

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY.

VOL. X.



LONDON:

(Published for the Institute)

HARDWICKE & BOGUE, 192, PICCADILLY, W.

1877.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

- “Origin of Life on our Planet.” By Principal Dawson, F.R.S.
From the Author.
- “Philosophy without Assumptions.” By the Rev. T. Kirkman, F.R.S.
From the Author.
- “Papers on Shakspeare.” By E. H. Pickersgill.
Ditto.
- “Rector and his Friends.” By Professor Lias.
Ditto.
- Page’s “Geology.”
From T. Barber, Esq.
- Crofton’s “Genesis and Geology.”
Ditto.
- Morell’s Tanneman’s “Philosophy.”
Ditto.
- “Egypt.” By Dr. Russell.
Ditto.
- Alford’s “First Principles of the Oracles of God.”
Ditto.
- Mahan on Romans ix.
Ditto.
- Letters of Gregory VII.
Ditto.
- Six other smaller Works.
Ditto.
- Abdiel’s Essays.
From the Rev. Prebendary Brooks.
- Bascombe’s “Epidemics.”
Ditto.
- “Cottage Construction.” By Strickland.
Ditto.
- Hershon on Genesis.
Ditto.
- “Pentateuch according to the Talmud.”
Ditto.
- Phillips’s “Pomarium Britannicum.”
Ditto.
- Taylor’s Hebrew Poetry.
Ditto.
- “Communion of Saints.” By the Rev. Prebendary Brooks.
From the Author.
- “Infidelity.” Ditto. *Ditto.*
- “Prophetical Interpretations.” Ditto. *Ditto.*
- “Solomon’s Proverbs.” Ditto. *Ditto.*
- Fourteen smaller Works, presented by Sir D. Salomons, Bart., Prof. Duff, D.P., W. H. Ince, Esq., Rev. J. McKay, F. Madden, Esq., Rev. R. Main, Prof. Morris, Captain F. Petrie, Dr. Sexton.

The following Paper was then read by the Author :—

PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM. By Rev. J. McDougall.

VARIOUS, and some of them august, voices tell us that man is outliving religion. Mr. John Stuart Mill has left this testimony : “the world would be astonished if it knew how great a proportion of its brightest ornaments are sceptics in religion.” Dr. Strauss this: that in publishing the negations of his last work, he only wrote for a great number. Almost all the more important Magazines of the day give ample space for the enunciation and exposition of non- and anti-religious views. In the “Contemporary,” Archbishop (now Cardinal) Manning and Mr. Fitz-James Stephen held recent tournament, in which, amongst other things, they fought over

the elements of religion, the eminent lawyer taking the sceptical side with the declaration that he was the mouth-piece of most intelligent men, who do not believe that the doctrines of our faith are demonstrable—such a doctrine as the Being of God, for instance ; so that influential and cultured people of his class now only accept religion because, on the whole, they deem it a better thing for society than no religion. I do not pretend to be able to measure the amount of truth which such assertions contain. That they do hold some, I feel convinced. That they are exaggerations, I am equally convinced. But that they should be true to any extent, and that they should be so boldly announced by such men, are sufficiently serious facts for me as a Christian, and I have responded to the request made to me to speak on the latest and most influential form of scepticism with much willingness, albeit with grave doubts of my worthiness.

My subject is *Present-Day Materialism*. Time was, and not long ago, when a shorter and simpler term would have conveyed the same meaning: the term *Atheism*. But it will not now. There are utterances of Dr. Tyndall (as Dr. Lionel Beale showed by quotations in the *Times* twelve months ago), which admit of only one interpretation: the total denial of the being of a God. I suppose, however, that we must date such utterances not in Dr. Tyndall's "hours of clearness and vigour," but in his hours of less strong, and somewhat unhealthy thought.* Be it so. The eminent scientist's own description of his atheistical mood accepted, what does he offer as a confession of faith? Something which I am quite unable to distinguish from Pantheism. As a plain man, desiring to exhibit intellectual sincerity *to*, and to see it exhibited *in* all, I have felt that to make the whole universe into God—a process involved in *placing in the atom of matter the initial, developing, and perfecting power of the universe, as Dr. Tyndall does*, comes to much the same thing as denying altogether the God in whom I believe. As I read Dr. Tyndall's address, the old and irrepresible question comes up for answer: Is there a living God? Is there a Supreme Spirit "immanent" in, but separate from, the universe of matter and force? On the reply to this momentous question hang all the essentials of the Christian faith; and the discussion of it, and of other related questions, has been forced upon us by Dr. Tyndall in his opening address, as President of the British Association, at its late meetings in Belfast. From this, the very best authority, we learn the latest views of the

* Note I. Appendix.

Materialists, and the nature (at least), if not the details, of their defence. If Dr. Tyndall is not the Chief Prophet of the Sect, he is certainly the most prominent, as he is one of the most eloquent and fearless, and we may accept his utterances as truly *ex cathedra*. I make his Belfast address, therefore, in some sort, my text, and solicit your patience while I comment upon some of his teachings which affect the foundations of our religion, and at such length as the time I can reasonably occupy will allow.

I shall not attempt to criticise the historical and descriptive portions of Dr. Tyndall's address, although a closer examination of them than I have given has enabled many to discover errors which its author ought not to have made. These excepted, I am very grateful for it; very glad to get it in a form so fresh and suggestive. As to the scientific results announced in it, I am bound to accept them as correct, until some other authority discovers them to be erroneous; or, as is not at all impossible, seeing his candour and fearlessness, Dr. Tyndall himself shall say that he wishes to retract or to modify them.

Taking up the subject with which the address first deals, I will speak of Creation, and human ideas about it.

