

physical spheres cannot be precisely separated, but interact as shown above. And as we cannot fix limits to this interaction, so it may be at once subtle, complicated, and extensive, beyond the power of our faculties to trace; since it is precisely in the moral sphere, as shown above, that our faculties are most likely to fail us. And as it has been seen that particular pains stimulate the moral sense of the individual (page 470) and since without such stimulus moral sense would be much feebler than it is; so on the larger scale the race of man stands in need of the perpetual witness of pain as a whole, stimulating by its presence the moral sense of humanity, and attesting higher aims of being than mere sensuous enjoyment. Our disposition to realize these, defective as it is, would be certainly far less, were it not for that witness never far removed from us.

ARTICLE VI.

THE DIVINE IMMANENCY.

BY THE REV. JAMES DOUGLAS, D. D., PULASKI, N. Y.

[*Continued from Vol. xlv. p. 355.*]

THE DIVINE IMMANENCY IN RELATION TO MATERIALISM.

BEFORE entering directly upon the subject of the relation of the doctrine of the divine immanency to materialism, I propose to answer the question, How does the doctrine of immanency as here propounded differ from that of Spinoza? Spinoza traces phenomena to substance, and affirms that substance, as the ground of phenomena, is all there really is of the universe; that this substance has two fundamental qualities, thought and extension, cognizable to us; that there is only one substance, and that is God. God is the immanent cause, but a cause not passing out of itself.¹

¹Bowen's History of Modern Philosophy.

With this theory transcendency is impossible. Substance cannot be transeunt and still be *substance*, that which stands under. It is only as we extend our analysis into substance, and unfold its nature, that we can reach the true solution.

In Spinoza's day, scientific thought and investigation had not discovered what it is that stands under matter; that it is force which constitutes the substratum of matter. Now the question arises, What is the source of force? The science that limits itself and its investigations to matter, both in its phenomena and substance, may affirm that we do not and cannot go beyond force, as the substance of matter, in our investigations; because into the airy regions of metaphysical speculations lying back of the physical we cannot go and apply the tests of science. But we answer: There is a science of mind, as well as of matter, a science of intellectual intuitions and moral consciousness, as well as of sentient feeling; for, all knowledge resolves itself into consciousness, and it is by this science of mind, we have revealed to us the source of force in mind itself, so that we reach, by a process of investigation thoroughly scientific, the discovery that the ultimate in the universe is not substance, but mind, as absolute spirit. And thus it is, that while we cannot affirm the transcendency of substance, for that would be an evident misuse of the term in its true significance, yet of spirit, not held to the limitations of substance, we can affirm transcendency, as well as immanency.

The whole solution of the subject lies in the doctrine of absolute spirit, rather than substance, being the ultimate principle, the principium, of the universe.

Spinoza's pantheistic doctrine of substance is essentially materialistic. In his doctrine of substance as the only reality, he really affirms only the existence of matter with its attributes. The term "matter" must include substance, as well as phenomena. Both conjoined are necessary to the complete idea of matter. We do not conceive of matter as mere phenomena. The idea of matter necessarily includes that of substance, in which the phenomena of matter in-

here. Spinoza, in his eighteenth theorem, affirms, that "God is the immanent, but not the transeunt cause of all things." This theorem necessarily follows from Spinoza's assumption, that substance is the ultimate principle of the universe, for substance, that which stands under, cannot go forth from itself and still be substance, or that which stands under. It is far different, if we regard absolute spirit as being the ultimate principle, for spirit as spirit, and mind as mind, must possess self-energizing power, by which, as transeunt cause, it can go forth in effects not only, but can exist transcendent to effects.

The thirty-second and thirty-third theorems of Spinoza land him in the "dirt philosophy," as it is justly called, of materialism and fatalism. They are these in part: "The will cannot be called a free but only a necessary cause." "God does not act by virtue of a free will; . . . and consequently *will* does not belong to the divine nature any more than all other natural things; but the will has the same relation to the Divine Being that movement and repose have and every thing else, which results from the *necessity* of the divine nature." The last italics are our own. The following is Spinoza's thirty-third theorem: "The things which have been produced by God, could not have been so produced in any other manner, or in a different order." This is the fundamental doctrine of fatalism.

