

air; they see nothing. The event is surely subjective. It is real enough to Macbeth but it is an illusion so far as the object outside of Macbeth's mind is concerned.

The brain is a very delicate organism and it responds more readily to external impressions than the daintiest mechanism of artificial manufacture. As the colian harp resounds when the wind passes through it, so the human soul vibrates in sympathetic response under the innumerable impressions that touch it. The suffering of one of our own fellow-beings calls forth in our own heart a similar disposition, the "fellow-pain" called *Mitleid* or co-suffering in German, *συμπάθεια* in Greek. Thus ideas, pains, sensations, illusions can easily become sympathetic. Some hysteric person may have a vision and impress others that are somehow predisposed for similar illusions so vividly with the picture oppressing him that they too see it; for instance, when the sentinels in the castle of Elsinore have an apparition which they consider to be Hamlet's father's ghost, they will easily find among those who are of a similar mental constitution, some who, when conducted to the haunted spot, will also swear they see the ghost of the late king who died in some mysterious way. Shakespeare's representation of the ghost-scene is characteristic enough for a description of a genuine vision, Horatio and the young prince are specially prepared for the occasion by having their imaginations stirred through the accounts of the sentinels. Thus we see that even two or several minds may have an illusion which to all outer appearances is the same—and yet there is no reason to assume that there is any ghost outside of these several visions.

## SCIENCE, THEOLOGY, AND THE CHURCH.

BY PAUL CARUS.

NOT very long ago in all Christian churches the Bible was believed to be the word of God in the literal sense of the term, but it is now treated by all Christian theologians, viz., by all those Bible scholars who lay claim to being scientific investigators, as a collection of books of Hebrew literature which is to be studied by the same methods and according to the same rules as any other literary products of ancient or modern times.

It goes without saying that the Bible has not lost its venerableness, its sanctity, its significance, either in the churches or in secular

history, for its several books are important milestones on the road of religious progress. They are documents containing evidence of how the human mind has been groping after the truth, and we learn from them how man rose higher and higher, from rung to rung, on the ascending scale of evolution.

All the civilized nations on earth possess religious books, and some of these books possess both philosophical depth and genuine piety. But the Bible contains the books of a peculiarly religious people which for centuries has identified its religion with its nationality and, whatever else we may say, has become by dint of historic facts one main strand of the intellectual ancestry of European civilization. What the Greeks are to us in art and science, the Jews have become to mankind in religion—our leaders, our spiritual ancestors. The documents of their religious endeavor in bygone ages have come down to us, as a most precious inheritance, as a holy writ, to be revered with awe and respect. Indeed, the Bible has become more truly sacred to us than it ever was. For now we understand the nature of its sanctity, while formerly our reverence was based upon a crude, indeed a pagan, conception of revelation. We have not lost the Bible. We understand it better. But we must not be blind to the change that has come upon our interpretation of its character.

This change has been fully accomplished in theological circles, but its effects have not yet reached the pews, in fact it is just now only beginning to take hold of the clergymen who stand as yet outside the pale of science, and they are the majority in the field of pastoral work. A goodly number of clergymen ignore the new conception and treat higher criticism as the product of infidelity. Some believe that there is much truth in the new theology, but they are reluctant to acknowledge the fact. Others are "on the fence" and know not how to face the problem. They are puzzled; they have heard of the change, they know that many of the traditional views have become untenable, but they do not know what to do about it. They have the best intention to adapt themselves to new conditions but feel uncertain as to what attitude to take and how far they should go in making concessions to science.

When I venture to make a few comments on this subject I have in mind mainly that class of clergymen who, just being affected by the change and feeling it as an important crisis in the development of the churches, are now confronted by the question, "What shall we use in our pastoral work of the methods and results of a scientific theology?"

The old method of dealing with such questions was to ignore the very existence of the problem, to deny the facts of the case pointblank, to denounce the scholar who discussed the difficulties as an infidel or a child of Satan. A favorite and convenient way out of the dilemma was to take refuge in agnosticism by saying that science is too human and fallible—truth itself can never be obtained, so let us stay on the safe side and believe.

The old method of suppression of the problem has been successfully applied in the Roman Church to modernism, the result being that the leaven which might have leavened the whole lump has been carefully removed and the old stagnation has been preserved; but I learn from Roman Catholics of Europe, that the end is not yet. The flames of enthusiasm in modernist circles have been quenched but the fire is still smoldering under the ashes, and what will become of it depends on many factors, the life of the present Pope<sup>1</sup> as well as the personality of his successor and also on other affairs in the social and political development of the Roman Catholic nations.

