

those which were current among the people with whom his earthly lot was cast; nor does this fact argue for or against his omniscience. It would, obviously, have been impossible for him to convey to the world any adequate idea of the modes of spiritual existence in terms which could be understood. He used the current coin of expression to convey to mankind the broad idea that the soul that is "saved" to immortal life through "belief" will then be punished or rewarded according to the deeds done in the body. It would, obviously, have been useless and confusing to his hearers had he attempted to employ any new symbols, or any language to which they were not accustomed, to convey that idea.

His mission, therefore, as the Saviour of the souls of men was accomplished when he revealed to the world the essential condition of immortal life. His mission as a moral teacher was secondary in importance. The one doctrine was new, the other old. The one was a scientific fact, the other a code of ethics. The one was essential to the attainment of man's ultimate destiny as an immortal entity, the other a standard of right and justice in this world, and a condition of felicity in the world to come.

It is said that when Hillel, who flourished in the century preceding Christ, was asked whether he could give the whole Jewish law in one sentence, he answered: "Yes, perfectly well. What you do not want anybody to do to you, do not you to them. That is the whole law; everything else is only commentary."

The same may be truly said of the New Testament doctrines and the law of faith. The only thing wholly new was the doctrine of faith. That is the whole law; everything else is commentary.



CHAPTER XXVI.

THE MISSION OF CHRIST; FUTURE REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS.

The Success of Christ's Mission. — Chaotic State of Spiritual Philosophy in His Time. — The Various Doctrines in Vogue. — Jesus the first to simplify the Doctrine of Immortality. — He gave it a Definite Status in Philosophy. — The Doctrine of Future Rewards and Punishments. — God will "render to every Man according to His Deeds." — Spiritual Penalties for Violations of Spiritual Law. — The Sin against the Holy Ghost. — The Sin of Unbelief. — The Status of a Lost Soul. — Possible Reincarnation. — The Means of Punishment for Sin. — Affections. — Conscience. — Memory. — General Conclusions. — Scientific Basis of Christianity.

IT is often charged by the sceptical world that the mission of Jesus has thus far proved a failure, for that only about one third of the inhabitants of the earth have ever heard the name of Christ; that of Christian nations but a limited proportion of the inhabitants belong to the Christian Church; and that of the church membership there is but a limited number who so live as to entitle them to the rewards of heaven. Measured by the common idea of what constitutes salvation, there may be good ground for that criticism. But measured by the number of those who believe in the immortality of the soul; by the number who have a hope of a life beyond the grave; by the number who have a consciousness of the existence within them of the transcendental ego; or by the number of those who have risen, directly or indirectly, through the teachings of Christ so far above the level of the brute creation as to have a consciousness of the possibility of immortal life, and a consequent hope and subjective belief in

immortality, — his mission has proved the grandest success recorded in the history of missionary effort.

It must be remembered that when he came into the world the doctrine of immortal life held a very vague and uncertain place in the philosophy of civilized mankind. I do not say that the doctrine of immortal life was unknown, but it was undefined, and so tintured with finite conceptions, and limited by the uncertain boundaries of a hundred different systems of fantastic philosophy, that it did not, and could not, form a basis of rational hope or intelligent promise.

Thus, among the Chinese of that day (1), the doctrines of Confucius held the most prominent place. His was a system which might be called a parent-worship, in which virtue was rewarded and vice punished in the individuals, or in their posterity, on earth, no promise of immortality being held out. (2) The sect of Rationalists, founded by Lautsz in the sixth century before Christ, taught the emanation of all good beings from the Bosom of Reason, and their absorption thither for an eternal existence, while the bad were doomed to successive births and many sorrows. (3) Another sect held that the principle of all things is but a vacuum, — nothing, — from which all things have sprung, and to which all must return.

The Hindoo doctrine was substantially the same as it is now; and it is so well known as not to require a particular statement, further than to say that its disciples believe in successive incarnations of the soul, and its final absorption into the incorporeal nature of Brahm.

