

sideration, the so-called "ethical" school, which is constructive in slight degree, in that it *affirms* something, but still retains some of the old and outclassed "demonstration" theory, and which must, for this reason be classed among the *negationary* schools, though not so in outward form or seeming.

. . . It is not a *religion* at all, though some have tried to give it the dignity of a school, being, as I have considered it, a thought based upon only the human side of religion, or upon one of the phenomena of religion, merely. . .

Many persons, I know, will object to my classification, as being crude and not satisfactory; but for the purposes of a short paper, it will, I think, be sufficient and not too misleading. It may be enough to answer these objecting friends that my purpose in this paper has been to show that all these schools of thought are misleading in that they have sought to compress the greatest blessing of God to man, religion, within the narrow compass or range of man's own intellectual perceptions. This is even true, I think, of some of the schools, like Unitarianism, which bearing the outward forms of Christian church organization, have made no room for the inner, higher meaning of God's greatest revelation, that which is so dear to the followers of George Fox, the Spirit.

Viewed in the light of the best, most reverent (and therefore most truthful) development of this age, the Christian virtue of *faith*, the great truth of the Indwelling Divine, both seem to assume a greater, grander, more blessed meaning. It is as though the Truth had been revealed from on high to the old prophets and teachers (for it surely could not have been revealed by any human agency) and that long afterward belated human intellect had come in in the rear of the train of progress and added its feeble confirmation to what was already very old and perfectly familiar. This has been the case with every great revelation, without excep-

tion; it was so with the old truth of the unity of God, revealed to the Hebrew prophets: the learning of men comes in after the lapse of ages and points out the fact that all it learns and knows points to the conclusion that the universe is *one*, and not an aggregation of separate pieces, that it seems to be dominated by a single thought and purpose. The thought of the brotherhood of man, taught by the blessed Jesus, is now seen, centuries after its promulgation, to be not only true in the moral world, but also a truth of the greatest efficacy in the material relations of men, a principle of the widest possible beneficence and utility. The great truth—the one which seems to cover and include all other truth, as the greater includes the less—the truth of religion, or, as Friends explain it, *the immediate revelation of God in the souls of His children*, proclaimed first in the long centuries ago, in many lands, by many inspired saints and prophets, is one before which the wisest of men stand in awe and say:

"Here we dare not deny; here we are in the presence of the Unknown; as far as we can see by our weak human means, this appears to be a truth which no learning can controvert, no sophistry even attempt to deny; as far as our learning can be said to go at all it seems to confirm it.

No! The aphorisms are greatly misleading; it is not true that "there is no religion greater than the truth" The converse is the case; there is no truth greater than religion. Even on the "demonstration" theory of which we have heard so much within the last fifty years, it seems as though no other conclusion can be arrived at. Religion is one of the greatest *facts* in the history of human development, and no one with eyes and intellect can deny it. Its impulse or motive is as surely divine, as anything can be; its greatest incentives are these other great facts, the emotions of men: love, fear, hope, faith, trust, veneration, and the whole