

intelligible to man? This leads Romanes to say that the theory of evolution leaves religion untouched, for it declares nature to be an "orderly cosmos." Science must abandon it there. How comes it that there can be an orderly cosmos? Religion answers, because it was created by a personal God. This to my mind is the very heart of the ontological problem. When I say this is an orderly universe, I mean that it is intelligible to me as a thinking person. How can it be intelligible unless it is the work of an intelligence like mine? Philosophy joins science here. "That word 'orderly' is absurd unless you postulate mind as the basis of it." Religion in its highest form says to both: "Him whom ye cannot find I declare unto you. Who can search out the Almighty to perfection? The only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father He hath revealed Him."

The next stage in his treatment is to consider whether nature throws any light upon the character of God. When he wrote these essays Romanes saw nature only "red in tooth and claw" without any trace of the moral quality of its Founder. This position he afterwards modified as his conception of God grew more religious and he looked upon nature teleologically. Who is to be the judge of the immorality and cruelty of nature? Who is to say that struggle is immoral? Surely not one who has not taken fully into account the final purpose of all things. The soldier driven back by some stunning charge may find confusion and nothing but confusion in the carnage of the *mêlée*, but the general on the heights knows how the battle is to move, and may send reinforcements to his baffled but faithful officer. Belief in his general brings him through his discomfiture. So too Romanes, afterwards saw that there is a divine ministry in suffering. Even nature is not all loveless for the religious man.

Our author wrote the notes which follow these articles apparently in the summer of last year—shortly before his death. In these he examines religion, and by this he means orthodox Christianity, from the standpoint of a "pure" agnostic. By "pure" agnosticism he understands with Professor Huxley, "an attitude of reasoned ignorance touching everything that lies beyond the sphere of sense-perception." Many men such as Herbert Spencer are "impure" agnostics, which accounts for the dogmatic and arrogant tone of much contemporary science towards religion.