

most proper way of showing her gratitude would be to save his soul, a point of view unusual in the ordinary relations of life.

On this particular day Maria Addolorata shut the door, and came forward into the parlor as usual. As usual, too, she sat down in the abbess's own big easy-chair, expecting that Dalrymple would seat himself opposite to her. But he remained standing, with the evident intention of going away in a few moments. He said a few words about the patient, gave one or two directions, and then stood in silence for a moment.

Maria Addolorata lifted her head a little, but not enough to show him more than an inch of her face.

"Have I displeased you, signor doctor?" she asked in her deep, warm voice. "Have I not carried out your orders?"

"On the contrary," answered Dalrymple, with a stiffness which he resented in himself, "it is impossible to be more conscientious than you always are."

Seeing that he still remained standing, the nun rose to her feet, and waited for him to go. She believed that she was far too proud to detain him if he wished to shorten the meeting. But something hurt her, which she could not understand.

Dalrymple hesitated a moment, and his lips parted as though he were about to speak. The silence was prolonged only for a moment or two.

"Good morning, Sister Maria Addolorata," he said suddenly, and bowed.

"Good morning, signor doctor," answered the nun.

She bent her head very slightly, but a keener observer than Dalrymple was just then would have noticed that, as she did so, her shoulders moved forward a little, as though her breast were contracted by some sudden little pain. Dalrymple did not see it. He bowed again,

let himself out, and closed the door softly behind him.

When he was gone, Maria Addolorata sat down in the big easy-chair again, and uncovered her face, doubling her veil back upon her head, and withdrawing the thick folds from her chin and mouth. Her features were very pale as she sat staring at the sky through the window, and her eyes fixed themselves in that look which was peculiar to her. Her full white hands strained upon each other a little, bringing the color to the tips of her fingers. During some minutes she did not move. Then she heard her aunt's voice calling to her hoarsely. She rose at once, and went into the bedroom. The abbess's pale face was very thin and yellow now, as it lay upon the white pillow; the coverlet was drawn up to her chin, and a grimly carved black crucifix hung directly above her head.

"The doctor did not stay long to-day," she said in a hollow tone.

"No, mother," answered the young nun. "He thinks you are doing very well. He wishes you to eat a wing of roast chicken."

"If I could have a little salad," said the abbess. "Maria," she added suddenly, "you are careful to keep your face covered when you are in the next room, are you not?"

"Always."

"You generally do not raise your veil until you come into this room, after the doctor is gone," said the elder lady.

"He went so soon to-day," answered Maria Addolorata, with perfectly innocent truth. "I stayed a moment in the parlor, thinking over his directions, and I lifted my veil when I was alone. It is close to-day."

"Go into the garden, and walk a little," said the abbess. "It will do you good. You are pale."

If she had felt even a faint uneasiness about her niece's conduct, it was removed by the latter's manner.

*F. Marion Crawford.*

(To be continued.)

## WHAT HAS SCIENCE TO DO WITH RELIGION?



WHAT has science to do with religion? This is a question often asked, and by none more frequently than by men of science themselves. Yet we have all heard and read and thought much about the "conflict of religion and science," and however we may have settled the matter in our own minds, there can be little doubt that there is still a "conflict," and that this conflict has had, and still has, much to do with the religious belief of many.

If proof were needed of this, it is readily furnished by Professor Huxley's essay, "The Lights of the Church and the Light of Science."

It is indeed [he says] probable that the proportional number of those who will distinctly profess their belief in the transubstantiation of Lot's wife, and the anticipatory experience of sub-marine navigation by Jonah; in water standing fathoms deep on the side of a declivity without anything to hold it up; and in devils who enter swine, will not increase. But neither is there ground for much hope that the proportion of those who cast

aside these fictions, and adopt the consequence of that repudiation, are, for some generations, likely to constitute a majority. Our age is an age of compromises. The present and the near future seem given over to those happily, if curiously, constituted people who see as little difficulty in throwing aside any amount of post-Abrahamic scriptural narrative, as the authors of "Lux Mundi" see in sacrificing the pre-Abrahamic stories; and having distilled away every inconvenient matter of fact in Christian history, continue to pay divine honors to the residue.