We are told that the same impulse which turned the thoughts of primeval man towards the sources of natural phenomena, is the spur of scientific action to-day. Determined by this impulse, we consult and test experience, and "form physical theories which are beyond the pale of experience, but which satisfy the desire of the mind to see every natural occurrence resting upon a cause."* This fair statement helps to explain how, as Dr. Tyndall says, men began to form theories in harmony with their characters and dispositions. Some used only their knowledge and experience of man, *i.e.* of human nature. Others, whom Dr. Tyndall chooses to elevate into thinkers of "exceptional power," used their knowledge and experience of physical nature,—endeavouring to connect natural phenomena with their physical principles. The first were ethical and poetical men; the second were rationalizing and logical men. The first attributed the universe to gods,—capricious beings having exaggerated human faculties and dispositions. The second, seeing that science repudiated caprice, and required absolute reliance upon law in nature, attributed the universe to self-evolution. I would here repair one omission of the address—the record of the growth in the world of a conception of creation different to both these: the conception found in the sacred

* Dr. Tyndall's Address, p. 1.

books of the Jews. Whether we choose to say that those books contain a supernatural revelation or not, there the conception is, which Dr. Tyndall does not notice in his first passages. Its appearance as an item of belief is not accounted for by the explanations just given. While religious heathens attributed all things to deified men—and non-religious heathens to innate and inseparable potency in the atoms of matter—the children of Israel ascribed all things to One Spiritual Being—absolute, infinite, eternal. This belief has come down like the other beliefs, and somehow it has commanded the assent and acceptance of the most intelligent and highly cultured of the most civilized races of the Christian ages. I admit that this belief has not always been clearly apprehended or carefully stated. I admit that religious communities have often held it ignorantly, expressed it grossly, and defended it foolishly. But the same may be said of any and every subject known to mankind,—yes, even of scientific subjects. Many supposed scientific facts having been proved to be fictions; many scientific theories having no better foundation than had the Ptolemaic system of astronomy. Nay, is not science itself—its whole array of facts and cyclopædia of results—a simple proof of the tremendous cost of knowledge and the fearful penalties of ignorance? I will admit more: that even now the best-trained religious minds find it a very difficult thing to speak in fitting terms of the God in whom they believe. They strive, and seldom successfully, to do so; human thought fails—and much more human words. But it is the business of a leading scientist to deal with the highest and best thought of religious men, not with the lowest and worst; and it is his business, also, to endeavour to seize their real meanings,—meanings too often, alas, distorted rather than revealed, by the imperfect medium of language in which they have to be embodied.

These admissions made, and this affirmation of the duty of a professed leader of science set forth, I think it unnecessary to notice the vein of scorn which runs through Dr. Tyndall's address, aimed against the cosmical ideas of religious people, except to say that it savours of the very spirit of intolerance which he ascribes to them. A fair and natural remark would be: "It is your business as a student of the physical universe to improve those ideas, and all truly Christian men will gladly welcome your facts, while eagerly helping to kill the spirit of bigotry which, as you show them, is not confined to religious breasts only."

The universe a fact—nature real and knowable—what of its "first beginnings"? What of a First Cause? if, as Dr. Tyndall

admits, an "inherent impulse" spurs men to try and find this out? In the "cosmical ideas" which we as Christians hold, there is a primary and fundamental one. It is stated in a few simple words by John, disciple and apostle of Jesus Christ. Conceiving, as best he could, the Supreme and Invisible to whom his faith ascribed the "first beginnings" of the universe, John wrote thus: "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made."* A similar statement is made by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrew converts, but suggesting, perhaps, other ideas: "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."† And in repeating these words I may as well point out that whether they humanize the conception of the Supreme Power or not, they are not chargeable with the notion (sometimes urged against them) of creation out of nothing. The contradiction involved in that use of the word *Creation* is not to be charged on the writers of the New Testament. The Apostles had in their minds (as I contend) the causation of the physical universe as we know it,—a sphere of life and activity for sentient beings. The already and competent cause they affirm, was God. How caused, *i.e.* by what means or by what methods, the Apostles nowhere suggest; except in the simple phrase "by the Word of God."‡ I suppose that Dr. Tyndall refuses the supernatural activity of God in the universe, as it is conceived of by Christian people, who accept, subject to the modifying light of ever-increasing knowledge, the simple confessions of the Apostles and the even simpler confessions of the Hebrew book of "first-beginnings," the book of Genesis.§ And yet great and good men, like Newton and Boyle (as he reminds us), lived and worked under the conception of the Godhead with which the Bible furnished them. Dr. Tyndall calls the idea of his great predecessor in scientific research, Sir Isaac Newton, that of a "detached Creator," like a human agent moving the wheels and handling the levers of nature. This is anthropomorphism, of course. But I venture to doubt if Sir Isaac Newton, or later, Dr. Faraday, would consent to allow Dr. Tyndall to state this conception for them. Even an unscientific person, of humble attainments, would object. You have only to meditate, for a few minutes, on your idea of God, to see reasons of a

* John i. 3.

† Hebrews ii. 3.

‡ See a fuller consideration of this view in Sermon IX. of my published discourses.

§ Note II., Appendix.

sufficient kind why you refuse to let another formulate it for you. You discover that you cannot satisfy yourself with a form of words that shall adequately embody your conception,—while you repudiate with all your soul the phrase which the Materialist kindly invents for you, that of a “detached creator,” man-like in his procedure and effort. The charge of anthropomorphism is chiefly based upon the fact that religious people speak of God as a *person*, of which more anon. Meanwhile, I desire to affirm that it is a mistake to suppose that the elements of *personality* are inseparable from limitation, or compel us to make the Deity only an indefinite projection of man. The “Builder and Maker”—the Mover and Changer of the worlds and what they contain—is not such a creature as man; and we are not driven to furnish Him with physical organs and limbs in order to do His work. Christians believe in God, and believe in Him as a personality, and in so doing we are to be ranked with neither Polytheists, nor Atheists, nor Pantheists, but are to be known as Christian Theists. This title has never failed to produce a correct impression on the minds of fair and sincere inquirers. The Bible and the whole literature of Theology explain it fully. We cannot say as much of the name *Materialist*. Materialism has not yet produced a text-book or compiled a library of reference for the use of men. For the first time, and at Belfast, we learn what a Present-day Materialist is. Of course, he is either a practical student or an enthusiastic worshipper of science; but he is not merely an analyst, an experimenter, a questioner of nature, and a recorder of her transactions. He may be all these things, as Messrs. Huxley, Tyndall, and Darwin are; but he is more. He is (we are now told) a conceptive being,—an imaginative being. Some years ago, at Liverpool, Dr. Tyndall enforced this in his remarkably eloquent essay on “The Scientific Uses of Imagination.” Therefore he tells us that the Materialist is one “who prolongs his vision backward across the boundary of experimental evidence, and discovers in that matter, which we in our ignorance, and notwithstanding our professed reverence for its Creator, have hitherto covered with opprobrium, the promise and potency of every form and quality of life.”* The first remark suggested to me by this description of the attitude, conduct, and discernment of a Materialist, is that it carries him from the region of fact to the region of speculation. The region of fact is safe and unassailable. The region of speculation is unsafe and

* Note III., Appendix.

