

## ARTICLE VIII.

INTELLECTUAL ARREST IN RELATION TO  
PHILOSOPHY.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM M. LISLE.

PHILOSOPHY is the love of wisdom. What we love we search after. The human mind is created with an irrepressible impulsion to explain phenomena by causes and reasons, powers and laws. It applies to particular departments of knowledge; when the mind thinks of God and government, we call it theology. The material world is explained by physics; and when the study is man, it is anthropology and psychology, with which are connected logic and ethics. Metaphysics treat of the necessary conception and relation by which philosophy is possible.

Philosophy has been defined, in more general terms, as the science of things divine and human, and causes in which they are contained; also, the science of sufficient reason, the science of truth sensible and abstract, the science of the relation of all knowledge to the necessary ends of human reason, the science of the Absolute.

A more correct definition is the one word "methodology." Methodology implies a plan in creation and government. Nature confirms this. Everywhere there is structural order, and cleavage. Philosophy is the pursuit of knowledge along these lines. It is the power of classification. To the philosophic mind all the facts of nature as well as the events of history fall into their proper order and interdependence. It is the scientific approach to, and opening of, every department of

knowledge. Methodology is to *investigation* what logic is to *reasoning* in general. It has been called the Philosophy of Philosophy, and was the unrealized aim of Plato and Aristotle. It is the *organon*—organ—or instrument by which we may discover the truth of any subject. This implement may be known by the thoroughness of its action. Its absence is known by arbitrariness and capriciousness of method, which starts with error, and multiplies it at every step.

This definition of philosophy is sadly confirmed in intellectual history. The lack of it is the explanation of the mental pandemonium of the world.

Such philosophy is theistic. Its fundamental postulate is a divine order, of causes and events. Plato and Aristotle were deists. Without the aid of Revelation this was all they could be. Hence their failure in searching for the *Organon*, the Key to all Knowledge. All they had were reason, nature, and conscience. These implements of man are insufficient.

Philosophy must be more than deistic: it must be theistic. The central key of universal knowledge had not yet been placed in human hands. It was not in the world until He brought it "who openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth." He is the Wisdom of God, and knoweth all things. His teaching is the unifying, organizing source of all knowledge. Truth is Christocentric. Its perfect sphere can be seen only from the summit of Calvary. There every department of knowledge falls into its proper order. If we begin with the cleavage of Calvary, the universe falls into harmony. This is evolution. It is the unfolding of the nature and relationships of Him in whom dwelt the fullness of God, and by whom all things consist. Christ is the generic seed of history. History cannot be unified except in him. His doctrines are the lines of intellectual arrest. He tells us where thinking ends,

and faith begins: where the mind reaches the limits of its quest, and asks for a Revelation from above. Plato and Aristotle are striking illustrations. They carried human thinking as far as it could be carried by nature's aid alone. They founded the two great schools out of which has come all modern philosophy. They were deistic: believed in a divine creation, and opposed the atheism and materialism of their time. But seeing truth only in the light of reason, conscience, and nature, it was not a straight line. Their deflections have been followed by modern successors into divergences as wide as theism and atheism.

Neo-Platonists degenerated into imaginative theosophy, and the followers of Aristotle into hair-splitting Schoolmen. Even as far back as the coming of Christ, Platonism had been displaced by Epicureanism. There were exceptions, represented by such as Philo, Plutarch, and Pliny, who still clung to Plato.

The early church fathers cast their defenses of Christianity into Platonic formulas, as against the Neo-Platonists, who hoped to establish a human philosophy that would render useless a system of Revelation. But in emphasizing philosophy we can now see the great mistake of the apologetic defenders of Christianity. They gradually emphasized their philosophy more than their facts. The best proof of Christianity is Christianity. Leaving the realities of the new religion as it had been lived during the first two centuries for the speculations of the school of Alexandria, they finally became lost in the tangled jungle of Aristotelianism. If the early teachers had kept within the lines of intellectual arrest as laid down by Jesus, how different would have been Christian history! The decline of spiritual vitality is always marked by the revival of rationalistic tendencies. In the absence of Christian experience, the human mind attempts to justify its moral and spiritual status by

an appeal to rationalism. Such a decline of the German Reformation was followed in the eighteenth century by the antagonistic speculative systems of theism and pantheism. The father of the former was Plato, and of the latter was Spinoza. The school of the latter, as represented by Hegel, is thoroughly destructive, obliterating all distinctions between right and wrong, free-will and fate. It rejects such terms as deism, theism, design, soul, conscience, morality, immortality, freedom, and beauty.