There really seems to be no reason why the next generation should not listen to a Bampton lecture modeled upon that addressed to the last:

"Time was — and that not very long ago — when all the relations of biblical authors concerning the old world were received with a ready belief; and an unreasoning and uncritical faith accepted with equal satisfaction the narrative of the captivity and the doings of Moses at the court of Pharaoh, the account of the apostolic meeting in the 'Epistle to the Galatians,' and of the fabrication of Eve. We can most of us remember when, in this country, the whole story of Exodus, and even the legend of Jonah, were seriously placed before boys as history, and discoursed of in as dogmatic a tone as the tale of Agincourt or the history of the Norman Conquest.

"But all this is now changed. The last century has seen the growth of scientific criticism to its full length. The whole world of history has been revolutionized, and the mythology which embarrassed earnest Christians has vanished as an evil mist, the lifting of which has only more fully revealed the lineaments of infallible truth. No longer in contact with fact of any kind, faith stands now and forever proudly inaccessible to the attacks of the infidel."

In the preceding sarcasm, the residue, to Professor Huxley's mind, is plainly stated. That residue is simply nothing — "faith no longer in contact with fact of any kind." This, we are told, is the result of casting aside certain fictions, and the necessary "consequence of that repudiation." That this result is accepted, and that this conclusion seems sound to many others, are plainly indicated in the literature of the day.

But this conclusion evidently rests upon an assumption. That assumption is, that religion is based solely upon certain records, and must stand or fall with them and their scholastic interpretation. To invalidate portions of one is therefore to destroy utterly the basis of the other.

It would seem worth while, then, to examine somewhat closely this assumption. If it happens not to be true, the conclusion based upon it fails.

I wish, therefore, to point out that the only basis upon which any religion can stand, or has a right to stand, is at bottom identical with that upon which science rests — viz., the basis

of universal experience, the testimony of universal consciousness, the result of daily verification.

This is a basis which science cannot ignore, and it is necessary first to consider this claim before we can follow Professor Huxley's argument to its conclusion. This is a basis which lies outside of the "relations of biblical authors concerning the old world," and therefore, if allowed, it does not follow that to invalidate the one is to destroy the other. On the contrary, faith still remains in "contact with fact," and such contact is not impaired simply because an added warrant is found in the Scriptures. Indeed, it is because of this basis that the Scriptures exist. We do not accept it because of the Scriptures; we accept the Scriptures because of it. They are the record of a fact, but they are not the fact.

I wish to point out as briefly as I can the bearing of certain facts and conclusions of science upon this issue, which appear to me to have much weight, but which I do not find put forward in this connection as prominently as I think they should be.

It is admitted as an undoubted fact of science that the universe is so constructed that any change of position or arrangement of any of its parts must affect the entire system. This is indeed but a statement of the law of gravitation itself. If the motion or position of so much as a single particle of matter is changed, the motion and position of every atom in the universe must be thereby affected. Every one will admit this as one of the most certain conclusions of science.

It is also an admitted fact that within our bodies matter itself is subject to mind — moves and is moved according to the dictates of mind. But since it is already admitted that to change the motion or position of even a single atom of matter must affect the entire universe, we are at once obliged to admit as a necessary conclusion, on the basis of the most certain facts of science itself, that *the entire universe is so constructed that mind not only can, but actually does, affect its every part.* The action of human volition is thus a force in the universe. A complete survey of the universe must deal with this force.

But everywhere in nature we observe motions that are not due to human volition. What can we say of such? Evidently we can only legitimately conclude, in harmony with what we already know, and in terms of the rest of our knowledge, that since some of the phenomena we observe are beyond doubt due to mind, and since such mind-action affects the entire universe, thereby proving that the universe is of such a nature that throughout its whole extent mind can and does affect it, therefore, *all*

the action and motions we observe, whether due to human volition or not, must likewise be referred by us to the action of mind. This is the only conclusion in terms of the rest of our knowledge that we can frame. It is the direct conclusion from admitted facts.