The Persians believed in the doctrine of hell for the wicked, and of paradise for the good; but held that all the wicked would eventually be purified by fire. It was thought that the fires were hot enough to purify the most abominable soul in about three days.

Herodotus tells us that the Egyptians were the first to defend the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and he says that they believed in its transmigration through various animal bodies for a period of three thousand years before its return to a human body.

Of the Grecian schools, the Pythagoreans held that the soul is eternal, — that is, uncreated and indestructible; that no real entity is either made or destroyed. The Eleatics held practically the same doctrine. The Ionics taught that the soul was reabsorbed into the Divine reason. The Stoics believed in the periodical destruction of all things by fire, when the good will be absorbed and the wicked perish. The Epicurean faith was well described by Paul in the phrase, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." The Pyrrhonists were the sceptics of the age, and doubted everything. Socrates taught the doctrine of immortality for the good, the virtuous, and the wise. The incurably bad are "hurled into Tartarus, whence they never come forth;" whilst those who can be cured are subjected to needful punishments before being admitted into the mansions of the blest. Plato was a Pythagorean, with certain bizarre notions of his own, such as the migration of souls through various brute and human forms; and he believed that even the duration of divine work is limited.

It will thus be seen that when Jesus appeared on earth he found the philosophy of the soul in a very chaotic state. It was his mission to bring order out of chaos, and to proclaim the true philosophy; to declare the conditions of immortality, and point the way to eternal happiness. That he simplified the doctrine of immortality into a system so plain that "the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein," no one will deny. Its grand simplicity, when placed in contrast with the complicated doctrines of all other systems of religious philosophy, ancient or modern, places upon it the stamp of inherent probability; for scientific truth is always simple and free from complication. It was Jesus who gave the doctrine of immortality a distinct and definite form and a permanent place in the philosophy of the civilized world. It was he who first proclaimed the fundamental law underlying the science of the soul. It was from his words, spoken to a few humble followers in an obscure corner of the earth, that the doctrine has spread

throughout all the civilized world. From the centres of civilization the Church has sent its missionaries, its representatives of the Master, among all peoples, civilized and savage, preaching the gospel of immortality to all mankind. Its influence is not confined to those who believe in the tenets of the Christian Church, nor even to those who have heard the name of Christ. It has spread, through some subtle, unseen power and potency, until it permeates every fibre of human society, and constitutes the promise of every religion, the hope of all humanity.

I have, in other chapters, pointed out some of the proofs which science affords of the doctrine of immortality, and of the verity of the history of Jesus of Nazareth. I have shown that every known fact which bears upon the subject points to the continued life of the soul after the death of the body. I have shown that the discoveries of modern science demonstrate the fact that Jesus was in possession of a complete knowledge of the science of the soul in its relations to its physical environment. I have shown that all known facts bearing upon the subject go to prove that he also had a knowledge of its laws in its relations to a purely spiritual existence.

We have then, *first*, an array of demonstrable facts which irresistibly lead to the conclusion that the soul survives the body; *secondly*, another array of facts which prove that it was possible for an exceptionally endowed person to perceive the laws of the soul; *thirdly*, an array of facts which demonstrate that Jesus did understand those laws as far as they pertain to the soul's relations to the physical man; *fourthly*, we have facts which show that he understood the laws of the soul in its relations to the spiritual world, and the essential conditions of its conscious existence after the death of the body; and *fifthly*, we have in the New Testament a record of the acts which demonstrated his knowledge of the subject, as well as of his solemn and repeated declarations of the laws which pertain to that subject.

When we consider together all these cumulative proofs, it may safely be said that there are few principles of nature

that are more clearly established by inductive processes of reasoning than is the principle of immortality.

Having established this proposition, it remains only to consider Christ's doctrine of future rewards and punishments. Obviously, this is a more difficult question to handle, for the reason that there are necessarily few facts known to mankind which can be considered scientifically demonstrative of any proposition which has been made by any one on that subject. Nevertheless, if there is one known fact which confirms his declarations on that question, and at the same time satisfies the demands of human reason and the common sense of Divine Justice, we may safely conclude that the Christian religion rests upon a purely scientific basis.