Materialism and fatalism is in every case, the inevitable outcome of every philosophy, or theory of the universe, which does not recognize absolute spirit as the ultimate principle. They invariably postulate "necessity," which is only another name for fate, as the ultimate principle which creates and controls all things. In the philosophy of Spinoza, substance, in reality, instead of being an ultimate principle, only occupies an intermediate place between phenomena and necessity or fate. This is at best only a disguised doctrine of materialistic fatalism.

The whole doctrine of materialism, with all its multifarious phases and modifications, can be effectually met, only

by establishing this fact, and that too on scientific grounds, that mind or absolute spirit is found to be the ultimate principle in the complete analysis both of matter and of substance. And it is this, which we propose to show, as the ultimate conclusion at which we arrive in our examination of the investigations by modern science into the nature and origin of matter. Let us now consider the relations of the doctrine of the divine immanency to materialism. There are four different theories of the material universe.

One is that of pantheism. This affirms the identity of God with matter, without attempting to define what matter is. "God and the universe are one."

Another theory, equally ancient and far more widely accepted, is that of dualism. This affirms God and the universe, matter and mind, to be two distinct and independent existences, and also, that there are two distinct and antagonistic principles, Good and Evil. This is the basis of all the religious systems of the world that do not accept of pantheism, except Mosaism and Christianity. But as Mosaism became infected with the dualism of Zarathustrianism, during the Jewish captivity, in Assyria and Babylon, so in subsequent times, Christianity became corrupted with the dualism of Grecian and Roman philosophy, which was so widely cultivated especially in mediæval times. The dualism of Grecian and Roman philosophy, in its doctrine of matter, was a clearly pronounced theory of materialism. In fact, dualism in all cases, whether it appears as a philosophical theory, or as a theological dogma, necessarily adopts the theory of materialism in respect to the nature and origin of matter, since it recognizes the independent existence of matter.

Gnosticism was a religioso-philosophical system that sought in some way to reconcile the Grecian dualism with the doctrine of the unity of the universe.

Mediæval theology has reached out its influence to form

and mould modern theology, and has infected it with the same philosophy, of a God separate from nature.

Idealism is another theory of modern times, whose most renowned exponent was Bishop Berkeley. He has been followed by some of the ablest thinkers of Germany, in the effort to restore unity in philosophic thought to the universe, to identify subject and object in a theory of Absolute Idealism.

All these theories of idealism, however acute, profound, and subtle, as examples of analysis and logical reasoning, have failed to satisfy the popular mind, which insists on believing in the reality of matter, as well as of mind.

The two remaining theories are materialism and spiritualism. These two stand in direct antagonism to each other. Either mind is the product of matter, or matter is the product of mind. Materialism adopts the former theory, spiritualism the latter.

Spiritualism or the spiritual philosophy (for we hope no reader will confound the word "spiritualism," as a system of philosophy, with the crudities of spiritism) the spiritual philosophy affirms the reality both of mind and matter, notwithstanding their intimate relations to each other. One stands to the other in the relation of cause to effect, of potentiality to energy, of being to existence, being constituting the ground of all existence.

Cause is a reality; so also are effects realities, however varied or multitudinous. Potentiality is a reality, as well as energy, the outcome of potentiality. The substance or substratum of matter is a reality, as matter itself. So also being and existence. The spiritual philosophy, based on the doctrine of divine immanency, alone can explain the harmony of these relations,—how these as entities are distinct from each other, yet not separate and independent. Matter is not mind, and yet matter cannot exist without the substratum of force whose origin is mind. Effect cannot exist independent of cause, nor the universe without God. The antagonism of modern scientific theories concerning the

nature of matter to the doctrine of materialism, has already been made to some extent to appear, in the exposition we have given of the relation of science to this doctrine of the divine immanency.