vulnerable. Dr. Tyndall will admit this, because he avows that he carries his vision across the boundary of experimental evidence. Now, to speculation as such, no objection can be made. What I shall object to is being required to accept as infallible truth anything that a Tyndall may think he discerns, even by the scientific use of his imagination. Given equal knowledge, culture, and ability, the speculation of one scientist may be set against that of another. I will venture to do this. Not long ago Faraday was living, a fellow-labourer with Tyndall, and of at least equal eminence and authority as a scientist. Faraday was not only devoutly religious, but a diligent Christian preacher. Faraday, full of scientific lore, and a daily student of nature, ascribed the "first beginnings" of things to a God,—a Being of power, wisdom, skill, foresight, and goodness infinite,—a Being equal to the work of the Universe. Tyndall, the Materialist, ascribes the "first beginnings" of things to things themselves, discerning in the particles of matter "promise and potency" equal to the work of the Universe.* The two solutions of the awful mystery are thus before you; they are the speculations of two of the greatest of scientific men. Accept which you please. For myself, I do not shrink from saying that I feel compelled, on every rational ground, to choose the solution of the religious experimenter, who places a Being of absolute and infinite power and intelligence above and before the raw material of the universe. Above and *before* the raw material. And in saying this I touch a critical subject in debate. The "promise and potency of matter" is Dr. Tyndall's scientific gospel. He declares the sufficiency of matter for all physical, plant, and animal life. The absolute competency of matter,—that is, his cosmical faith and confession. But to matter he gives *movement*. For movement he requires *force*. To get force he must postulate *power*. And in and over, above, below, around,—everywhere indeed,—he declares that there is *law*. Matter there is not, *as matter* endowed with absolute and infinite potency, but matter plus *form*, plus *power*, plus *law*. Put these into it, and matter will do everything you want without a God.† As if startled by his own gospel, Dr. Tyndall proceeds to confess mystery in the whole business. Even evolution, wonderful hypothesis as it is, does not get rid of mystery. Mr. Herbert Spencer, whom Dr. Tyndall refers to, confesses that "Evolution is the manifestation of a power absolutely inscrutable to the intellect of

* Note IV., Appendix.

† Note V., Appendix.

man." Dr. Tyndall echoes Mr. Spencer's avowal: "As little in our day as in Job's day can man by searching find this power out." Considered fundamentally, he declares "it is by the operation of an insoluble mystery that life is evolved, species differentiated, and mind unfolded from their prepotent elements in the unmeasurable past." Without staying to object to his terms or phraseology, I may for the moment join with Dr. Tyndall, and say, "There is no very rank materialism here." Perhaps not. But when we come to state our theories definitely in an attempt to realize, however imperfectly, a whole idea of the Universe and its life, we find out where we disagree. The matter in debate between the simple-minded Christian and the Materialist is not the *mode of procedure* but the *nature of the power* which causes all procedure. Is that power part and parcel of the physical world? Is it inseparably united with or inherent in particles of matter? Is it unable to separate itself from matter? Is it, for instance, indissolubly wedded to the bit of protoplasm of the first beginning? Or is it another thing,—another reality? Is it not independent and distinct? Is it not, indeed, extra physical, as it is superhuman? And are we not compelled by the "impulse inherent in our natures," which Dr. Tyndall starts with, to assign to this mysterious Power an entity, an ability, and an activity which can belong only to that which is Absolute, Infinite, and Eternal? I have heard it charged against Christian ministers that sometimes we put into the Bible that which the good and great men who wrote its books never dreamed of. But I think that Dr. Tyndall is even more truly open to a similar charge, that of first putting into his raw material of the Universe living power, and quality, and promise to the displacement of the necessary God. This result is certainly wonderful, even in its human productions. That ridiculous-looking thing, the "Marine Ascidian,"—nay, that even less worthy thing, a bit of protoplasm, whatever it may be in the original, contains the promise of potency of all that a Milton, a Shakspeare, a Bacon, or any genius ever was? We say, in reply to this teaching, that scientific experiment does not sanction it. It is the effervescence of the fancy. It is not the outcome of the scientific use of the imagination. It is, I venture to think, contradictory. It involves more than mystery, nothing less than impossibility, and does violence to reason and experience. Our reason will not allow us to place mind lower than the materials of its dwelling; will not allow us to say that it is a phenomenon of the brain only, the result of certain grey matter in excitement: while experience shows us that we must make the mind master

of the material. Nay, the more real and solid the physical world is, the more essential is it to place above it, around it, and within it, a spiritual power to rule, guide, and master it: "to load it with God." *

For again: Matter is not the only element required. Everywhere we hear of force or forces — mechanical, chemical, dynamical forces, but all resolvable into aspects or modes of one central force. What is force? As Sir John Herschel has shown, we must come at last to regard it as the manifestation of power. But what of power? Where does power arise? Where does it reside? † The most profound thinkers fail to suggest any source of power but mind; any residence of power but mind. And when I recall the fact that such men as Herschel and Clerk-Maxwell declare the atoms of matter to be "manufactured" articles, I suggest to you the only sufficient and satisfying idea of "first beginnings"—beginnings, that is, in which power was manifested and force employed equal to the causation, evolution, and eternal government of the universe. From the thing made, an "inherent impulse" lifts us to the Maker: from the created universe, to the Creator. ‡ If there be law, there must be mind; if order, there must be reason; if skill, there must be intelligence; and if everywhere and at all times, there must be causes and effects, there must be mind behind them. Take any of the postulates of thought and an argument for God may be safely conducted. Take *law*, which the scientist assures us, is universal and everlasting. What is the first and most natural remark we have to make about *law*? Clearly this, that the things subject to it did not make it, and did not impose it upon themselves. Need I add, that the subjects of physical law cannot repeal the law? It is above them, beyond them, independent of them. Though some of the creatures in the world,—man, for instance,—can rebel against law, he cannot annul it. He is obviously under laws of health, against which he very frequently sins. But he is powerless to annul any law of health. Let him break one of them and he will suffer. He would, if he could, so modify, or suspend, or annul physical law, as to secure for himself immunity from pain. But he cannot. He is impotent to do so. As he feels his utter subjection to law, and his inability to escape or annul law, what does man reason-

* I borrow this phrase from an able paper on "The Principles of Modern Pantheistic and Atheistic Philosophy." By the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A. See *Transactions of the Victoria Institute, or Philosophical Society of Great Britain*, 1874.

† Note VI., Appendix.

‡ Note VII., Appendix.

ably conclude? Simply this, that there is law in the universe independent of him, and of his will. And when, by inquiry, he finds that such is the fact throughout all history, he becomes finally convinced that everywhere and at all times in the physical world, there is law independent of the will of the creature, law which somehow or other asserts, defends, and avenges itself.