The first important fact which confronts us in considering this branch of the subject is, that Jesus said very little on the subject. It was obviously impossible for him to convey to the human mind any adequate knowledge or idea of the actual conditions of a spiritual existence. He was hedged about by the limitations of human speech and the finite understanding of his followers. His descriptions, therefore, of the places of future rewards and punishments were necessarily limited to material conceptions. He could effectively employ no other symbolism than that with which his hearers were familiar and which they could appreciate. He had taught them in plain and unmistakable terms the conditions upon which the soul could attain a conscious existence; and having done that, his mission was thenceforth a moral one. Having taught them how to attain eternal life, he taught them so to conduct their lives in this world as to entitle them to the joys of that life. It was no part of his mission to reconstruct the accepted geography of the world of spirits, for it could only add confusion to their crude conceptions. His parables were drawn from the objects and incidents of their every-day life, and were necessarily limited in their application to a spiritual existence. His only object was to enforce a code of morals founded upon the eternal principles of right and justice, simple in terms, and adapted to their comprehension, but

grand in its simplicity, and adapted to the varying conditions of human society for all time.

The question now is, What is to be considered the doctrine of future rewards and punishments to be gathered from the New Testament? It is clear that we must reject all material conceptions of both heaven and hell. It follows that the punishment must be a moral one, since there is no material entity to be dealt with. The sense of justice inherent in all mankind would seem to indicate that the punishment shall be commensurate with the offence. It must be assumed, therefore, that the true doctrine is expressed in Romans ii. 6, where it is said that God will "*render to every man according to his deeds.*"

This satisfies the finite sense of justice, and perfectly accords with the highest human conceptions of the character of a God of love, mercy, and justice. The good man would ask nothing more, the bad could expect nothing less. Reasoning from analogy would lead to the same conclusion. We know from daily experience that every violation of the laws of our physical nature is followed inevitably by its adequate punishment. We have a right to suppose, therefore, that every violation of moral and spiritual law will be followed by its appropriate penalty. We know, indeed, from what we have seen of the teachings of Christ, that spiritual penalties follow a violation of spiritual law. In other words, the law of suggestion follows the soul across the boundaries of eternity. Spiritual death is the inevitable result of spiritual unbelief. It is not a vindictive punishment, it is the fundamental law of spiritual life. Just as the spirit quickens the flesh, so does faith quicken the spirit.

Again, we find a spiritual penalty following a violation of spiritual law in what Christ taught regarding the sin against the Holy Ghost. Just what that sin consists of, never has been satisfactorily defined. We are told that it is a sin which cannot be forgiven. It must, therefore, consist of a violation of some fundamental law of the soul's existence, the penalty for which is inevitable according to the fixed laws

of God. It cannot be a moral offence, consisting simply in wrong-doing, for such sins can be atoned for. A moral offence so gross that a God of infinite mercy and love cannot forgive it, and, if the Scriptures are to be believed, does not stand ready to forgive it when proper atonement is made, cannot be conceived. Nor has it been mentioned in Holy Writ. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that, as before remarked, the sin against the Holy Ghost must consist of a violation of the fundamental law of the soul's existence. It must, therefore, be the sin of unbelief, and consist of a blasphemous denial of the existence of the soul and its Father, God. This would be in strict accordance with the fundamental law of suggestion, as it has been scientifically demonstrated to exist. The emphatic and persistent denial of the soul's existence must eventually prove to be a suggestion so strong as to overcome its instinctive belief in its own existence, and thus neutralize its instinctive desire for immortal life. It would, therefore, have the same effect as unbelief arising from a want of knowledge, or a lack of the intellectual power to conceive the idea of immortality. The soul, in either case, could not have a consciousness of its own existence or individuality.