Notwithstanding that modern science has been largely accused of materialism, by some criticising, yet not critical, theologians, still the evidence is clear and conclusive, that the best as well as most accepted scientists thoroughly repudiate the doctrines of materialism. The materialistic theories of the scientists of former times have been effectually controverted, and, in fact, annihilated, by the scientists of our times. Professor Tyndall has most completely demolished the theory of Bastian, concerning "spontaneous generation." Huxley has abandoned his old theory, concerning Bathybius. The theologian who now wastes his time in controverting the old doctrine of spontaneous generation spends his breath in reviling a corpse over which scientists themselves have pronounced the last words of sepulture.

When the doctrine of the conservation and correlation of forces was established, some regarded it triumphantly, others suspiciously, as tending to confirm the doctrine of materialism. But as Mr. Fiske remarks, "One of the great results of the discovery of the correlation of forces is, the final destruction of the central argument by which materialism has sought to maintain its position. . . . The materialistic hypothesis is doomed irretrievably."²

Again, not a few are inclined to regard the scientific discovery of the relation of psychical, or mental manifestation to brain-action, as confirming, or at least favoring, the doctrine of materialism. Says Moleschott, *Kein Gedanke ohne Phosphor* ("No thought without phosphorus"). This formula has been caught up as a watch-word by a school of materialists in Germany, and certain discoveries in nervous physiology, such as the invariable concomitance between psychical phenomena and the phenomena of nervous action, have been assumed, to prove the materiality of mind.

²Cosmic Philosophy, Vol. ii. p. 440.

But such inference is wholly unwarrantable. Nothing is proved, except the correlation of the two, which must necessarily exist on the simple affirmation that the brain is the instrument of the mind. Brain-action involves waste, the same as muscular action, and the physiologist with the aid of the chemist has found that one of the principal chemical elements eliminated in this waste is phosphorus. Hence the aphorism of Moleschott, "No thought without phosphorus."

There are, however, occasionally materialists to be found, like Maudsley, who, while they avow belief not only in the existence of God, but also in the immortality of the soul with the body, both to be resurrected in eternal and inseparable union, consider thought to be a secretion of the brain, just as bile is a secretion of the liver.⁸ But it is in this very comparison between the functions of the liver and those of the brain that both the fallacy and absurdity of the theory of materialism is most clearly revealed. The liver secretes bile,—that is its function,—but the substance which is secreted is as plainly a material something as is the liver itself. But the brain, a material organ, on this theory secretes an *immaterial* something, we call "thought." That is its function. Now if thought could be shown to be a material something, the analogy would have some pertinence as an argument, but with the acknowledged immateriality of thought, it refutes rather than supports the theory. On this point of the entire diversity between thought and the physical phenomena of matter, and that it is impossible even to conceive of the transformation of matter into thought, all our leading modern scientists are fully agreed.

Says Professor Allman, in his Presidential Address before the British Association, "Between thought and the physical phenomena of matter there is not only no analogy but no conceivable analogy.... The chasm between unconscious life and thought is deep and impassable, and no transitional

⁸See Maudsley's *Body and Mind*, p. 324 sq.

phenomena can be found by which, as by a bridge, we may span it over."

Professor Tyndall also writes, "The passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable."

Says Herbert Spencer: "Can we then think of the subjective and objective activities as the same? Can the oscillations of a molecule be represented in consciousness side by side with a nervous shock, and the two be recognized as one? No effort enables us to assimilate them."⁴

Says Fiske: "Through no imaginable future advance in molecular physics can the materialists be enabled to realize their desideratum of translating mental phenomena in terms of matter and motion. . . We were right in hinting that one grand result of the enormous progress achieved, during the past forty years, in the analysis of both physical and psychological phenomena, has been the final and irretrievable overthrow of the materialistic hypothesis."⁵

Says Huxley: "The materialistic position, that there is nothing in the world but nature, force, and necessity, is as utterly devoid of justification as the most baseless of dogmas: with a view to the progress of science, the materialistic terminology is in every way to be preferred. But the man of science who slides from the formulæ into materialism, seems to me to place himself on a level with the mathematician, who should mistake the x's and y's with which he works his problems, for real entities, and with this further disadvantage as compared with the mathematician, that the blunders of the latter are of no practical consequence whatever, while the errors of systematic materialism may paralyze the energies and destroy the beauty of life."

