

the two essays on the *Influence of Science on Religion*. His definition of Religion is:—

“That department of thought having exclusive reference to the ultimate. More particularly it is a department of thought, having for its object a self-conscious and intelligent Being which it regards as a Personal God, and the fountain-head of all causation * * * The problem of science is to discover the fewest number of phenomenal data, which being granted, will explain the phenomena of experience. Its aims and methods are exclusively concerned with the ascertaining and the proof of the proximate How of things and processes physical. Religion, on the other hand, is not in any way concerned with causation further than to assume that all things and all processes are ultimately due to intelligent personality.”

When these two departments are kept in their proper position there is no need of any conflict at all. If it be asked, what is the cause of such an event, it is from a scientific point of view simply no explanation at all to say that God has brought it to pass. This is the religious or ultimate explanation involving the assumption of a personal original source. The scientific man asks for that set of conditions which is and has been, so far as observed, the invariable antecedent of this event. Such an explanation of course is only a step or two backward, but it moves in the reign of phenomena, and is scientific. It seems to me that the distinction here drawn is quite valid and holds for philosophy as well as science. The God postulated by science or philosophy is a mere hypothesis to explain things as we observe them—in the one case so much force, in the other the Absolute. Both are utterly devoid of the moral element, being consequently worlds away from the religious conception of God as the personal source of all things.

Has religion then not been affected by the methods of science? This leads Mr. Romanes to an examination of the argument from design in its classic Paleyan form. This argument was based on the theory of special creation, according to which each particular species was supposed to have been individually designed by divine intervention. Romanes insists that modern science takes no account of such a theory, but by its doctrine of evolution and its reign of natural law, examines phenomena and explains them as the result of natural causes in an almost infinite chain of events. But when the dark womb of the hypothetical fire-vapour has been explored, the furthest limit has not yet been reached, for how comes it that the universe has issued from that darksome brilliancy in an *orderly* evolution