What is law? Law, say the philosophers, is another and convenient name for an invariable order, or change, or for a method of action,—an order, change, and method which are natural and invariable, and, as we may discover, indispensable. We learn what law is by observation; and, when observation has been sufficiently long, extended, and exact, we can make safe decisions about it. What always happens in the same circumstances happens according to law. Bodies fall through space, or they assume definite shapes, or they attract or repel each other according to law. Everywhere and in all things there is law.

Whence comes law? As we have seen it does not administer itself. As Mr. Fitzjames Stephen has well written in the *Contemporary Review* of May last,—“This idea of law does not, and indeed cannot stand alone. It involves other ideas of right, duty, sanction, and sovereignty.” Now, if we are told that physical law involves no moral ideas of right or duty, we cannot be told, with reason, that it involves none of sanction and sovereignty. If there be law, the mind, by inherent impulse, refers to sovereignty, and to the sanction of sovereignty, in some form. “Yes,” Dr. Tyndall would interpose, “but science and experiment do not uncover any such thing.” Perhaps not, I answer, but I am free to use my reason,—nay, if I please, my imagination,—but here reason and logic are quite sufficient. If there be sovereignty and sanction, there must be ideas of will and power. We cannot put away these ideas. And further, if, as scientific men affirm, there can be no caprice, law proclaims method. Now, call the depository of power a personality or not; call the power and will which create order and use method the elements of a personality or not—the mind can have no rest or satisfaction until it ascribes them or assigns them to an entity, a substance, a living, knowing thing like itself. Mind implies mind. Mind declares mind. The human will points to the Infinite will; human reason to the Supreme reason; human intelligence to the Absolute source of all knowledge, which is immanent in, but independent of all nature. Nay, take the most familiar of all ideas of the position—the scientific man above all others—the idea that he is the contemplator of a

universe which appeals far less powerfully to his bodily than to his mental self. He is reading what? The so-called Book of Nature. It would not be a book if it did not suggest thought and evoke emotion. But is not an author needed for every book? Whose thoughts are these, he asks? Whose emotions tremble in every page? As I put the question and feel that there can be but one answer in the mind, heart, and conscience of every sincere man,—I think I see new and irresistible meanings in that famous saying of the Old Book,—“The fool has said in his heart, ‘There is no God.’”

The Old Materialism denied the existence of a soul in man, and, with the Sadducees, denied resurrection after death. What says the New Materialism? It is not easy to make out. We have to learn by inference rather than from any positive statement. Dr. Tyndall and Dr. Huxley have both used the expression, “Soul of force,” to describe the Mysterious Power which they declare to be inscrutable. I hold it to be a fatal expression for men who hold religion at arm’s length, and thrust Christianity aside. It is an admission which undermines their whole philosophy. But as I desire to adhere strictly to an examination of this philosophy on its own teachings, and to avoid every aid which revealed truth offers, I invite you to take up with me one or two of the accepted teachings of science, and inquire how they affect the great object of man’s spiritual nature and its continued existence in another state. The human body, science says, like the body of every animal, is subject to the law of change. Every seven or ten years a man has quite a new body. Daily waste goes on. Daily supply is therefore necessary. Meal by meal, breath by breath, the body is nourished. Particle by particle it disappears; particle by particle it is sustained. The sustaining process is a process of renewal. What is renewal? It is simply the replacing of lost particles by fresh ones. The infant begins its life in a little plump, soft body, very familiar to us. At the age of ten it has become quite a different creature. Physically it is in no sense child. Science says so—will not have it otherwise. Follow the same child up to seventy years of age, and what will be seen? A very different body indeed; so changed that except by those who have personal means of identification it could not be recognized. Who, indeed, having seen me in my cradle, and not seeing me again until to-day, could recognize the infant in the man? No one. And yet that I am the same person in the cradle forty years ago and in this place now, cannot be questioned. How the same? Not the same materially; but the same mentally and morally. The softest parts of our bodies change most rapidly. The brain,

being a soft part, is doubtless changed very frequently during life. What follows from these facts? This fact, viz., that after several changes—entire disappearances, indeed—of my body, my personal identity remains. This being so, it results that the maintenance of my personal identity does not depend altogether (if at all) on the particles of matter which compose my body. Something there is which lives on continuously amidst all the physical changes and disappearances. Something there is which remains. What is it? The particles of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, iron, and what not, come and go. They are clearly particles only—fragmentary, separable, dismissible atoms. They have not, in themselves, even the “promise” of continuity. If they have not its promise, still less have they its potency. And yet continuity there is. And there must be something which not only possesses it, but guarantees it. That something is not one or any number of these wandering atoms. Of that there can be no doubt. But if so, then does matter, even when we add to it, or put into it, motion and force and law, fail to account for that continued identity of the living man, which is the most astonishing fact of all. Declaring that, as a piece of matter, *I*, a living man, disappear every seven or ten years, Present-day Materialism fails to account for my continued personal identity.*

Again: Science teaches that there are certain natural or physical forces. I suppose they are called such because they affect matter. But we are now assured that those various forces are all phases or modes of one Master-force.† However this may be, I desire you to observe that those forces—separately or conjointly—do not account for all kinds and qualities of life, as Dr. Tyndall affirms,—I mean, of course, the forces of gravitation, attraction, repulsion, electricity, and the forces called chemical affinity, and so forth. Physiologists declare that when they examine organized creatures they are brought face to face with a quite independent force: nay, an unknown force. This new force they call the *life force*, and we are assured that without this force the phenomena of living bodies cannot be explained. All organization pre-supposes this special life force.‡ And you will perceive how true this must be when you think upon Death. What is a dead body? A body from which the life-force has disappeared. What happens to it? It becomes the subject of the activity of all the physical forces—chemical and mechanical—unaffected by the life-force. Heat, light,

* Note VIII., Appendix.

† Note IX., Appendix.

‡ Note X., Appendix.

attraction, repulsion, gravitation, and electricity,—these do not cease at death. Only their *Master-force*—Vitality—has ceased. They go on playing within and upon the dead body; and, as we know, to its rapid change, yes, to its speedy destruction. That which resisted these changing and destroying forces is gone. Once dead, the body is seen in its pure materialism—a mere lump of matter—the subject of the chemical and mechanical forces which never cease to act. How evident, then, is it that quite independent of, and separate from, the mass of silent, motionless, unanswering matter we call a corpse, there is a life-force which was only continued in it for a time, but was not of it, or inseparable from it,—a force outside of it, and giving the living potency which Materialists assert belongs essentially to the atoms of matter.