Protestant theologians, and even those clergymen who by disposition and preference are not scholars but preachers, confining themselves to the practical work of their pastoral duties, are pretty well agreed that *the problem is not to be avoided but must be faced, and that the truth should prevail.*

We know that in the end the truth *will* prevail, but we may either promote the truth or retard it; and the latter need not be the attitude of a hypocrite, at least not in the present case, because the unscientific clergyman is still in doubt whether or not he can trust the "higher critics" and how far he can accept their results when he finds that there is something in their labors where their contentions cannot be denied.

My answer to the question here raised is not intended to be of a specifically new nature, nor will I indulge in generalities, for I believe that every clergyman must for himself find the mode of adapting his pastoral work to the changes which make themselves felt through the influences of science and of higher criticism upon his way of using the Bible. His relation to his congregation is of an individual character, and the needs of the several congregations are very different. Only this is to be borne in mind, that in giving unto science what belongs to science we give to God what belongs to God. In so far as science is genuine it is divine, and the assured

<sup>1</sup> [This article was written during the pontificate of Pius X.—Ed.]

results of science are truth, which means they are a revelation of God.

The religious spirit consists in the sentiment of devotion, and our devotion may remain the same even if our dogmas and theological interpretations change under the influence of a deeper and more scientific insight. And the fostering of intellectual growth is a duty of every man.

Therefore, first of all, I would expect of every clergyman that he should endeavor to keep abreast with the progress of his profession. Every professional man, be he a physician, or an engineer, or what not, must keep posted on the new inventions in his specialty; why should the theologian deem himself exempt from a duty which is really a matter of course?

A preacher must know what the great lights of Biblical research have discovered; he ought to know what comparative religion has to say about non-Christian religions and what parallels exist between the sacred writings of other faiths and the Bible, and also how these parallels have to be explained, whether by a historic connection or on the assumption of a borrowing on either side, or whether they are due to the universal laws which determine the religious development of mankind in Asia as well as in Europe. The primitive human soul is the same, and social as well as other conditions are to a great extent also the same throughout the world. It would therefore not be astonishing to find that the decimal system of numbers has been invented independently in several parts of the globe. Why should not the Golden Rule have been proclaimed independently by prophets of different nations, in China by Confucius, in Palestine by Jesus?

There are the strangest coincidences in religious legends and doctrines where there is no possibility of a historical connection, and where the theory of borrowing is absolutely excluded. I will quote only one striking example. The Buddhist saint Shinran Shonin, the founder of the True Sect of the Pure Land who lived more than seven centuries ago (1173-1262) in Japan, insisted most vigorously on the doctrine that man can not save himself, that he must rely on another and a higher power, on Buddha, and that salvation is accomplished "by faith alone." This very formula "by faith alone" is literally the same as Luther's *sola fide*.

The influence of science upon religion appears at first sight to be negative and the first duty of a pastor is to be constructive. He has to edify—to build up—the souls of his flock; he must strengthen them in temptation, comfort them in the grief of be-

reavements, and establish them in the faith that righteousness is the only principle that can be adopted as the supreme rule of life. This is positive work, and *I see no use in preaching any negativism or dragging the controversies of scientific speculation into the pulpit*

Here the first duty is one of restraint, perhaps even of omission. A clergyman who has grown liberal and has given up many beliefs of the old tradition, should *not* say that he no longer holds this or that view, but his proclamations should be positive. He should state what he believes and on what grounds he bases his convictions. If for some special reason he feels for honesty's sake compelled to let a negative statement slip in, he should never disparage the old view which he countenances no longer, but should speak of it with the respect which is due to his father and grandfather who held these views.

In other words, it is not necessary to parade the new and more scientific theology with a demonstrative ostentation which will give offense to the old-fashioned believer. The fifth commandment does not say "Tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth even if it gives offense"; the commandment is negative, it says "Thou shalt not lie." It would be wrong for a clergyman to make statements which he no longer believes; but neither is he expected to vent the negative results of higher criticism in the pulpit. A discussion of them may be, and indeed is, in place in the advanced classes of Sunday-schools, but they are out of place in sermons. I see no harm in speaking even in the pulpit of "holy legends" when referring to Biblical stories which have since proved to be unhistorical, but that ought to be done incidentally and without emphasis, more as a matter of course, not as something novel, or heretical, and without a coquetry as evincing originality or holding advanced views.

We can summarize all these demands by the one word "tact." A clergyman ought to use tact when he speaks to the congregation about higher criticism or any other innovation of modern times. But the warning not to proclaim negative results does not mean that the positive truths of science should be concealed. On the contrary, they ought to be discussed and the congregation should become acquainted with them through their own spiritual leader. If science and dogma collide, then an explanation would be in order to show that, though the letter of the dogma be untenable, the spirit of it may be or actually is true.

The advisability of this policy of not concealing the results of comparative religion and higher criticism, was impressed upon me

twice when I had been asked to address a congregation, once on the former, the other time on the latter topic. After the lecture I met on each occasion members of the congregation who expressed their satisfaction by saying, "I heard this and that before, but I had the impression that these things militated against Christianity; now I understand them and I am satisfied that they are all right. I am no more disturbed about them."