We arrive, then, directly from admitted facts, at the conclusion that *the universe in all its parts is the visible manifestation to us of underlying mind, and hence all interpretation by us of the phenomena of nature should be guided by the assumption of underlying purpose.*

Let us now, as in all scientific work, check this conclusion by the consequences of its application. The test of the truth of such a conclusion is found in its capacity of explaining and harmonizing. Every such explanation and harmony furnishes corroborative proof. This is strictly scientific procedure.

First, then, this view of the universe as the manifestation of mind, to which we are directly led from the consideration of admitted facts of science, accounts for and interprets the idea of *uniform action* in nature, which is the basis of all science. When we speak of uniform action we simply assume that in whatever way in the past we may have observed the purpose which underlies all phenomena to act, if those same circumstances are duplicated, we shall infallibly observe again the same action. What can this mean in terms of will, in terms of knowledge and consciousness, but the expression of unchanging purpose, acting ever and always in accord with the conditions? To change the conditions is to observe new or hitherto unobserved action; to repeat the conditions is to observe again the same action. In that which science calls "law," therefore, we recognize the action of a supreme will of which all nature is the visible expression, and that which science calls "uniform action" is but the necessary result of unchanging purpose, acting in view of unchanged conditions. Uniformity is thus the necessary consequence of that view of the universe to which the admitted facts of science have directly led us. It is no longer an assumption, but a necessary conclusion.

But, now, regarding the universe, as we are forced by these admitted facts of science to regard it, as a vast system of related parts in which any disturbance, however slight, must produce its due effect throughout the whole extent,—recognizing, as we are forced to recognize, man himself as an active agent in producing such disturbance,—*can we ever find or ever expect to find at any two intervals of time strictly identical circumstances?*

Evidently not. Man is not only a result of influences, he is a cause of results. He himself introduces new conditions. The universe is momentarily affected by his voluntary action.

We are thus forced to regard the law of uniformity itself, like the idea of a straight line in geometry, as an approximation to an ideal limit recognized, rather than a fact of nature realized,—as the expression of an ideal state of things to which we can more or less closely approximate, but which we can never actually bring about. The more nearly we duplicate the circumstances,—that is, the more nearly identical the conditions,—the more nearly we obtain the same action. But back of all we recognize mind ever acting in accord with present conditions, and we expect uniform action only in so far as we can duplicate those conditions.

But, as we have seen, conditions can never be absolutely duplicated. No two states of the universe can ever be precisely alike in all respects. In so far, then, as conditions must vary, we must admit the possibility of a new or hitherto unobserved result.

By this admission we concede at once all that has ever been properly claimed for miracle, and in view of it we cannot deny the possible efficacy of prayer.

A miracle in this view is simply the unique result of unique conditions. But it does not contradict uniform action in the least, and it is no breach of natural law. It is in harmony with the constitution of the universe as we are forced to recognize it,—a visible expression of that which lies back of all law,—because of which law is. It must be established, like any phenomena, by evidence. But if so established and accepted, it ranks with all natural phenomena, not as supernatural, but natural, not as outside the order of nature, but as included in nature.

We are therefore led to define miracle as *an effect in nature which, as dependent upon controlling will and due to the action of that will, is as natural in every sense as all other observed actions, which are all likewise similarly dependent; but an effect also, which, in so far as it is the result of unique conditions, stands alone among other observed effects, and thus emphasizes to us the direct action of that divine agency which underlies all effects.*

Once admit the possibility of unique conditions, and science must admit the certainty of unique results.

What we call "natural law" is thus the result of purpose acting under duplicated conditions. What we call "miracle" can only be the result of that same purpose acting in view of unique conditions.

In this view we need not go to the Bible for miracles. We find them in the history of the earth and man. The beginning of life, the origin of consciousness—these are the well established miracles of science. They are natural

as the inevitable result of antecedent conditions; they are unique in that those conditions cannot be duplicated. As the unique result of unique conditions they are miraculous, and yet they are strictly natural.

