

carry out their principles to the logical end, and thus destroy, as they thought, revealed religion.

Whatever prejudices Hume may have had, they were not theological, perhaps the reverse. In him we find the true philosophical spirit of rationalism which, regardless of consequences, inquires concerning the foundation of all knowledge, and is determined to accept the results, no matter how contrary they may be to received opinions. His problem and method was much the same as that of Locke. He saw the weakness of both Locke and Berkeley in the conclusions they had drawn from their sensational data. It has been said that both these continually introduced, inconsistently, intellectual elements, and it was only because of this they succeeded in retaining certain knowledge.

Hume accordingly endeavored to find in experience some other principles which would take the place of Locke's mental elements. The pivot of his empirical system is his doctrine of Causation based upon the association of ideas. Inheriting Locke's definition of knowledge, viz., the perception of agreement or disagreement between ideas, he inquired as to what relations could exist between ideas, and of these relations he found that from only one, viz., causation, could anything be inferred not already present to the mind. He accordingly seeks to discover from experience the nature of the idea of causation. From his investigation he concludes that a cause is an object precedent and contiguous to another, and so united with it that the idea of the one determines the mind to form the idea of the other, and the impression of the one to form a more lively idea of the other; and accordingly he concludes that such a relation can never be an object of reasoning, and can never operate on the mind but by means of custom, which determines the imagination to make a transition from the idea of one object to the idea of its usual attendant, and from the impression to the more lively idea of the other.

It is possible this is the only doctrine of Cause that can be given on strictly empirical grounds. It differs radically from that of Locke and Berkeley, which is that which produces some change or that which operates so as to produce something, on which principle everything that begins to exist is regarded as caused by something.

In harmony with his doctrine of causation, Hume differs from Locke and Berkeley on many important points. Locke, as we