The reason for this attitude of some people seems to be that outsiders, i. e., non-Christians or even infidels, would speak about the noble ethics of Buddhism or other topics with the outspoken intent to discredit Christianity; but if a Christian moral maxim is also held by Buddhists why should a Christian feel scandalized? An ideal does not lose its worth and dignity if it is pronounced by two prophets of different faiths in different countries at different times. On the contrary, we gain through such coincidences the assurance that these ideals are founded on the nature of cosmic conditions and that there is a probability that on other planets the religious development of rational beings would be very similar to ours. Wherever rational beings develop on other planets, their reason, their logic, their mathematics, their arithmetic, and their algebra will essentially be the same as our own, and so their moral ideals and their religious notions, yea their very Bibles, their Holy Writ will show many similarities and exhibit some close parallels in moral maxims and the expression of devotional sentiment. Details may differ but the essentials will be identical; for instance, in their arithmetic they may adopt an octonal or a duodecimal system, in case they happen to have either four or six fingers, or perhaps three, on each hand.

While theological scholars are remarkably fearless, the attitude of the clergy to-day is on the whole still dominated by an over-conservatism which fights shy of innovations, partly because they are not sufficiently acquainted with modern theology and partly because clergymen are afraid of the new light and the changes it may bring about. But there is no reason to shrink from the truth. The changes which truth brings will in the long run always be wholesome, but truth must be stated with truthfulness, which means that no sinister motives should prompt the statement, no vanity or ill will.

Truthfulness means the *subjective* state of mind of serving the cause of the truth that is *objective*. It is love of truth, and truth should be preached in the true way. There is no excuse for an untruth, still less for a lie, and a lie under all conditions will prove dangerous. Schiller and Goethe in their *Xenions* have devoted

much thought to these problems of pragmatism, and we quote here one or two of them.<sup>2</sup>

Schiller says:

“Truth that will injure  
Is dearer to me than available error,  
Truth hath a balm for the wounds  
Which she so wisely inflicts.”

Another distich reads thus:

“Whether an error will harm us?  
Not always! But certainly erring  
Always will harm us. How much,  
Friends, you will see in the end.”

Hypocrisy should not be tolerated, but for that reason truth should not be outspoken or presented with rudeness. The Germans have a saying which makes the phrase “to tell the truth” identical with giving offense and being rude, and we must bear in mind the commandment “Thou shalt not lie” does not mean to speak the truth in this sense. There is the one condition that the truth must be sought with sincerity and must then be made our own; it must prove itself to be truth by agreeing with our highest moral ideals, and when found, it must be preached with tact.

The best way to teach or preach new truths is by suggestions, and wherever there is a difference of opinion we must practise charity. Those who cling to tradition need not see in the recent changes of our belief a decay of truth. Do not class yourself in the same category with the pious Cotton Mather who was grieved at the cessation of witchburning as indicating the disappearance of the glory of God. On the other hand, those who belong to the new school of theology should be liberal and broad enough to feel in sympathy with the narrowest and most old-fashioned brother.

The religious needs of mankind remain the same, but our comprehension grows. Thus the religion of the future will in all essentials remain the same so far as the needs of our heart are concerned but it must adapt itself in externalities to the intellectual demands of the times, otherwise our religion will become inefficient. Above all we need the light of truth, of genuine scientific truth, for science or, more definitely, the well-assured results of scientific research, is “the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”

<sup>2</sup> *Goethe and Schiller's Xenions, Selected and Translated.* Open Court Publishing Co., pp. 144-147.

At present we pass through a period of a slow reformation. This slow reformation of to-day is of an intellectual nature. Its aim is not the abolition of abuses as was the case in the Reformation of the sixteenth century, but it endeavors to raise the level of our religious consciousness above the medievalism of our traditional beliefs.

We must consider that from the standpoint of the most radical science, religious notions as well as scientific conceptions follow in their growth a definite law of approximating the truth by first formulating it in myths, in parables, and in symbols before we can see the truth face to face. A fairy-tale may never have happened, it may even be impossible in itself, and yet it may be true; so a symbol, or a dogma (and all our dogmas are symbols) may be irrational in the letter and yet the meaning, the spirit of the dogma may contain the most significant truth.

Therefore I say, ye who are liberal have not yet attained the truth so long as your truth is merely negative, and so long as it does not embrace the truth of the past. As soon as you attain the positive aspect of your new truth you will find that the old view is only a prior stage of your own, of your new truth. It was merely the last station on the road to reach your present position.

