. There may be found not a few persons in Christian countries who know little about God besides the name, and superstitious people too who worship images and saints. On the other hand the wisest of us, as Bishop Boone truly said, "can form but very inadequate concep-
tions of God." But through all the grades of knowledge, from the grossest ignorance up to the inspiration of an apostle, the name holds good for universal use. We may presume that, before the first sentence of the Bible was written, clear notions about creation were not generally prevalent; but we must also presume that among the people for whom it was written "Elohim" meant "God" even before they were aware that He "created the heavens and the earth."

6. Finally a good knowledge of our own Language, and of our English Bible, with sturdy Anglo-Saxon common sense, is all that is needed on the one-part, while on the other part the mind must be bent on Chinese only, without any foregone conclusions.

**Encouragement.** I am writing specially for missionaries, and my reason for writing at all just now is because my name has been put forward, without my consent, as a member of a committee on the Question. I write for younger men, at the request of several who take a deep interest in the subject. The older men I cannot presume to instruct. But to the young men who "are strong," I say, Come to the consideration of this subject free from foregone conclusions. Do not settle the question *a priori*; and do not suppose that it is settled for you. *It is not settled.* And it is a shame and a reproach to the whole missionary body that it remains as it is. Do not content yourselves with the trite remark that there is much to be said on both sides. This is only another device of the enemy for putting off the happy day of union. It is just as incumbent on the young man who arrives in the field to-day to set about settling this question, as it was incumbent on
Boone or Medhurst, Williams or Legge. That they and their contemporaries and successors did not settle it, and have not settled it, only makes apparent the necessity of some change of method. You have to thank them for much; though indeed it is not strange if you feel at times inclined to blame them for this. Nevertheless they have by their labours placed you on a vantage-ground from which you can attack the difficulty with far better prospects of overcoming it than they had. They have facilitated wonderfully the acquisition of Chinese, so that you can with comparative ease learn to read the context of passages where the, as yet, unknown terms occur. Let these be to you as x, y, z,—unknown quantities. Then by the help of those who have gone before you, get the ability to read purely native literature without referring to a teacher or a Dictionary at every point. Let all foreign-made Chinese books, all versions of the Bible, all Tracts and Treatises on Christianity, be to you non-existent as far as this question is concerned. Their evidence, so long as it is self-contradictory, is null.

Chinese Idiom. The field of Chinese literature is of vast extent and highly cultivated. Whatever may be thought of Chinese style or idiom, it is a thing established. We might as well expect to change the course of nature, as to change the idiom or usage of the Chinese Language. Paul and the other writers of the New Testament did not violently change the usages of the Greek Language, and if they had sought to do so they could not have succeeded; for even to this day their style is tested, and approved or condemned, by the
standard of classic Greek; or, if not that, at least it is tried by the previously existing standard of the Hellenistic dialect. But if any one thinks that the appreciation and the influence of classic or cultivated style in Chinese is evanescent, and may be disregarded, let him reflect upon the esteem in which classic Greek and Latin, that is heathen Greek and Latin, are held even at the present day after eighteen centuries of Christian culture; and let him reflect again, that the hold which Chinese Literature has upon this great people is immensely greater than that which either Greek or Latin had upon the nations of Europe at the beginning of the Christian era. Christianity did not kill out the taste for classic Greek and Latin, and he is a bold prophet who says that Christianity, even with western civilization, railways, and telegraphs superadded, is going to crush out Chinese Literature. Whoever acts on such a supposition is not wise.

*Method.* The field of Chinese Literature, as I have said, is immense; and I do not profess to have explored a tithe of it; but only to have made incursions into it here and there, where varieties of subject and of style invited. As a preparation for the present essay, I have, in the course of a few weeks, made a selection from a small and imperfect library, with the occasional help of the *Pei-van-yun-fu*, of nearly 600 passages tending to throw light on the meaning and usage of the *Terms*. When the point to be established was important, or one on which there exists difference of opinion, I selected many examples, and where no difference of opinion exists, I was content with one or two just to complete the view of native usage. It
must therefore be distinctly understood, that a multitude of examples of one use of a word does not, unless so stated, signify that as many examples could not be found of another, where only one or two are given. I have no notion of securing the preference for one common usage to the rejection of another that is also common, by a triumphant production of one or two hundred more examples. The curious question whether Dr. Williams gives most examples of shan for "god" or of shan for "spirit" does not tend to good. The Chinese tradesman hangs up a lantern at his shop door every day with "reverence shan" on it, and there are perhaps few days on which he does not make some remark about his own or another's tsing-shan, "good spirit." How can we decide the case by a majority of instances, when, on both sides, they are numerous as the sand? The List of examples and quotations from native books I have decided to print as an Appendix, and they are numbered for convenience of reference. I shall always give the number of each sentence referred to in the subsequent pages, so that the reader may turn to it at once. There is a certain order and method aimed at in this List, which will appear from the English headings, but if individual sentences seem here and there out of place, it must not be supposed that the force of my argument is dependent on the arrangement, so that finding some fault with that would upset it.

Weighing evidence. As to the comparative value of evidence on the immediate points at issue, I place (1) first, the usage of well-known and approved Chinese writers, (2) next, the definitions given in native books, (3) third, the observations of good foreign
Sinologists, and (4) last of all, what native teachers who know our views may tell us. Definitions in native books, especially in philosophical books, sometimes conflict with usage, and with one another, in which case they are of little or no value. Foreign definitions may be used to confirm an inference from native usage, but are utterly worthless on the opposite side; and taken by themselves are of little account. A good native teacher is a valuable assistant so long as he does not know one's motive for consulting him; but the moment he knows his employer's motives and wishes, he is the most prejudiced of all witnesses. He is ingeniously untruthful. Colloquial usage, unless where the colloquial is in print and of strictly Chinese origin, belongs to the third or fourth class of evidence. At best it is but hearsay or second-hand.

Arguments involving two or three logical steps, and drawn from single definitions of several words found anywhere, are not only feeble, but often vicious, or else rediculous.
CHAPTER II.

WHAT WE WANT.

*Spirit.* In the English Language the word *Spirit.* as regards its variety of meanings, may be compared to the word *Light.*

1. *Light* is *something* belonging to and forming an integral part of something else; as, "the light of the sun."

2. *Light* is simply a quality, in which sense it is either an adjective or a substantive (=*bright* or *brightness*); as, "a light and airy room," "a thing of light and life."

3. *A Light* is something luminous (=*a luminary,* *a taper*); as, "God made two great lights," "he called for a light." This usage is called *metonymy.*

4. *Light* is spoken of as a distinct essence; as "*God said,* Let there be light, and there was light." Then, in this sense, *Light* is a subject of science, and there are two theories about it; according to the *corpuscular theory* it is really an independent essence; but according to the *undulatory theory* it is a only a quality or condition of undulation of something else called a *medium.* If the former theory be true the more scientific meaning of light is the first. *Light* is then a *thing.* If the latter theory be the correct one, then the second meaning is the more correct, or scientific. *Light* then is a *quality.*

The analogy between the above and what follows is almost complete; and the reader will excuse
SPIRIT.

me, if he does not thank me, as we proceed, for being a little particular about this illustration. We will suppose that the account of Light is understood and admitted. Then, we go on to give the plan of this essay.

I. A Spirit is something belonging to and forming an integral part of a living being; as "the Spirit of God", "the spirit of man"; in which sense the word is more or less personal.

II. Spirit is simply a quality; as, "a man of spirit"; in which sense it is not personal.

III. A Spirit is a spiritual being; as "God is a spirit" (which expression becomes altered in all our minds to "God is pure spirit"), "they supposed that they had seen a spirit," "Sir Spirit, I doubt I do nick-name you, for those of your kind (they say) have no sense" (sensation. *Queen Elizabeth to Lord Burleigh*), "several energetic spirits resident at Amoy" (*China Mail*). This usage is, strictly speaking, what is called metonymy. The whole Being, the entire person, is included in the word which primarily denotes only a part.

IV. Spirit is spoken of as a distinct essence; as, "The Egyptians are men and not God; their horses are flesh and not spirit." This usage directly suggests the inquiry, "What is spirit?" And then we have as before, in the case of Light, two theories, the one, that spirit is really a distinct essence, in which case the philosophical account of it approaches to the first meaning; the other, that it is only a mood, or mode of activity of matter, which approaches to the second meaning. Here we come on the verge of higher metaphysics, a land of extreme
indefiniteness, and interminable mists. Spirit becomes either personal or impersonal, and we cannot tell in many cases which sort is meant. From each of the above leading meanings there branch off any number of different shades of meaning and figurative uses. "Spirit" has 21 meanings in Webster, and "Light" has 26. I mention this only to make it more clear that they belong to the same class of words. We have at present little to do with the figurative meanings, and we shall deal only with the broader distinctions here pointed out, chiefly under the three following heads.

I. Soul and Spirit. The word "soul", seems primarily to coincide with "spirit" in the first sense as referring to man, but only to man, and in its secondary uses it is much more restricted than "spirit." Whether "the soul of man" is identical with "the spirit of man" is an open question. It must be admitted however that the soul, if not a different thing from the spirit, is the same thing viewed in a different aspect. The idea of spirit is decidedly finer or purer, and more subtile than that of soul; and whether we accept the tripartition of human nature into "body soul and spirit" or not, we cannot dispense with either word in this connection. The German missionaries, if they do not all hold the doctrine of tri-partition, are all so familiar with it that they probably never fail to seek at an early period for the best terms by which to express "soul and spirit" in Chinese.

As there is no controversy about the word for soul, I may state here that hewn (36) alone (not ling-hewn) is the word almost invariably used in Chinese for the soul of the living. The other word
p'oḥ (40) presents a still grosser conception with which nothing in our language coincides. We may for distinctions sake call it the "shade." But in our systems of psychology the word is superfluous. The combination ling-hwun (222-224) is also sanctioned by usage but not common. We shall return to this by and by.

II. Spirituality, Genius, Intellect. The three words, spirituality, genius, and intellect (intelligence,) all denote uncommon or variable qualities of the heart or mind and come under our second meaning of spirit. The first is primarily the most comprehensive, referring to the affections, the emotions, the tastes, and the thoughts. It is now, however, much confined to a religious use, and refers specially to the affections. Genius (not the personified Latin Genius) has generally no reference to the affections. In other respects it is much the same as the first. Intellect or intelligence refers only to the tastes and thoughts, and says nothing about the affections or the emotions. In religious teaching we want especially the equivalent of the first of these words.

III. God, gods, spirits. The word "God," whether it be in the singular or in the plural, manifestly does not belong to the same class with the words "Light" and "Spirit," which have so many and divers meanings and shades of meaning. "God" is held rigidly to one sense, and the only real distinction is that of "true God" and "false god." The question "What is God?" is also of a different nature from "What is spirit?" The former does not take us directly and unavoidably into the domain of metaphysics. There is one step remaining, and by that one step Theology may pass into metaphysics; or she may save herself and wisely stop short after replying,
"God is a Spirit." Although the definition of "god" specially adopted by one side in the discussion before us, "a worshipped being," is novel and faulty, "God" is certainly either the name of a Being, or of only one class of beings, under our third meaning of "spirit." All spirits are not gods. When taken as the name of a class (generically, if you please)—"god," "gods"—it is like "luminary" under the word "Light." All lights are not luminaries. Luminary is soon defined: it is a light of heaven:—the sun, moon, and stars are luminaries. We define it by saying, "It is a light." But the ulterior question "What is light?" is of a different sort. It takes a great deal of science to answer that. So we can define "God" as above, but we cannot go a step farther and define "spirit." Let this be distinctly understood and borne in mind. The word "God" is outside of pure metaphysics. The word "Spirit" is inside of pure metaphysics. We define God to be a Spirit, and if our definition is accepted there is no more to be said. But the ulterior question "What is a Spirit?" perplexes us. We simply cannot answer it. And it is around this word that the battles of metaphysics have to be fought over and over again without end. We must accept the existence of spirit as an ultimate fact. Our analysis can go no further. To say, "Spirit is God, or such a being as God, or angel, or man," is to sound a retreat. You then evidently give it up.

If we select a word which means "spirit" and use it for "God" we put the ultimate idea (spirit) in the place of the penultimate (god); and leave it no longer possible to say "God is a Spirit." We can only say "Spirit is Spirit" (490).
CHAPTER III.

FIRST SENSE OF SPIRIT—SHAN.