Again: This vital or life-force only accounts for life—that is, for vitality—in an organized body: it does not account for other facts and phenomena of which you and I are conscious. Physiologists confess that they cannot account for thought, memory, fancy; for any of the feelings such as love, hate, joy, fear, hope, despair. And yet this other life of thought and feeling is more real to us than anything else. That I *think*, that I *love*, *fear*, *rejoice*, and *grieve*, are facts of my most real life. They need no evidence, no proof, no demonstration. I am conscious of them; and no one can reason, or persuade, or frighten me out of this consciousness. For these facts of personal consciousness physical science cannot—does not pretend to account; and yet they form the most certain, constant, and unchanging life of man. He knows far more about them than he does about his digestion, the motion of his blood, or the activity of any vital organ. Once more, then, science is face to face with an unknown reality—call it force, or substance, or life. Life it is—whatever meanings the word life may cover. Life which is not physical but *Psychical*, or *spiritual*. And Science has been compelled to call the force which is so visibly active in the life of thought and feeling, the *Psychic force*. There is thus a duality of unknown unanalyzed forces manifested within us, and the most eminent and trustworthy men of science accept this duality. Once more: If the mechanical and chemical forces be attached to matter, are not the phases or kinds of spiritual force attached to spirit? Is there not an entity, appropriate and real, to which they belong? In answer, I quote the following passage:—“There are various kinds of *Psychic activity* propagated in various impulses, and through different organs, but proceeding from one centre, ruled and directed by one force. They have a common direction. There

is unity in the consciousness which attaches to them (or to which they are attached) and this points, of course, to the unity of the Psychological reality—that is the soul. The soul is not and cannot be an atom, or a group of atoms. Atoms of matter as we have learned, are atoms merely—detached, fragmentary, dis-missible particles without continuousness. *The soul*, the seat of consciousness, thought, and feeling, must be a continuous and independent reality or substance, for *unity* is visible in all its phenomena. The soul once discovered, we discover what the Materialist fails to supply, because his atoms of matter fail to supply it, the ‘promise and potency’ of consciousness and personal identity.”*

Allow me now to apply these scientific facts and deductions to those elements of our Christian faith which scepticism has so persistently assailed: Man’s spiritual nature and his immortality. What bearing have they upon those elements of our faith? We do not look for moral and religious truth from the study of natural science. We do not go to the laboratory for our religion—nor do we seek for its essentials by the help of the crucible, the retort, the blowpipe, and the spirit-lamp. But we are confident that the teachings of true science will not contradict the teachings of true religion. And this confidence is not vain; for we are able to see that if the latest revelations of science have any effect on our religious faith, they rather strengthen it, and in no way weaken it. For, reviewing what I have said:—

(a.) As the two forces, the life-force and the spiritual force, are not dependent upon the presence and permanence of the same particles of matter now and here, they will not be in any other period or in any other state of existence.

(b.) As the consciousness of one’s personal identity is not dependent upon the presence and continuance of the same particles of matter now and here, it will not be in any other period or in any future state.

At this point I remind you of another canon of science, which says that no force, no substance, no existence can be annihilated.

Therefore, with the approval of science, I affirm—

(c.) That the soul-substance, or the soul-existence, will not cease when the dissolution of its union with the body arrives. It has been well said that self-consciousness may be confused, disturbed, or suspended by such an organic dissolution. But, let the interruption cease, and then the consciousness will

* *British Quarterly Review*, July, 1874, p. 115.

return. We can test the reasonableness of this view for ourselves. We are witnesses of the temporary suspension of consciousness in some states of severe illness. In high fever, for example, the consciousness is confused, disturbed, and even suspended: but when the fever abates, consciousness returns, and the soul resumes its usual power and activity. These facts have a very definite value in their reference to the Christian doctrines of immortality and man's spiritual personality. The substance of the soul, like every real thing, being indestructible (as science admits), it may exist after death takes place. Nay, if science teach the truth, it must exist unless destroyed by a higher power than any now known to science. And the soul will live on in a consciousness of personal identity, whether it be joined to the same particles of matter or not. The same identical physical body is not necessary to mental and moral life and personality here. It is a fact, as we see, that we live on for 20, 30, 40, 50, or more years, in very different bodies now, while knowing that we are still the same selves all the while. Therefore, science cannot object to, nay it must favour the idea, that man may live on in real self-conscious identity, in a very different body hereafter.

It would be very interesting to take another line of thought, science being still our guide, and show that from all we see of physical change and development here, it is reasonable to expect new bodies for the self-knowing and continuing soul. Science assures us that every atom and every substance once set free from any union by any cause, instantly seeks union with other atoms and other substances to form new unions and to play new parts. Even so, the soul may with confidence be expected to obey the same universal law: may be expected, at its separation from the body at death, to seek new associations or new surroundings. The soul, like every other reality, will not live in isolation. But live it will, if our greatest scientists speak the truth—on grounds, as I have shown—of pure human investigation and acquired knowledge. Need I remind you how all this harmonizes with the teachings of Christ and Christianity? Our faith in the unseen things which are eternal—God, the soul, eternal life—does not stand in the “wisdom of men but in the power of God.” That divine Power which first caused the soul to be and placed it in the flesh, on earth and in time, can surely continue it out of the flesh, in heaven and throughout the future. The great elements of personal identity are not material but spiritual. Even here and now we recognize the wonderful and inexplicable changes which nature exhibits. The caterpillar becomes the chrysalis. *There* a living creature is formed into