But beside this concurrence of views, among modern scientists, of the radical difference in the nature of matter and thought, we find a similar concurrence of views in relation to the nature and origin of matter itself, in utter op-

⁴Principles of Psychology, Vol. i. p. 158.

⁵Cosmic Philosophy, Vol. ii. p. 444.

position to the materialistic hypothesis. One of the ablest and clearest expositions of the spiritualistic theory of the nature and origin of matter may be found in the last essay of Alfred Russell Wallace in his work entitled "Natural Selection." After stating and defending the principle as an unquestionable scientific fact, that "matter is force," he goes on to say: "If we are satisfied that force or forces are all that exist in the material universe, we are next led to enquire, What is force? We are acquainted with two radically distinct, or apparently distinct, kinds of force; the first consists of the primary forces of nature, such as gravitation, cohesion, repulsion, heat, electricity, etc.; the second, is our own will-force. Many persons will at once deny that the latter exists. It will be said, that it is a mere transformation of the primary forces before alluded to, that the correlation of forces includes those of animal life, and that 'will' itself is but the result of molecular changes in the brain. I think, however, that this latter assertion has neither been proved nor even been proved to be possible." Pursuing this argument, he finally concludes, "if, therefore, we have traced one force however minute to an origin in our own will, while we have no knowledge of any other primary cause of force, it does not seem an improbable conclusion *that all force may be will-force*, and thus that the whole universe is not merely dependent on, but actually is, the will of higher intelligences or of one supreme intelligence.... It is surely a great step in advance to get rid of the notion that matter is a thing of itself, which can exist *per se*, and must have been eternal since it is supposed to be indestructible and uncreated; that force or the forces of nature are another thing, given or added to matter, or else its necessary properties; and that mind is yet another thing, either a product of this matter and its supposed inherent forces, or distinct from and coexistent with it, and to be able to substitute for this complicated theory which leads to endless dilemmas and contradictions, the far simpler and

more consistent belief, that matter as an entity, distinct from force, does not exist, and that *force is a product of mind.*"

Dr. Carpenter, the eminent physiologist, takes the same view of the origin of force, in his work on Physiology. He there declares: "When we have once arrived at that conception of force, as an expression of will, which we derive from our own experience of its production, the universal and constantly sustaining agency of the Deity is recognized in every phenomenon of the external universe, and we are thus led to feel, that in the material creation itself, we have the same distinct evidence of his personal existence and ceaseless activity, as we have of the agency of intelligent minds in the creations of artistic genius, or in the elaborate contrivances of mechanical skill, or in those written records of thought which arouse our own psychical nature."

This view of the origin of force in the will, which is taken by scientists, and the only view possible to the metaphysician, for the only conceivable source of force is will, is also adopted by Herbert Spencer, both as a physicist and metaphysician. In his work entitled "First Principles," he writes: "The force by which we ourselves produce changes and which serves to symbolize the cause of changes in general, is the final disclosure of analysis." "We are obliged to regard every phenomenon as a manifestation of some power by which we are acted upon. Phenomena being, as far as we can ascertain, unlimited in their diffusion, we are obliged to regard this power as Omnipresent, and criticism teaches us that this power is wholly incomprehensible. In this consciousness of an Incomprehensible, Omnipresent power, we have just that consciousness on which religion dwells. And so we arrive at that point where religion and science coalesce."

With similar views Mr. Fiske writes in his work on "Cosmic Philosophy:" "If now we proceed to the outermost verge of admissible speculation, and inquire for a moment, what may perhaps be the nature of that Inscrutable Existence of which the universe of phenomena is the multi-

form manifestation, we shall find that its intimate essence may conceivably be identifiable with the intimate essence of what we know as *Mind*."* With infinite satire Mr. Fiske refers to "those shallow writers, known as materialists, who speak of 'natural law' as if it were something different from divine action" (p. 426). What will the theological admirers of the Duke of Argyll, with what Huxley well calls his pseudo-science on "the reign of law," say to such characterization of those who personify law as an intelligent and volitional agency, distinct from God?