In full accord with our view, the mysterious power of man's will over matter is the result of delegated power. Our consciousness of freedom is justified by the source of that power. Man's mind shares in kind the attributes of the supreme mind to which it owes existence. Uniformity of action, freedom, power of causation, are the attributes of the supreme will, and in a less degree they are also attributes of our own. Within certain limits matter obeys our behest, even as all matter is subject to mind, and we possess conscious personality, free will, and causality, as partakers and co-workers with mind, through the possession of mind.

Again, our view alone fills the gap between mind and matter, which is otherwise impassable to science. In the light of our conclusion, "persistence of force" resolves itself into existence of mind. We start with mind in nature, with purpose back of force. We are compelled to start thus, as the necessary conclusion from admitted facts.

The same also holds true as to the introduction of life and consciousness. No life without antecedent life, no consciousness without antecedent consciousness, no mind without antecedent mind, become necessary conclusions.

This view is admitted by Herbert Spencer when he says that the universe implies an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed. It is recognized by Matthew Arnold when he speaks of a power not ourselves that makes for righteousness. Such views are the direct, unavoidable conclusions from the most certainly admitted facts of science, and few, if any, representative men of science can today be found who will deny them, whatever their difference upon other points of religious belief.

Finally, our view of the universe as the visible expression of mind, to be interpreted by us in terms of mind, is practically accepted and acted upon in all scientific work.

Science assumes related phenomena. It deals with facts in logical sequence, which are capable of interpretation in terms of mind, and which therefore bear witness to the existence of mind. Science reasons from the known to the unknown only by virtue of this assumption. Thus it predicts and uses analogy, and finds even in imagination an aid to the discovery of relations. It assumes mind so adjusted to phenomena that the workings of the one correspond to the relations of the other. The laws of science are thus apprehended ideals — not simple statements of facts, but the expression

of conclusions from related facts — of the ideal limits to which such facts point.

We may then define science itself as *the verification of the ideal in nature.*

It appeals to experience to verify the ideal. It forms logical conclusions, and then appeals to experience to justify these conclusions. It is mind following the traces of mind, assuming the existence of purpose and relation, and, whether consciously or unconsciously, every man of science so reasons and so acts.

Has not our conclusion stood the test of verification by the results of its application? This corroboration we claim as the result of legitimate application of the accepted facts of science. Lest we may seem to have come a long journey too hastily, let us briefly review our steps, and see if they are not direct and unavoidable.

*First.* We admit that the universe is so constructed that any change in any of its parts must affect the whole.

*Second.* It is known to be a fact that within our own organism mind affects matter.

Mind, then, as manifested in ourselves, affects the entire universe.

If, then, mind as manifested in ourselves can and does affect the entire universe, and since part of the effects we observe are due beyond dispute to our own voluntary action, all other effects not thus traceable to ourselves must be attributed by us to the action of mind also.

We conclude, then, directly, that the universe in all its parts is the visible manifestation to us of the action of mind, and all interpretation by us of the phenomena of nature should be guided by the assumption of purpose.

We then seek to test this conclusion by the consequences of its application, and on every hand we find simplification, harmony, corroboration.

We find uniform action at once accounted for, and interpreted in terms of mind, as the necessary result of unchanging purpose acting in view of recurrent or duplicated conditions.

Then at once the long-standing controversy between science and miracle falls into line, and we rest solidly in a position which yields all that theology claims without opposing anything which science holds.

Then the gaps close up between mind and matter, life and consciousness. The law of biogenesis — of no life without antecedent life — receives now its solution in antecedent life, and merges itself into the more general expression — no mind without antecedent mind, no consciousness without antecedent consciousness, no will without antecedent will, no spirit without antecedent spirit.

In the light of our conclusion the standing quarrel between religion and evolution disap-

pears from sight. A sentence disposes of it. It is no longer a question between divine foresight and divine interposition. There is seen to be no "interposition" possible. It is a question simply of divine *method*.

Again, consciousness, freedom, causation in man, appear as results of delegated power. We possess conscious personality, free will, and causality as partakers and co-workers with mind, through the possession of mind.

