

II. *Examination of the Theory.* We must refrain from offering criticisms on the general principles of Spencer's philosophy further than to say that we are convinced that his system although very ambitious does not by any means meet the conditions demanded by a true and adequate philosophy. In this case the theory he sets forth to explain the religious consciousness can have no greater validity than the principles of the philosophy on which it rests. A strong waggon on a weak bridge is as liable to break through as a weak one on the same bridge. The following critical considerations are now offered in regard to Spencer's agnostic explanation of the origin of religion.

1. *Spencer's notion of man's double or second self is quite unscientific.* A man's shadow is surely one thing and his soul or spirit another, and the difference between them is so marked that even a rude savage would not be likely to confound them. Then in dreams, if anything sallies forth on excursions it is the person, the real self, the only self there is, which goes forth and returns to the body, so that there are not two selves but a body and a spirit constituting the person one self. At death also the real self departs from its bodily dwelling place to another scene of being and activity. It is not correct, therefore, to say that man has a *double*. It is unscientific to speak of a second self, for personality is unitary and indivisible. It is exceedingly unlikely that even rude primitive man would so mix up his own identity or the identity of his kindred as to come to entertain the views that Spencer puts into his hand. All the facts and customs to which Spencer refers can be far more reasonably and completely explained by supposing that the early belief in immortality as connected with religion lies back of all these beliefs and practices.

2. *The theory is far-fetched and disjointed.* It abounds in suppositions and far-fetched inferences. The primitive man whom Spencer finds so useful for his theory is so far removed from us in time that almost any supposition can be safely made concerning him. The whole theory is so much of a *may be* one that it cannot claim in any sense to be philosophical. It is not even a plausible theory in view of the facts. Its evidence consists chiefly of curious scraps of information gathered from the religious beliefs and observances of savage tribes in modern or recent historical times, and no definite information is given in regard to what the religious beliefs of primitive man really were. It is, therefore, at best an elaborate