

and one way of working upon all men. The Romish Church tried to do it for the world; the Episcopalian Church has tried to do it for England. You see everywhere proofs of the failure. The attempt to make all men agree in their ways of interpreting truth—the attempts to unite them on points where of necessity they see differently and feel differently—must utterly fail. Nor can they be made to work this spiritual work in any one way, or by the use of any particular set of machinery. Men differ, and modes of operations and forms of speech must differ. Creeds are stereotyped things, but men grow. Institutions have a settled form, but men develop. The child has but few words—he speaks as a child—but the man has a rich vocabulary. The temple on Mount Moriah was great and very grand: it was built with much labour and most wondrous skill; it did for a time, meeting the wants of a nation, but it passed away, for the nation broadened into a world for whom only one temple was great enough and grand enough—Jesus Christ, the living Lord, in whom man could hide his life and worship God.

What then are the real grounds of unity, how are men to be made brothers? The Apostle gives it here—he calls it “the unity of faith.” Not the unity of theological belief—not the unity of an intellectual agreement—not the unity of a common institution, but the unity of *faith*. We shall find unity in sentiment, but not in science. What was Christ's idea of unity? As far as I can find it is this—A state of heart in which all men should experience love, sympathy and a co-operative benevolence. They were to be united in love to God and love to all mankind: they were to join in works of charity, making all their life a blessing to the world.

And that is the only possible unity, it is the only true unity—the union of hearts. For *love* is the universal solvent. When men are actuated by the sentiment of goodness, when they desire, not only to be good, but to do good, they will come together that they may carry out their lofty purpose. Difficulties that rise up as separating barriers will disappear as snow before the warm breath of Spring. Differences of early education, of modes of thought and of worship will not be hindrances, but only diverse ways of rendering service unto God. Love creates a sympathy so deep, so tender, and yet so strong that all doubts will be solved and all difficulties mastered. And love is the universal composite—it fuses all things, and makes the many into one. Everything it touches gets transfigured: it melts down the hard, it rounds the angular, and beautifies the ugly; it combines the most differing natures by a grand affinity. You know what this love, in the form of Patriotism, has done to fuse incongruous elements into oneness of sentiment and action. Men have been divided on questions of political economy, divided as to forms of government—have ranged themselves under different banners as they stood for or against a king. Some have declared for the old regime and some for the new, but when a danger threatened—when a foreign foe approached, feuds were forgotten, animosities disappeared; animated by one common sentiment—patriotism—they stood shoulder to shoulder as brothers to defend their fatherland. We have seen most wonderful instances of the fusing power of love in the history of Christ's Church. Men of many sects and parties—men divided in matters of creed and matters of outward form, have put their differences aside and joined hearts and hands in some great philanthropic work. That is the ground of unity in the home, a common sentiment, a love that fuses various things into oneness. And that, I am sure, is the spirit, the genius of Christianity. Look at the teachings of Jesus Christ intellectually, —and they are very complex—so complex, so many sided, so many colored that no two men can define them in exactly the same way. But look at Christianity as Religion—it is simple, very simple. It is absolute, pure morality, rightness of conduct: more, it is goodness, the love of God and the love of man acting without let or hindrance. The only creed it lays down is the great truth that springs up spontaneous in the heart—there is a God. The only form it demands is a divine life, doing good deeds from high motives. Its sanction is the voice of God in the soul, the perpetual presence of Him who made us and the stars of heaven—Christ and the Father ever abiding within us. The end of Christianity is to make all men one with God, as Christ was one with the Father. It allows perfect freedom. It does not demand that all men shall *think* alike, but that all men shall think uprightly. It does not demand that all men shall *live* alike, but that all men shall show in their conduct the beauty of holiness. Christ set up no pillars of Hercules, beyond which no man should sail the sea in quest of truth. He laid no rude hand on the sacred peculiarity of individual genius and character, but he allowed free play and full scope to all.

My friends, this is our ground of union. We are not going to unite the different Churches, we are not going to be united among ourselves by agreement in matters of doctrines and of forms; we shall only be made one by the Christianity good men feel in the heart. The Christ in us is always the same to each soul that feels it. There is—a common Christianity, but it is that which burns in the hearts of pious men. If you are going to take current notions of this sect or of that, and call them Religion, you are going to do that which will dwarf you—that which will dry up all the springs of life—that which will make you the subject of an often recurring fear, for often the ground will shake under your feet. But if you take the true word of God and live out that, you shall be strong, standing sure in the time of storm. If you will try to feel and exercise the faith of the Gospel—love, sympathy, benevolence, truth and justice—you will find that you are joined to all the good and great of the past, and to all the good and great of the present. Whatever Church may own them you will find that you are a member of a great and holy fellowship, joined in love and trust to Christ and God, the Father of us all—that the goal of life is full in sight, and a perfect manhood made possible.

Cease, oh my brothers, the vain endeavour after intellectual agreement or institutional union; in all these things respect your manhood and give and take a large liberty, but join hearts and hands in works of goodness—be one in sentiment, one in truth and charity. Let each be persuaded in his own mind—but all striving to be like Christ. Be brothers—fellow-labourers together—co-operating in all and every work of charity; but the bond of union must be the Christ you feel, the ground of union must be the living, strengthening, purifying faith of the Gospel of the Son of God.