It may be asked, What becomes of the soul when deprived of a conscious existence? Does it actually die, disintegrate, and return to its original elements? Is it possible that a human soul, created by God and endowed with the power and potency of immortal life, can fail of accomplishing its mission, and become extinct? Can a segregated portion of the Divine essence, once individualized, ever perish or lose its identity? All these questions, and more, will be asked. I do not know. Perhaps it is reincarnated. I do not know anything about reincarnation. I know as much about it, however, as any one else knows. I mean by this that no one can be said to know anything about the truth of any proposition that has not underlying it a substratum of demonstrable fact. The theory of reincarnation has no such basis; and I shall not, therefore, indulge in speculation on the subject further than to say

that it is possibly true that reincarnation is the process of the soul's evolution. If so, reasoning from analogy, I should say that the process ceases when the soul reaches the status of a conscious existence. In the physical world we see that the process of evolution has gone forward progressively from the lowest form of animal life up to man. There the process ceases. All further progress is in the line of improvement in the human race. No higher type of animal life is developed, and in our pride of manhood we believe that there never can be any higher animal existence. It may, therefore, be true that the progress of a soul is through reincarnation from the lower animal life to the higher, until it reaches the human; and that it may still go on in the lower grades of human organisms until it reaches the dignity of a conscious human soul. Having reached that point, the law of progress will expend its force in carrying it forward to its ultimate destiny. Considered as the process of the soul's evolution, the necessity for further reincarnation apparently no longer exists after the soul has attained the power and potency of a conscious, self-existent entity.

I throw out this suggestion for the benefit of those spiritistic mediums and other trance-seers who have found out so much more than Jesus knew about the internal economy of the spiritual world and the laws which pertain to spiritual existence. But this is a digression into the forbidden field of speculation without facts.

The common experience of mankind demonstrates the proposition that appropriate physical penalties are the necessary result of a violation of physical laws; and it has been shown from the teachings of Jesus, confirmed by the inductions of science, that the violation of the laws of spiritual existence is followed by inevitable spiritual penalties. It now remains to be considered what facts are known to science which will confirm the doctrine that moral punishment will follow the infraction of moral laws, in exact accordance "with the deeds done in the body." In order to do so intelligently, we must first briefly consider the question

as to what the nature of the punishments and rewards must be. It being manifestly impossible for us to know, affirmatively, the particular modes of spiritual existence, we can arrive at a conclusion only by the method of exclusion. We must, therefore, begin by excluding all idea of material penalties or rewards. All such conceptions of spiritual life must be relegated to the dark ages of human intelligence, when man was able to conceive of no joy apart from physical pleasure, and no punishment other than physical suffering. Our conceptions must, therefore, be limited by what we know of the nature and attributes of the soul, as exhibited through phenomena. The first question, then, is, What do we know of the attributes of the soul?

We know, first, that it is the seat of the emotions. It is therefore capable of being rewarded or punished through the natural affections.

Secondly, we know that it possesses the inherent power of perception of the laws of nature and of God, including the eternal, God-ordained principles of right and wrong. It will, therefore, after its release from the body, be able to estimate the value of every good deed, and realize the inherent infamy of every wrong one, as weighed in the scales of Eternal Justice.

Thirdly and lastly, we know of one attribute and power of the human soul more pregnant with weal or woe, with joy or sorrow, than all the others combined; and that is its perfect memory.

These are the essential things that we know of the soul from the observation of phenomena. Our conceptions of it, therefore, are limited to its intellectual, moral, and emotional attributes. We know it only as an intellectual entity, and our conceptions of the rewards and punishments adequate to the ends of Divine Justice must be limited accordingly.

Little need be said in explanation of the trend of this brief summary. The conclusions are obvious. We have before us an intellectual entity capable of experiencing all the natural emotions of humanity, of joy and sorrow, of

love and friendship; endowed with a perfect perception of the principles of right and wrong, and consequently in possession of an awakened conscience more keenly alive and active than the objective mind can conceive, and possessing a memory so perfect that every good and every bad deed of its whole earthly existence is constantly before it like a vast panorama. What greater reward could such a being ask or experience than would be found in the contemplation of a well-spent life? What greater punishment than the remorse of conscience arising from the ever-persistent memory of a life of wickedness and crime?