The facts which these terms represent would not long exist in society, should rationalism supersede Christianity. Their movement might continue for a time, through custom and education, just as an ocean steamer may continue some distance on its course after the impulsion of the engine has ceased.

The Bible marks the lines of intellectual arrest. It is impossible to rationalize with precision on the basis of naturalism. Premises that omit a Personal Intelligence at the center of the nature of things cannot find such a Being in the conclusion. Such a conclusion is intellectual and moral confusion.

The best logic starting from the same premises will reach different conclusions according to the Christian or unchristian point of view. The mechanical theory of evolution is possible, only by biological action being assimilated to chemical processes. But chemical processes can be accounted for only on the theory of teleological factors. Darwin and Weismann both admit that natural selection without teleological factors is *not* adequate to account for biological evolution; "and further," as Professor Ward says, "such teleological factors imply not a nondescript force called vital, but psychical: something endowed with feeling and will, and the cosmos therefore must be referred in its orderliness and meaning to an indwelling and informing Life and Mind."

Philosophy has never been able to bridge the chasm from matter to mind, and mind has never made fast to matter. But knowledge as a complete circle must include both. The philosophy of Kant organized and unified this knowledge beyond others, in that they all maintained a dualism between realism and idealism while he postulated a *duality in unity* of both, in maintaining the reality of experience, in the world of sense and of ideas.

The experience of matter must be extended into thought, and thought is as much an experience as the thing from which it started. It is a duality in unity of subject and object. This is a unity, imposed neither from without nor within, but an experience best defined by the analogy of life, which includes as a reality both subject and object, for the living individual. This unity is necessary to philosophy, which organizes knowledge; for matter or mind without the other would be a contradiction.

This contradiction,—dualism of physics and psychology,—Kant calls “a scandal of philosophy and of human reason.” The only way to remove this scandal is to unite both, as included in an actual experience of life, as the two halves of a perfect whole. This experience is not simply as to the subject and object, *per se*, that is, the contents of either perception or objects perceived, but *both in relation to moral ends*, which constitute the real aim of life, according to the universal consciousness of mankind. Just here seems to have arisen the intellectual confusion of both the sensationalism of Locke and the idealism of Berkeley. Both veins of knowledge have been worked wholly on intellectual levels, as furnishing answers to man’s inquiries simply as a *thinking* being. But man’s thinking never stops with himself. His whole mental impulsion leads up to a Supreme Intelligence, that has not only devised

a physical, but also moral, universe, to which every mind feels amenable. But *experience* as the basis of knowledge takes into account human forces, not simply as forces, but their activity and aim, or real business; hence their positive or negative worth, their goodness or badness, as ends or means to life.

Naturalism has to do, on the other hand, with an indefinite multiplicity of inert, unchangeable, unmeaning, mechanical laws: and of course can have no connection with *experience* of things as the self-conservative process, which the cosmos is to every man. That the nature of things can be treated as mechanics on the one hand, or speculation on the other, is true. But the question is whether we should have a perception of either one or the other if we had no practical interest in them. Psychology conditions mental activity on sufficient motive. The conceptions of abstract and unreal elements of space and time in themselves have no motive. But, as related to practical mathematics, or, more important still, to the solution of the cosmic process, the motive is sufficient for their pursuit. The time element, in like manner, urges intellectual activity, because of its practical and moral bearings on our present and future.

This fact shows that *experience* must be regarded as a life, and not merely as a theory. This is demonstrated in the *motif* of such abstract thinkers as Locke and Newton, who compared the ubiquity of space with the ubiquity of Deity. Newton speaks of absolute space as the sensorium of God. Whether the mind is skeptical, as Locke's, or believing, as Newton's, the *terminus ad quem* of human thinking is always Deity, and is therefore practical and moral. All cosmic conceptions must begin within the circle of experience, as philosophic knowledge. Before space and time can be conceived as measurements of geometry or chronology, they must first be concrete

facts of experience, as known to children and savages. As the mind matures, and becomes capable of scientific investigation, it may pass beyond formal experience. But this partial transcendence of personal experience must not be taken as entire. It is still the space and time of mathematics, and, more important still, as these conceptions rise into the higher realms of mathematical formulas, they approach nearer to the conceptions of the mathematical mind that designed the universe, and thus bring thinking man within the circle of practical and moral impulses as a living and self-conservative being, in relation to the Creator of all things.