Shan stands at the head of this chapter by virtue of its prevalent use, as will be understood by glancing over the first 200 examples in the Appendix. Ling occurs a few times, but its meaning is as yet indefinite. With shan it is different; we can ascertain its meaning from the multitude of examples, quite near enough to the truth for all practical purposes. I know there is a theory that shan ought not to be used for "spirit" but exclusively for "God", "gods"; but we have nothing to do with any theory just now. It will perhaps appear as we proceed with our examination of facts that shan is legitimately as well as habitually used by the best Chinese writers for "spirit"; and, if so, I have already pointed out that such a habitual usage cannot be abolished by any power on earth. Moreover it is extremely undesirable, even in a theological point of view, to abolish this usage, because it will presently appear to us all, if I am not very much mistaken, that there is no other word in the language that comes near answering to "spirit." Shan of course only approximates in all its usages to the English word. It is probably true that no two words either in the same language or in different languages are perfectly synonymous. We should remember this. And I have one other general
remark to make, namely, that it is not necessarily any desecration of a word that is used for "God" or "gods," nor need it be reckoned a sin or a heathenish error, to use it at the same time with an entirely different reference. All depends on the nature of the word. I may call a man "the Lord," though I must not call him "God." And how are we to discover the nature of a word except by inquiring for what purpose it is used? I do not mean to deify the man whom I call "my Lord," nor does the Chinese mean to deify himself when he says "my spirit is high" (183). The theory referred to takes another shape, namely, that etymologically the word shan contains in it the idea of divinity. But if any part of the etymological contents of a word is entirely lost, it is to all intents and purposes the same as if it had never been there. In the expression just quoted, shan-kau "high spirit," or, according to English idiom, "high spirits," there is ever present the mystic, metaphysical idea described in last chapter, but not a trace of divinity.

Shan emotional. I find in the Chinese Language feelings of pleasure and pain, emotions of fear, sorrow, joy, excitement, and the like, ascribed to the sin (63), heart or mind, to the hwun (36), soul, and to the sing (167 note), nature. I seek for another word which in common usage takes turns with these in representing that sensitive, emotional, excitable something that is within us all. Other words like p'oh (64), shade, k'i, air (impersonal, spiritual substance, 524) may be found as the subject of emotions, but they are rejected by common consent as unfit to represent "spirit." Tsing, essence (alone 58, 81, 86, not in combination as tsing-shan) and ling (alone
73, 82, 119, not in combination as sing-ling) are sometimes the subject of motions, but not of feelings or emotions in a living man. I have been particular about ling in this connection, and have faithfully put down whatever tended to illustrate the use of the word. There is just one instance of ling (alone 167) being "pleased"; but it is a sort of exception which greatly confirms the rule. In the first place, the passage copied verbatim from the P'ei-wan-yun-fu is in all respects so obscure that, without a reference to the History of Han from which it is taken, it is impossible to punctuate it; and in the second place, it is thought necessary to add a note of explanation, that "pleasing ling means pleasing the emotional and intelligent nature." Sing-ling is a well established combination (35, 158). Ling is therefore perhaps used elliptically for sing-ling.* In the latter passage quoted (158) the reason for adding ling to sing, nature, is stated to be that man's nature is most ling, intelligent, and thus a contrast is brought out between "nature", and "stupefaction" by drink.

If hereafter a case can be made out for ling as signifying the spirit of a living human being, either in the sense of the fluctuating "animal spirits" or of the emotional spirit common to all men, which "returns to God who gave it" or "goes upward" at death (226—228), what I am now saying in behalf of shan for "spirit" may be so far set aside, but not otherwise. I do not simply say what follows, I hold up before the eyes of readers who know Chinese the facts. The shan of a living human being is capable

* Referring to the original it appears that "pleasing-ling" was really a name of a rank in the emperor's harem,—"pleasers of his majesty".
of suffering, is frequently wounded or broken (1—16),
toiled, weary, or sorrowful, in bitterness, or in afflict-
tion (17—38). It may be sick (39). It may be
frightened or stunned (41—54), bewildered, foolish,
or besotted (21,54—62). It is sometimes stirred by
feelings of pity, wonder, longing, or impatience
(63—72). At other times it wanders in dreams, fancy,
reverie, or madness (74—80). It may be wasted, or
squandered by dissipation or over-work (83). But
again it is restored, quieted, comforted, brightened,
made free (84—129). It is occupied and attentive
(130—138). It is then cared for, cultivated, re-
freshed, solemnized, or harmonized, or has tone given
to it(139—164.) It has emotions of joy, being elevat-
ed, elated, or even overflowing with pleasurable ex-
citement and eagerness (166—186, 209).

It will perhaps be noticed that among the above
instances, which all refer to living men and women,
nothing of a strictly moral character or of affection,
as love or hatred, is ascribed to shan; but a reference
to Cruden's Concordance will show that the same is
the case with "spirit". Words like "bad", "good",
"love", "hate", are rarely if ever used in speaking
of the human spirit. Such terms are reserved for
other kinds of spirits which we shall come to by and
by. Where we say "a man has a bad spirit" (dis-
position), the Chinese would probably not use shan
(but see 193).

Shan-ming (135, 199—208, 513). I have put
down over ten examples of shan-ming is connection
with the spirits of the living, though the sense is
often that of a special quality, in order to call atten-
tion to the fact that this combination is far from
being the exact equivalent of "the gods". It is
necessary in every case to observe the connection before even loosely translating it by any term denoting objects of worship. The first sentence is from *Chu-tsze on Mind*, and he says, "From first to last the mind in its constitution and function, though there are contained in it, it may be, both what is true and what is false, both what is right and what is wrong, is in reality all alike the mystery of *shan-ming* inscrutable." Must we always bring in "the gods" in such cases as this? or, does not the philosopher rather mean the inscrutable mystery of spirit which has been already pointed out? Here is another sentence (204):—"The ears and eyes attend to their own duties, and the *shan-ming* keeps its dwelling" i.e. the spirit keeps its place within (537). I am not going to translate all the passages, but please look at them, my brethren, before you make up your minds irrevocably that *shan-ming* is equivalent to "the gods". Can the shadow of a reason be given for not translating this term by "spiritual intelligence", singular or plural as the case may be? If we do so it becomes at once evident how it is that the Chinese worship the "spiritual intelligences" that are outside or above them, and at the same time have "spiritual intelligence" within. Worshipping a being does not alter the nature of the word used to indicate that being. In the last sentence quoted (208) the mystic word has received, as often it does, a more mystic explanation, upon which the laconic remark of my Chinese assistant is "The more explained, the less understood".

*Tsing-shan* (259, 317, 228—231, 474, 509, 513, 514, 516, 526). Of all combinations of *shan* and another character probably *tsing-shan* is the most common. Yet it is not so very common in books as
its constant use in colloquial might lead us to expect. I have a few remarks to make on this expression, all of which are justified by the Chinese quotations. 1. Tsing-shan and shan alone, when used for the spirits of human beings, are in general the same. The former term is a little more vague in form than the latter, owing to the extreme ambiguity of tsing, but this is compensated for by the distinction which it serves to make between the human spirit and other spirits. The addition of a syllable which means almost anything or nothing (essence, subtility, fine, &c.) becomes useful in this way. 2. Both terms, shan and tsing-shan, vary in meaning from the most concrete and personal sense of soul, to that of a mere feeling of health and animation which we call "good spirits." 3. In this last sense, the usual colloquial one, tsing serves the purpose of a qualifying adjective, as in example (213) where the writer "Arose from sleep and felt in good spirits." Here tsing-shan is like shan-kau "in high spirits" (182, 183). 4. Tsing-shan is used for the spirit after death as well as before (228—231, 514). Chu-tsze says, the tsing-shan goes up as an "air" to heaven (474). But he says elsewhere that tsing is the "shade" and shan is the soul, and that the former goes downward, and the latter upward at death (519—521). So then, according to Chu-tsze, tsing-shan may be either one thing, namely, a human spirit that goes upward to God; or two very different things with different destinies. "Who knoweth?" (Eccl. III. 21.)

Shan of the dead. I have acted on the suggestion of Confucius (See Analects XI. 11.), and
taken up first what we know most about, the living. We have seen what place shan holds in the living man. When he dies the same usage continues uninterruptedly. At the moment of death, it is the shan that passes away (218). Immediately the shan returns to its original source (221), or the shan ascends to the ninth heavens (226). Bereaved friends however see the shan of the dead in their dreams and have converse with them (233, 235). Sometimes the shan can be summoned back by magic art (237). Sometimes the dead come of their own accord in bodily shape and tell that their shan are not at rest (239). Observe all this is quite independent of, and antecedent in the order of nature to, any peculiar custom of sacrificing to the dead. Whatever remains of activity or life without distinction of class or character is called shan (420, 522). As remarked above, it is also called tsing-shan. According to the school of Chu-tsze, it is just the tsing-shan of the dead that their descendants are supposed to worship (526). I say "supposed" because it is painfully evident that Chu-tsze encourages the sham worship of beings that he does not believe have any personal or conscious existence (228, 521, 523, 528, 556). Observe that he admits a sort of "air", which is euphoniously called the tsing-shan of king Wan, to have gone up and united with Heaven (474), but in reference to the suggestion of a more spiritual man than himself, that something of immortality belongs to us all, he says, "It cannot be intended that when we die we, so to speak, have tsing-ling that does not perish." Tsing-ling is different from tsing-shan, which may be anything
resembling the spirit of wine (318). *Tsing-ling* means intelligence, and implies consciousness or at least individuality (259—263, 575). It is strange, after reading some of the dissertations of the orthodox on the proper way to keep the balance even between wisdom (conviction?) on the one hand which says the dead they worship are no more, and benevolence on the other which will not hold them dead (513), to read the statement of the same men that one of the peculiarities of the Buddhist creed, just then imported from India, is that “when men die their *tsing-shan* does not become extinct” (514). I may here call attention to two very bold statements by members of the same orthodox school, whose ideal man is *chi-ch‘ing* “most sincere” (!). One says that “the ideal men when he offers sacrifice need not believe in the existence of any *shan* in heaven or on earth that he sacrifices to. He does it solely for example and instruction” (532). Another says, “There is Air above, Form below, and Knowledge in the middle. These are the three Powers. Air is a ghost, *kwei*, is not that Heaven? Knowledge is a spirit, *shan*, is not that man? It is we that have get the rational nature” (482). With such passages before me, am I not justified in regarding with some suspicion the spiritual definitions of philosophical Books?

There are other names for the portion of a man that survives or outlasts the body. *Hwun*, soul, is retained and of course *p‘oh*, shade. It is here that the latter comes into play, either, (A) as a separate entity, when it is an unquestionable *kwei*, or ghost, a dark, cold, and injurious being (519, 521, 518), but usually returns soon like the body to the dust
(521, 522); or, (B) in union with the hwun, when the dissolution is not complete as in the case of sudden death on the battle field. Then "the spirit retains its consciousness and faculties in full vigour, and the hwun-p'oh being resolute becomes a brave ghost" (579). "Ghosts", kwei, is the name which is distinctive for the spirits of the dead as different from the spirits of the living (shan), from the spirit of Heaven that liveth and abideth for ever (shan), and the spirit of the Earth which is otherwise distinguished (k'e). But Heaven, Earth, and living man, all three alike, have what is called shan. Neither of them is strictly speaking a shan, but all three have shan (525). Put this in plain English with "god" for shan. "Heaven has a god, Earth has a god, and living man has a god; only when man dies his god is called a ghost." Surely if ever a word was out of place "god" is out of place here. For "god" read "spirit", and all is plain.

The concrete use of ling for the relics or emblems, as well as for the souls, of the dead, will be explained in another chapter. It may however be said in general that, while kwei means death and extinction, "a dying ghost", shan means a living spirit (522), and ling attributes consciousness and intelligence to the dead (513).

Our Spirits. "My shan", "his shan", "your shan" mean invariably "my spirit", "his spirit", "your spirit" in Chinese books (2, 11, 12, 13, 15, 22, 33, 34, 52, 55, 59, 63, 85, 114, 115, 126, 150, 171, 178, 192, 196, 217, 237, 239, 240). What I intend to say is that, wherever a personal name or pronoun in the possessive case precedes shan, this word does not mean the person's object of worship.
outside, but his own spirit within which belongs to no body else. Of course, as in English "my spirit" might have the meaning of "my God" forced upon it, or it might mean among spiritualists the attendant spirit that is always hovering about me, so in Chinese. The one language is just as plastic in this respect as the other, and, I suppose, no more. One can tell from the connection of your discourse that you do not mean your own spirit, but the one you were just speaking of as having something to do with you.* But thus far the authority of native usage is entirely wanting for "my shan" in the sense of "my God."

Having made it plain beyond a doubt that "the shan of a man" is his spirit; it follows as a matter of course that "the shan of Ti," whether this word be Jove or God, means also His spirit (488).

* But let the reader try the experiment of asking any unprejudiced Chinese the meaning of Isaiah viii. 19. with ki-chi-shan for "their God."
CHAPTER IV.
SECOND SENSE OF SPIRIT—LING AND SHAN.

When denoting a quality, ling and shan are both used either as substantives or adjectives.

1. The highest style of man, the shing-jan, who is perfect according to the Chinese ideal, and is more than a genius, is described as shan (497—502). Ling seems inadequate to express inward perfection. In this connection I recommend to the attention of the reader the remarks of Yang-tsze-yun on shan, as genius or spiritual penetration (502).

2. The genius of a painter or poet is called shan, (241, 242, 284, 287). The same thing is called ling (243). In either case the idea is special powers of mind, taste and skill, or ability. Shan however is the most common word in the sense of genius. It is often said of a writer, or of a person of extraordinary ability, "He does this as if he had shan, that is, as if he had a genius within him. "Shan-help" is equivalent to poetic inspiration. Nobody thinks of asking, who helps, or who inspires? To have caught the shan of another (289) is precisely the same idea as that in the following lines:

"A perfect judge will read each work of wit"

"With the same spirit that its author writ."