It is obvious that both rewards and punishments are adequate and exact, and that God will "render to every man according to his deeds," by and through the operation of his immutable, unchanging laws.

I have now summarized enough of the leading points in the history of Jesus of Nazareth and of his doctrines, and compared them with known phenomena with sufficient particularity to show that the inductions of modern science demonstrate the essential truth of the history of his physical manifestations, and to prove, as far as inductive reasoning from known phenomena can prove anything not physically demonstrable, the truth of every essential doctrine of his spiritual philosophy. I have by no means exhausted the subject, for the New Testament is full of passages confirmatory of the view I have taken. It is true that I have interpreted the passages relating to the conditions precedent to the attainment of immortal life in a way in which they have never before been interpreted; but in doing so I have harmonized that which has heretofore seemed incongruous, and have thus removed a stumbling-block from the pathway of scepticism. I have no fear that even prejudice will find fault with my interpretation; for it not only leaves the essential doctrines relating to rewards and punishments uncontradicted, but it affords strong confirmation of their essential truth. Moreover, my interpretation is confirmed by the facts of modern science, and must, therefore, shed a new lustre upon the name and attributes of Jesus, demonstrating, as

it does, the accuracy of his knowledge of the laws of the soul.

It has been but a few years since the researches of science began to furnish facts confirmatory of the history and doctrines of Christ; but it has come to pass that every new fact discovered, and every new principle evolved, weakens the foundation of every other religious superstructure, and adds strength and harmony of proportions to that erected by the man of Nazareth.

It may, therefore, be now confidently asserted that Christianity possesses that to which no other system of religion can lay a valid claim; namely, a sound scientific basis.



CHAPTER XXVII.

DEDUCTIONS FROM VARIOUS ATTRIBUTES OF THE SOUL.

The Question of Identity. — Consciousness and Memory. — Identity considered in Reference to Rewards and Punishments. — Conscience. — Conflicting Theories of Psychologists. — Education and Intuition. — Different Standards of Morality. — The Soul's Perception of the Eternal Principles of Right and Wrong. — The Instinct of Worship. — Its Abnormal Manifestations. — The Law of Suggestion. — Universality of the Sentiment of Worship. — Its Normal Manifestations. — Demonstrative of the Existence of a God of Love. — Old Arguments invalid. — Socrates and Paley. — Argument predicated on the Affectional Emotions. — Syllogistic Deductions. — The Divine Pedigree of Man.

IT has often been said that no proposition is worthy of belief that is not verified by phenomena. Whilst I do not commit myself to a maxim so broad in its terms, I have thus far religiously refrained from advancing an idea that is not so verified. In other words, the primary object of this book is to interpret phenomena, and not to advance new ideas, except those which are thrust upon me as necessary deductions from the terms of my hypothesis. Sincerely believing that the fundamental propositions of that hypothesis are true, I have not hesitated to follow them into whatever field they might lead, and to accept every legitimate conclusion. In pursuance of such deductions I have been led reluctantly to the conclusion that none of the phenomena commonly attributed to supermundane agencies afford tangible evidence of the continued existence of the soul after the

death of the body. I have, however, been more than compensated by the discovery, in pursuance of the same hypothesis, that in the inherent powers and attributes of the soul is to be found indubitable evidence of its immortality. This evidence is based on phenomena which have been, and may be, produced by experiment. Many of these phenomena have been already pointed out, but others remain to be considered which have an important bearing upon the question under immediate consideration; namely, the immortality of the soul, and its relations to the Supreme Being.

There are still other attributes and powers of the soul which have been considered, from which further conclusions may be drawn which may assist us in forming correct conclusions regarding its status in a future life. The first of these attributes which I purpose briefly to discuss is that of memory, and its relations to the question of spirit identity.