For what is law, but an observed order of sequence? How unwarrantable and unscientific, is it, to affirm law—an observed order of sequence—to be "fixed" and "invariable!" No finite person, with his limited range of observation, can affirm the fixity and invariability of any observed order of sequence. Mr. Fiske appropriately says on page 428, "It is not science, but theology, which has thrust back divine action to some nameless point in the past eternity, and left nothing for God to do in the present world. For the whole difficulty lies in the assumption of the material universe as a 'datum objective to God' and in the consequent distinction between 'divine action' and 'natural law,' a distinction, for which science is in no wise responsible. The tendency of modern scientific inquiry, whether working in the region of psychology, or in that of transcendental physics, is, to abolish this distinction, and to regard '*natural law*' as merely a synonym of divine action. And since Berkeley's time, the conception of the material universe, as a 'datum objective to God,' is one which can hardly be maintained on scientific grounds. It is scientific inquiry working quite independently of theology which has led us to the conclusion that all the dynamic phenomena of Nature constitute but the multiform revelation of an Omnipresent Power, that is not identifiable with Nature. And in this conclusion, there is no room left for the difficulty, which

*Vol. ii. p. 446.

baffles contemporary theology. The scientific inquirer may retort upon the theologian: Once really adopt the conception of an ever-present God, without whom not a sparrow falls to the ground, and it becomes self-evident, that the law of gravitation is but an expression of a particular mode of divine action, and what is true of one law is true of all laws."

Speaking of the true scientist, Mr. Fiske says: "To him no part of the world is godless. He does not rest content with the conception of an absentee God, sitting idle ever since the first Sabbath, at the outside of his universe and 'seeing it go' for he has learned with Carlyle 'that this fair universe, were it in the meanest province thereof, is, in very deed, the star-domed city of God, that through every star, through every grass-blade, and most through every living soul, the glory of a present God still beams.'"

It is also true that it is theology rather than science, or theology in the garb of pseudo-science, that has not only made the false distinction between "divine action" and "natural law," but, worse still, has deified "natural law," making it a pitiless Juggernaut, before which, humanity must bow down to be crushed under its wheels. With prelatial pomp and majesty the theologian, who worships at this shrine, discourses on "the sacredness of law." We ask, What law? We bow in reverence, confessing the sacredness of the moral law of God, which he has prescribed, as a fixed and inviolable law for man's observance. But natural law is quite another thing. That is the divine mode of action which God prescribes to himself. Moral law is for man's observance. Natural law is for God's observance. And yet finite man presumes to write out natural law for the observance of the Infinite One, and to pronounce it "fixed" and "invariable." The sacredness of moral law which God has given, for man's observance, the theologian has transferred to natural law, for God's observance.

Natural law, the Divine Power changes as it may please him. Cold contracts; this, say the scientists, is a natural

law ; but we find, it is not fixed and invariable, because the Divine Power changes this natural law as it may please him. This law holds with water up to a certain degree of falling temperature, then it is violated ; and instead of contracting, the cold expands this liquid. Of the beneficence of the violation of this natural law, in the specific case referred to, no one can question. It saves our streams and lakes from solid congelation, defends the life that floats within, and clothes the earth's surface, with the mantle of kindly protection. With God there is something more sacred than natural law of man's prescribing, or even than the doctrine of uniformity.

For ages men have vainly attempted to find a fixed and invariable law for meteorological phenomena. They have taxed governments, endowed bureaus, erected stations of observation, at immense expense, but have not been able to fix an invariable law, and so with commendable modesty, write, instead of law, "probabilities," but only to see "probabilities," because of its exceeding variableness, become the scoff of the populace. And yet, the hallucination still besets men, that if they only could make their observations sufficiently extensive, they would be able to write out the law that governs the weather ; for it is *law* that reigns, not God.

Comparative religion can furnish no account of the personification and deification of any of the powers of nature among ancient religions that can parallel the personification and deification of "natural law," in modern times. For among heathen nations, these deified powers of nature were subject to God as the supreme power, but in modern theology, God is himself regarded as subject to deified law.

