

ered, for the reason that it lies wholly outside of the sphere of scientific inquiry. Scientific proofs of God's existence are inadequate. "Religion lies beyond the domain of science, and will always do so. . . . The Christian religion freely admits that demonstrations are impossible; it demands faith, not knowledge. But just as it is certain that science can never prove the truth of religion, so it is equally certain that it can never overthrow the doctrine of religion." The author proceeds to examine the arguments of scientists against Christianity. Men now, as formerly, drag foreign elements into religion; these will be modified by science. But pure religion has exactly the same sphere to-day as formerly, and will always continue to hold it. If God revealed himself, it must have been in a way adapted to those receiving the revelation. It is unreasonable to suppose that He would have given revelations which were anticipations of scientific discovery; men could not have comprehended them. Hence, figurative language had to be resorted to just as we do now with children. Pictures could yield to plain language only when man, under the working of God's own law, had been sufficiently developed to understand plain language. "If we take all things into account, we must conclude that God's Word must have been just as it is; in the point under consideration (respecting science) it could not contain more or less. We can, therefore, accept it fully and entirely, and yet maintain the scientific stand-point of our day." He also opposes the view, that it is no longer possible to believe in miracles. If all that transpires can be traced to natural causes, then prayer, trust in God, and religion itself, will be altogether impossible. Of course, the investigator is not to postulate miracles if he cannot at once discover the causes of events. It must be his aim to eliminate miracles entirely. "But it would be a very hazardous conclusion to infer from the general validity of the laws of nature that miracles are out of the question. What investigator can prove that the world was not created by an Almighty Creator? And if it was created, then the Creator can surely affect, according to his pleasure, the regular course of his work." Indeed, not only are miracles possible, but we cannot even know but what miracles occur daily in our surroundings. The author affirms "that the assertion that there are no miracles and can be none, is just as hazardous an hypothesis as the assertion that hundreds of miracles daily transpire in our environment."

He regards the freedom of the will as not possible on the Darwinian theory, but holds that the consciousness of freedom is not questioned by science. The practical question of freedom, he holds, is, therefore, not affected by evolution.

Some have held that the Christian doctrine of redemption is in conflict with science, but this

is not the case. Redemption has not heretofore been explained; neither is it made any more or any less explicable by Darwinism. "Why God's Son had to die a bodily death in order to overcome eternal death for men, is, and remains, inexplicable unto us, whether we accept consistently the old view or the theory of Darwin. In making this statement, no opinion is intended to be given respecting the value of the dogma. We desire only to confirm the assertion of the teachers of religion, that it is a mystery to us."

Like the other doctrines peculiarly religious, that of the immortality of the soul is not affected by science, which would have to transcend its limits to determine the question. "Not by any result of science is faith in eternal life shaken. It may be affirmed as certain that the spirit of man cannot be annihilated, for science teaches that nothing can be utterly destroyed. The atoms may be transformed, they do not perish. But the question is, whether the human spirit continues to exist as an individual after the body perishes? The spiritual individuality of the living person cannot be questioned. We cannot speak of a dissolution of the spirit into atoms, or of such a transformation as takes place in chemical compounds, because the spirit cannot be compared with matter. The continued existence of the individuality in some manner is, therefore, just as well possible as the opposite view. In this respect we know nothing of the properties of the spirit. We know the spirit only as it manifests itself in living beings by means of its effects on the body; therefore, we can never draw scientific inferences which go beyond the existence of the body."

From what has been said, it is evident that the value of our author's work consists in indicating the limits of science. It is certainly a healthy sign, when from the ranks of science men arise who recognize the limits of their specialties, and distinguish the sphere of exact science from the speculations of a philosophical character, which are so often endowed by their authors with the absolute certainty of science. In view of such speculations, the negative results of our author are valuable. It is time for the universal recognition of the fact, that there is a large domain of human thought and human interests respecting which science gives no light. In a widely circulated German paper the statement was recently made, that one must either choose science or religion; he cannot take both, because they are incompatible. This superficial view has become quite prevalent, and we can but rejoice when men of science themselves vindicate a sphere for faith beyond the domain of science. If it is once established that religion, as an author claims, is demanded by Darwinism, then its value will also be admitted by evolutionists, and a sincere effort will be made to discover the influences which must be drawn from its necessity.