Different from this usage is ju-shan, "like a spirit," which is a comparison, as in the following
sentence:—"Like spirits they" (the wise men) came casting no shadow before them, and like spirits they departed passing away into the obscurity from which they had emerged" (Dr Hanna).

3. Persons have the quality of shan or of ling ascribed to them for a variety of reasons of a lower nature than the actual possession of sage perfection or genius. Here we come to the most common use of ling. Shan is still preferred in certain connections, where mystery is a leading idea; as when the awe-inspiring reserve of kings is spoken of, which indeed is considered equivalent to the possession of genius, on the ground of omne ignotum pro magnifico. "Authority is the shan (soul) of the king" (275). "Propriety and righteousness are the shan (soul) of a prince" (276). Expressions like "shan-courage" (312, 313) and "shan-steed" (314) may be interpreted either by "spirited" or "spirit-like"; but in any case shan here departs far from the sense of ling. A "ling horse" would be as different as possible from a "shan horse." The former would perhaps denote a horse with supernatural or unusual intelligence, but the latter denotes a horse of extraordinary swiftness.

4. Ling. Let us now take leave of shan for a time and concentrate our attention on ling. In frequency of use and variety of meanings this word is subordinate to shan. It does not occur very often in the classics. We shall give here all the cases we find in Dr Legge's published Volumes, including the Tso-chuen, and avail ourselves of the Translation to bring out the meaning. The references will enable any one to consult the original. Of course a translation must be such as to make sense. The reader
may try to substitute the word spirit in each case, for Dr. Legge's translation of ling, and judge if it will fit, especially if it will fit in the sense of "soul and spirit", for no other would be of any avail.

For antiquity and genuineness, anything that comes down in the form of poetry* ought always to be preferred to prose; it has something like organic life in it. Let us therefore begin with the Book of Poetry, or, as it has been otherwise well named, the "Old Ballad Book". The Translator's equivalent for ling will be always put in italics.

Ling in the Book of Poetry. "When the good rains had fallen" I. iv. VI. 2. "The marvellous tower". "The marvellous park". "The marvellous pond" III. i. VIII. The child came in to the world without giving any pain "shewing how wonderful he would be" (the first cultivator of grain). III. ii. I. 2. "Glorious was his fame; brilliant, his energy." (Woo-ting's). IV. iii. V. 5.

Ling in the Book of History. "I did not slight your plans, I only used what were best of them". IV. vii. Pt. iii. 7. "Of all creatures man is the most highly endowed. The sincere, intelligent, and perspicacious among men becomes the great sovereign". V. i. Pt. i. 2. [Chinese Note (539). "Intelligent is also ling. The sage possesses before me that of which I have the seeds in common with himself, and among intelligent beings (ling) he is the most intelligent (ling)".]. "The sovereigns of our Chow for their great goodness were charged with the work of God." V. xiv. 13. "The first cause of his evil course was his internal misrule which made him unfit to deal well with the multi-

* See Note B at the end of this essay.
tudes”; but, “Our kings of Chow treated well the multitudes”. V. xviii. 5. 9. “Among the people of Meau, they did not use the power of good, but the restraints of punishments”. V. xxvii. 3.

Ling in the Tso-chuen. “By the good influence of his lordship, I have no serious hurt”. V. 28. “I venture to depend on your powerful influence, to complete the victory of my army”. VII. 12. “I will remember your kindness. VIII. 3. “By the powerful influence of your ruler I find myself”, a stranger, safe among you. VIII. 16. “The marquis of Ts’e invaded Lae, the people of which sent to bribe the chief eunuch of Ts’e with a hundred choice horses and as many oxen. On this the army of Ts’e returned. From this the reader “might know that” the above marquis “was indeed ling” (Ling was his posthumous title). IX. 3. The continued success of certain negotiations “is to be ascribed to your lordship’s powerful influence.” IX. 11. “If by your” (his ministers’) “influence” I come to die a natural death, pray, call me afterwards, “Ling (562), or Le (223).” IX. 13. “If by your” (his ministers’) “powerful influence I preserve my head and neck, &c.” X. 25. “Now I wish by the blessing and powerful influence of king Ch’ing to repair the walls, &c.” Ch’ing had built the walls some centuries before. X. 32. My ruler now wishes to seek the blessing of the duke of Chow, and desires to beg the help of the power of the Tsang family.” XII. 24.

There is nothing in the Four Books to be added to these examples of the use of ling; and in all probability the radical meanings of the word are exhausted as far as it is applied to living men.
Let us take them in the order in which they occur.

(A) "Good," "best," "goodness," "well," "the power of good," "good influence," "kindness":—these all suggest a powerful leaning of the word to virtue's side, so to speak; and there is no mistake about it, for the commentaries and Dictionaries quite agree that ling has the meaning of "good" (561); the first example from the Poetry requires some meaning of the kind, "rains" in their season can only be good, kindly, useful rains; and most of the other phrases are complimentary, amounting to "by your favour", though stronger than that. But the evidence that "good" is an essential part of the meaning of ling, and not an occasional or metaphorical sense put upon it, is that when it is used in a concrete way, that is to denote the being of which it is a quality, it is never qualified further by an adjective meaning either good or bad. A good ling would be a tautology, and a bad ling would be a contradiction in terms. There are certainly no "bad ling" or "evil ling" in native books. Nothing immoral or malignant is ever imputed to a ling. I cannot produce evidence of this, and must content myself with asking those who think otherwise, or adopt another usage, to produce their authority. But now, granting that "good" is an inseparable element in the meaning of ling, I here observe further that neither "spirit" nor shan has any such element of good in it; and on this we have, on the one hand the evidence of Webster's Dictionary, and on the other the passages quoted in the Appendix (443—463). Thus far then shan coincides with "spirit," and ling is different from both.
THE QUESTION OF TERMS.

(B) "Marvellous", "wonderful";—these expressions must be elliptical, and we must supply the quality, either "goodness" or some of those that follow, which excites marvel or wonder. At first sight this seems to resemble a meaning of shan which is well known, "inscrutable"; but there is perhaps no respect in which the antithesis of the two words comes out more strikingly than in this. In ancient times there were towers called "ling towers", and others, it seems, called "shan towers". The difference is explained with reference to the men that had them built. The one (shan) resembled heaven in its intrinsic depth, the other (ling) resembled earth in its superficial adornment (550)—he was "a remarkable man". In this respect, heaven, however bright it may be to look at, corresponds to (yiu) the obscure and unfathomable which is shan, and earth corresponds to (ming) the bright and intelligible which is ling (551). In a metaphysical point of view, shan must always take the precedence of ling (563), because it expresses the profoundest mystery of spirituality. It is specially the attribute of sages, perfect men, who are supposed to be in intimate communion with the universal Spirit (552—556). But it is also an attribute of every man. Even the most foolish (251) and the most depraved (199), that is those who have least ling, and creatures lower in the scale than man also (520, 530), are shan, and have a shan in them. And there is not a shadow of blasphemy or heresy in this, viewed in the light of the Bible; because shan is not and can never be the same sort of word that "god" is. Do we not read of the "spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth"? And is that not a mystery? It is surely
a thing unfathomable. And it is a widely different thing from the marvellous sagacity (ling) displayed by some of those beasts, as apes for example (568). This is ling, and it is contrasted with the stupidity of other animals. But shan is life, fire, spirit (539—544). A horse that in swiftness seems to fly and not touch the ground is a shan-horse (314), also marvellous in his way, but different from the apes. He has spirit. The Chinese would not describe him as ling. A soldier who never turns his back on the enemy, but cuts his way through their ranks, has shan-courage (312, 313). So we should say, "he has spirit". And the Chinese would no more think of describing him as having ling, than we should of praising his sagacity or intelligence, or his kindly disposition. Look at that poor pheasant eagerly pecking up grains of food along the meadow till suddenly it treads on a snare and is caught. Its spirit (shan) was in full force, but it was "not good" (184). No more is that man's high spiritual condition good who has drunk a hundred cups at a sitting (185); or that of the other, who audaciously plunges into a swollen stream and attempts to swim across it (186). All these have shan, but with a deficiency of ling.

(C) "Energy" is the translation given of ling is one passage in the Book of Poetry. "Energy" is closely allied to courage. But of course it is mental energy that is meant, or else "powerful influence" as in other passages. "There is no spiritual excitement imputed, though of course it is implied, by ling, when denoting" "influence" or "mental effort". "Pure intellect" (hü-ling, 573, 574, 575) would not likely manifest any "power" or "in
fluence'. There is always a spirit behind, that is, an emotional nature; and every manifestation of ling, is an effect of shan, as ling itself is a quality of the shan or soul. This is very much the difference between the words; shan is a cause, ling is an effect.

(D) "Highly endowed", "intelligent".—Here we come to one of the household words of China, "Man is the ling of all things"; and ling has the current colloquial meaning, for the phrase in the Book of History and the colloquial usage are inseparably connected. Tsing-ling ("smart, apt, clever". Williams), ming-ling ("smart intelligent, quick of apprehension". Ib.), ling-pien ("quick at perceiving," "the pith of a machine". Ib.), are expressions about which there is no mistake. Does a Chinese student then understand when he reads the sentence, "But man of all things is ling", that man is here said to be "spiritual"* above all things? We know that "smartness" is an effect of spirit, but it is a very outward and visible sign, having a very remote connection with any inward and spiritual grace. I am not trifling. I mean what I say; and I beg my brethren to reflect upon it. We want to speak about the most inward and vital things, about the heart and affections, and the spirit of a man which is the candle of the Lord; and shall we set aside shan, the only word in the language which seems to penetrate the inmost soul of a man (502) in favour of an outward, obvious, unmysterious term like ling? Do not the commentators tell us that ling here is equivalent to the two words, "intelligent and perspicacious", which immediately follow? And do we get any

* In a Tract on the Name of God in Chinese which I published 13 years ago, I translated ling by "spiritual," but there is reason to doubt this rendering, though in a loose way of speaking shan and ling are interchanged.
nearer to the mystery of our being, when we reflect upon the sage being the “most intelligent of human intelligences”? (557). How very different in tendency from this is the expression of Chwang-tsze, referring to the same class of men, but gazing inward upon their souls, “they are the spiritual among spirits”, and as a result of this they “are capable of more subtilty” than others! (500). Or take the following, and here I present to the friends of chishan for God a far better part of a sentence than any that has been produced hitherto on that side: “There is a Perfect Spirit in heaven, who is the Lord of creation; and the spirit of the sage” (our word for saint) “is the fountain of truth. The Spirit is one” (367). Whatever defects of doctrine any one may discover in this “form of words”, the words we want are unmistakeably here. Compare, “But he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit”. 1 Cor. VI. 17. (E) “Influence”, “powerful influence”.—Most readers must have begun to suspect that the word ling in Chinese covers a wider ground than any English word we can translate it by. Such is undoubtedly the case. We cannot even put the above meanings into one phrase, much less express them all in one word. If we call it “good intellectual and perceptive abilities”, or more vaguely “good abilities”, the notions of “marvellous” and of “influence” are excluded. Sometimes the Greek word nous has been introduced into this discussion, but nous “mind”, “thought”, “intelligence”, is far too narrow for shan; and at the same time, too concrete for ling. We speak of “keeping a thing in mind”, but no body keeps any thing in ling. On reviewing the above meanings of the word, and coming last of all to “influence”, especially when we know what an
amount of occult "influence" is attributed by the Chinese to spiritual beings, to ghosts, to fang-shui, as well as to living men, we are forcibly reminded of another word found in Mark V. 30, and elsewhere:—"virtue had gone out of Him". We are not however to take ling as denoting the putting forth of virtue (dynamis). It is the "power" itself. "Influence" (influens) is quite a different sort of word; it could never assume a concrete sense as "intelligence", "power", and ling do. It is here, however, where ling seems to mean "influence", that it comes near to the meaning of shan, and it appears that the influencing Spirit of God might be expressed by the one term as well as by the other. No doubt the "powers" above or the "invisible intelligences" may be said to influence men, or even things to men. Ling is used in this connection (435). But the passages where Heaven reveals, and shan influences (432, 433), are more plain and more common. To influence ling (i.e. intelligent beings) is also more common, than for men to be influenced by them. Men influence intelligent beings(436, 437, 390), and perhaps the influence is reciprocated, but nothing is taught by this of the primary meaning of the word ling.

There are other expressions like permeating shan, or being in communication or rapport with shan, permeating ling, entering into shan, and entering into ling; which are for the most part a little obscure. Only, we can understand entering into the spirit of a thing (294—301), not entering into the god.

