

Law," and the fact is notorious. There was in the theologian a deep-seated suspicion that the discoveries—rather the theories—of science would be found opposed to the doctrines which it was his business to defend. It was of little use pointing out to him that one truth could not contradict another, that science could have no quarrel with any other department of knowledge or investigation; and that any contradiction that might seem to arise only demanded further investigation and not mutual anathemas. We are familiar with this state of mind; and in our own society it has been dealt with by two of our Presidents, Sir W. Dawson and Monsignor Hamel.

But it is not merely that theology and science have come to a better understanding; science itself is, in recent times, actually coming to the aid of theology, and this in a very thorough and far-reaching manner. Science is no longer arrayed on the side of materialism or even atheism; it has passed over to spiritualism and theism.

We cannot altogether wonder at the prejudices and suspicions of the theologian. When a scientific man could say of the idea of God, "I have no need of that hypothesis," he declared war upon the advocates of Theism; and it is not so very long since a school which was essentially materialistic was the dominant school of thought in Great Britain. The present speaker well remembers a conversation which he had more than forty years ago with Professor Mansel, the famous Bampton Lecturer of 1858, a man of whom I may say that, however we may now refuse to accept his conclusions in regard to the limits of religious thought, he was certainly one of the most powerful intellects of the Oxford of the nineteenth cen-

ture. Speaking of some of his contributions to the magazines, I asked him why he did not collect them and publish them in a volume. His answer was, "People here in Oxford read nothing in Philosophy now but J. S. Mill." Nearly at the same time the speaker had a conversation with another leading man at Oxford, now a Professor of Divinity, who espoused the side of Mill. With the ardor of comparative youth he broke in, "Mill is an Atheist." "He has not said it," was the reply. No! he had not said it; but, since then, he has said it from the grave, in his Autobiography and in his "Three Essays," published by his step-daughter after his death. Mr. Mill, in these writings, declares that, at a certain period of his life, he became an atheist. I need not here enter upon the process by which he arrived at this conclusion. Yet it may be useful to notice that even he, towards the end of his life, felt constrained to admit that the argument from adaptation was certainly very strong—a concession almost savouring of Theism. But we have now long passed that moment of transition. Not merely did Professor Tyndall, in his Belfast address, declare that materialistic Atheism did not commend itself to his judgment, but, at the present moment, there is hardly a man eminent in science who will not declare that Materialism is an impossible theory of the world.

May we not say that men of science are, more and more, returning to the position of Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, who declared: "I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind?"

If I have ventured here to bring forward these statements, it is not merely for the purpose of asserting