

(p. 57), in my own view they represent at their best nothing more than respectable magazine and newspaper verse. This is as simple, sane, and modest criticism as the poems deserve. Anything else in the way of criticism may be safely left to the members of the meat-axe brigade. And so I pass to my essential theme.

Often I have been asked—"How does it happen that you who are a metaphysician and agnostic (!), repeatedly use in your verses the name of God?" Observe the innuendo: metaphysicians have not poetic gifts, or if they have, they have no right to use religious concepts and emotion in their utterances. The personal aspect of the question I dismiss in a few words. I am religious, though not pious; agnostic only in matters that belong to omniscience. And though I profess metaphysics, chiefly through mental indolence, technically named by the guild "love of speculation," I am as naïve, ordinary, and human as the little child that weeps heart-broken over its lost toys, or the strong man who stands silent amongst his shattered ideals, or is happy and eloquent in the day of achievement. Therefore I need the spiritual world as much as does anyone else; perhaps more so, because metaphysics breeds moral doubt, often despair. The fact is: we all are metaphysicians when we function on the universe with the faculty of abstract thought; we all are poets when we function on the same world with the heart and imagination; and our vocabulary for the one differs from that for the other precisely as the formula, the sq. on the hypotenuse of a right triangle = the sum of the sqq. on the other two sides, differs from the glorious vision of a summer sunset. If, then, in technical prose writings the metaphysician uses difficult scientific terms to express his *conception* of the universe, is he thus to be debarred from using in verse a familiar, socialized term to express his *sense* of divinity in the inner and outer world?