Above all, we, conservatives as well as liberals, must be guided by an unshaken confidence in truth. If our God is not the God of truth, He is an illusion; let the illusion go. But if our God is the God of truth, let us not shrink from seeing even our conception of God change and grow and broaden. In a scientific age and in the minds of scientific men the conception of God will necessarily be more scientific and more philosophical. In the long run the truth will prevail. I quote from the Book of Esdras, and I am only sorry that this passage does not appear in a canonical text:

"As for the truth, it endureth, and is always strong; it liveth and conquereth for evermore.

"With her there is no acceptance of persons or rewards; but she doeth the things that are just, and refraineth from all unjust and wicked things; and all men do well like of her works.

"Neither in her judgment is any unrighteousness; and she is the strength, kingdom, power, and majesty, of all ages. Blessed be the God of truth."

In conclusion I may be pardoned for adding a few personal comments based upon my own experience. In my childhood I was a devout Christian, and all my highest, my noblest and dearest aspirations were based upon my faith,—everything centered there. I had



no alternative—either I accepted this Christian God-conception, this view of the soul, this belief in immortality, or nothing but a bare, empty, dreary nihilism was left to me. Such was the prevalent view of religious truth. But the crisis came and I found the old traditional beliefs untenable. I held out as long as there was any possibility or hope to doubt the arguments. Finally the faith of my childhood broke down and I have never recovered it. I became an unbeliever and for a time I was, or rather considered myself to be, an infidel and a despiser of religion. But in my attempts to overcome the negativism of my position, I constructed upon the facts of experience a positive world-conception with positive ideals and moral principles, and lo! I found again the devotional sentiment and the religious attitude of my childhood. The dogmas, however, and the literalism of the old view now no longer appeared to me quite redundant or objectionable, or even offensive. They had served a good purpose in their day and appeared now as prophecies of a truer and higher religion; they were not true in themselves but they were symbols of the truth. The religious devotion of my former days was not untrue, not erroneous, for its kernel was a seed full of life; but the husks might go so long as the grain remained.

Here are some lessons which I have learned.

1. I have learned to be charitable with views differing from my own. I have made it a rule not to condemn interpretations of creed or scripture simply because I don't agree with them, and to be patient even with zealots, be they infidels or bigoted believers.

2. I have learned not to fear the truth, for the truth will always be right and is the only possible basis of morality. I feel confident that every negative truth has a positive aspect, though it may sometimes be difficult to find it, or to appreciate it.

3. I deem it wise not to rush progress but to be patient.

The dogmatic stage of religion is, probably, an indispensable step in the development of religion. It seems that mankind *must* pass through this phase. In observing the religious sentiments of myself and of others, I have gradually come to the conclusion that every one has the religion he needs. For instance, a literal belief in hellfire, with plenty of brimstone and a suffocating smell of sulphur is good for many vulgar minds who do not know that the degradation of being vicious is worse than the worst conception of Sheol can be, worse than a Breughel would paint it. Nature does not create a man ready made. Man must pass through a regular development, from a mere cell through all forms and conditions, of a babe, a child, a youth; when going to school, he must rise

through the classes from degree to degree—he must not skip any of the successive degrees.

Nor must we teach the child what the child's ears are not yet fit to understand. There are different lessons to be taught to the girl of twelve and to the wife and to the matron. This consideration leads me to think that it might be wrong to remove the dogmatic phase of religion from the life of those who have not yet reached the higher and broader interpretation of panpathy, the All-feeling of the soul, which attunes our sentiments to the All-life of the universe.

Our soul must sound the right note, it must produce a melody which brings forth the noblest and best part of our inmost self, and though every soul should have a character of its own, it should be in harmony with the sound that comes from the lives of our fellow beings, and all must unite in a hymn of glorification of the whole in accordance with the eternal norm of life, with God, with that law which is the standard of truth in science, of goodness in morality, of beauty in art.

## PAUL CARUS: THE PHILOSOPHER, THE EDITOR, THE MAN.

BY LYDIA G. ROBINSON.<sup>1</sup>

DR. Paul Carus may be regarded as a philosopher in the real sense of the term in a period when there were few others in the field. Professors of philosophy there have been and are in increasing numbers, but they are professors first, well versed in the philosophies of the ages and of the age, but thinkers only secondarily, if at all. Many of these have made valuable original contributions to the specific and allied sciences of ontology, psychology, sociology, and the rest, but Dr. Carus dealt with the fundamentals of all sciences, the philosophy of science, the science of philosophy. His hypothesis of monism, his unitary world-conception, provided the simplest basis from which to solve the age-old problems of time and space, of God and the soul, without falling into the fallacies and crudities which some others who have followed the standard of monism have deduced from similar premises.

Because one central kernel in Buddhism, in the pure form ascribed to its founder, seemed to Dr. Carus to contain a truth over-

<sup>1</sup> Editorial assistant to Dr. Carus, 1905-1917.