an apparently lifeless object. The chrysalis bursts, and out comes the winged moth—a quite new creature, for which old things are passed away,—a creature with a new body, new powers, new life, new purposes. Science has no key to such mysteries. The human intellect can but prostrate itself in confessed incapacity before them. And yet what do we see in the mystery of caterpillar life? Simply the passage of living creatures into new bodies and new conditions. Its identity cannot be disputed, but the change it has undergone is simply marvellous. What of the power which wrought such change? It is just infinite. To say that it is superhuman and extra-physical is to say little. It is transcendently mysterious and divine. Unseen it is and must be. Unseen it is, but real. The Christian places it in the only source which enlightened reason will sanction—in the Absolute Being we call God. For the use of such power, infinite wisdom; for its beneficent control, infinite goodness; for its direction to the innumerable needs of innumerable worlds and creatures, infinite skill are required. Thus again, are we led from nature up to nature's God. And once more I declare, that it is in this Power alone we Christians stand. It is the cause, the reason, the eternal sustenance of our faith. Where mystery is, there faith is needed. Our life is laid in a universe of mysteries. The highest efforts of genius, the grandest achievements of scientific capacity, will never accomplish more, in this state of being, than the disclosure and application of principles and facts *within the range of human endowment*. Beyond the human is the divine. But we must bide our time ere we are permitted to pass through the veil which shrouds it. Meanwhile, have we not a noble calling and work? What are we in relation to the unknown and inscrutable things of the Universe? "We are stewards of the mysteries of God."* Let us be faithful stewards. Let us look onward, as we labour and wait, in faith and patience. The Power we trust will gradually lead us into all the truth. All light comes from one source: be it natural or spiritual—scientific or religious. And the light will never cease to shine upon the darkness. What we know not now we shall know. The soul was made for eternity—the body for time. The infinite and eternal await us after the inevitable change. There are awful mysteries ahead. But they do not alarm us: still less do they cause us to doubt the power, the wisdom, or the love of God. Nay, having His own assurance of eternal life, we stand firm amidst the cares and ills, the sorrows and separations of this state of being. We strive to

* 1 Corinthians iv. 1.

endure as "seeing Him who is invisible."* Invisible and omnipotent. Invisible and ever-active: directing omnipotence by love. Active in a mode, and by a medium, science knows not of, and which Materialism rejects, for it refuses to permit the Soul of Force in the universe to take possession of a human body and incarnate itself in one personality for specific spiritual purposes. We cannot thus think. We dare not limit the freedom and power of the Absolute. Nay, we hold that if He were pleased to undertake the glorious enterprise of the religious and moral salvation of His creature, man—He must do so by a personal manifestation which would furnish the means of closest communion and most intimate intercourse with man. The world yearned to know a God of mercy, pity, love, and patience. It needed to be drawn by the "very cords of a man" †—the chords of sympathy, fellowship, tenderness, and grace. It needed to have God brought down from far-off clouds and inaccessible heights—from the regions of air,—and brought up and out from atoms of matter and physical force into human nature and life, into the common ways, the common haunts, the common hearts of ignorant and sin-ruined men. A true all-sided science will say so. A false and narrow science will not; it will shut God out of the one sphere in which He is most needed—the soul of the man made in His own image.

From such false science I turn for the satisfaction of my soul to the God manifest in the flesh, in whom I believe. Once in the flesh He proved Himself to be God by His control of all forces, material and spiritual. His last visible act gave a crowning proof of His Divinity. He ascended into heaven. There, as my faith believes, He re-assumed His invisible Spirituality. There He began a new epoch in the history of the Spiritual universe. There His activity took a new direction. Having put a new factor into human history by His Gospel, He adapted His invisible operations thereto—the operations carried on in the kingdom of heaven. And, in perfect harmony with the laws of change and development—call them the laws of evolution if you will—the Divine Being, the Word, the Christ of God, is now preparing the conditions necessary to changed creatures. He is preparing places for us in the many-mansioned universe, which is as truly His as this earthly globe: making ready a habitation for us when we shall have put off this fleshly body and shall receive a glorious spiritual body. "For this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the

* Hebrews xi. 27.

† 1 Hosea xi. 4.

kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." * From the natural to the spiritual. From the mortal to the immortal. From the corruptible to the incorruptible. "And as we have borne the image of the earthly † we shall bear the image of the heavenly." ‡

All round us we see the rising of a tide of scepticism which we must do our best to keep back—or at least confine within narrow limits. From all quarters we hear the warning notes of an intellectual and spiritual conflict. I trust that the young men of our families—Christian families in every sense—will not flinch from taking their proper share of the solemn duties which such warfare involves. Let them not be alarmed. Religion is not going to disappear. Christianity is not going to be dismissed. History has shown how God refuses to leave Himself without a witness in the hearts of men, and history will show, too, how God in Christ will maintain His Sovereignty and retain the universal inheritance upon which He entered, that day He left this earth to re-assume His own glory. In the conflict of future years new facts will come to light; new aspects of truth will appear; new conceptions will be created; new words will be coined; new phrases invented to suit the larger life and vaster knowledge that are to be true. But firm in our faith in God and in His Christ, we know that the Spirit of grace and truth will overrule all for good. His truth is changeless and eternal as Himself, and while new facts, new ideas, new forms crowd upon men's minds, they will only live and last, as they harmonize with the eternal verities of God—as they lead to the acknowledgment of His perpetual presence and activity in the physical universe, and in the Spiritual Kingdom, which He has called into being.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure you will join with me in returning our best thanks to Mr. McDougall for his very interesting paper; it is now open for any one desiring to do so to offer remarks thereon.

Rev. G. CURREY, D.D.—I feel scarcely competent to enter upon a subject which involves so many abstract thoughts. At the same time I have great pleasure in expressing my sincere thanks to Mr. McDougall for the able manner in which he has maintained some of those truths which are dear, I trust, to the hearts of all now present. The feature of the paper which struck me most forcibly was this, that while Mr. McDougall

* 1 Corinthians xv. 50, 51.

† χοϊκός—ἐπουράνιος.

‡ 1 Corinthians xv. 49.

pursued the subject with a strictly scientific mode of examination, he did not shrink from entering upon, and from showing the bearings of, the highest and the most abstruse doctrinal truths which form the foundation of our religion. In a meeting of this kind, it is desirable that different views should be put forward, with the object of bringing out any points upon which differences may arise, which may be cleared away by examination. I am afraid that, upon this occasion, I cannot offer any contribution towards that end, for I really do not feel competent to advance any views or hints with regard to the propriety or the logical force of the arguments which have been adduced. These arguments were thoroughly satisfactory to my own mind, and I have nothing to bring forward as a point on which differences might arise. The author's aim seems to be to establish the existence of an independent power, an independent will, and an independent thought, apart from our own selves, and from those beings whom we see around us, and whom we believe, by a natural analogy, to partake of the same kinds of thought and feeling as ourselves. The belief in a power independent of and superior to us is naturally impressed upon us by our finding within us two forces, of which we ourselves, if I may so speak, are composed—a material force, which we exert by means of our body, and a spiritual force, independent of and controlling the material. Hence we arrive at the conclusion of the existence of a Supreme Intellect, an eternal and all-powerful God; because, as we feel within ourselves that we possess some power independent of the matter which composes our frames, and yet that matter does contribute and give to us a force by which we accomplish many ends. I shall, however, not now dwell upon differences, but try to gather up the sum and substance of the paper, as it has presented itself to my mind. To have the general scope of the paper before us may facilitate the comprehension of its abstruser arguments. So we conclude by analogy that there is, superior to the whole material universe and to ourselves,—who, in one sense, form part of that universe,—some great and supreme Will, Intelligence, and Power, who is using that universe and the beings that are upon it, for His own great, wise, and beneficent ends. If we conclude that there is such a Being, we only conclude that which our own experience tells us exists, in a certain sense, in our own personal beings. This I understand to be the ground upon which the paper of this evening rests, and is the substance of the argument that has been drawn out with regard to the existence of a supreme, intelligent, and beneficent Creator; and I think it is an argument which is perfectly unassailable. It is one which, as has been well pointed out, is entirely independent of the special discoveries of modern science, which, after all, only reveal the different modes in which the material forces act and have their influence, but do not approach, in the least degree, the source of that independent power which controls material things and uses material instruments. Though, with regard to our own being and our own persons, we may discover, with greater particularity, by science, the mode in which our will may move certain members of our body to perform certain acts, and