We have seen that our conclusion must be accepted and acted upon, consciously or unconsciously, in all scientific reasoning, for it alone is the basis of that relation between phenomena without the assumption of which there can be no science. Thus is it that science finds imagination itself but another name for

clearest insight, amplitude of mind,  
And reason in her most exalted mood.

We have seen that law itself is the expression of an ideal limit suggested by observation and confirmed by experience, and that science is thus the verification of the ideal in nature.

We have also seen that as circumstances, so far as man's will is operative, are never strictly identical, not only is the law of uniform action the expression of an ideal, not only is the way opened for the admission of miracle, but the door swings open to the voice of prayer. It, and the mind which frames it, are new conditions. The all-embracing knowledge and purpose which encompass nature cannot ignore such conditions.

Such is the view of the universe to which we are directly conducted by admitted facts of science. It is a universe of purpose governed by mind. It is not a wreck drifting hither and thither, and the sport of chance. It is framed in wisdom, instinct with purpose, headed toward a port — and the hand of a Pilot is at the helm.

Looking back now upon the past history of this earth in the light of purpose, what can we discern as indicative of that purpose?

We see first a vast interplay of force and matter on a scale surpassing human comprehension, passing from inorganic to organic, and finally leading up to life and consciousness. This life and consciousness appear at the proper time in strict accord with antecedent conditions. There is no breach here of uniform action. The same unchanging purpose underlies all. If we could now reproduce these conditions, we should expect again the same action. Then, still in accord with progressive conditions, we observe the evolution of mind, emerging at last in conscious identity, reason, intelligence, and the conviction of freedom. Then come to the front self-government, self-denial, self-im-

provement, moral responsibility, intellectual and spiritual development, conscious coöperation of mind with mind as the condition of further progress, mind recognizing the workings of mind, endowed itself with power of causation, and consciously coöperating in the great plan and therefore working to the same end.

What is that end? Is it the development of the race alone, rising with each generation to higher planes of intellectual and spiritual development? This is beyond doubt in accord with our past history. But this cannot be all. Our human lives are like the "little breezes" that

dusk and shiver  
Thro' the wave that runs for ever.

Earthly civilization, human progress here, even the earth itself, are all doomed by science to final extinction. A plan founded in purpose, and interpreted by reason, must not end by contradicting reason. Every step in our progress thus far has been in the direction of higher life. The last step of all cannot end in extinction. Conscious coöperation begun here must have a sphere and scope beyond the scene of its present earthly activity, or reason is stultified.

And here again, how confirmation and corroboration stream in on every side!

What a vast disproportion between the faculties of man and his purely physical needs! Life in this world has strangely overfitted him for this world. His true life begins only when he passes outside of physical environment, and when the physical laws which have governed and shaped thus far his physical development are swayed by his own voluntary action into channels of intellectual, moral, and spiritual progress.

And what corroboration do we find in man's spiritual nature? Born of earth, he raises imploring hands to heaven. Reason, intellect, awe, wonder, imagination, the sense of beauty, conscience, justice, love, hope — what a mighty equipment is this for an ephemeral life of eating, sleeping, and dying!

Thus we find corroboration on every hand. That view of the world which the facts of science demand is in exact accord with every requirement of our own nature. Such corroboration in a universe governed by mind and guided by purpose has convincing significance.

And now, in such a universe, so constituted, what do we find to be man's individual work? It is not alone to learn the secrets and harness the forces of nature to his will, and thus to provide for physical wants and desires; for, satisfy every physical need and supply every bodily want, and only then does he begin to

live. Spiritual ends are his pressing, impelling powers. He takes part in the progress of the race, but his action has, beyond this, an individual result.

The end of all, consistent with admitted facts of science demanded by the legitimate conclusions from these facts, is the formation, by voluntary action, of a personality, of a character self-attained by conscious effort, which, as it is capable of and does actually coöperate here through the exercise of reason and will with supreme will, may be fit for future development and continued coöperation hereafter.