We cannot escape from a teleological world. We have to assume causality, and causality presupposes law and order, before any experience can be explained, and before "universal experience" can begin. This conception of law and order is not reached by an accumulation of impressions, but by applying conceptions to these impressions, and by inductive processes working out a scientific order.

Huxley says, "Our one certainty is the existence of the mental world." He is also compelled to admit, after long efforts to show the contrary, that "the conception of universal and necessary laws is ideal, an invention of the mind's own devising, not a physical fact." But this is a mental paradox to those who deny that "there is a spirit in man," as an active unifying principle, the ground of self-consciousness and self-determination. Naturalism, however successfully it may account for what is known as material permanence, mechanical necessity, and natural law, reaches the line of intellectual arrest, when man himself is considered. The known world will not account for *knowing* man. This has been established and admitted by every form of materialism. The question is, now, whether in man can be found an explanation for what is exterior to him.

If so, then the universe is teleological, and therefore divine.

Kant put this conception in a paradoxical though very expressive form, when he said, "the intellect makes Nature, though it does not create it." That is, it organizes, but it does not originate. And this is the mental limit. When the mind has determined the Unity of Nature, by following out and organizing its system of laws, it can go no further. It is the line of intellectual arrest. But this Unity of Nature proves that nature itself is teleological, "(1) in being conformable to human intelligence, and (2) in being subject to human ends."

Intellectual arrest is determined by character, as well as mental capacity. This arises from the fact, that, the reason is not a special organ or faculty, as one sense for a moment contradicts another sense, or as our senses are corrected by our intelligence; for example, the apparent motion of the sun, or the unreality of the apparent color of objects. Kidd's "Social Evolution" is based on the assumption, that the intellectual acts separately, and in opposition to moral and spiritual character. But the best definition of reason is, that it comprises all the human antecedents of action. It is man's entire self. It includes both his intuitions and logical faculties. To be misled by it is possible, but it is not possible to act consciously against it. Man can no more think or act outside of his reason, that is, the entirety of his impressions and inducements, than he can jump out of his skin. It is true, as Kidd says, that mankind as a whole, and in the long run, prefers social to individual interests, and moral to material objects. This is not because the social and moral nature is opposed to, and overcomes, the separate faculty of reason, but because, on the whole, the social and moral tide of man's being is strong enough to overcome his selfishness, which controls his reason.

The proper distinction, therefore, is not between the moral



and rational, but between the natural and spiritual. Kidd says, "that the industrial classes have no sanction of reason for maintaining the existing relations of society. In self-interest they would end them." And so they would if they had the power. They would do so, however, not simply on rational grounds, but because their reason expresses their anarchist disposition, which constitutes the whole man. They are restrained by the power of the state until Christianity comes in to change their characters. When that change is effected, their reason is even more emphatic for the preservation and improvement of society than it was before for its destruction. The progress of social evolution has therefore been the expression of the advancement of Christianity.

Intellectual arrest is therefore a question of morals and religion. The Bible is thereby confirmed in its diagnosis and remedy of human ills. Its broad and deep distinction between the natural and spiritual man is the only explanation and philosophy of history. Cain and Abel are its first types, and the human race has flowed down through the ages in these two channels. One moves by reason, the other by faith, and the movement is in opposite directions, and results in strong antagonisms. There is violence on the one hand, and suffering on the other. The unchristian world is a world of Cainites. Their Abel victims have left a path of blood, back to the progenitor, who was slain for his faith by the father of the Cainite world. As society has become more cultured, the natural man has assumed rational grounds, as against the alleged uncertainty of faith. Great emphasis is laid on the value of the human reason in determining the problems of life and destiny. But if it be true that the reason is not a separate faculty, but comprises the whole constitution of man, then rationalistic religion, as opposed to spiritual, is only the opposition of the

natural man to the man of faith, and was forecast at the beginning of history in Cain and Abel. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact, that the same grounds of naturalism on which an unchristian mind rejects Revelation are used, when that mind has become Christian, in maintaining the doctrines of theism.

Professor George Romanes is a striking example of this. The change in his reason was simply the proof of the change in his character, as expressed by his reason.

