

haired sages had set up an empire over bi-valves and rhizopods and rhododendrons and silicates and planets for the express purpose of justifying men in drunkenness, adultery, gambling, and corrupting the elective franchise. It is due, therefore, to Science itself, to the men who have nobly devoted their lives and fortunes to its pursuit, as well as to the interests of truth in general, that an adequate definition of Science be given to the world if that has not been already done.

Now it may be that such a definition has been published; but if so, the writer in his researches has not been able to discover it as coming authoritatively from the British Association. I make bold to ask, therefore, what objection any man of science would take to the definition of Sir William Hamilton,—the only man who has added anything of importance to the Science of Logic since the days of Aristotle—"Science," says Hamilton, "is a complement of cognitions having, in point of form, the character of logical perfection and, in point of matter, the character of real truth." Or, translated into popular language, science is the systematic arrangement of ascertained facts and of legitimate inferences from those facts. The materials of science, therefore, are *facts* and *inferences* from facts. The facts must be certified and the inferences must be warranted by the facts. The process of science must be in accordance with the known laws of mind and the materials of science, determined by the criteria of truth. If these remarks are well founded, and I am unable to conceive of any proper objection that can be urged against them, then it follows that guesses and perhapses and working hypotheses are not of the essential nature of science. They may serve the same purpose in relation to science that scaffolding does to a building in course of erection, but they do not enter into the proper conception of science any more than the scaffolding forms a part of the dwelling or the temple.

If, then, the proper notion of Science be that it is concerned with facts and the inferences which they warrant, I ask by what authority is *Theology* excluded from the programme of the British Association for the advancement of Science? For Theology is concerned with materials precisely analogous to the materials of Chemistry or Botany or Geology or Biology. It contemplates facts. It undertakes to draw inferences from those facts. It deals with matters professedly of transcendent importance. It is not the "Science of sciences" in the sense that Logic is, but it is the Science of sciences by way of eminence. Its materials are of universal occurrence—so far as this world is concerned, at least. They are of universal interest. "The angels desire to look into them." It is not a *new* enterprise. It is the oldest of sciences. From every point of view its claim to recognition is amply sustained. *It deals with facts*. It begins with the "existence of God"—a fact. He who denies it writes himself a fool—a fool because he displays an insensibility to the force of evi-