This, then, stands out as the end of the whole mighty process, as science, looking back upon the history of the race in the light of purpose, must recognize it: for the race, continued progress in spiritual attainment and moral advancement; for the individual, self-struggle, self-mastery, self-conduct in obedience to law,—not compelled but voluntary obedience,—conscious coöperation, with the promise of continuance of such coöperation sanctioned by reason, justice, love, hope, and faith.

But right here we face a dilemma. *How can man do this?* Here he is, handicapped by the very laws of nature which have thus far aided him! Heredity is now against him. The results of a long and bitter struggle for self-existence are his inheritance. Repeated transgressions of past generations are incorporate in his flesh and blood, and all the allurements of desire, and all the past history of a race, reinforced by voluntary action and hardened into habit, and all the resulting depraved appetites and passions, are against him. A hard warfare truly, and a strange position! Yet who believes it hopeless? Who can doubt that here lies his battle-ground? No noble heart but throws itself into this strife with the consciousness of thus fulfilling its real destiny, its highest ideals and ambitions. Yet the history of the race is a history of defeat, and no man enters that unequal contest except to acknowledge bitterly his own inherent weakness.

He knows a baseness in his blood  
At such strange war with something good  
He may not do the thing he would.

He may not do the thing he would! He recognizes the good; he is made and meant to pursue it; he finds his progress and success, his hopes and his future, conditioned upon such pursuit—and he seems doomed to fail. Civilization in its highest and best sense, love, patriotism, human brotherhood, mutual help, the relations of the family, spiritual ambitions, the hope of continued existence—all demand the subordination of self. These are man's strongest incentives, far more than food or drink,—the substance of his ideals,—and yet he falls

short of his ideals and confesses daily his weakness. Is not this the experience of every human heart? Is there a man who can rise and deny it?

Man, then, needs help from without if the plan is to be fulfilled. Without such help the entire scheme is futile, and the purpose which guides is stultified. As progress has ceased to be physical and must now be spiritual, as the physical environment has served its end and is now become a hindrance, he must expect to find, he must find, a spiritual environment.

It is just here that we find religion claiming to supply precisely what we need and must have. For spiritual development it claims a spiritual environment. It thus appears, not as an antagonist of science, not as contradicting, but as supplementing, science, in perfect harmony with the rest of our knowledge, and in full accord with the purpose which runs through the whole plan. Right up to the foot of the hill of difficulty science takes us, and then deserts us. Up that weary ascent we must climb, and carry with us the heavy burden of the past and present. Heavier and heavier the burden presses, our feet slip, our breath fails, the bright goal just appears to view at the moment when despair forbids attainment. We raise imploring hands for help, and, lo! a sweet voice bidding us be of good cheer, informing us of our relations to that purpose we recognize and would fain fulfil, telling us that the help we invoke is to be found henceforth in conscious relations with the supreme will which governs all. Here, we are told, is the spiritual environment we need, for lack of which we faint and fall.

Without are light and spiritual influences, the necessary environment for the soul in its upward progress, boundless and free as the sunlight, but into the earth-darkened chambers of the soul they cannot force their way. The relation must be self-sought. This, again, is in harmony. Man is no longer driven; he must choose, must need, must desire, must ask. Stretch out the hand in conscious effort, throw wide the shutters of the soul, and the spiritual environment is established, the impelling powers are with us now as in the past, and still in pursuance of the great plan mankind presses on and upward, no longer driven, but clinging to a Father's hand, with a Father's aid to cheer, toward the now certain goal.

Thus is it that

Out of darkness come the hands  
That reach through nature, moulding man.

This, I take it, is the mission and the message of religion to man, under whatever garb of doctrine or theology it may be clothed, by whatever voice proclaimed, by whatever books recorded.

Why should we, or why do we, believe it? Shall it depend upon the literal exactness in matters of scientific fact of certain printed records called the Scriptures? If so, then indeed to invalidate the one is to destroy the other, and Professor Huxley's version of the future Bampton lecture may yet be heard.