The question as to whether the soul of man retains its identity after the death of the body, is second only in interest and importance to the question of immortality. There are many who hold that the soul is necessarily reabsorbed into the Divine essence, and finds its compensation for the ills of earthly life in becoming an integral part of God, and, as such, a participator in his power and glory. This presupposes a loss of identity, and to most minds would be considered equivalent to annihilation; by others it is regarded as the highest conception of eternal felicity. Thus far no one, as far as I am aware, has attempted to offer any scientific reasons for believing one way or the other. It seems to me that there is abundant evidence in phenomena observable in this life to demonstrate, as far as such a proposition is demonstrable, that the soul does retain its identity in a more pronounced degree, if possible, than we can retain it in this objective existence. In what does identity consist, or, more properly speaking, how is it retained? The answer is, through our consciousness and memory. It is obvious that if either is lost, identity is lost. It is equally obvious

that if both are retained, identity is retained. Now, the phenomena alluded to which bear upon the question relate to the perfect memory of the subjective mind, or soul. This faculty of subjective memory is implanted in the human soul for some purpose. It certainly does not pertain to this life, for, as we have seen, it is only under abnormal conditions that the phenomenon is observable. It must, therefore, be a part of the Divine economy pertaining to the future existence of the soul. It has no use here, for objective recollection is all-sufficient for objective existence and purposes. The conclusion is irresistible that it is for the purpose, amongst other things, of enabling the soul to retain its identity. Its bearing upon the question of future rewards and punishments has already been commented upon; nevertheless, at the risk of repetition, a further remark will be ventured. It is obvious that if the soul did not retain a conscious memory of its earthly life, no adequate or just reward or punishment could be meted out to it. Even human justice would revolt against, and human laws would prevent, the infliction of the penalty for a capital crime, if it were clearly proved that the criminal had so far lost his mind as to have no recollection of the events of his past life, or, in other words, had lost conscious identity. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the soul is the seat of the emotions, as well as the storehouse of memory. It is obvious that it is only through the emotions and the memory that rewards can be conferred, or punishments inflicted, upon the immaterial soul.

Another question which has been incidentally alluded to deserves a more extended notice, for the reason that it bears directly upon the question of future rewards and punishments, and is also illustrative of the general hypothesis under consideration; it is the question of conscience. Metaphysicians are divided in opinion on this question, one school holding that conscience is innate and instinctive, and the other that it is the result of experience and education. My hypothesis leads to the conclusion that each school is partly right and partly wrong. Granted that the eternal

principles of right and wrong are a part of the fixed and immutable laws of God, it follows that the soul of man will, under favorable conditions, have a clear perception of those laws. Those conditions may or may not be present during the life of the body. They certainly will be present when the soul is freed from the clogs of the flesh, and is able to perceive all the fixed laws of nature. In the mean time, while it is an inhabitant of the body it is amenable to control by the power of objective suggestion, and hence is dependent upon the objective education of the individual for its standard of right and wrong. This standard may be high or low in any individual case. There will be one standard in one community, and another in another, all depending upon education and social environment; but in each case the subjective mind will follow the suggestions imparted to it by objective education. If the standard is high in any individual case, the sentiment will gradually become instinctive, so that the subjective impulses and emotions will play an important part. If the standard is low, the instinctive emotions will only be conspicuous for their absence.

Man stands in his relation to the principles of right and wrong in just the same position that he occupies in his relation to the laws of electricity or any other natural law. He is struggling to ascertain the laws in each case for the purpose of placing himself in harmony with them. His knowledge is of slow growth, but each century finds the general standard of right and wrong higher than it was the century before. If the soul possessed, in the normal condition of man, an instinctive knowledge of those laws, he would not have to await the slow process of evolution to develop them.

History records the name of but one man in whom the eternal principles of right and wrong were instinctive. That man was Jesus Christ. He perceived those laws, as he perceived all spiritual laws, while yet in the flesh. We may profit by his example and his precepts, but otherwise we must work out our own salvation, knowing that, when the

soul reaches its final home, it will be in possession of the eternal standard by which to measure the guilt or innocence of every deed done in the body.

