

seek for knowledge, not, as previously, in their inner consciousness, but by observing nature; thus giving rise to the inductive method of Aristotle, the real father of modern Science. The method once adopted was carried on by the school of Alexandria—the focus of learning for many centuries—and by the Nestorian Christians. The great contest between Science and Religion did not fairly commence till Christianity became the state creed of the Roman Empire. Dr. Draper enumerates six conflicts in all, respecting:—1. The Unity of God; 2. The Nature of the Soul, its emanation and absorption; 3. The Nature of the World; 4. The Age of the Earth; 5. The Criterion of Truth; and 6. The Government of the Universe. The division has its defects as well as its merits. It leads to the exclusion of many relevant matters which cannot conveniently be brought under any one of the different heads, such as Omens, Oracles, and Divinations; Dreams considered as supernatural visitations, Astrology, and Magic; Ghosts, Witchcraft, Lunacy, Diabolical possession generally, and the existence of the Devil; the Divine Right of kings and the cognate doctrine of the Divine Right of priests; the supernatural character of diseases—plagues and pestilence—as indications of Divine wrath, and the doctrine of Divine judgments generally; the efficacy of prayer; the doctrine that sin brought physical death into the world, and that the receipt of interest on money is an offence against God; besides the general question as to miracles and the miraculous, including prophecy. The whole of these subjects and others that might be mentioned, have given rise to the bitterest conflicts between theologians and those who represent the scientific spirit; conflicts many of which are still raging as fiercely as ever. Many of these subjects, however, are not even alluded to by Dr. Draper, and none of them receive more than the most cursory notice.

Dr. Draper's classification, besides being faulty in what it omits, is also faulty in what it contains. The first conflict, that respecting the unity of God, cannot, except by a misuse of language, be described as a conflict between Religion and Science. Dr. Draper brings it under that head in a fashion both original and peculiar. He tells us that Aristotle and his followers, as a result of the scientific investigation of Nature, came to the conclusion that the Author of Nature is one and indivisible; that the unity of Nature proclaims the unity of Nature's God. This doctrine, Dr. Draper contends, being handed down by the Greek philosophers, especially those of Alexandria, became the property of the Nestorian Christians, from whom Mohammed, when quite a young man (*boy*, Dr. Draper calls him) received it; so that the resulting crusade of Mohammedanism against Christianity was a conflict between Science and Religion. Passing over the facts

that Mohammed did not announce his belief till he was over forty years of age, and that he always attributed his conversion to a direct revelation from God by the angel Gabriel, the other undoubted fact remains that the Mohammedans, of that age at least, did not hold the doctrine of the unity of God as a scientific truth, but as a theological dogma revealed to them by Mahomet, *as the Prophet of God*. Moreover, even if it could be proved that they did hold it as a scientific truth, we should demur to the proposition that wars between men holding a scientific idea, and those holding a religious idea, are a conflict between Science and Religion. A duel or a bout of fisticuffs between Prof. Tyndall and Archbishop Manning, would with more propriety be called a struggle of physical force and skill than a conflict between Science and Religion. Science does not win her victories by brute force, but by convincing the human mind. *Her* conquests, at least, are free from the taint of blood. The wars between Mohammedans and Christians, then, were not a conflict between Religion and Science, but a conflict between one religion and another, or rather between their respective adherents. Moreover, Christians generally would strenuously deny that they fought against Mohammedans because Christianity denies the unity of God, a doctrine which Christians have always professed to hold firmly, implied as it is in the word "Trinity," which, of course, is merely an abbreviated form of Tri-Unity; Three in One. Dr. Draper's second conflict is open to an objection similar to the one made against his first. Belief in the emanation and absorption of the soul is not and never was a scientific doctrine, but a metaphysical one. Science deals with matters of experience, with objects of sense, with the physical world. Speculations—they have never been anything more—respecting the existence, nature, origin, and ultimate fate of the soul are outside the sphere of experience and the physical world; that is, they are *meta*-physical. If science makes any deliverance on the subject, it is that not even the *existence* of the soul is capable of proof; which is the view taken by such writers as Maudsley and Bain, and by the whole modern physiological school of psychologists. To project, as Dr. Draper does, the doctrine of the Conservation of Force, a completely modern idea, the growth of the last twenty-five years, backwards into the Arabian mind of a thousand years ago, is simply absurd.

The want of due proportion in the details is another striking defect. Irrelevant matters are treated at far too great length, while others more important, as pointed out above, are either passed over altogether or treated inadequately. The conquests of Alexander and of the Mohammedans appear to have fascinated Dr. Draper's imagination, and are related at needless length. Whole pages are filled with details of scientific