It seems to me there can be but one sufficient ground for acceptance—a ground which science itself must admit, a basis which science especially should be the last to deny: the ground and basis of universal human experience. The religion which is to stand secure from all assault, "proudly inaccessible to the attacks of the infidel," must not be exclusively the religion of a book, or a church, or a person. It must, above all else, be the experience of a fact and the testimony of a life. This is the very basis of science itself. We are required to take nothing upon authority alone, to accept nothing not sanctioned by experience, to pin no faith upon any theory of verbal inspiration, to claim no special knowledge of the "unknowable," to form no special theories as to the nature of the messenger. As to such points, many men make many minds. But in any case the message itself must first appeal to us all on the same ground as any statement in the synthetic philosophy. We must accept it upon the same ground, because it appeals to reason, and we can test it by experience. It is not given as a deduction; it is not a system of philosophy. It is stated as a fact for all men to verify, and which all men can verify at once, without apparatus, or special training, or rare intellectual culture, or exact scholarship. It necessitates no theories, conflicts with no results of science, requires no laboriously acquired knowledge, rests upon no dogmas. It is a message which appeals to the acknowledged need and weakness of every mortal man—as broad as humanity, and as comprehensive as it is simple. If it is to stand as true, it must stand as a fact of human experience and human testimony. On such ground science must admit it. If true, it is simply the weightiest utterance ever heard by man. If true, to be ignorant of it is to miss the sublimest relation of human life—that which gives purpose and meaning to the whole. To ignore it is to be out of touch with the highest intellectual and moral development of the race.

As we have defined science as the verification of the ideal in nature, so now we would define religion as *the verification of the spiritual in human life*.

Both, then, have a common basis; both appeal to the results of experience. Religion in this sense can no more be attacked by invalidating portions of the Scriptures than science can be impugned by invalidating portions of the synthetic philosophy—not so much so,

for the latter is a chain of reasoning where flaws may well exist; the former rests on the basis of a simple statement of fact, which invites and challenges universal test.

Religion, then, challenges scientific recognition upon the very grounds of scientific demonstration, as the verification by daily experience of a fact of daily life—the verification of the spiritual in human life and action, even as science itself is the verification of the spiritual in nature. The fact of gravitation rests upon no firmer basis. The one traces the operation of mind and purpose in external nature, the other experiences the action of this same mind and purpose in the conduct of life and in the heart of man. It can point to its results in the history of the human race, in the progress of civilization, in the testimony of individual experience and the record of individual lives, and demand that science shall account for such results. It is not a thing of moods, but of experience through action; the faith it demands is not a body of dogma, but an attitude of the spirit. It lays no claim to any special knowledge of the unseen world or of this. It is not something esoteric or superadded to life, but is evolved from life. It is not "an *a priori* theory of the universe," as Herbert Spencer informs us, nor is it "ethics heightened and lit up by emotion," or "morality touched by emotion," as Matthew Arnold has told us. It is more than these, because based upon that which lies back of philosophy and ethics and morality. It is a fact of daily life, of universal human experience, or it is a delusion and a dream—a dream strangely consonant with all that is highest in human nature, strangely aiding to all that is best in human ambition, strangely satisfying the yearning of every human heart, strangely in accord with the facts of science, and strangely necessary in a universe where, without it, a wondrous scheme of development in accord with purpose ends in purposeless activity and total annihilation of the entire result attained. What a strange dream is this!

Now, if we find a thing true, it is but natural to have confidence in the book, or the man, or the system that tells us of it; but we do not therefore first pin our faith to the book, or the man, or the system, and then blindly accept what they teach us. We find in the Scriptures record of what the faith there inculcated can do, and has done, for human nature. He who proclaims it with such confident utterance points in evidence to its results as shown in his life. He stands as a great object-lesson, showing us the future of humanity under its influence. That life commands the reverent homage of every man; it is an unanswerable appeal to fact; it stands as a prophecy of the future of the race. Because the individual experience of

millions justifies their belief, do they accept the record of that life.