so we may resolve the actions and motions which we are thus enabled to put into exercise to certain mechanical or any other laws ; still, we do not approach any nearer to the solution of the great question—the connection between our spiritual and our material being. Just in the same way the discovery of the laws, or the rules, or the modes of operation, of certain portions of the material universe, or of certain persons residing upon that material universe, if we could resolve those motions or those actions, or even those mental operations, into their laws, and simplify or classify them, and our comprehension of them, by such discoveries, we should not touch the great question of the connection between the universe and the one Supreme mind and intelligence which directs and controls it. We need not, therefore, shrink from any result of science, which is engaged in classifying, simplifying, and explaining, either the operations of matter or the operations of mind. If we can resolve the phenomena of the mind into certain laws, and explain the connections between them, we do not lessen or alter the truth, that all these mental operations are the result of one mind. We may classify and describe mental operations, but that does not affect or alter the question, that those mental operations are the operations of one mind, just in the same way as all the operations and proceedings in the material universe itself, however much we may classify, simplify, or arrange them, are guided and arranged by one Supreme Being to work out His will. I have only said these few words because our Chairman called on me to speak. I heartily thank Mr. McDougall for his paper, for he has addressed himself to his subject in a manner which, to my mind, carries not only reasonable probability, but comfort and assurance. I am glad to find these great truths, which are dear to my mind and heart, stated ably and forcibly by one who does not shrink from placing them upon a scientific basis. (Cheers.)

Mr. M. H. HABERSON.—I cannot but admire the very close logic which characterizes Mr. McDougall's paper, and the general way in which he has dealt with the subject must have commended itself to every one present. It occurs to me, however, that there was one omission from the paper, inasmuch as Mr. McDougall did not refer to animal life as well as to the spiritual life. I think an objector might possibly say, "What about the intelligence manifested to a certain extent by the lower animals?" The life-characteristic of man, Mr. McDougall has shown, will continue, but what about the intelligence of the lower animals? The paper needs something in anticipation of the objection which an unbeliever might raise in reference to its logic upon that point.

Mr. W. THORP.—Mr. McDougall's able paper will be of great importance not only to the religious, but to the scientific world. But it seems to me that there is a difficulty, meeting us at the very outset, for which we are entitled to demand an explanation, and that is, the connection between the attributes of matter and the particles said to constitute that matter. That map yonder is hung upon a nail which is driven into the wall. If you ask why the nail supports the weight, you will be told that it is in consequence of the cohesion

between the particles. But does that tell us anything? What is cohesion? *Why* should the particles keep together?—Take another illustration from chemistry—a fertile field. Some of the compounds to be found there form bodies which are known to chemists as isomeric,—that is to say, they are absolutely identical in a material sense, but they have different properties. Take an instance of this: the common form of phosphorus is a yellow, waxlike substance, easily fusible, and taking fire at a very low temperature; but there is also a substance known as amorphous phosphorus, which is well known and seen by us every day on the sides of safety match-boxes as a red powder, and that cannot be fused except at a high temperature, and does not take fire except at a comparatively great heat. Yet those two substances are absolutely identical, so far as their material essence is concerned. What is the difference between them? Some chemists say the particles are differently placed; but why should that different arrangement bring about so great a difference in their properties? The same difficulty arises in the explanation of the force of gravitation. We are told that by it bodies attract each other. But why should they be so attracted? It seems to me that Professor Tyndall's remark, that he sees in matter "the promise and potency of every form and quality of life," may well be challenged. How can particles of matter have any potency in them at all? That was felt by the great Faraday—an authority which we must all receive with respect—who, when writing on the subject, said, "As to the little solid particles which are by some supposed to exist independent of the forces of matter . . . they greatly embarrass me; for after taking account of all the properties of matter, and allowing in my consideration for them, then these nuclei remain on the mind, and I cannot tell what to do with them." Professor Tyndall gives us no explanation whatever as to the connection between matter and its properties. There is one term used by Mr. McDougall which is, I think, a little unfortunate. He speaks of "psychic force"; but that phrase has already been used for a totally different force to the one he suggests. Mr. Crookes has used it for quite another purpose; and, however appropriate it may be for Mr. McDougall's meaning, I think it would lead to confusion to employ it in a new sense.

The CHAIRMAN.—It seems to me that there are one or two arguments which may be used respecting that potentiality of matter which is asserted by materialists—its potentiality, of its own accord as it were, to enter into the formation of all organized beings. Undoubtedly the particles of matter are capable of entering into those combinations which constitute all organized beings, when that property is called into action, but not otherwise. The meaning I wish to express is this: take for example a field; you have the various elements of matter composing the soil, and the various elements composing the atmosphere—the oxygen, nitrogen, aqueous vapour, and other gaseous matter which composes the atmosphere overlying the field. We know perfectly well that from these same elements ten thousand different vegetable organisms may be produced; but how are they produced?