Your ling. We have seen that "your ling" means "your goodness," "your powerful influence",
or "your intelligence". I have now to remark, in order to remove all doubts about the sense of ling being always of the complimentary kind, that as a general thing no Chinese speaks of his own ling. It is only in foreign-made books that we find "my ling"—"my ling hath rejoiced." Luke i. 47. Will any of those who adopt this rendering produce from native literature an instance of ngo-ling, or of ling-loh? I have not found such an instance; and most probably if found the reference will be to the soul or ling-hwun, after death; or ngo-ling may be found with a negative, ngo-puhl-ling, "I am not intelligent", a phrase quite according to propriety. I am sorry that this again is a case in which it is impossible to adduce evidence; but I throw the onus probandi on the other side. Meantime I can produce cases of ngo-shan by the score. Will the authority be produced for ling? I mean something more than an isolated sentence. Or will native usage still be defied?

Intelligent and foolish. Ling is frequently found in antithesis with words meaning foolish, or stupid (158, 223, 322, 564—567, 575, 578).

Body and spirit. Shan is not found, like ling, in antithesis with foolish, but with form (22, 37, 38, 69, 80, 92, 103, 107, 142, 194, 197, 218, 311), with body (31, 76, 77, 150, 101, 283), with parts of the body (28, 65, 118, 153, 177, 39, 58, 96, 136, 113, 144, 190), and with outward appearance (79).

Materialism. There are multitudes in China who hold that the soul of man is not a spiritual substance distinct from the body, but that it is the result of the organization of matter in the body (558). With such people, and Chu-fu-tsze
is one of them, though the old words *shan*, *ling*, and *hwun-p'oh* are retained, they all tend to identity of meaning (523, 524, 527, 528, &c). They are all only what might be called a "spiritual intelligence inside the air" (524), the word "air" in this case corresponding to the word *medium* in the *undulatory theory* of light (528, 576). Wherever the phenomena of intelligence (*ling*) are recognized, as in man (558) or in an idol (576, 577), the existence of *shan*, in what we call the personal sense, as a being or essence, is denied. Those who follow the popular belief that there is a "ruling spirit" (558) in man, do not indeed distinguish its substance from "air," or primary matter, and most people do not inquire into this subject at all. But the more spiritual of thinking men define *ling* differently from the materialists. The former say, "*Ling* is the essential brightness of the spirit," that is, a quality of the spirit (559, 560). This definition agrees with what we have found to be the usage, and with various definitions of *ling* by itself as "intelligence and perspicacity" (557), "understanding" (578), "knowledge" (513), "consciousness" (575).* But the latter say "Evolution is *shan* and reversion is *kwei* (521); this (kind of movement) is *ling*, and also the soul" (516). Hence, with them, "soul", "spirit", and "intelligence" are very much the same (561).

It is for Christian Missionaries to choose between the spiritualistic and materialistic definitions. A rare, very rare, use of *ling*, intelligence, by metonymy for the soul of a living man is possible.

*Cicero.*
CHAPTER V.

FURTHER ILLUSTRATIONS.

This Chapter is interposed here in order to illustrate further the usage of shan. It consists chiefly of notes made years ago, and the longer quotations are not all given in the Appendix to the present essay.

I. The Book of Rites on the Shan of men.

"When Confucius was in Wei he took notice of people attending a funeral and exclaimed, 'What a good manner of mourning they have! It is quite a model. Remember it my children.' Tsze-kung said, 'What is good in it?' Confucius replied, 'They went as if eager after something. They returned as if in doubt.' Tsze-kung again asked, 'Would it not be better to hasten home to perform the seven days' ceremonial?' But Confucius said again, 'Remember it my children.'"

Kung Ying-tah says, on the above passage, "The filial son mourns the parent left behind, and does not know whether his shan is coming back after him or not; therefore he does not feel inclined to go home and seems as if in doubt. Tsze-kung's idea was that when the burying was done, then the shan-ling required to be tranquillized. Why should they not hasten home to perform the sacrificial rites and give rest to the shan? But the mourning for the parent was the radical feeling; and the sacrifice
of peace to the shan was merely ceremonial. Therefore Confucius did not admit his objection."

Confucius said, "Treating the dead as dead, is contrary to humanity, and not to be done. Treating the dead as alive, is contrary to knowledge, and also not to be done. Therefore there are made for them bamboo implements, but not complete; earthenware, but without finish; wooden articles, but without planing; harps and organs, but not tuned; and bells, but not hung up. These are called 'bright implements'; importing that they (the dead) are shan-ming" (i.e. that their spirits are alive and intelligent, not all dead as kwei, ghost, would signify 522).

Chinese Note.—"To serve the dead as if they were alive is the strongest feeling of their children. But the way of shan may be different from the way of men. The libation immediately after death approaches to treating them as men, but the funeral approaches to treating them as shan. So that, in the whole service of the dead, everything is as it were midway between the state of man and the state of shan."

When the head of a house dies, according to the Book of Rites, the process of laying out and dressing the corpse is commenced in the same position the person occupied when alive, because, it is said, the filial child cannot bear to regard the parent as dead (that is, says Ying-tah, the child cannot bear to treat the parent as a shan, and to turn his head to the north, which is the direction of darkness whither the ghost-shan goes). Afterwards by two or three separate movements the corpse is transferred to the place where it is to be till the funeral, and
these movements are said to denote the gradual passing of the dead to (the state of) *shan*.

Is there any more of *divinity* in this word *shan* than there is in the word "spirit" in the following: —"Rest, rest, perturbed spirit"? Achilles sacrificed to the "soul of the miserable Patroclus," which came to him in distress, twelve young Trojans besides four of his horses and two of his dogs, at the funeral pyre. *Iliad* XXIII. 65. But, had such practices any tendency to make the word (*psuchê*) "soul," assume the meaning of "god"?

II. *Shan in the Universe.* *Shan* is used, in speaking of the Universe, either personally or impersonally, in strict accordance with idiom, as each man thinks. Since this word means, in man, either an enduring essence which is more or less personal, or mere excitement, it follows that, in using the same word to express their conjectures about the Universe, the Chinese may legitimately use it either personally or impersonally.

Emerson uses the word *spirit* quite legitimately when he says, "One mode of divine teaching is the incarnation of the spirit in form—in forms like my own" (*The Oversoul*). We can scarcely say the same however of the use of "God" by this author when he affirms, "O my brothers, God exists. There is a soul at the centre of nature, and over the will of every man, so that none of us can wrong the universe" (*Spiritual Laws*). His definition of what he is pleased at times to called God is precisely the same as Chu-tsze's definition of *Shang-ti*—"Thus is the universe alive. All things are moral. That *soul*, which within us is a sentiment, outside of us is
a law. We feel its inspirations; out there in history, we can see its fatal strength. It is almighty. All nature feels its grasp. It is in the world, and the world was made by it. It is eternal but it enact itself in time and place” (Compensation).

There are many of our countrymen who think with Schleiermacher that it is a mere matter of taste whether we believe in a personal or an impersonal God. But we cannot take any such men into our counsels. I have not met with any missionary who holds this opinion; and I think it will be universally admitted that what is spoken of as “it” in the above quotation is strikingly different from “the Jehovah of the Bible.” And, far more than that, it is different from the common usage and definitions of the word “god.”

Persons who hold opinions like Emerson’s can only treat the word “God” in two ways. They must either exclude it from their discourse altogether, or use it in a sense entirely different from that which is understood by the mass of mankind. This latter they may do as a matter of taste; or out of deference to popular belief, because they are afraid of seeming flatly to contradict the Sacred Books. The same thing is done with Shang-ti in China, whether that term should be translated by “God” or by “Jove.” There is indeed one other way, not often followed in Christian countries, though Emerson follows this too, namely, to speak of “God” or “Jove” as a result of evolution. (See Parallel 8. below). Mr. Watters says with perfect correctness of Lautsze’s philosophy, “Tao, then, is something which existed before heaven and earth were, before Deity was, and which is, indeed, eternal” (page
If it was "before Deity," a fortiori it was before God. "Deity" is not the word we want. We want a personal God.

Ten years ago, before any of Mr. Watters' Articles on "Lao-tsu" had appeared, in one of which he says, "the soul of Lao-tsu may have transmigrated into Emerson", I had collected a number of parallels between that American author and Hwai-nan-tsze, who flourished a century before the Christian era, and was Tauistic. But indeed there is a great deal of the same sort in all Chinese philosophers. If the doctrine of a personal God, versus an impersonal, is to be settled by a majority of votes, the philosophers of China I fear will turn the scale against us. But what I wish to observe is, that the use of "spirit" (or "mind") by Emerson corresponds exactly to the use of shan by the same class of thinkers in China; and that both usages are perfectly idiomatic. We recognize in both words the same amount of vagueness, not put into the words by these writers, but found in them. The vagueness belongs to the words as a part of their nature. I give only a few examples; the parallelism might be carried out to any extent.

**Parallel 1.**

"The universe is one man's body, all it contains is one man's work. Therefore heaven and earth cannot frighten him who understands nature, miracles cannot deceive him who can judge of the fitness of things. Hence the sage gets a knowledge of distant things from things near, and all varieties become unity. The men of remote an-
tiquity united their shan with heaven and earth (the universe), and were free men of their age."

_Hwai-nan-tsze § VIII.

"There is one mind common to all individual men. Every man is an inlet to the same and to all of the same. He that is once admitted to the right of reason is made a free man of the whole estate. What Plato has thought he may think, what a saint has felt he may feel, what at any time has befallen any man he can understand. Who has access to this universal mind, is a party to all that is or can be done, for this is the only and sovereign agent."

_Emerson—History. Parallel 2.

"The mind is the lord of the body, and shan is the mind's precious thing."  
_Hwai-nan-tsze § VII.

"Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of our own minds."

_Emerson—Self Reliance. Parallel 3.

"If you cannot restrain yourself, then give way. If you give way your shan will not resent it."

_Hwai-nan-tsze § XII.

"Accept your genius, and say what you think."


"The purer essence of the mind may by its shan influence men, though it may not be able to teach them."  
_Hwai-nan-tsze § X.
"Who has more soul than I masters me though he should not raise his finger. Round him I must revolve by the gravitation of spirits. Who has less, I rule with like facility.

*Emerson—Self-Reliance.*

Parallel 5.

"He whom demons will not dare to vex, and on whom the shan of mountains and streams will not dare to send calamities, is most noble" (the nobility of perfect virtue).

*Hwai-nan-tsze § IX.*

"All the devils respect virtue."

*Emerson—Spiritual Laws.*

Parallel 6.

"To enter into the mystic sympathy and perfect blending of shan, and to roam in the place where hands and hearts are all emptiness—where there is no connection with material things, is what a father cannot teach his son. The musician's art by which he expresses ideas, imitates things, and images shan, as his fingers dance over the chords, is what a brother cannot impart to a brother" (See 287).

*Hwai-nan-tsze § IX.*

"Why insist on rash personal relations with your friend? * * Leave this touching and clawing. Let him be to me a spirit" (210).

*Emerson—Friendship.*

"One class live to the utility of the symbol; esteeming health and wealth a final good. Another class live above this mark to the beauty of the symbol, as the poet, and artist, and the natu-
ralists, and the man of science. A third class live above the beauty of the symbol to the beauty of the thing signified; these are wise men. The first class have common sense, the second taste, and the third spiritual perception."

Ibid—Prudence.

Parallel 7.

"The universal mind is diffused through everything. Man gets it, and it is man's mind. Other creatures get it, and it is their mind. Trees and plants, birds and beasts communicate with it, and it is the mind of trees and plants, birds and beasts. It is all one universal mind."

Chu-tsze—On Heaven and Earth.

"All creatures partake of the (impalpable) ether of the whole. Man has it correct and complete, so he stands with his head erect. Beasts have it in a partial manner, and so their heads are in a horizontal position. Plants again have their heads in the ground and their tails straight above."

Ibid.

"These appearances indicate the fact that the universe is represented in every one of its particles. Everything in nature contains all the powers of nature. Everything is made of one hidden stuff, as the naturalist sees one type under every metamorphosis, and regards a horse as a running man, a fish as a swimming man, a bird as a flying man, a tree as a rooted man."

Emerson—Compensation.

Parallel 8.

"T'au" (an abstraction) "seems to have been before Ti" (Shang-ti).

Lau-tsze (486).
"Tau gives spiritual existence to demons and Ti’s" (Shang-ti’s).

Chuang-tsze (484).

"One ever-present ling."

Note on Chuang-tsze (485).

"The mind has its motion and its rest. In itself it is called (the power of) Change (alternation 易). Its Law is called Reason. Its operation is called shan."

Chu-tsze—On Mind.

"Shan is the operation of Ti" (Shang-ti).

Yik-king, Comm. (488).

"The Universe has three children, born at one time, which re-appear under different names, in every system of thought, whether they be called cause, operation, and effect; or more poetically Jove, Pluto, Neptune; or theologically, the Father, the Spirit†, and the Son; but which we call here the Knower, the Doer, and the Sayer."

Emerson—The Poet.

Parallel 9.

"Therefore the ghost-shan of my own shan, of my object of worship, and of the system of nature, are all one and the same."

Notes on the Doctrine of the Mean.

"The superior man performs worship all in and for himself; therefore the highest worship is spiritual (shan). The highest worship is spiritual (shan) and the vulgar make it double" (suppose a distinction between subject and object), "therefore they cannot attain to it."