A man is thirty years old before he has any settled thoughts of his future—it is not completed before fifty. He falls to building in his old age, and dies before his house is in condition to be painted and glazed.—*Brady.*

THE SOUL AND FUTURE LIFE.

II.

The rational view of the Soul (we insisted in a previous paper) would remove us as far from a cynical materialism as from a fantastic spiritualism. It restores to their true supremacy in human life those religious emotions which materialism forgets; whilst it frees us from the idle figment which spiritualism would foist upon human nature.

We entirely agree with the theologians that our age is beset with a grievous danger of materialism. There is a school of teachers abroad, and they have found an echo here, who dream that victorious vivisection will ultimately win them anatomical solutions of man's moral and spiritual mysteries. Such unholy nightmares, it is true, are not likely to beguile many minds in a country like this, where social and moral problems are still in their natural ascendant. But there is a subtler kind of materialism of which the dangers are real. It does not indeed put forth the bestial sophism, that the apex of philosophy is to be won by improved microscopes and new batteries. But then it has nothing to say about the spiritual life of man; it has no particular religion; it ignores the Soul. It fills the air with pæans to science; it is never weary of vaunting the scientific methods, the scientific triumphs. But it always means physical, not moral science; intellectual, not religious conquests. It shirks the question of questions—to what human end is this knowledge—how shall man thereby order his life as a whole—where is he to find the object of his yearnings of spirit? Of the spiritual history of mankind it knows as little, and thinks as little, as of any other sort of Asiatic devil-worship. At the spiritual aspirations of the men and women around us, ill at ease for want of some answer, it stares blankly, as it does at some spirit-rapping epidemic. ‘What is that to us?—see thou to that’—is all that it can answer when men ask it for a religion. It is of the religion of all sensible men, the religion which all sensible men never tell. With a smile or a shrug of the shoulders it passes by into the whirling workshops of science (that is, the physical prelude of science); and it leaves the spiritual life of the Soul to the spiritualists, theological or nonsensical as the case may be, wishing them both in heaven. This is the materialism to fear.

The theologians and the vast sober mass of serious men and women who want simply to live rightly are quite right when they shun and fear a school that is so eager about cosmology and biology, whilst it leaves morality and religion to take care of themselves. And yet they know all the while that before the advancing line of positive thought they are fighting a forlorn hope; and they see their own line daily more and more demoralised by the consciousness that they have no rational plan of campaign. They know that their own account of the Soul, of the spiritual life, of Providence, of Heaven, is daily shifting, is growing more vague, more inconsistent, more various. They hurry wildly from one untenable position to another, like a routed and disorganized army. In a religious discussion years ago we once asked one of the Broad Church, a disciple of one of its eminent founders, what he understood by the third Person of the Trinity; and he said doubtfully ‘that he fancied there was a sort of a something.’ Since those days the process of disintegration and vaporisation of belief has gone on rapidly; and now very religious minds, and men who think themselves to be religious, are ready to apply this ‘sort of a something’ to all the verities in turn. They half hope that there is ‘a sort of a something’ fluttering about, or inside, their human frames, that there may turn out to be a ‘something’ somewhere after Death, and that there must be a sort of a somebody or (as the theology of Culture will have it) a sort of a something controlling and comprehending human life. But the more thoughtful spirits, not being professionally engaged in a doctrine, mostly limit themselves to a pious hope that there may be something in it, and that we shall know some day what it is.

Now theologians and religious people unattached must know that this will never serve—that this is paltering with the greatest of all things. What then is the only solution which can ultimately satisfy both the devotees of science and the believers in religion? Surely but this, to make religion scientific by placing religion under the methods of science. Let Science come to see that religion, morality, life, are within its field, or rather are the main part of its field. Let Religion come to see that it can be nothing but a prolongation of science, a rational and homogeneous result of cosmology and biology, not a matter of fantastic guessing. Then there will be no true science which does not aim at, and is not guided by, systematic religion. And there will be no religion which pretends to any other basis but positive knowledge and scientific logic. But for this science must consent to add spiritual phenomena to its curriculum, and religion must consent to give up its vapid figments.

Positivism in dealing with the Soul discards the exploded errors of the materialists and the spiritualists alike. On the one hand, it not only admits into its studies the spiritual life of men, but it raises this life to be the essential business of all human knowledge. All the spiritual sentiments of man, the aspirations of the conscious soul in all their purity and pathos, the vast religious experience and potentialities of the human heart seen in the history of our spiritual life as a race—this is, we say, the principal subject of science and of philosophy, no philosophy, no morality, no polity can rest on stable foundations if this be not its grand aim; if it have not a systematic creed, a rational object of worship, and a definite discipline of life. But then we treat these spiritual functions of the Soul, not as mystical enigmas, but as positive phenomena, and we satisfy them by philosophic and historic answers and not by naked figments. And we think that the teaching of history and a true synthesis of science bring us far closer to the heart of this spiritual life than do any spiritualist guesses, and do better equip us to read aright the higher secrets of the Soul: meaning always by Soul the consensus of the faculties which observation discovers in the human organism.

On the other hand, without entering into an idle dispute with the spiritualist orthodoxy, we insist on regarding this organism as a perfectly homogeneous unit, to be studied from one end of it to the other by rational scientific methods. We pretend to give no sort of *cause* as lying behind the manifold powers of the organism. We say the immaterial entity is something which we cannot grasp, which explains nothing, for which we cannot have a shadow of evidence. We are determined to treat man as a human organism, just as we treat a dog as a