The only remaining psychic phenomena which I propose to discuss are those connected with that emotion of the human soul which finds its expression in the worship of the Supreme Being. This feeling is so widespread that no system of philosophy is complete that does not take it into account. Like every other emotion, it has its normal mode of expression, and its abnormal manifestations. The difference between the two modes of expression is so great that their identity of origin has been, to a great extent, lost sight of.

The abnormal manifestation of this emotion now occurs principally among the uncultivated classes of religious worshippers, and the feeling has been somewhat contemptuously designated as "emotional religion." It is conspicuous in the revival meetings of certain religious sects, where in former years its manifestations were so violent and unseemly that it was looked upon as reprehensible; but these exhibitions have been, of late years, generally repressed, except among the lower orders of the people. Scientists have tried to account for it on the ground that it is the result of mesmeric power consciously or unconsciously exerted by the preachers over their congregations, resulting in an ecstatic emotion wholly abnormal and entirely unconnected with true religion. The fact that it sometimes results in a cataleptic condition, and sometimes in a trance undistinguishable from that produced by hypnotic processes, lent color to the theory, and has gradually brought the educated classes to regard the feeling of religious emotion with distrust. The result is that what used to be known as "vital religion" is gradually becoming a thing of the past, and is giving place to a cold, self-contained, unemotional sentiment, which is as unlike true religious worship as the other, and as abnormal.

It is true that the abnormal manifestations of the emotion are governed by the same laws, and are produced by the

same causes, as other subjective phenomena. Suggestion plays its part in these as in other things pertaining to the attributes of the soul; and in these, as in all others, a wrong, extravagant, or misdirected suggestion produces abnormal results. But this does not argue that the emotion is abnormal. There is no emotion of the human soul that has not its abnormal manifestations when not directed and controlled by reason. The common experience of every-day life demonstrates this proposition. One of the most sacred and praiseworthy of all the human emotions is that of love between the sexes. But the fact that our jails are filled with those who have indulged in its abnormal manifestations does not argue that the institution of marriage is abnormal.

The sentiment of worship is as widespread as the sentiment of love; and that very fact shows that it must be taken into account in the diagnosis of the human entity, if we would arrive at correct conclusions. That this sentiment is universal, and is repressed only by an effort of will, no one will deny. It is its abnormal manifestations merely that are to be guarded against. Like every other emotion of the soul, its normal indulgence is in the highest degree healthful and exalting. The normal expression of the emotion of earthly love brings us into harmonious relations with our fellow-beings. The normal expression of the emotion of worship brings the soul into harmonious relations with its Creator. Every form and act of worship is an expression of this emotion. It is experienced by all races of the human family, from the fetich worshipper to the Christian. Each stands in awe and reverence before some superior power, external to himself, and capable of controlling his destiny. In proportion to his intelligence will his conceptions of that power be exalted; and in proportion to the exaltation of his conceptions will be the intensity of his emotions of awe, reverence, love, worship.

The conclusions which necessarily follow are of the most important character. The first and most important — for it includes all the rest — is that the fact of the existence of

the emotion of worship is demonstrative of the existence of a Supreme Being.

And right here I wish to make an important distinction. The standard theological argument in favor of the immortality of the soul is based upon the following syllogism :

1. There is a universal desire for immortality.
2. The mind of man cannot conceive an object of desire the means for the attainment of which are not somewhere in existence.

Conclusion : Man is necessarily immortal.

Now, if these premises were demonstrably correct, we might safely rely upon the conclusion. But they are not correct. The first may be assumed to be practically true, for the sake of the argument ; but the desire for continued life beyond the grave may be explained upon other grounds, namely, upon the instinctive desire to prolong life. This instinct is shared with man by all the animal creation, and pertains, primarily, to the preservation of animal existence. Man soon learns that continued animal existence is impossible. He sees that all must die ; but, as "hope springs eternal in the human breast," he conceives the hope that he may, somehow, live after the death of the body. The existence of the desire for immortality is, therefore, traceable directly to the purely animal instinct of self-preservation.