Is not this the explanation of the long controversy between reason and faith? The difficulty is not that faith is non-rational, but that reason is the expression of the instinctive and irrepressible repulsion of the natural to the spiritual man. Reason does not abdicate when man matriculates in the school of Faith. On the contrary, the rational faculties are intensely quickened. Christianity is the harbinger of intelligence. It is only when we assume the truth of Revelation that we obtain a key to the nature of things. Both science and philosophy become self-consistent only when a Divine Creator is postulated. Reason when the character is Christian is as intensely occupied with science and philosophy as when the character was unchristian. This shows that the heart rather than the mind is at fault. The heart is only another name for the *Will*, and the *will* is the whole personality, recording its motives and decisions in rational terms. Every man feels the necessity of giving a reason for the hope within him. If the hope is non-Christian, its reasons will be like itself. The stream must be as the fountain. Since man must defend his naturalism, his whole nature through his reason will summon all its energies for his justification. He bases his defense on the abstract "principle of unity" in nature. This is idealism. But such a principle is destitute of all moral qualities. Loving-kindness

and equity are not the offspring of an abstract principle. If we find these qualities in creation, they must have come from a Creator who possessed them. If idealism, on which rationalism rests, be true, then the relations by which the universe consists, cannot be ascertained by experience at all. But to dispense with all sense-perception is a stultification of reason itself.

We do not say that all metaphysical systems are valueless. The best we can say of them, however, is, that they are fragmentary. They were the best embodiment of the spirit and power of their time. When Revelation is accepted, it will be an organizing principle, eliminating and recasting these fragments, and forming them into an orderly whole. Custom, not reason, is the determining force and ground of assurance. Custom is the expression of personality, and personality therefore must rest on a divine basis to bring certainty.

Revelation gives mental balance and rest. By marking off the limits of mind, the authority of belief comes in as a necessary sequence. If rationalism were, as it claims, an unprejudiced examination of every question, it would be a great blessing. But this cannot be. This may be its ideal, but in reality it is only the protest of the natural man against biblical belief.

As long as the faith of Christianity centered on popes and virgins and relics, the reason or natural man remained indifferent. But when Luther startled the world with the cry of "justification by faith in Christ," rationalism protested, feebly at first, but gradually increasing through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and culminating in the naturalism of to-day. Christianity is herself to blame for much of this. Had she maintained her primitive character, she would have forestalled the present rationalism and materialism. By relapsing into asceticism, for centuries, she abused both body and mind.

We now have the reaction, in the physical indulgence of materialism, and the excessive rebound of the mind so long repressed by superstitious beliefs, which excluded all recognition of the facts of nature.

The rationalism that simply protests against the abuses of belief is one thing, and a very good thing: but a rationalism which seeks the destruction or the recasting of all beliefs to conform to its own formulas, is quite another, and very bad thing. Destruction is often very necessary, when something better is to follow. Unfortunately rationalism ruthlessly destroys, when she has nothing to substitute. By excluding the super-sensible, the circle of knowledge is broken, and a system is produced inconsistent with itself and with nature.

But theism must not make too much of nature. It is only as nature is supplemented by Revelation, that it confirms theism. Natural theology alone is not a satisfactory basis for religion. Naturalism may take the same premises, and with a warped logic deduce opposite conclusions. It is at best but a balancing of probabilities.

Professor Drummond has put the facts of nature as strongly as possible in relation to works of design and benevolence. He offsets the Struggle for Life, with the Struggle for the Life of Others. In nature the latter is indeed faint, but a prophecy and promise of its fulfillment in Christianity. But the materialistic philosopher, applying his own logic to the same facts, reaches an opposite conclusion, and apparently to his own satisfaction. His conclusions deny the proof of a First and Personal Cause, reasoning from general laws of causation as seen in nature. Benevolence in creation is not proof of benevolence in the Creator. The most he will admit is the machinist conception of the Author of nature. The machine looks after itself, after having once been started.

In like manner the natural man reasons in relation to the progress of society. The facts on the side of theism seem irresistible, as compared with evidences of the Divine in nature. The sheerest globe-trotter, and blindfold at that, cannot resist the conclusions that Christianity is the one explanation of the difference in nations: that all progress has followed, and resulted from, the advancement of the Cross in the world. And yet a Buckle or Lecky, representing the cultured deism of the nineteenth century, will explain all these facts on the general course of secular human history. The phenomena of history are to them but the laws of nature applied to man. They are the laws of life and death, growth and decay. All nationalities and religions simply follow this law. This law, plus the principle of evolution, which gives an upward trend to all development, accounts for the stream of anthropology and sociology, from an unknown past to an unknowable future. It is simply the unfolding of the intellectualism of humanity. But if it is true, that rationalism is only the sum total of personality, then human progress is simply the effort of mankind to lift itself to higher levels without Divine aid. But the facts of anthropology, past and present, are squarely against this.

