

not the end? If there is, there seems to be no reason why we should not listen to it, even though its message may be incapable of verification such as, in regard to a material hypothesis, is required by physical science. That the intelligence of our five senses, of which science is the systematized record, is exhaustive, we have, it must once more be said, no apparent ground for assuming; the probability seems to be the other way: it seems likely that our senses, mere nerves even if completely evolved, are imperfect monitors, and that we may be living in a universe of which we really know as little as the mole—which no doubt seems to itself to perceive everything that is perceptible—knows of the world of sight. Now, there does seem to be a voice in every man which, if he will listen to it, tells him that his account is not closed at death. The good man, however unfortunate he may have been, and even though he may not have found integrity profitable, feels at the end of life a satisfaction in his past and an assurance that in the sum of things he will find that he has chosen aright. The most obdurately wicked man, however his wickedness may have prospered, will probably wish, when he comes to die, that he had lived the life of the righteous. It may be possible to explain the sanctions or warnings of the conscience generally as the influence of human opinion reflected in the individual mind, transmitted perhaps by inheritance and accumulated in transmission. But such an explanation will hardly cover the case of death-bed self-approbation or remorse. There seems to be no reason why we should not trust the normal indications of our moral nature as well as the normal indications of our bodily sense; and against the belief that the greatest benefactors and the greatest enemies of mankind rot at last in the same grave our moral nature vehemently rebels.

Not much, it is to be feared, is to be gained in regard to this or to any other question respecting man's estate by taking mystical or transcendental views of the moral law. Kant said that the two things which most impressed him with awe were the starry heavens and the moral law. He assumed, as systems of moral philosophy in general assume, that the moral law is one, the fiat of a single authority, or the embodiment of a single principle. There are rules which we must observe to enable us individually to preserve our bodily health and strength, to enable us to earn our bread, and to keep our affections warm and pure for the enjoyment of social and domestic happiness. There are rules which we must observe as domestic beings for the regulation of our families. There are general rules of mutual help and forbearance which we must observe toward our fellow passengers through this life, and the better to secure