The second premise is intrinsically absurd. It is obvious that the brain of man may conceive of many objects of desire which are manifestly impossible of realization, as well as non-existent. In the Christian mythology of Milton the idea is developed of a rival power — Satan — in heaven almost, but not quite, equal to God. In the struggle which ensued from a rebellion of Satan he was cast out, and set up a kingdom of his own on this earth. Now, a strictly orthodox person might say that this was merely an allegorical representation of an existent fact. But suppose the poet had gone a step further, and had represented Satan as going outside the universe and setting up a rival universe of his own. Would that

conception have proved that an outside universe is possible or existent?¹

Again, the existence of a Supreme Being is thought to have been demonstrated by the argument of Socrates wherein he confuted Aristodemus the atheist, and used the statues of Polycletus and the pictures of Zeuxis to illustrate the idea that, as the structure of the universe shows evidence of design, therefore there must have been a designer. Theology has never improved upon this argument, and Paley makes the same use of the watch for an illustration as Socrates did of the statues and pictures. It is a strong argument, but it does not reach the point which the human heart desires to have demonstrated. Nor does it add force to, but rather weakens, the argument which is found by all reflecting minds in every tree, leaf, bud, or flower. It simply proves the existence of a force, which all admit.

What the human heart desires, and what the human mind seeks, are proofs of the existence of a God, not of mere intelligence and potentiality, but such a God as Jesus characterized, — a God of love and benevolence, a God who sustains the relation of Father to all humanity.

It seems to me that in seeking within the realm of human desire for an argument in proof either of immortality or the existence of a Supreme Being, theologians have failed to make a necessary distinction between desires which may or may not be universal and inherent, and desires which have their source in the affectional emotions. It is upon the latter only that an argument can be logically predicated.

¹ One of the most eminent and fair-minded theologians in the United States, who has kindly read the manuscript of this work and indulgently criticised its contents, suggests that I have not treated the standard theological argument quite fairly, in that I should have stated the second proposition less broadly : that the desire referred to is *instinctive desire*, and should have been so limited. I freely admit that as careful and candid a reasoner as he would naturally so limit the statement of the proposition. But not all theologians are as candid and logical. However, I provisionally accept his limitation, and reply that the answer to the amended second proposition is embraced in the answer to the first.

And I may go further, and say that an argument logically predicated upon the affectional emotions, is demonstrative. It is true that some of the emotions of the soul seem to pertain exclusively to this life; but not all. The emotion of religious worship pertains solely to that invisible power which we call God. Nevertheless, we may employ the others for illustration. Let us see how this doctrine applies to the subject under consideration. Putting it in syllogistic form, we have the following:—

1. The affectional emotions are universal attributes of every normally developed human mind.
2. No affectional emotion can have an existence in the normally developed human mind in the absence of an object of affection capable of reciprocal feeling.

Therefore, when a normally developed human being experiences the emotion of love or affection, there is necessarily existent an object of love or affection normally capable of reciprocal emotion.

Thus, the emotion of friendship presupposes the friendly relation existing between man and his fellow-man.

The emotion of sexual love presupposes the sexual relation and the existence of persons of the opposite sex normally capable of reciprocal emotion.

The emotion of parental love presupposes the relation of parent and child, each normally capable of reciprocal attachment.

It follows that *the emotion of religious worship presupposes the existence of an object of worship capable of reciprocal emotion.*

If this is not the correct interpretation of the universal sentiment of worship which is inherent in the breast of every normal human being, then there is an exception to the laws which govern every other human emotion. As there are no exceptions in the operation of nature's laws, the conclusion is inevitable, not only that the emotion of religious worship is normal, but that it is the one phenomenal attribute of the soul which gives to man indubitable evidence of his Divine origin, and demonstrates the exist-

ence of a God of love. It is the connecting link between man and his Creator. It is the instinctive manifestation of filial affection which proclaims our Divine pedigree, and demonstrates the universal brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God.

“Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee.”

THE END.