Revelation photographs the natural man as so spiritually blind and deaf and paralytic as to be unconscious of his condition. This is strongly true of unchristian people of highly specialized intelligence. The evidences of Christianity are specially obnoxious to this class.

It is true that there are many apparent improbabilities in the way of these evidences. Many effects seem out of proportion to their causes. That such a system of world-wide religion as Christianity should spring from such an insignificant people and country as the Jews, seems incredible. But, on the other hand, to the theist, this seems in entire keeping with the

tone of supernaturalism running all through the Bible, which minimizes causes, in order to magnify their divine results.

The analogy of nature is on the side of Revelation, since the physical and animal world amply illustrates the principle of *progressive creation*, from the less to the greater, and social science is based on the doctrine of progressive development. Such is the prejudice of those who advocate naturalism as the best explanation of causation, that they seem unable to recognize this fact when applied to theism, though it is altruism in science.

This emphasizes intellectual arrest. Human philosophy of development furnishes no basis of consistent thinking or moral rectitude, because its advocates are unable, through moral stigmatism, to see spiritual truths. They have no proper perspective of truth as related to the cosmos. Naturalism is the exposition of nature. But we must remember that there is a vast difference between nature and the universe. It is the difference between a part and the whole. Nature is from *natus*, born or created. But universe is a much larger word, including nature. What therefore is supernatural in nature may be natural in the universe. In attempting to traverse this wider circle, we meet with phenomena beyond all explanation of rationalism.

A rationalism must be found, large enough to cover the cosmos. If the universe is a consistent whole, the intellectual system that underlies and explains it must also be consistent with itself. But human philosophies are nothing if not fragmentary and self-destructive. Idealism is succeeded by realism, and then the pendulum swings back again. Each new philosophy is followed in the next decade with a newer one. The newness, however, is usually nothing but a new dress for an old thought. There is no real progress. The limits of the-

istic thought were long ago reached by the human mind. Recent theories are but an approach to the impossible barriers under a new guise.

The genealogy of naturalism is as manifest as that of faith. The materialistic philosophy of Comte, Bain, Feuerbach, and Herbert Spencer of to-day can be traced unbrokenly back, through the Epicureanism of Rome and Sadduceism of Palestine, to the teaching of Democritus, five hundred years before Christ. Idealism by an equally unbroken chain goes back to Locke, who propounded the theory of knowledge of sensationism. Realism and idealism both contain fundamental truths. But each by itself is a half truth. Pursued by thinkers, as half truths, the result has been vast systems of error. Why the human mind has never been able to combine the two into a perfect whole, is the greatest possible proof of a mental perversity, which man is unable to overcome. This shows the fact of intellectual arrest. The mind is able to see but a half truth, and a half truth is a falsehood.

What then is the true philosophy? The true philosophy combines idealism and realism. The Bible therefore is the only true philosophy. It recognizes the external world as real. It has a *bona fide* existence independent of mental concepts.

In like manner the mind has a real existence aside from the external world. Its intuitions and consciousness of itself are just as solid facts as anything in nature. Its apprehensions of God, matter, space, and time are reliable data for final conclusions. These concepts relate to material and spiritual realities. Spiritual truths are only in part apprehended by the mind. But the mind, recognizing spiritual intuitions as first truths, confidently trusts their sequel when it cannot follow them by ratiocination. Faith, therefore, is only a higher kind of knowledge, giving certitude where the mind cannot reach,

—a certitude, in regard to spiritual realities, resting upon the testimony of our rational natures, and also on the confirming voice of God. Uniformity of nature is not more necessary to physical science, since it also rests on human testimony and our primitive cognitions, than Faith is to spiritual truth.

The Bible assumes three realities in relation to man,—the external world, the internal or world of ideas, and the unseen world, apprehended by faith. This makes man a threefold being,—body, soul, and spirit,—and corresponds to the plan of the ancient temple, of outer court, middle court, and holy of holies. These are interrelated and self-confirming, each without the other being unmeaning, and worse than useless.