The law of uniformity is not to be found in any principle of necessity, or fatalism, but in the divine wisdom and goodness. The modes of operation chosen by the divine wisdom must be the best modes ; and, because they are the best, they will remain fixed and invariable, so far as divine wisdom and goodness see them to be the best, yet subject

to all those variations which the same divine wisdom and goodness may see fit to impart, for natural law is not force working by a principle of inherent necessity, but the divine action, God working "according to his good pleasure." Again by tracing out the relation which matter holds to motion, and that which motion holds to mind, we again find mind to be the ultimate principle in nature or the material universe. Modern science has revealed the fact that the molecules of matter, however dense or solid may be the body in which they are aggregated, are still in constant motion.

The sphere of their motion is more or less limited, but in no case completely arrested. The sphere of motion is contracted, or enlarged, depending on certain conditions, or circumstances. When the sphere of action is enlarged and the action itself intensified, we have the evolution of heat. This theory, that heat is only a mode of motion, is universally accepted in modern science. A familiar illustration is presented in the transformation of water into steam. The expansion of the water and also the steam is produced by the enlargement of the sphere in which the molecules of water move, and also by the intensification of their movement or action.

Modern science has also established the fact, that the chemical changes constantly going on about us, as well as within, are always accompanied by molecular motion. No function of life is performed without these changes.

Clerk Maxwell, a most eminent physicist, who has written largely on the subject of molecules and atoms, has calculated the rapidity with which the particles of hydrogen, at the barometrical pressure of thirty inches, and a temperature of sixty degrees, must move in order to produce a pressure of fifteen pounds to the square inch, the same as the pressure of the atmosphere on our bodies or on the earth's surface, and he estimates the velocity at more than six thousand feet per second, or about seventy miles a minute. He has also calculated the number of times in which one of these

hydrogen molecules, moving at this rate, of seventy miles per minute, strikes against others of the vibrating swarm, and finds that in one second of time, it must knock against others, no less than eighteen thousand millions of times. Incomprehensible as this may seem to the ordinary mind, the fact of such motion is now regarded as demonstrated mathematically in modern science.

Now the next question is, What is the power that produces this motion among the particles of matter with all this astonishing rapidity.

G. T. Romanes, another eminent scientist as well as evolutionist, has written upon this subject of the relation of mind to motion.⁷ Quoting Hobbes' statement, that "the beginnings of motion within the body of man, before they appear in walking, speaking, striking and other visible actions, are commonly called *endeavor*," he shows how in consciousness is revealed the source of motion. He also affirms "that all the forms of energy have been proved to be but modes of motion," and "all that we perceive in what we call matter, is change in modes of motion."

From this view of the relations of matter and motion, Mr. Romanes goes on to affirm, that "the antithesis between mind and motion, subject and object, is only phenomenal and apparent, not absolute or real;" and after deciding affirmatively on the question whether the will is to be regarded as a cause in nature, he says, "that from what we know, we feel impelled to conclude, that there is a mode of mind which is not restricted to brain, but co-extensive with motion, co-substantial and co-eternal with all 'that was, and is, and is to come,'" and that "the advance of natural science is now steadily leading us to the conclusion that there is no motion without mind." Thus again we attain to mind as the ultimate principle in the analysis of matter and energy.

Again, that the ultimate principle in nature is mind, appears, in the very doctrine, which the materialists originally claimed as proof conclusive of materialism, that of the cor-

⁷ Rede Lecture, 1885.

relation and conservation of forces. This doctrine, well established as a scientific principle, is intimately associated with that of the indestructibility of matter and also the indestructibility of force. No property, both of matter and of force, is more firmly established. Matter may be transformed in many ways, but cannot be destroyed.

Whatever may be the molecular constitution of matter, its indestructibility must be allowed, and from this it follows, that the whole quantity of matter in existence must be fixed and constant. Now the question arises, What is it that fixes and determines this invariable quantity? The same question applies to force as to matter, for they stand in the most intimate relation to each other, since force is the substratum of matter and also indestructible. Says Clerk Maxwell, in his essay entitled "Matter and Motion," "The total energy of any material system is a quantity, which can neither be increased nor diminished by any action between the parts of the system, though it may be transformed into any of the forms of which energy is susceptible."

Now as it is impossible to conceive of any source of energy or force but mind, or will, we find at once in mind that which is not only capable of fixing and determining the amount of energy, but what must be postulated to explain the very existence of energy; so that alone in the existence of mind do we find a principle or power that can explain both the fact of energy and its condition of indestructibility.