Han-Fei-tsze § XX.

*This expression reminds us of Nous, but it is not Chuang-tsze’s own.
†Observe "operation" takes the place of "spirit" and of shan.
"Ineffable is the union of man and God in every act of the soul. The simplest person, who in his integrity worships God, becomes God; yet forever and ever the influx of this better and universal self is new and unsearchable; ever it inspires awe and astonishment.

Emerson—The Over-soul.

Nothing can be more obvious than that the word shan in the above Chinese examples corresponds to the "soul," "mind," "spirit" and "over-soul" in Emerson's writings—not to "God" which he brings in occasionally by a kind of poetical license, or as a metaphor borrowed from the language of theology.

Parallel 10.

"There are 10,000 shan in the human body. If a man receives spiritual essence and nourishes his body, inhales air and refines his form; then the 10,000 shan will each hold its true place. But if not, the glorious garrison will fade away—the 10,000 shan will die."

Biography of Genii—Pang-tsu (417).

"The 10,000 shan are one shan."

Tsʻi-hʻiu-tsze (389).

Taoist Books speak of the "The shan of the eyes, of the nose, of the month, of the tongue, of the teeth, &c., &c. The shan of the human body are so many, it is impossible to count them." "The 84,000 individual downy hairs all turn into protecting shan, but one shan in the heart rules them all."

Hwang-tʻing-king Kiai (416).
"Every line we can draw in the sand has expression; and there is no body without its spirit or genius."

Emerson—The Poet.

III. Poetical and figurative uses of shan. The last quotation brings us near to a branch of the subject on which it is needless to dwell, further than to call attention to the wonderful agreement between shan and "spirit or genius." An artist first attains to expression with his pencil, and then he gets, by another stage, the very shan of it (290). The shan of a person is communicated to his portrait by an artist (243 292). The same is done in drawing a picture of a bamboo or any object in nature (291). Chwang-tsze puts into his writings the shan of Lautsze (292). Music can express the shan (293). When a person imitates another's performances to the life it is called a "shan resemblance" (310). A poet describes the shan of hope (307), or "the shan of smiting upon his breast and winging his hands" (grief or despair 548). A man whose features are not like another's, but whose expression or manner occasionally remind you forcibly of the other, is like him in shan (311). An artist who has attained to the mystery of his art is shan-miao, spiritually mysterious, i.e. has a genius inscrutable to others (309). And his peculiar faculty or genius (shan) cannot be imparted to any. It is like the faculty or genius (shan) of the eye for seeing which cannot be communicated to the ear or to any other organ of the body (287). A magical doctor could see the shan of a disease, before there were any symptoms, and remove it (319a).
CHAPTER VI.

THIRD SENSE OF SPIRIT—LING, SHAN, AND TI.

When it is said, "The shan of Heaven settles in the sun, as the shan (spirit) of man settles in the eye", the parallelism leaves it impossible to suppose any metonymy in the case. So also, when we read in the Book of Poetry (III. iii. 5), "The great mountains sent down shan" (430), taking the native commentary, and not the translation, as our guide, we understand that these mountains sent down "their spiritual influence and harmonious air", or else "the harmonious air of their spiritual intelligence". In short the ling of the mountains, in the sense in which many missionaries use the word, "their spirits, descended." Again, when in the Confucian Analects, "the T'ai Mountain is said to be "discerning" (III. 6), or "the mountains and rivers" capable of discerning the colour of "a calf" to be offered to them in sacrifice (VI. 4), and the commentators tell us that "the shan of these mountains and rivers" are referred to; we can understand that shan is the same as "spirit" or "soul." This usage is very common. All beings, from Shang-ti down to the smallest material object that the eye can see (a hair for example 415, 416), have spirits (shan). But now we come to another usage of this word, the usage about which all the controversy is. Heaven itself,
those mountains and rivers themselves, men, beasts, birds, fishes, insects, stones, and, most common of all, graven images themselves are called shan. It is about the first and last of these, Heaven and graven images, that practically our inquiry is concerned. The objects of worship of the Chinese generally speaking are Heaven, Heaven and Earth, their ancestors, and images, made mostly in the form of men and women. They do indeed habitually burn insense and make bows and gesticulations in the open air and into the void; but the objects then are so vague, that, though called shan, or kwei-shan, or kwei, they scarcely come under the class of beings which we call "the gods." As a rule an object of worship of any note or definiteness has an image and a temple. This then is what we call "a god" or "an idol", and the Chinese call it a shan. And the contention of those whom I, with all the earnestness of which I am capable, seek to lead into another way of thinking, is that, since the Chinese speak habitually of Heaven and Earth, their ancestors, and their idols as shan, the first great object of the Christian missionary ought to be, to convince them that the entire usage of this word from the earliest dawn of their history down to the present time, in all its diversities of application and in all its ramifications in their literature, is founded on ignorance, error, and sin; that the word properly means "god"; and that having never known the true God they have never used this word in its true and proper sense. In short all shan hitherto known in China, according to this view, are "false shan," while the word, as an adjective, means divine; and, as an
impersonal noun, deity or divinity. They do not state their argument precisely as I have done; but their translations of the Scriptures and daily accumulating volumes of Hymns, Discourses, Tracts, &c. are my authority for saying, they want to throw this word out of the Chinese language in every sense except that of God, gods, and divine. Even tsing-shan cannot be used in such a place as Judges XV. 19, "his spirit came again and he revived", but the "spirit" has to be expressed by tsing-k'i, "subtile breath." And all this follows quite naturally; for the Christian religion and theology cannot be taught with a word for God which may, at the same time, be correctly used for the human soul, or spirit.

**Spiritual and intelligent men.** Shan is used by metonymy for "spiritual men" (324, 326, 327); ling is used by metonymy for "intelligent men" (320, 321, 322, 325, 340); and Ti is used by metonymy for the Emperor of China, the vice-gerent of Heaven. The last statement will be discussed in next chapter. The other two will probably not be disputed. Shan is used where we should say "genius" in the personal sense. One man is a "flower-genius" because he excels in the cultivation of flowers (328); another is a "tea-genius" because he wrote three volumes on tea (329), a third is a "genius of strong drink" because of his extraordinary capacity for it (330). These are metaphoric uses of shan which decide nothing as to its being "god" or "spirit."

**Spiritual and intelligent things.** To this class I refer the grosser kind of things which are so designated. To the vulgar mind aerial beings are
pure spirits. Of course it is only a question of degree, where there is no recognition of spirit as an essence entirely distinct from matter. Let us not shrink from the fact. Every body, be he Jew or Gentile, who has not clearly made up his mind, that "a spirit" is a being independent of matter and distinct from it, so that he would be a complete personal being if all that is called matter (air, ether, and imponderable media included) were annihilated, must think of God himself as in some respect material. That many excellent and pious men have done so, is, I think, easily ascertained. The confounding of air with spirit has been all but universal among mankind; e.g. tsing-h'i above. The present paragraph has nothing to do with "trifles light as air." Things of the grosser kind seem to be more frequently called ling than shan. I can only explain this on the ground that, ling being merely a quality, the metonymy is more obvious than in the case of shan, which may denote an ethereal substance, without any figure of speech. Hence to speak of mankind in general as shan would cause confusion of ideas and suggest something of an ethereal nature perhaps belonging to our bodies; whereas shang-ling, "living intelligences," is a common designation of men (320). Hence also the firmament is called "the round intelligence" (343) the nine heavens, "the nine intelligences" (344); the moon "the shady intelligence" (345). A gigantic being who tore assunder with his hands the heavens and the earth at the command of Shang-ti is called the "big intelligence" (346). Heaven, Earth, and Man are called "the three ling", or "the three shan" (350). The sun, moon, and stars are also "three ling" (349).
The four *ling* are the unicorn, phœnix, tortoise, and dragon (351). The five *ling* are five creatures of different colours representing the five elements (352). Then, long before there were *shan* of clay and wood (idols 356), there were "grass-*ling*" (354), a sort of rude figures ancienly used at funerals. And, not only is the soul of the dead called *ling*, but the material things, in or near which the soul is supposed to hover, are included in this name (355). In all these cases the metonymy is evident. It is not so clear however when it is said that a Tauist's bones, that do not decay, are *shan* (spirit 357). It seems as if the bones might "turn all to spirit", as the angel told Adam he might do, in *Paradise Lost*.

Here I must again give a few parallel passages to illustrate the more concrete use of *shan*.

**Parallel 1.**

"That which, when it would be small, becomes like a moth or a grub, when it would be large, fills the world; when it would ascend, mounts on the airy clouds, when it would descend, enters the deep; whose transformations are not conditioned by days, nor its ascending or descending by seasons, is called *shan* (496). *Kwan-teze.*"

"For spirits when they please
"Can either sex assume, or both; so soft
"And uncompounded is their essence pure,
"Not ty'd or manackled with joint or limb,
"Nor founded on the brittle strength of bones,
"Like cumbrous flesh; but in what shape they choose,

---

*管子.*
"Dilated or condensed, bright or obscure,
"Can execute their airy purposes,
"And works of love or enmity fulfil."

Paradise Lost I.

Parallel 2.

"No shan is left uninvoked."

Book of Poetry.

The spirit of draught is described as a man three feet high, naked, and having his eyes in the crown of his head. All sorts were propitiated in time of distress (448, 457).

"O all ye host of heaven! O earth! What else? And shall I couple hell?"

Hamlet.

Parallel 3.

"When Hwan prince of Ts'e (B.C. 685—642) was on an expedition against the north, at Ku-chuh, he saw a man of a foot high, with clothes, cap, and ornamental cuffs, running before his horses. Kwan-chung said, 'This is the shan of the mountain. Its name is Yü'-rh. When a usurping prince arises it appears.'"

Shuh-i-ki.

"Dr. Percy tells us that the existence of fairies is alluded to by the most ancient British bards, among whom the commonest name was that of 'spirits of the mountains.'"

Brand's Popular Antiquities.

Parallel 4.

"The carp, as soon as its scales number 360, is caught and carried away by dragons; but if every year a shan be placed to guard it, it cannot be carried away. This shan is a tortoise" (358).

Shuh-i-ki.
"A spirit called the hairy one, in the Isle of Man, cut down and gathered in the meadow-grass which would have been injured if allowed to remain exposed to the coming storm." — Brand.

Instances like the above could be multiplied to any extent. There is not a fairy or ghost story in our language, but might be matched with a Chinese one in which the subject is shan.

Things that are gods. Some one has quoted the passage in which it is said certain people's "god is their belly," as showing the extensive generic use of "god" (theos). Here is a parallel case of ti, used figuratively:—"In a dry year, the earth-dragon; and in pestilence, the grass-dog (figures made to remove the evils) are ti (gods) for the time being" (359).

Worshipped beings. I have quoted passages to show that ti, shan, and ling in many combinations referring to objects of worship are synonymous or nearly so. The Supreme Ti, the Supreme Shan, and the Supreme Ling, all mean, or may mean, the God of Heaven (360—366). Let none of my brethren be alarmed or offended, as if I meant to say that the Chinese know a great deal about the God of Heaven, which they are supposed a priori not to know till we tell them. I wish to affirm nothing as to the amount of their knowledge; and no man can be more deeply convinced than I am of their need of teaching. But these terms, in some connections, all mean the Most High. Chi-shan means the same in the passage quoted (367), though it is rather pantheistic. The next following expressions, referring to the firmament, are of a somewhat material nature (368—372). It must also be noticed that shan and
WORSHIPPED BEINGS.

ling have a strong tendency to be plural and to include too much, especially shan (363)—"the spirits of the souls that are above." Observe also the difference between shan and ling in the explanation of "high intelligences", namely, "the spirits of heaven that have intelligence", as if some might be without that quality (ling). All three words are used in the plural with equal freedom. I should say, the four terms, shang-ti, ti, shan, and ling have all more or less of a plural use. There is no question about the last two, and not so much about the second. But the first, shang-ti, has also decidedly a plural use. In the Chow Ritual, shang-ti alone is generic (378), and an epithet has to be added to distinguish the Highest One. With the Tauists "all the shang-ti of heaven" are thirty-two or thirty-six (381, 382). This is not a mere poetic license, as "the thirty-six yuh-hwang" (384) appears to be. The use is fully established in Tauist Books (388). There are also not a few shang-ti whose names are well known (383). Then, if we want a word with a still wider scope, we have "ten thousand ti" (388), and "the host of ti" (392), by only dropping the shang. Is this not generic enough? On the other hand, there is ling also quite as comprehensive as shan itself for objects of worship, not indeed in such common use, but still usable. It is my serious conviction that to adopt ling for objects of worship would be less injurious than to adopt shan, because the former is not nearly of such frequent occurrence in other senses nor so varied in its uses as the latter. But it is not practicable to adopt either. Again, in Canton and other places, it is well known that pu-sah is quite as commonly used
for objects of worship as shan, and pu-sah has the
great advantage of being confined very much to
that sense. Is not common usage for objects of
worship utterly inadequate to prove a word equi-


dent to "god or gods"? Our word "idol" would
denote very much all the objects of worship of the
Chinese people of the present day; but we know
well "idol" is not the same sort of word as "God."
Neither is "spirit" the same sort of word. If there
ever really was a race of Red Indians who wor-
shipped "the Great Spirit," it would have been
necessary probably for missionaries to substitute
some other term for "Spirit", as Great One or
Great Being, in order to relieve this word for its
proper use in the Christian theology. This is at
all events the case with shan; whatever strong
reasons any one may see for using it for "God"
and "gods", in translating the Bible and teaching
Christianity, there are far stronger for retaining it
for "spirit"; because, to use a familiar phrase,
there will be a dead lock, if the right native word
is not available for spirit.