But the key to the door of faith, which opens into the holy of holies, is Love. It is only the loving mind that can comprehend spiritual truth. Love marks the lines of limitation of religious thinking. God is seen only by the pure in heart, and purity is divine love. The same is true in the material world. The knowledge of the beautiful is conditioned on love of the beautiful. A blind man cannot appreciate the beautiful: he even has good ground for denying its existence. But his denying the external world because he cannot see it, or love it, does not make that world any less real to those who have eyes to see and love it. Darwin was so long and so deeply absorbed in nature as to lose all love, and therefore appreciation, of poetry and music. How true this is of spiritual truths! The mind that is conscious of having no love for God, but is conscious of positive dislike for him, is effectually debarred from any true knowledge of him. Early susceptibility of conscience may prevent the darkness being total, at first, but it grows by neglect, like an increasing cataract, until all vision is gone. Reason cannot know God. Faith only can apprehend him, and faith is conditioned on love. We *will* do what we *love* to



do. Will is the efficient cause, but a wish, preference, or affection determines the specific character of the action. Every volition has its motive. We do what we want or love to do, and this makes necessity of freedom. Love to God necessitates our knowledge of him, both in kind and degree. We may say, that we are fated to believe in his Revelation, by our love. But while irresistibly impelled by that love, we are conscious of the most perfect freedom. The absence of that love makes a necessity to *disbelieve* the Bible as love causes us to believe in it. The same person without love, and disbelieving, may come into the possession of love that will make him as thoroughly believe spiritual truths, as before he disbelieved them.

This is the attitude of the human mind before and after what Christ calls the "new birth." There is an entire change, from blindness to sight. It is the opening of the eyes of a man born blind upon the beautiful world, whose existence he had long denied, because he could not see it.

Have we not found in this fact the line of intellectual arrest? There are other lines of course. The impossibility of the finite mind comprehending the Infinite has been the strong line of defense of Christian apologists for centuries. It has been a long history of metaphysical fencing. But, as strong as this defense has been, it has not been impregnable. There have been points of weakness, which the enemy has not failed to discover. The argument has sometimes proved too little, and sometimes too much. Mansel carried it so far as seriously to discount all spiritual knowledge, and open the way to agnosticism, which is the ground now generally held by disbelievers in revelation. It is a great gain to find out that philosophy *cannot explain the universe*. The philosophic world is still divided into realist and idealist. The existence of matter, in-

dependent of our senses, is yet a metaphysical discussion. The reality of the material world would seem much easier to demonstrate than the existence of God, but in fact, it is less so, for man is born with an intuition of God more real than the world of sense. Idealism is rationalism. Experience as a source of knowledge is excluded as to the nature of the universe. But the knowledge of idealism will not explain the *facts* of existence. It is a warfare of attack and defense. Every new defense has been matched by a greater projectile force, and this in turn has been met by greater thickness of armor. As the Czar said in his Ukase of Peace, "hundreds of millions are devoted to acquiring terrible engines of destruction which, though to-day regarded as the last word of science, are destined to-morrow to lose all their value in consequence of some fresh discovery in the same field." But if it can be shown that all attack is cut off by the defenses occupying ground that is entirely unassailable by the opposition, a great step will have been gained. According to the old methods, the same ground is gone over again by each new generation. Old straw is beaten afresh, with no winnowing of new grain. But if the knowledge of God be conditioned on the love of God, all controversy is ended. There is no common ground on which to begin an argument. This indispensable condition is not arbitrary and unreasonable. It is based on the most fundamental principles. Revelation, which is the point in dispute, rests on the only ground of philosophy that is *self-consistent* with the deepest facts of nature, and satisfying to the human mind. It maintains the truth of idealism, realism, and spirituality. It regards the knowledge of matter, mind, and faith, as equally varied and trustworthy. It is the only philosophy which combines them all, and thereby points to an Author whose mind includes all sides of truth which are necessary to a completed

circle. In order for man to obtain the same point of view, he must put himself in accord with this Divine Being. The first thing, therefore, to be insisted on with one who objects to Revelation is, that he put himself *en rapport* with the Author of all things. Until then there is no debate. Jesus is conceded by all minds as the Prince of teachers. He touched the springs of primal knowledge. His horizon swept both the seen and unseen worlds. And this was because he was one with the Father. The same must be true of all minds. The first step is therefore not debate, but submission. The will is the objective point. As Jesus said, "If any man is *willing* to do his will, he shall know the doctrine."

