

held by all sound Metaphysicians, that the pure data of consciousness are high above suspicion; they admit neither of doubt nor demonstration,

Once more, and finally, so far as philosophic arguments are concerned, *Materialism contradicts our strong and indistructible consciousness of personality.* Each of you feels that he is an individual and as such incapable of division like a piece of matter. You cannot think of yourself as separated into parts, your consciousness is one and not two or three. And when you speak of memory, or judgment, or imagination you cannot regard these as parts of an object composed of a congeries of things. On the contrary, *you, the indivisible being*, remember, judge and imagine. I grant that you can readily conceive of the dismemberment of your physical organism, but not of the disintegration of your soul. The consciousness of its unity is carried with us through all the changes from infancy to old age, and abides with us even in the last throes of physical dissolution, the soul asserting its individuality above the wreck of the mere material frame. Interrogate a person the very last moment before death and he will tell you that he has this consciousness as strong as at any previous period of his existence. This is the last you *know* of him. And can you fairly say anything beyond what you *know* in the case? Assuredly not. And hence if any one will venture to affirm that the soul becomes extinct at death he affirms that of which in the nature of the case he must be absolutely ignorant. And this, you observe, narrows our controversy to a single point, viz. shall we abandon as chimerical that of which we are fully assured by the consciousness of every moment and rest our creed upon that of which we have, and can have, *no knowledge*, so far as philosophy is concerned? Assuredly not. Let Materialists advance the negation, "*no soul.*" We answer, it is utterly incapable of proof and must therefore be rejected, while the opposite can be fully established, and forces itself upon our acceptance.

And now, in bringing my discussions to a close, let me shew, briefly, *that the results thus arrived at philosophically are fully sustained by the teachings of Scripture.*

This argument, which to many minds is by far the most satisfactory, might be extended to great length, but I must limit myself for the present to a few passages. It is scarcely necessary to remind you that the view presented of God as the Great First Cause, as absolutely independent of what is material, as the Intelligent Author and Ruler of all things, is the uniform doctrine of the Bible. The very opening words in the volume are decisive in this respect. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Here the two, the Creating Spirit and the things created are clearly distinguished from each other. And, I believe, that just as in consciousness we apprehend soul and body so with equal certainty do we recognize God as the Supreme, the only Cause of our being. "In him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts xvii 28) And if this be so, you may see, in passing, that demonstrations or logical proofs of the being of God add nothing to the certainty of our belief in this fundamental doctrine. On the contrary a logical process admits of error and thus far may unsettle our creed while the very semblance of error is totally excluded from the pure deliverance of consciousness.

Need I remind you, too, that the propositions laid down as furnishing a basis for a true system of morals are fully recognized in the Bible? No one can have any hesitation in saying that it most emphatically declares that there