 Evil spirits and possession. As, at the outset
of our investigation, we found shan alone good for
the spirit of a living man, so now, at the close, we
take leave of all other terms but this. There are
no evil ling, unclean ling, or possessions by ling,
in my collection. If I had found such I would
have put them in. Will my Christian brethren
trust me thus far? Then, as for shan, look at the
passages quoted, and, if they are insufficient, I
will bring double the number on a few days warn-
ing. There are evil shan, malignant shan, wicked
shan, lewd shan, fierce shan, scorching shan, pesti-
lental shan, and unclean shan (442—453). There are shan whom people run against innocently and unawares, and who thereupon inflict upon them every kind of misery (453, 454). Sin is laid to the charge of shan (455), attempts are made to slay them (456), and, failing that, offerings and religious service are rendered to them, when of course opprobrious names will be dropt, and flattering titles given to them, but all along they were called shan (457, 458). Shan come sometimes on invitation and take possession of men's bodies, when they lose for a time their personal identity, and the shan act and speak, eat and drink through them, and even get intoxicated, as we read in the Book of Poetry, the oldest book in China; the phenomena there recorded being precisely the same in nature as modern possession by demons (460). The evil shan at other times come uninvited, without any assignable cause, and torment people (451). A man when under the power of such shan is called a wizard, and a woman in the same condition is called a witch (462). Possession by ling is something new in Chinese. A "familiar spirit" may be a kwei, or a shan, but not a ling.
CHAPTER VII.

HEAVEN, TI, AND SHANG-TI.

There are a great many Chinese quotations in the Appendix which have been touched on but lightly, or not at all. They are put on record as bearing on the subject, for future use, in the belief that they may be helpful towards the final settlement of the question. I am not aware of having overlooked any passage which tells on the opposite side; and I should like to see some quotations from Chinese authors to prove, for instance, that ling is used for the human spirit; or that "my shan" is usable for "my God", or that Ti is any thing different from what I have represented that word to be. If such passages were before me now, I should be delighted to put them in where they ought to go, so as to complete the evidence on both sides. I might here wind up with the remark, that Shang-ti for "God" needs no words of recommendation from me. It is the word we find in the language for the Highest. It is not indeed the Jehovah of the Jews, nor the Theos of the Greeks, nor the God of English Christians; and, at the same time, it is not the Jove of the Romans, or the Baal of the Canaanites, or the Great Spirit of the Red Indians; but it is the word corresponding to God in Chinese as near as we could wish or expect. Take it and be thankful; or, if not, find another, the use of which will not render
co-operation impracticable, and conference on mission work a mere name for nothing. It must be apparent to any sensible man, without a knowledge of Chinese, that between those who freely use the word shan in all the senses described in this essay, and those who say, "there is none shan but one, that is, God", there can be no effective co-operation or consultation about their work. We divide at the very threshold, we contradict each other in every sermon or prayer or hymn we make; our versions of the Scriptures read like two different Books; the disregard of idiom, in the case before us, is followed up by a general disregard of idiom, and a dislike of what is deemed undue pandering to Chinese taste on the other side. Then, the other side are driven to the Classics and standard literature for confirmation of their usage; and, finding indeed what they want, they are liable to be too much fascinated by ornaments of style, and thus they are impeded in their usefulness, as well as laid open to the charge brought against them. What a waste of power this question has caused and is causing, God knows; and we are all in our measure responsible for it to Him.

Objections answered. 1. Shang-ti is, in the usage of the Confucianists, too much like the visible heavens personified. 2. Shang-ti is, by the Tauists, and by the people generally, applied to various idols, here to Yuh-hwang, there to Huen-tien, and again to Kwan-kung, to one, or two, or more indeed, but not to the whole pantheon. 3. Shang-ti contains in it the idea of supremacy. 4. Shang-ti cannot be used naturally and properly in the plural. 5. By using this term we seem to be taking the chief god of the Confucianists, or the chief god
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of the Tauists, to be our God. 6. The second syllable of the term is equivalent to Emperor, and denotes in fact the Emperor of China.—That these objections are founded on facts no one can deny. I object to some of the facts, that is to say, I wish that they were not facts; but their validity as objections to the term is far from apparent. Let me illustrate this by means of the first objection and the second. The Confucianists were long before the Tauists in their use of this word. Lau-tsze, the founder of the Tauist system, knew nothing about those idols referred to, and probably no one would have been more horrified than himself at the idea of giving such a name to such things. Confucius, on the other hand, who lived about the same time (B.C. 551—478), did not initiate the practice of calling Heaven personified Shang-ti. The usage came down with the language from unfathomable antiquity. "Heaven" and Ti and Shang-ti were used almost synonymously, in the old Ballads* which he recited, and which he cherished as perhaps the most precious heritage of antiquity. Grant then for the moment that Shang-ti is Heaven, even if it does not coincide with our theological conception, are not the Tauists just as much in error as if it did? And shall we not join the Confucianists in a holy alliance against the blasphemy of calling an image of clay Heaven? In my humble opinion we might do many worse things; as for instance, we might occupy ourselves in adducing far-fetched arguments against each other, which would be a much more questionable thing than taking the Confucianists' word for God, even it be in

* See Note B.
their mouths a little like Jove.* I can with great good reason object to the Tauist usage of Shang-ti; a course which no one is justified in adopting in regard to the universal usage of shan for spirits whether objects of worship or not. The objections brought against Shang-ti are, as far as I can ascertain them, either objectionable things, or else really recommendations to the word. The definiteness, the strong personality of the term, and the fact that it denotes the chief gods of two existing sects, and not of one only, are really recommendations. We can come in between them, and say, "You are both in a measure wrong. That Being, whom one of you ignorantly makes to be Heaven personified, or the animated Cosmos, and the other still more ignorantly makes to be an image of clay, or the king of Fairy-Land, and at the same time also the god of the North Pole, that Being, whose sacred name you have both profaned by giving it to men, as to Kwan-kung, and in one of its forms to your emperor,—Him declare we unto you. Not only certain of your own poets, but the universal consent of your wisest men, we can adduce, to shew, that this name, whether Ti or Shang-ti, means properly Heaven, or 'the Lord of Heaven', and nothing else. Do not tell us that Shang-ti is the proper name of an idol. It is the most improper of all names that could be named. We tell you, the Almighty has revealed himself, and He has given an authoritative command, saying, 'Thou shalt have no other shang-ti before me.'" The word is used in the plural. This also is an established usage of the

* The name of the Supreme Deity among the Romans. Webster.
Chinese language, and it is obviously an improper usage. But can any one show a good reason for refusing the word because of the obviousness of this impropriety? If there were really no impropriety in saying "gods", then the plural form would be in accordance with the truth of things. Should we not rejoice to find a word for God in Chinese, like Shang-ti, of which the impropriety of a plural use is rather more apparent; considering that the language has no inflections; and that "to worship God" and "to worship the gods", while we use the same name throughout, are not distinguishable from one another? Just consider it one moment. The Chinese will very soon find out that we do not worship Huen-tien, or Yuh-hwang, or the Emperor, or the visible Heavens. We are liable to be mistaken by very ignorant people and perfect strangers in this way, and we are liable to be teased also by impertinent questioners who know better. But that we do not worship certain visible and very substantial things may soon be known. That is not the difficulty. The difficulty is to let them know what we really do worship; and, to all but the initiated, "worship shan", in the light of the exposition here given of the meanings of shan, must convey a very vague notion indeed. We must ever remember that what we do now, we do, not merely for those at present under our instruction or those to whom we give a Bible or a Tract, but for a great nation and a long future; and the liability of mistaking Shang-ti for Yuh-hwang is of a temporary, local, and trivial nature, while the teaching of spirit-worship is a radical mistake as to theology, and a deviation from what we are sent
here to teach, which may result in very serious consequences. The mistake is of an inward and spiritual kind, and so are the consequences—not easily estimated.

Lord of Heaven (379). The term T'ien-chu is just one of the Chinese definitions of Ti and Shang-ti (469, 470, 478, 480). There are many other definitions of Ti, e.g. "Ti is Heaven" (463, 464, 466, 467). "Ti is the Spirit of Heaven" (465), "Ti is the heart or mind of Heaven" (467, 468). "Ti is the Nature of Heaven" (471). "Ti is Law" (472, 473). "There is not a Shang-ti like the images men make" (474, 480). "There is not a Man (Person) in Heaven who issues decrees as the old books seem to say (473); nevertheless, in reading those old books, it seems impossible to exclude altogether the notion of something more than Law, and in order to realize what they mean by the decrees of Shang-ti, or Heaven, we must" (in the private opinion of the speaker, Chu-tsze) "include the idea of the visible Heaven as that which decrees" (479). In spite of this materialistic tendency of the philosophical interpreters, they had long ago made up their minds that "the visible Heaven and Shang-ti must be distinct," and that "Shang-ti has no bodily form" (465—468, 479, 480). The questionings of thoughtful men, of a sceptical nature, which have come down from before the Christian era (475, 476), are deserving of our earnest attention. Compare the two passages here referred to with the xxxviiith chapter of Job beginning at the 5th verse—"Who hath laid the measures thereof?" Then look at the unsatisfactory conclusion of the second questioner, Chwang-tsze:—"It seems as if there were a True
Ruler, only we cannot get at His personality” (477). Chwang-tsze does not make use of the personal name (Shang-ti) here, or elsewhere as a rule, just because he could not “get hold of the personality” of the Deity. And Chu-tsze admires his unanswered questions, saying, “Chwang-tsze perceived this principle; the (Ruler or) Ruling Power is self-existent, inherent, necessary, unspeakable. You must see it for yourself” (478). I give only the sense of the original. “Self-existent” with Chu-tsze does not here refer to a Being but to a Law which Heaven has in itself.

The above are a few of the answers the Chinese have attempted to give to the question, “What is God?” We find among them “God is the Spirit of Heaven,” and “God is the Ruler or Lord of Heaven.” Can there be any hesitancy about preferring the plastic word itself (Ti or Shang-ti) to the one rigid definition of it (T’ien-chu), “Lord of Heaven?”

**Ruler.** Perfect precision of language is not attainable; and often, when aiming at precision in one direction, we err egregiously, without perceiving it, in another. Apart from all abstruse discussions about the nature of God, the two words “lord” (chu) and “ruler” (tsai) are equally concrete and personal, and amount very much to the same thing. To make the two together, chu-tsai, equivalent to “Ruling Power” is a device of pantheistic or atheistic philosophy. But observe what has been done, on our own part, in this debate about Terms for God. One Chinese definition, of Ti and Shang-ti alike, has been taken and translated into English as “the Ruler of Heaven,” then cut in two, and the least
significant part of it retained for use—"Ruler," "ruler." Following upon this we have an interminable logomachy. On the one hand, there is an elaborate argument to shew that "God" also has the relative sense of "Ruler"; whilst, on the other, this is denied, and a beautiful argumentum ad hominem appears, to the effect that "ruler" is utterly inadequate to express "God." All this is just like taking out one of Webster's definitions, "the Sovereign of the Universe," dropping the latter part of it, and, then seeking, from the uses and meanings of "Sovereign," to determine the nature of the word "God." Sovereign is a relative term, and so also is Lord. But, nevertheless, does not common sense suggest, since the Romanists have chosen this very phrase "the Lord of Heaven" in Chinese, for "God," and not a few Protestants and Anglicans are inclined to follow their example, that the native phrase, t'ien-chi-chu-tsai, "the Lord and Ruler of Heaven," when taken entire, is one of the best definitions of God which can be given? Else, why should the definition be preferred to the very word itself? Can there be any satisfaction to an ingenuous mind in the maintenance of such a discussion as this about "Ruler" or "ruler"? If any one lays hold of any inadvertence or want of precision in my language, and founds a similar argument upon it against the truth, I can only answer him with silence. Ti is not "ruler," but "Ruler of Heaven."

