

selves with saying, "God made the world"; and no little opposition was offered when the scientists set out to learn, if they could, when and how it was made. But now certainly the universe is nowise hurt by the discovery that its transformations (and apparently its genesis) are the result of natural laws which we see constantly in operation. Thought in regard to the Bible follows the same order of development. It has been said "God gave the book." Now the question is again as to manner and time. And what if study into the making of the book, as before into the making of the world, leads to the positive conclusion that the process was a purely natural one? Are we the worse off for learning the ways of God in the development of history and of literature? Indeed there is no more reason why we should shrink from the conclusion that the government of the human world, the evolution of thought, of morals and religion, are by natural law, than there was for revolt against the now conceded doctrine that the earth has taken its present form and constitution solely from the operation of natural causes.

Nor is the distance between God and man widened by this mode of thinking. When it was said that God made the universe in a week, some six thousand years ago, the impression was apt to obtain that he then withdrew from the scene. At all events the mind seeking to contemplate his activity in nature was always inclined to go back to that memorable week. But since creation has been seen to be a beginningless, ceaseless process, the immanency of God in nature, the immediateness of his activity, has