By putting into the soil the appropriate seeds. That is to say, the matter of the field and the matter of the air, by which it is surrounded, would not of themselves form any plant. In order to determine the inherent powers of the matter itself to form any particular plant, it requires the presence of a seed, that is to say of a certain germ—a certain organism derived from a previous plant of the same species, the result of which is, that the presence of that germ, by some inscrutable power residing in it, determines the action of those forces by which the various elements of which the earth and air are composed, unite together, so as to form that particular plant. A great deal has been said about protoplasm as the physical basis of life, and it is perfectly true that in order to form an organized being, protoplasm is necessary; but the protoplasm itself is not able to produce the organized being, except under such an influence as arises from the presence of an element derived from a plant or animal of the same species. The presence of such an element is necessary to call into action the organic forces—the merely material forces—of the matter itself, so as to produce the plant or animal in question. Now there is not a particle of reliable evidence that the most simple monad—the simplest organic plant or animal—was ever produced by the mere concurrence of inorganic particles. All the reliable evidence goes entirely the other way. If only sufficient means are taken to exclude the possibility of the presence of a germ derived from a similar organism, no organism will be formed, although the materials to produce it may be present in close proximity to each other, and so apt to run into those combinations which will produce the organization in question that the mere presence of a germ is alone necessary to cause that production to go on with the greatest rapidity. Therefore, so far as evidence goes, there is no evidence whatever that the inorganic matter possesses the property of combination of itself, of its own accord, to form even the most simple and lowly organized being in existence; and as we go higher in the scale of organization the difficulties are greater still. It appears to me that there is no sufficient ground for assuming the possibility of matter itself producing any organized being without an influence derived from a previous organization of the same kind; if this be the case, we must go back *ad infinitum*, and we cannot come to any logical conclusion except that the first organism, or the first element, which was capable of producing the formation of a given organism, must have been originally the subject of creation. With regard to the doctrine of evolution, the only thing that needs to be said is, that no one can deny that the Divine Will, with regard to the successive formation of organisms, may have worked in that way or in any other way; we cannot limit the Divine power, and we must admit that it is quite possible that successive developments from a lower to a higher form of organization have been made. The existence of such a state of things is quite compatible with Divine power, but we have no evidence that Divine power worked in that way: it is quite possible that it might have done so, but evidence that it has is absolutely wanting.

Rev. A. BLACK.—I seems to me that one argument which Mr. McDougall

has used is not altogether borne out. He says the body changes its atoms continually, so that every man has an entirely new set of atoms in his body every seven years, and then he goes on to argue that since man, in 30, 40, or 50 years, has had bodies composed of different atoms, while the soul has continued to exist without change, therefore the soul cannot be destroyed, but must have an existence elsewhere when the body perishes. Now that does not seem to me to be conclusive, because, though the atoms of which the body is formed change, yet when one set is taken away it is replaced by similar atoms.* It does not, therefore, follow that the soul cannot undergo any change or suffer any diminution of life, so to speak, when it goes into perhaps a totally different form of organization. The arguments of Mr. McDougall are similar to many I have heard and read. You will recollect Plato's statement that the soul is a simple uncompounded substance; but whether that affects the proof or not is another question, and certainly it is one of those statements which we have not the slightest scientific grounds for making. Another objection which strikes me is this, and I do not state it as my own objection, but as one which has occurred to my mind, and on which perhaps Mr. McDougall in his reply may throw some light. The objection is this, that the arguments brought forward in support of the immortality of the soul of man would hold good of the immortality of the soul of the lower animals. Mr. McDougall talks of man's various feelings, thoughts, and affections; but, in a lower degree, similar things may be said of the lower animals. They have memory, and they can love and hate; so that if such arguments are to hold good in man's case, may they not also hold good in the case of the lower animals. I have seen this same objection urged with reference to the views of Bishop Butler and others, and I only advance it now in order that Mr. McDougall may deal with it when he comes to address us again.

Mr. L. DIBDEN.—Butler says that that may be true of the lower animals.†

Rev. J. W. BUCKLEY.—The question depends very much upon this—whether or no we have any revelation upon the point. Will not somebody undertake to show that, whatever science may do with reference to the power of matter, we are driven to this conclusion, that we must have a revelation upon the subject. Let science do all that is in its power: still reason says that there is a Power immensely above matter; and we are driven to the conclusion, that we must have a revelation. *We* may argue that we have that already; but we must not assume it here. *We* believe it clearly and distinctly, without any doubt or hesitation; but I should like to see a logical argument put forward which would show that, let science do what it will, there is a Supreme Power over all, and that that Supreme Power must be the subject of revelation to us before we can take cognizance of it.

Mr. McDUGALL.—In replying to the discussion which has been raised

* Still they are changed.—Ed.

† But Butler can scarce be said to *admit* it.—Ed.

upon my paper, I have to thank Dr. Currey, and the other gentlemen who have spoken, for the very generous way in which they have dealt with it ; and I am also obliged to them for the points they have suggested as to where its deficiencies might have been supplemented. With regard to the gentleman who spoke of the connection between the imperishable soul and the perishable, changing body, he rather misapprehends my meaning. I did not enter into any argument apart from the fact that the accepted teachings of science do not contradict that element of our faith which leads us to accept the revelation of the immortality of the soul. What connection there can be between that and the question of the possibility of animals also living hereafter, I really do not see. I am not bound to defend or to enter into that matter at all : it is a question which is open to discussion upon quite other grounds, I am not involved in it in any way, for I have advanced nothing which requires me to answer the question as to whether the dog shall or shall not live in another world. All I have to say is, that the Christian view of the immortality of the soul is that it is revealed to us, and that all the accepted teachings of scientific men cannot invalidate it. An impression has obtained currency, that scientific teaching contradicts the teaching of the immortality of the soul ; but I think I have shown that that is not the case, and that is a very important point ; for we should take hold of these men according to their teaching, and not merely according to their theories. Speculations we can indulge in, as well as they ; but their speculations are not to be accepted as truths. What I try to prove is, that there is something in man beyond the material atoms ; in other words, that the atoms of oxygen and hydrogen and carbon and iron contained in his body do not constitute the identity of a man, but that there is something else which does give him a continued identity ; and that much even Professor Tyndall has been obliged to admit in his last paper ; for he states that the process by which consciousness is infused into the material atoms is unthinkable ; that is to say, he has no answer at all to give to this important question. I am very much obliged to our Chairman for the very clear way in which he has stated the argument which shows that the original elements out of which organized life is produced are not the products of inorganic matter. If you take a field of soil, you certainly cannot get a crop of corn from it unless you sow the living seed. That opens up one of the greatest questions which we have to consider ; and I believe that a very useful book, both to ministers of religion and to men of intelligence, is Professor Janet's *Modern Materialism*, in which the mistakes of Buchner are exploded. I would recommend the gentleman who spoke of the immortality of the soul to read that book with care, and I think he would derive much assistance from it. What has been said by our Chairman is in exact accordance with the latest experiments and the best teaching as to the production of life from inorganic matter. I have only to repeat my thanks to those who have spoken, for their kind appreciation of my paper.

The meeting was then adjourned.