Emperor. The modern use of this word or its equivalent, "Imperator," dates from the time of Julius Caesar. The use of Hwang-ti and Ti, for the Sovereign of China, dates from Ts'ien Shi, about two centuries earlier. But, the origin of the two titles,
the Roman and the Chinese, and their primary meanings are quite as different as the two men just named were different the one from the other. Julius Cæsar was an imperator. Ts‘in Shi was not a ti (either Heaven or God) although he impiously called himself this. This act of Ts‘in Shi may be made intelligible to all readers by transferring the account of it given by Sze-ma Ts‘ien, in a figure, to Julius Cæsar. Suppose that Cæsar, in the height of his power, had called together the Roman Senate, to consult about what title he should assume. The Senators, with fear and trembling, suggest that, according to the veritable traditions of Rome, one of the early kings was styled "Superbus Rex," and that Cæsar might assume that honorable title. But Cæsar here interposes and says, "Put away the 'Rex,' and retain the 'Superbus.' Then, make a further selection from the veritable traditions you speak of. Was not the founder of Rome called 'Deus Deo natus'? Call me therefore 'Superbus Deus'" (334). There is not a single point exaggerated in this imaginary illustration. The traditions of China were three or four fold more remote, and fully as incredible, as those of Rome which were put on record as veritable history by Livy. And the credulity of some European scholars who to this day accept without question the statement of the Chinese Book of History, that the first two sovereigns of China, who reigned 2,000 years before Ts‘in Shi, were "Ti"; while, during the intervening period of two millenniums, no human being was so entitled, and the name Ti belonged to Heaven alone, is a mystery I cannot
fathom.* But I venture here to throw out one mild suggestion, which may lead to profitable reflection. "Emperor" is a western word, very special in its application, and, as far as I know, never applied to God. It so happens that this word suits our purposes in translation, where ti and hwang-ti denote the sovereign of China. But where is our logic, if, after translating the Chinese title in this way, we reason back from our own translation to the meaning of Ti? Would it subserve the interests of truth to construct another beautiful argumentum ad hominem founded on Dr. Legge's translation of the Book of History, Part I. and Part II., referring to the two sovereigns aforesaid as (ti) "emperors" far back in "antiquity"? Is the translation inspired? It would be well to read the Translator's Notes, in this connection, where the uniform testimony of natives is given, that "Ti means Heaven," that those two men were called ti because their virtue was equal to Heaven, and that the sovereigns of China have been, since Ts'in Shi, called by the same title "as the vicegerents of Heaven" i.e. by metonymy. Before Ts'in Shi the sovereigns of China had been called "celestial kings" (tien-wang), but, since his time, the noun (Coelus or Deus) has taken the place of the adjective; yea, even the name of "the Lord and Ruler of Heaven" has been freely given to them. But it should be remembered that the same title is not freely given to any other earthly potentate, or ruler. If the Chinese could have their will, we should not only be still called "barbarians," but our sovereigns would receive, instead of

* See Notes A and B. It might have been said of Ts'in Shi, as it was said of Domitian, "Dominum se et Deum primus appellari jussit." Eutropius.
hwang-ti, the humbler title of "sons of heaven" (t'ien-tsze) to intimate their inferiority (464). We laugh at "the Celestials"; but nevertheless we demand, in our intercourse with them, that a title equivalent to "the God of Heaven" shall be given to our kings.

In conclusion, as I said of shan so I say of ti, no metaphoric use of the word can alter its radical meaning; and much less can the abuse of it have this effect. An extensive and impartial examination of the usages of a word seems to me the only legitimate means of ascertaining what its radical meaning, and metaphoric uses or abuses are. My aim has been to find and set forth the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in regard to those three terms, shan, ling, and ti. If I have failed in any particular it will probably be found to have arisen from taking too narrow a range, and possessing too superficial a knowledge of the Chinese language. Of one thing I am convinced, that a less comprehensive view of the language, and the introduction of more ancient western lore, will only promote darkness and confusion. If I am ever to get new light on this subject, or if any one else is going to place it in a new and better light, it must be by following out the same line of investigation here pursued more perfectly, and, I can add with a clear conscience, in the same spirit.
Imagine yourself in China in the time of Confucius (B.C. 551—478) instead of in the nineteenth century. Very different was China then. It was indeed a very old nation, having more than a millennium of history, some say 18 centuries, but very dark in the early parts (341).

1. There were as yet, it appears, no idols in China.

2. In the Old Ballad Book, the only book which Confucius required his pupils to master, "Heaven," Ti, and Shang-ti were used almost synonymously, and the other objects of worship, parts of nature, and souls of men, were spoken of generally as poh-shan (hundred spirits).

3. No emperor of China was as yet called Ti. If there ever was a quibble, the quoting of a satyrical Ode (II. vii. X.) against this is one. "This Shang-ti is very shan" refers to the emperor, but neither Shang-ti nor shan is his title. So also a charming lady is compared both to Heaven and to Ti (I. iv. III). We have all read what the Indian poet styled the Prince of Wales.

4. Confucius could not give a credible account of the two dynasties preceding his own for want of documents. There must have been very few Books.

5. But, men then strove hard to make the Book of History extend back even beyond these dynasties; and Confucius himself, falling in with the popular craving for a grand origin, imagined he saw far back in antiquity two divine men, whose virtue corresponded to Heaven.

6. In the Confucian Analects, even these two are not spoken of as Ti; and, considering that Mencius, two centuries later, pronounced the Book of History as he had it incredible in many parts, we may suppose that what we have now is by no means the same that was approved by Confucius; and thus we may acquit him of the charge of styling a human being Ti or Heaven.

7. Since the History of those 18 centuries, as we have it now, opens with two Ti, and there are no other beings, but Heaven and these two, counted worthy of such a title, we must conclude that these two were deified, if not by Confucius, then by the writer of the first two parts of the History, and by Mencius.

8. The authoritative publication of the first commandment in the form "Thou shalt have no other Ti besides me," would have had a powerful significance at that time, when the notion was growing up that the first sovereigns of the Empire were Ti.

9. Many sayings were in after ages imputed to Confucius which in all probability he never uttered. It was said, for example, that he was well aware of the existence of "five Ti," who reigned.
in succession in ancient China; and, further still, of "three August Ones" who reigned before the "five Ti."

10. In uncritical ages, mankind easily believed such inventions. But, strangest of all is the last discovery, that Confucius was well acquainted with a person of the name of P'an-ku,* who lived and reigned ages before the three and the five; the fact being that, historically, P'an-ku was the invention of a dreamy Tauist† in his dotage, on the top of Lo-fau-shan in Kwang-tung, a good thousand miles away from the home of Confucius, and nearly a thousand years after he was dead. This belongs to modern "Confucian Cosmogony."

*盤古
†葛洪，枕中書
NOTE B, ANTIQUITY OF BOOKS.

The Confucian Analects may be taken as the earliest and most authentic record of Confucius' sayings and doings. In that document we find the following evidence as to Books.

1. The Book of Poetry is quoted correctly (I. xv., viii., III. ii., IX. xxvi., XII. x.) five times, portions of the Book are referred to and correctly described (XVII. x., III. xx., VIII. xv., XI v., XV. x., IX. xiv., XVII. xviii.) seven times, and the number of Odes is given roundly as 300 (II. ii.), nearly correct. Both Confucius and his disciples were quite familiar with this Book, so also was Mencius. They seem to have committed it to memory.

2. The Book of History is quoted differently from the one we have now, and without point (II. xxi., XIV. xliii.), only twice. On the only other passage which might be taken for a quotation (XX. i.) Dr. Legge, who did not then think Yaou and Shun mythical but historical emperors (ii), says, "The first five paragraphs here are mostly compiled from different parts of the Book of History. But there are many variations of language. The compiler may have thought it sufficient if he gave the substance of the original in his quotations, without seeking to observe a verbal accuracy, or possibly, the Book of History, as it was in his days may have contained the passages as he gives them, and the variations be owing to the burning of most of the Classical books by the founder of the Ts'in dynasty, and their recovery and restoration in a mutilated state. We do not find this address of Yaou to Shun in the Book of History Pt. I., but the different sentences may be gathered from Pt. II. ii. 14, 15, where we have the charge of Shun to Yu. Yaou's reign commenced B.C. 2356, and after reigning 73 years, he resigned his administration to Shun. He died B.C. 2256, and two years after, Shun occupied the throne, in obedience to the will of the people." Reader, you are free to believe all the History of that ancient time if you can.

3. Defective Records. "The Master said, I am able to describe the ceremonies of the Hea dynasty, but K'i cannot sufficiently attest my words, I am able to describe the ceremonies of the Yin dynasty, but Sung cannot sufficiently attest my words. They cannot do so because of the insufficiency of their records and wise men. If those were sufficient, I could adduce them in support of my words" (III. ix.). That is to say, as it was, no body would believe him; and no wonder, when he had no documentary evidence to adduce.

4. The Yih is once mentioned (VII. xvi.). Whether Confucius was superstitious enough to make the remark here attributed to him or not, which I very much doubt, it is evident to every one who examines the Book now called the Yih-king, that it could not have
been in existence in the time of Confucius. And what did exist even Confucius himself had not studied, and did not discourse about.

5. Rules of Propriety. "The Master's frequent themes of discourse were, the Odes, the History, and the maintenance of the Rules of Propriety" (VII. xvii.). What these last were we can only gather from the Analects, because the three voluminous collections of Rules of Propriety are of a much later date than Confucius. Mencius quotes from a Book of Rules, but not from any of those we have now. It is time for western scholars to give up repeating that the Chow-li, or Rites of Chow, is an authentic book. Even Chu-tsze, who was fascinated by its really absurd ceremonial, and imagined it must have come down from Chow-kung, was obliged to confess that Mencius could not have seen it:—孟子是不見周禮 Chu-tsze's Works § xxxvii.
EXPLANATIONS OF ZHONG.
至於狐猴形狀類人，便最靈於他物，只不善說話而已。

又性理性，道無方體性有神靈，此語畧有意思，但神靈二字非所以言性耳。又其靈而有知有覺而言，故謂之魂魄。

又以二氣言則鬼者陰之靈也，神者陽之靈也，又《禮》曰：“魂魄是形氣之精英，謂之靈。”

又心至靈細入毫芒纖芥之間，便知便覺，六合之大，莫不在此，又如古初去今，是幾千萬年若此念纔發，便到那裏。下面方來，又不知是幾千萬年若此念纔發，便也到那裏。這箇神明不測，至虛至靈是甚次第，然人莫不有此心多是。但知有利欲，被利欲將，這箇心包了起居動作，只是有甚可喜物事、有甚可好物事一念才動，便是這箇物事。
GEKEKI
EXPLANATIONS OF ZIPI
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気由神生道由神成。

又陸佃解天受藻華句

賢生聖生道道生法生神神神明明者正之末。

管子心術下

心之中又有心，詣動亂之心，又有靜正之心也。

其神乎，心神舍也。舍虛而神中居心之中，又有心也，即性宗是，

其所謂外來乎哉。神吾神也，從外來乎哉。

老子居位篇

又漢高誘詁注老子曰：以道推天下，其鬼不神也。

神為生為氣之浩然有深情集句

神者生之本也。
太上者, 隕無之神也, 天地者, 陰陽之神也, 人蟲者, 血肉之神也, 其同者, 神其異者, 形。

又, 太虛一虛也, 太神一神也, 大氣一氣也, 太形一形也, 命之則四根之則一, 守之不得。

聖人之於祭祀非必神之, 益附之教焉, 故於天地示有尊也, 不肅則無以教, 應於有功烈者示報, 德也不肅則無以勸善凡。
GENERAL EXPLANATIONS OF SHAN.
形故謂之鬼，遊者伸而不測，故謂之神，人物皆然，非有聖愚之異也。

又以二氣言則鬼者陰之靈也，神者陽之靈也，以一氣言則至而伸者為神，反而歸者為鬼，一氣即陰陽運行之氣，至則皆去，則皆去，則皆去之謂也，二氣謂陰陽對峙，各有所屬，如氣之呼吸者為魂魂即神也，而屬乎陽耳目鼻口之類為魄魄即鬼也，而屬乎陰精氣為物精與氣合而生者也，遊魂為變則氣散而死者也，人以為神，便是致生之以為不神，便是致死之。

即聖賢則安於死豈有不散而為神怪者乎？如黃帝堯舜不聞其既死而為靈怪也，又問鬼神便只是此氣否曰？又是這氣裏面神靈相似，又鉅問陽主伸，陰主屈，鬼神陰陽之靈，不過指一氣之屈伸往來者而言耳，天地之間，陰陽合散，何物不有，所以錯綜看得曰固是今且說大界限則周禮言天曰神地曰闇。
各自屬陰陽，然陰陽中又各自有陰陽也，或曰大率鬼屬形體，魂屬精神，日精又
是魂神又懸魂，問陽魂為神陰魂為鬼祭義曰：氣也者神之盛也，魄也者鬼之盛
也而鄭氏曰：氣虛吸出入者也，耳目之聰明為魄然則陰陽未可言鬼神陰陽之靈
乃鬼神也，如何曰：魄者形之神魂者氣之神魂魄是形氣之精英謂之靈
又鬼神
來者為神去者為鬼以人身言之則氣為神而精為鬼
又氣便是魂冷氣便是魄，魂便是氣之神魄便是精之神會思量計度底便是魄，
記當去底便是魄，
蘇氏曰，物鬼也，變神也，鬼常與體魄俱，故謂之物神無適而不可故謂之變，
精氣為魄魄為鬼志為魂魂為神，未子謂蘇氏失之。
帝聞西域有神，其名曰佛。因遣使之天竺，求其道。其書大抵以虛無為宗，貴慈悲不殺人。以爲人死精神不滅。隨復受形生。時善惡皆有報應。