Submission is the one great word in the universe. Law is interwoven into the nature of things, from insect to seraphim. Submission therefore is the one condition of peace and order. *Thy will be done*, is the anthem of the spheres. Submission is followed by love, and love is the avenue to all knowledge. Following in this King's highway, the mind is brought into a growing apprehension and comprehension not only of nature, but the cosmos, of which nature is a part. Revelation, it is true, does not offer an explanation for all the difficulties of the physical order. But, on the other hand, naturalism is equally incapable of harmonizing the physical realm, and at the same time is entirely unable to explain the facts of the mental and spiritual life. "In fact, the beliefs of religion," as Mr. Balfour has said, "are too sacred to be sacrificed even to intellectual consistency, if that could be established." Says Joseph Cook, "Man will discover stars, only when their images are thrown on the brain by the lenses of the telescope being perfectly adjusted to the eye. In like manner spiritual worlds are revealed to the mind when all the faculties of man's being are adjusted to divine obedience." Even rationalism is

compelled to recognize a supersensible realm of which it knows nothing. For example, take spiritualism, for the most part a fraud, and yet tested and accredited by some of the ablest minds. The Society of Psychic Research, London, is hospitable to it. The eminent scientist Wallace has now admitted that ghosts have been photographed. The most we can say is that we touch on an unseen and unknown universe of both good and evil spirits of which the intellect can give no account.

The same is also true of certain phases of Christian science, so called, and other mysterious facts. It is plain that we are on the verge of a realm of occult forces, where the power of the mind over matter is vastly increased, and the limitations of which human intelligence is unable to forecast. But this we know, that revelation offers us a sure explanation and guide, when the mind can no farther advance. The Bible puts before us, as we reach this unseen and unknown spiritual realm, the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as dominant in the spiritual world. Human experience, individual and national, amply verifies the statement, that those who follow his teaching prove its satisfactory solution of life and destiny. On the other hand, those who follow other spirits than the Paraclete of Revelation give evidence of the contrary character and consolations present and prospective. This is experience, not speculation, and as susceptible of verification as any facts of naturalism.

Unity of the spirit, which is the bond of peace, has only one known source of causation. It follows the uniformity of nature, of like begetting like: every seed reproducing its own kind. The Holy Spirit in man at the Pentecost, and in every recreated soul since, is the same in kind that descended on the Christ at baptism.

We should discriminate between the different relations of the Holy Spirit. He has relations like Christ, whom he rep-

resents, both to time and eternity. In regard to the latter, he takes the things of Christ, and shows them unto us. He also is related to God as the Eternal Being, and reveals that Being in relation to the universe.

If the advocate of spiritual agencies claim the right to go beyond the seen world, and invoke spirits from the unseen world, good, bad, and indifferent, then surely believers in the Bible may appeal to the unseen world as the sphere of the Holy Spirit. If the sequel of evil earthly life is the existence of evil spirits in the unseen world, then it must be still more true, that the sequel of the Holy Spirit working in life here, must be a larger control of such life in the purely spiritual world.

The supernatural working of the Holy Spirit, both in the moral and spiritual regeneration of individuals and nations, gives assured ground for its identification with the Author and Upholder of all things. We may say that wherever the Holy Spirit acts, God acts. Science is obliged to recognize him in history: the changes wrought can be accounted for in no other way. The historical effects of Christianity and the realities of Christian experience are entirely susceptible of verification. Christ's spirit and life in man are self-evident truths, which are attested not only by the testimony of those who have experienced great inward illumination, like the Friends, but also by such a distinguished philosopher as Lotze.

Behind natural law is spiritual law, as the primal source of causation; and, if there is a law, there must be a lawgiver. To say, that we live in the environment of the Holy Spirit, is to say that we are in close and constant touch with God himself.

Why, then, should we not expect the mind to receive divine communications? Such must have been true of the apostles,

and writers of the New Testament; else how could they have produced writing so entirely beyond their own conceptions? When we think of their Jewish prejudices, it is incredible, on any rationalistic basis, that they could have written such a cosmopolitan biography of the Christ. If the apostles felt such an impact and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, it is also true that he has presided over and directed his church ever since: church history cannot otherwise be accounted for. This relation to the Holy Spirit may be sought by all who are in obedient fellowship with him. We must not press too far, however, the direct messages of the Holy Spirit to the mind to the exclusion of authorized revelation of the written Word. In doing this, the Church of Rome was led into fatal error. She contends that, as the written Word was not in existence for a long time after the founding of the church, and that the church received Christ's communications from inspired minds; so, after the Word was written, the Spirit gave special messages to priests, bishops, and supremely to the pope. But we must insist not only on the voice of the whole church, but also on the written Word as the authority for individual and church life.

The Holy Spirit therefore marks the line of intellectual arrest. When the mind reaches the limits of power to know, the Holy Spirit becomes the *Guide into all truth*. But he is guide only to those who love and keep his commandments, and that is Revelation and Christianity.

