

receive grace, but also insists that only by an act of obedient effort can this assistance become effective, and that this is a process going on whereby the sinner who has turned about continues "to work out" (not to) "his own salvation with fear and trembling."

It is a moral-religious experience—moral in so far as it turns from the past, religious in so far as it turns towards the future; and in so far as this is just the same right-about-face, it is always and necessarily moral and religious together.

Diametrically opposed to this view of the vital and inseparable union of morality and religion is the prevailing tendency to regard morality and religion as entirely distinct and completely separated.

Theory always affects practice, and the theory of separated morality and religion leads in practice to two futile lines of endeavor. The first futile effort is an attempt to live a moral life without religion; the second is the attempt to live a religious life without morality.

The moral effort that excludes and utterly repudiates religion produces a great deal of squirming and twisting and wriggling, but, like a mud-turtle on its back, though there is much movement, much beating of the air, there is no genuine progress. Before true progress can take place, the whole self-centred attitude of morality without religion, with all the variations and refinements of this attitude, needs to be reversed. A Copernican revolution must take place from the man-centred to the God-centred universe.

Seeing that a morality that excludes religion falls short, there is a very natural tendency to jump to the conclusion that moral effort should be utterly abandoned for the religious life. The religious life as opposed to the struggle and effort and activity of morality, is conceived as one of rest and peace and receptivity. Undoubtedly the religious life has in it rest and peace and receptivity, but if we exclude the moral element of struggle and action entirely, this rest and peace and receptivity becomes a purely mechanical passivity. But the soul cannot receive mechanically and passively, unless the soul is a mere mechanism. If the soul is spiritual, even its receptivity must be spiritual. Nevertheless, many people speak and think of the soul as if it were a kind of substance or matter to be stamped upon, like John Locke's famous "wax tablet" mind. And this view of the soul, combined with the attempt to exclude moral effort, leads them to suppose that, both in the inception and in the continuance of the religious life, the "wax tablet" "phonographic cylinder" attitude is the correct one. Only a very earnest conviction of its fundamental inadequacy could lead me to call in question a view of religion so widely believed,