朱子全書鬼神論魂魄之說曰：今在人便自一半是神，一半是鬼。但未死以前，神爲主。已死之後則鬼爲主。問氣也者，神之盛也，魄也者，鬼之盛也。豈非以氣魄未足，爲鬼神者？氣魄之盛者，乃爲神。神非曰非也。凡說鬼神皆是通生死而言。此言盛者，則是指生人身上而言，所以後面說骨肉殞於下，陰爲野土。但說體不說魂，也問問問先生言耳目之精明者，以能吸吸者爲魂，是否已然看來魂是箇物事形象在裏面，恐如水晶相似，所以發來爲耳目之精明，且如月其黑暈是魄也。其光是魂也。想見人身魂魄也是如此。人生時魂魄相交，死則離而各散。魂爲陽而散。上魄爲陰而降。又曰陰主藏受，陽主運用。凡能記憶，皆魂之所藏。受也。至於運用發出來是魂。這兩箇物事本不相離。他能記憶，則是魂。然發出來底是魂。能知覺底是魄。然知覺發出來底又是魂。雖
心者形之主也而神者心之寶也
稽康養生論
精神之於形骸猶國之有君也神躁於中而形喪於外猶君昏於上國亂於下也

無動非神
通鑑綱目 漢明帝永平元年朝原陵訟
與有知也又知靈也左傳子産曰人生始化曰魄既生魄陽曰魂用物精多則魂魄
強是以有精爽至於神明注人生始變化而為形形之靈者名曰魄若視聴動運之
類魄屬陰其中自有陽氣氣之神者名曰魂如精神性識之類
又永平八年詔聴贖罪訟
或問曰心，請問之曰：天指天時地地天地，天地神明而不測者也。心之神也，猶將
測之況於人，況於事倫乎，故問心於聖日，昔仲尼，心於文王，及達之顏淵亦
作類，人心其神矣乎，操則存，則亡。
天之心神，棲乎日人之神棲乎月
魂即神也，文選和神註
神人之精爽也，朱子全書
又，道統
神是心之至妙處
心氣之精爽
性理
又
EXPLANATIONS OF SHAN—HEAVEN AND EARTH.

聖人曰神

此謂王德之人云云。神之又神，而能精焉。

莊子

安仁立政曰神又民無能名曰神，

謚法

知人所不知曰神，

淮南子

聖而不可知之謂神，

上下無時謂之神，

欲小則化如蠟蜋，欲大則藏於天下，欲上則凌於雲氣，欲下則入於深泉，化無日。
天上自有神，非鬼神之神。

朱子全書周子書

解動而無動，靜而無靜。此說動而生陽動極，靜而生陰，靜極復動。此自有箇

神在其中，不屬陰，不屬陽。故曰陰陽不測之謂神。且如晝夜，晝夜，靜動在

俱動。在夜間，神不與之俱。靜。神又自是神，神即變得分明。晝夜，晝夜，變

不得神。妙。萬物。自是有形象底。是說粗底了。又曰，靜者為主，故以蒙良終。
莊子卷三大宗師

夫道有情有信無為無形可傳而不可受可得而不可見自本自根未有天地自古

以固存神鬼神帝生天生地在太極之先而不為高在六極之下而不為深

又無古無今歸震川枌一靈長在

老子

吾不知其誰之子類帝之先

韓文公

象帝威容大詮指玄元也即老子

神字集解

帝之神易經

神者妙萬物而為言者也詮神即帝也又帝者神之體神者帝之用又所以妙萬

陰陽不測之謂神

集仙錄謝自然傳
之性則就其全體，而萬物所得以為生者言之，則天即理也；命即性也，性即理也，是如此否？然但今人說天非
之到合而言之，則天即理也，命即性也，性即理也。若是則不得
帝之不帝久矣，注，百王稱帝者，相沿前代號也，自秦始皇始，故曰不帝久矣。又
文中子
帝謂無形象，恐恨不得若如世間所謂玉皇大帝恐亦不可。畢竟此理如何學者皆
氣為上形為下，識都其中而三才備矣。氣為鬼，其乎，識為神，其乎？吾得之理性
也
通鑑編目，周赧王二十七年
秦以伯爵僭王亦既與周無別矣，昭襄何意思及稱帝，豈非欲以是求加於周哉？罪
孰在於此者？
天其運乎地，其處乎日月其爭於所乎，孰主張是，孰綱維是，孰居無事而推行，是意者其有機絨而不得已耶，意者其運轉而不能自止耶，意者為雨乎，雨者為雲乎，孰隆施是，孰居無事淫樂而勤是風起北方。一西一東有上彷徨孰虛吸是孰居無事而披拂是敢問何故，註重重微問者要人深思自得運化主宰，以立君道之准。又有真宰而特不得其朕，或問伊川說以主宰謂之帝孰為主宰，自有主宰，蓋天是箇至剛至陽之物，自然運轉不息，所以如此，必有為之主宰，這樣處要人自見得非言語所能盡也，因舉莊子孰綱維是孰主張是十數句，他也見得這道理。又性命四者之別，天則就其自然然言之命，則就其流行而賦於物者言之，問天與性命與理，惟時何為？陰陽三合何本何化，圓則九重，孰營度之，惟兹何功，孰初作之。
震怒之類然這箇亦只是理如此天上莫尊於理故以帝名之

又曰

問人之死也不知魂魄便散否曰固是散又問子孫祭祀有感格者如何曰畢竟
子孫是祖先之氣他氣雖散他根却在這裏盡其誠敬則亦能呼召得他氣聚在此
如波檣後水非前水後波非前波然却通只是一水波子孫之氣與祖考之氣亦

合於天此是如何曰便是又有此理用之云恐只是此理上合於天耳曰既有此理
便有此氣或曰想是聖人稟得清妙純粹之氣故其死也其氣上合於天也

如此方看得這箇道理活又如云文王陟降在帝左右如今若說文王真箇在上帝
左右真箇有箇上帝如世間所塑之像固不可然聖人如此說便是有是理

爾曰遂古之初誰傳道之上下未形何由考之冥昭瞢闇誰能極之鍾翼惟像何以
宰者，即是理，不是心外别有箇理，理外别有箇心，又問此心字與帝字相似否曰

天之生成萬物而主宰之者謂之帝

漢祠，一求神仙方曰，天神貴者，太一，太一之宰曰帝，身之主宰曰心，又曰至靈之貞宰，其性也

朱子天地

帝是理而主，又性理二命

問命之不齊，恐不是真有為之賦予。如此，只是二氣錯綜參差，隨其所值因各不齊，皆非人力所與故謂之天所命否曰只是從大原中流出來模樣，似恁地不是真有
帝字雜解

此素皇內帝之法註，帝者天號王者人稱，王者天人之總美大之名，

又天子夷狄

問天地之心，天地之理，理是道理，心是主宰底意，否日心因是主宰底意，然所謂主
婆娑豆豆小葛，非神之神，
附鬼神。
周禮記詐，非神之神，
附鬼神。
安在乎，有二司神，
非神之神，
附鬼神。
今世鬼神之附著生人，
非神之神，
附鬼神。
神在男曰顯，在女曰容，
非神之神，
附鬼神。
GODS, SPIRITS, OR INVISIBLE

沈亞之賢良方正策。殷宗之極誠於神，神感於夢而得傳說。

張茂先勵志詩

弋者亦下，故云感也，

徐陵為陳武帝下州郡璽書，豈曰人謀，皆由天啟。

張華詩，

齊書樂志，

德經序

夫辯言之艱，能使窮澤生流，枯木發榮，庶感靈而激神，

老子託神李母剖左掖而生，生而正直死而為神。

生而為英死而為靈，神可致，

始皇夢與海神戰間，占夢博士曰此惡神當除去，而善
BEINGS SERVED IN CHINA.
BEINGS SERVED IN CHINA.

杜甫詩

玉京羣帝集北斗

偏羣靈以從之祀。嚴太祖以爲之侑。

懷柔百靈及河嶽嶽。

以是知先靈。百神者。先靈先王之靈。

又

楊雄諫不受薊于朝書。神靈之所想望。

神靈扶其棟宇千載。

神靈日歌歎。註言山谷鳴吼如神靈也。

每大陵深溪皆有靈。

願父母有靈啟牖二第。

東告廟神靈歡喜風雨明晦。無不從順。

魏靈節。譔書高祖紀。

隋書高祖紀。書經。

管子註。今古奇觀。

書經。李商隱詩。

詩周頌。鄭獬賦。

書堯典。

神靈。有百神靈神靈神靈神靈帝。百衆羣百羣羣。有百。百靈。
BEINGS SERVED IN CHINA.
GODS, SPIRITS, OR INVISIBLE BEINGS SERVED IN CHINA.
三神，謂之四靈五方之靈物也。麟鳳龜龍謂之四靈，赤靈黃靈青靈白靈黑靈。

蓋神名曰扶神，扶神主牌轎杠曰扶靈神之類，扶神泥木偶像也。

道士年已至仙家鳥亦來，骨為神不朽，眼向故人開，鰭魚滿三百六十鱗蛟龍鰐鰐而飛去，一年置一神守。則不能去，則龜也。若早來之土龍疾疫之牛狗是時為帝者也。
INTELLIGENT OR SPIRITUAL THINGS.
INTELLIGENT OR SPIRITUAL MEN.
INTELLIGENT OR SPIRITUAL MEN
OF ANY PERSON OR THING.
又左傳宣公十二年，我欲徧福假靈於成王，臣又昭公二十四年，寡君欲徧福於周公，乞靈於臧氏。北史魏彭城王勰傳，上於布衣，猶為知己盡命，況臣託靈光先皇，誠應竭。
10 GENIUS, WISDOM, POWERS OF SPIRIT OR MIND.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE DEAD.</th>
<th>夢</th>
<th>夢</th>
<th>夢</th>
<th>夢</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>小鬼之神</td>
<td>神</td>
<td>神</td>
<td>神</td>
<td>神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>前漢書</td>
<td>形</td>
<td>形</td>
<td>形</td>
<td>形</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。

夜夢歸長安，見我故親友損之在我左，順之在我右，

死而為神，再世為人者有之。
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE DEAD.
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SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.

第十九节

道德有同非，外相慕也，內在心，術之動。然後從之者也，其寐也魂交其覺也形開。詠魂交者精神交錯也。長空秋雨歇，蟠起覺精神，金泥舞虎精神，銅鑼交龍氣色，精神駭騖於外而不忘，則福福之至，雖如邱山，無由識之矣。

又有精而使有神而不行，詠不濁其精不勞其神，魂亦有，神魂忽而不返，形枯槁而獨留，詠魂靈速逝，遊四維也。

又曰，朋友之交，交者精神有契。
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.

[Text not legible due to image quality]
 SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.

静定
神神神神室恬

班固竹扇賦

安體定神達消息
神靜而心和形全
神靜則少費
神靜意平

又

韓非子

又

云笈七籤

神恬而心清則形無累矣

神恬心清則形無累矣

後漢書仲長統傳

但見神色闊中如虛空

安神閑房思老氏之玄虛呼吸精和求至人之彷佛
Spirits or Souls of the Living.

Ji Shun summer could be赋
仰者目眩精耗处者神昏体悸

71 70 69 68 67 66 65 64 63 62 61 60 59 58
飛騖 驅神 神惕 神峙

賈松夏日可畏賦

荀子

酒亂其神也

哀樂之感不以亂神

曹植詩

劉淶子

曹子

淮南子

勞形則神亂

孔德璋北海移文

自顧非金石，咄咄今心悲。

心悲動我神，

潘德章北海移文

形駭魄散志變神動

體輕似無骨觀者皆聳神

劉禹錫詩

張山甫詩

朱排六相助神聳

遊天台賦

劉禹錫詩

又詩序

關尹子

琴賦

獨此身如夢中物，隨情所見可以飛神。

知夫此身如夢中物隨情所見可以飛神。

賦詩法般般駭神

神駭而形閉者

神駭而形閉者

使令坐形神駭

因話近代仙釋然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

便我獨坐形神駭

使令坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭

因話近代仙释然心神惕，

余所以駭神運思

使我獨坐形神駭
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.

28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14

勞

神

南子卷十六

不覺老夫神內傷

荀粲婦病亡未殯傳詭往唍粲粲不哭而神傷

魏徵上十思疏

十年學道苦勞神

何必勞神苦思

坐看孤峭却勞神

貧穀者多智而勞神

飛春走月勞神昏

不動勞神傲楊朱墨翟兮

不能勞神傲蘇生張生兮

不能勞神傲楊朱墨翟兮

失寢覺神勞

日夜役神多損壽

役盡心神銷盡骨

顧甄遠詩

又

李中詩

杜光庭詩

姚合詩

方干詩

莊子

李紳詩

雲笈七籤

唐方干詩

半融詩

晉陽秋

杜甫詩

有言則傷其神之神者

役

神

役
SPIRITS OR SOULS OF THE LIVING.