The mind of man is arrested by his spiritual nature. It is not arrested by the contradiction of his spiritual nature, but by being superseded: just as a colonel is outranked and superseded in war by the arrival on the field of his commanding general. When the intellectual is superseded by the spiritual nature, it makes a great change in both nature and human nature. The fundamental conception of the universe, accord-

ing to Sir Isaac Newton, has only one rational basis: it is that of "God who is supreme, infinite, omnipotent, omniscient, absolutely perfect, and whose ideas and will have given rise to the whole diversity of natural things." But a mind not possessing the reverence and religious point of view of Newton, though starting with the same premises, reaches opposite conclusions. A hundred years after Newton's "Principia" appeared the "Mecanique Celeste" of M. Laplace, which was based on the lines laid down by Newton, but which marked out a system of the universe which did not even mention a Creator, and which, Laplace said to Napoleon, "had no need of any such hypothesis." The same cleavage exists now, as then, between Christians and agnostic naturalists and philosophers. The supernatural is not boldly denied in natural science, but simply omitted: there is no need of it. To Newton or Cuvier or Faraday, a Divine Being *was* necessary to any explanation of the cosmic order, though Laplace or Holbach and their successors wholly omitted any reference to him. Newton sees in the motion of the planets the necessary action of an intelligent Agent. But Laplace substitutes the nebular hypothesis, which has no need of supernatural agency. Paley held that the examination of the eye was a cure for atheism, while atheism describes it as an instrument that a scientific optician would be ashamed to make.

The difficulty of dispensing with a theistic hypothesis on the part of agnostics, is shown in the tortuous intellectualism of Professor Tyndall, in his famous Belfast address to the British Association. "You who have escaped," he says, "from these religions into the high and dry light of the intellect, may deride them: but in so doing you deride accidents of forms merely, and fail to touch the immovable basis of the religious sentiment in the nature of man. To yield this sentiment rea-

sonable satisfaction is the problem of the present hour." And how does he satisfy it? He satisfies the religious hunger by defining it as something which has emerged from the region of *mystery*; and is "capable of being guided to noble issues in the region of *emotion*, which is its proper and elevated sphere, but should never be permitted to intrude on the region of *knowledge*, over which it holds no command, and, that each succeeding age must be held free to fashion the *Mystery* in accordance with its own needs."

On the other hand, it is still to be noticed, that a long list of the most eminent scientists have asserted their strong belief in the supernatural character of Christianity. The writer expressed a wish to the late Sir J. W. Dawson, when giving a course of lectures in the Lowell Institute, Boston, that there might be more men of science in sympathy with his very positive belief in the Bible, and received the reply, that there were very many known to him, and the number was increasing.

It was this fact that impressed Professor Romanes during the years of his unbelief. He remarks: "If we look to the greatest mathematicians in the world's history, we find Kepler and Newton as Christians. . . . Or, coming to our own times, and confining our attention to the principal seat of mathematical study, when I was at Cambridge there was such a galaxy of genius in that department emanating from that place as had never before been equaled. And the curious thing in our present connection is, that all the most illustrious names of orthodoxy, Sir W. Thomson, Sir George Stokes, Professors Tait, Adams, Clerk Maxwell and Cayley, not to mention a number of lesser lights, were all avowed Christians. Now it would be easy, no doubt, to find elsewhere than in Cambridge, mathematicians of the first order who in our own generation are or have been anti-Christian in their beliefs, although certainly



not so great an array of such extraordinary powers. But, be this as it may, the case of Cambridge in my own time seems to me of itself enough to prove that Christian belief is neither made nor marred by the highest powers of reasoning apart from other and still more potent factors.”<sup>1</sup>

Sir William Hamilton has left on record these remarkable words: “The highest reach of human knowledge is the scientific recognition of human ignorance; *Qui nescit ignorare, ignorat scire*. This ‘learned ignorance’ is the rational conviction of the human mind of its inability to transcend certain limits: it is the knowledge of ourselves,—the science of man. This is accomplished by a demonstration of the disproportion between the Infinite and the finite. In fact, the recognition of human ignorance is not only our highest, but the one true knowledge, and its first fruit, as has been said, is humility. Simple nescience is not proud: consummated science is positively humble. The grand result of human wisdom is this, only a consciousness that what we know is as nothing to what we know not,—an articulate confession, in fact, by our natural reason of the truth declared in Revelation, that ‘*now* we see through a glass, darkly.’”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Thoughts on Religion*, pp. 137-138.

<sup>2</sup> *Philosophy*, pp. 517-518.