

pressed in the Old Testament, that all shall be "taught of God," and applies it to that inward testimony of God in the heart which induces men to come to Him. So when He says that His sheep hear His voice, the reference is to the inward intuitions of the mind acting on certain persons. In like manner He appeals also to the works which they could see—as, for instance, in John x: 38, where He says, "Though ye believe not me, believe the works" done by Me—that which is, in fact, within the scope of your own senses. Here is a very practical fact, that even the Divine Teacher has to hang His lessons on what is in the consciousness of the man He teaches, and on what the man can see with his bodily eyes. To influence men, we must know not only the spiritual truth to be taught, but what is in the man to be taught, and what he has learned or can learn by means of his natural senses. Hence the extreme value to the religious teacher of all that concerns those works of God which men behold, as well as of the prevalent modes of thinking of ordinary men. The epistles of Paul are very full of this deep insight into the habits of thought and the environment of humanity. A noteworthy instance is that passage in the Epistle to the Romans where he says: "The invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity." There could be no clearer statement of the inference of an unseen universe from that which is visible, or of the precise amount of knowledge of God deducible from the latter—namely, His power and His supernatural existence—nothing more and nothing less.

It is not wonderful that men unenlightened as to spiritual things, when they get hold of any new natural truth, should regard it as subversive of spiritual truth; and this is the more likely when religious truth has been presented to them as something contrary to nature, or without any wise reference to its natural analogies and connections. Indeed it not infrequently happens that what is called the "conflict of science and religion" is really the conflict of modern science or of modern scientific theories, more or less accurate, with old and obsolete theories of science, which have somehow got mixed up as an integral part in current theology. It is most instructive to observe that the Bible itself, which has no theories as to nature, except the general one of its unity as the work of one Creator, and its regulation by His perfect laws, rarely gets mixed up in these controversies, except where its teaching is altogether misunderstood. Not long ago I was gravely told from the pulpit that it is the doctrine of science that "nature abhors a vacuum," and on this was built many wise conclusions. Yet this statement of a mere speculative figment, intended to cover the ignorance of a past age, is itself quite as abhorrent to sound theology as it is ridiculous in modern science. For it personifies