So long as men and women all over this earth can rise up and bear such testimony, so long as heart after heart finds its desires appeased, its longings satisfied, the spiritual help it craves and needs, of what avail is it to discuss the "transubstantiation of Lot's wife," the "anticipatory experience of submarine navigation by Jonah," whether water is or is not in the habit of standing "fathoms deep on the side of a declivity without anything to hold it up," or to argue at length about "devils who enter swine"? Are such things as these the real ground of such a faith, or do they in any proper sense stand or fall with it? Is the necessary "consequence of their repudiation" a faith "no longer in contact with fact of any kind"?

A theology which reflects more or less accurately the views of nature prevalent at an early day is not the proper test of a living fact of the past and present. Theology may be, and indeed ought to be, profoundly affected by the science of the time. It ought, like any other science, to be always in close touch with it, not a lingering reflection of the past. If it is, as it claims to be, a science, it must, like all science, find its revelation in man and nature alone; for the Scriptures are not scientific treatises, and cannot be used as such in the interests of any branch of science. The effect of scientific work and the influence of scientific ideas and method in this direction should be welcomed by theology, and, as a matter of fact, have been quite widely welcomed. What is the so-called "new theology" but the acknowledgment, conscious or unconscious, of the influence of science in this respect?

Thus we see that faith, instead of being "no longer in contact with fact of any kind," is daily coming into line with the known facts of nature and man. But however conflicting and diverse the views of theology, back of all lies the solid fact of human experience. This is the basis of religion — the *verification of the spiritual in life*. Doctrines of theology, like theories of science, have their day, and give place to better, but the basis of both is the same. Faith is thus not a dream; it is not merely the substance of things hoped for: it is the evidence of things unseen.

And as the theologians differ, so do we all. Facts and analogies appeal to different minds with varying force and effect. The nature of Christ, the inspiration of the scriptures, apostolic succession, predestination, foreordination and election, close communion, transubstantiation, probation after death, authority and infallibility — a dust of systems and creeds! It must be so, so long as men's minds are variously

constituted. Variety, diversity, conflict of opinion, there must and always will be. But so long as there is a unity back of all this diversity, so long as human experience testifies to a spiritual environment, so long as man makes conscious progress toward his highest ideals by conscious coöperation with God, so long as a message received, tested, and found to be true must stand, whatever the views as to the character and nature of the messenger, just so long we have solid common ground, just so long we can accept the Scriptures, because in them we find the facts of experience. This, then, is the residue! And while we hold, as perhaps we must ever hold, that our views are the best, or our theology is the best, or our baptism is the best, or our church government is the best, or our apostolic succession is the best, or our ordination is the best, or our interpretation of Scripture is the best, or our communion is the best, or our creed is the best, or our prayer-book is the best — let us keep ever in mind that back of all, under all, must lie the common ground of Christian experience with its daily fruitage of Christian effort and Christian character; that if this is not true, the testimony of experience is a false guide, the basis of science itself is false, the history of past progress is false, the promise of that wondrous life is false, the hope of humanity is false, the longings of the human heart are false, the whole vast scheme, founded on purpose, attested by uniform action, is a dream — magnificently false! Let us, then, hold fast through all discussions that vital fact on which religion and science must ever rest, viz., the constant, unvarying verification of daily experience.

Science, in the words of President Eliot, has thus exalted the idea of God, the greatest service which can be rendered to humanity. . . . In displaying the uniform continuous action of unrepenting nature in its march from good to better, science has inevitably directed the attention of men to the most glorious attributes of that divine intelligence which acts through nature with the patience of eternity and the fixity of all-foreseeing wisdom. A hundred lifetimes ago a Hebrew seer gave utterance to one of the grandest thoughts that ever the mind of man conceived. . . . This thought, tender and consoling toward human weakness and insignificance as a mother's embrace, but sublime also as the starry heights, and majestic as the outward sweep of the ages, science utters as the sum of all its teaching, the sublime result of all its searching and its meditations, and applies alike to the whole universe and to its last atom. "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."

The voice that speaks in nature finds responsive echo in the heart of man. Deep answers unto deep.

Augustus Jay DuBois.