The deepest of all philosophical questions is the relation of natural forces to the divine energy. Although inherent forces immanent in matter, they are not independent self-acting agents. On the contrary, in an important sense "they must be regarded by the philosophical thinker," says Mr. Fiske, "as the ever-present, all-pervading, ever-acting energy of Deity."

It is then this view of force, as having its origin in mind, which, applied to nature, not only exhibits all the phenomena of the universe in their immediate connection and dependence on the Divine Power, but also gives us the philosophic

explanation of the fact of the indestructibility, both of matter and force. To annihilate matter would be to annihilate force, to annihilate force would be to annihilate the energizings of the divine will. But these energizings must be dependent on God alone. So we have revealed to us the fact that all power of creation and of annihilation dwells only in God. Such is the sublime conclusion of science concerning the relation which the material universe sustains to God as the Absolute Spirit.

The fact is that modern science, in its very theory of the immanency of force in matter, has wrought out its own deliverance from the old materialism based on the theory of the material atom. Although some scientists may refuse to answer to the question, What is the source of this force, immanent in matter? yet there are others, as we have seen, who answer to the question, unhesitatingly postulating mind as the only conceivable source of force, while the origin of force in mind is verified in our own consciousness. In view of the vast array of the most eminent scientists who have fully discarded the old materialistic theories of the nature of matter, we may fairly consider that modern science has declared against the doctrine of materialism.

The only remaining stronghold of materialism is to be found in theology, in the doctrine of dualism, of the independent and separate existence of the natural and supernatural, of Nature and God, in which it is assumed that nature exists, and its processes are carried on by a principle of inherent necessity, while God exists apart from nature, with no power to interfere in the operations of nature except from without: that is to say, the dualistic theologian still clings to the old doctrine of materialism in respect to matter, and affirms the separate existence of God. To the theologian holding the old materialistic theory of matter who yet reviles science as being materialistic, or, at least, having a materialistic tendency, the scientist of to-day may well reply, "Cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then mayest thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye." It

is only as the theologian rejects the theory of dualism, of the separate and independent existence of the natural and the supernatural, by adopting the doctrine of the divine immanency, that he can be delivered from the thralldom of materialism, and free the universe God created, from the degradation and opprobrium he so constantly casts on it, calling that "base," "vile," "corrupt," which God in creating pronounced "very good." "And God saw every thing that he had made and behold it was very good" (Gen. i. 31).

The doctrine of the divine immanency stands opposed, not only to the materialism of science, but to the materialism of theology, for both agree in this, that matter is an independent entity, having a separate existence of its own, dependent alone on its own inherent forces and laws, or on some principle of necessity—while, on the contrary, the doctrine of the divine immanency affirms the immediate and constant dependence of matter and the material universe on the Divine Power. The theories of modern science unite in sustaining this doctrine, by affirming that the potency which works all these wonderful transformations in matter is within, and that this potency is, in its essential nature, akin to mind. Most scientists do not hesitate to use the term "mind" as applicable to its nature. A true theology comes to our aid, to supplement the discoveries of science, revealing this potency as the divine power, this mind to be the divine mind, Creator and Lord of the universe not only, but a Father of infinite love, as well as of wisdom and power: the God and Father that adorned the lily surpassing the glory of Solomon, that feeds the raven, without whom not a sparrow falls to the ground, ever-present, ever-near, above, around, within, notwithstanding the "little faith" that would limit that infinite power to a throne in the skies, or to a narrow section somewhere in the universe, which men call heaven.

It may be truly said, that modern science has already freed itself from the old materialistic theories of the material atom, by the recognition of force as the substratum of matter, and

not only by the recognition of the immanence of force, but also of mind, as its source. It now remains for theology to emancipate itself from thralldom to the old theory of the separate and independent existence of matter, renouncing the old Epicurean doctrine that the processes of nature are carried on by an inherent necessity, and recognize natural law as divine action, God in nature, if it would escape the reproach of the Master that (Revised Version) "the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light."

The next article in this Series will treat of The Relations of the Doctrine of the Divine Immanency to the Miracles of Christ.

[To be continued.]