

tony, drink, lust, gambling, and prize-fights. The philosopher is answered.

Little space remains to me for unmasking the evil tendencies of other sensualistic, expediency, and utilitarian philosophies. The reader must take hints. Their common key-note is: *no a priori*, common, ruling intuitions of necessary, rational truths, either logical or moral. *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*. Very well! Neither spirit nor God is cognized by any sense-faculty. Therefore, philosophy should know nothing about either. Secondly, the concept of the moral good, or virtuousness in actions, is not cognized by any sense-faculty. Is it seen as a fine color, smelled as a perfume, heard with the ears as a harmony, tasted with the mouth as a savor, felt with the fingers as satin or velvet? No. Then philosophy should know nothing about it. It should say there are no such things in the soul as distinctly ethical feelings; nothing but sensitive ones and their combinations. For mind can only feel as it sees; where it sees nothing it should feel nothing. Then there are two results; there is no science of ethics, nothing but a psychology of sensibilities, which being merely personal, there is no source for any altruism; it is a silly fiction. And, next, since the sensibilities are only moved by objective causes, there is no free agency. Look and see. Hume was logical in becoming fatalist and atheist. So Hobbes, the father of modern sensualism.

Finally, there is a modern class of professed religionists who seem to regard Mill, Darwin, Spencer, and Huxley as very apostles of philosophy (why, we know not); and when thereafter proclaiming their agnosticism, add, that they still leave room for religion; that while religion has no standing-ground in philosophy, she may be admitted in the sphere of feeling. Our pious neighbors are very thankful! This is the "advanced thought" destined to sweep everything before it; and we are so grateful that it still leaves us a corner for our dear religion! But common sense says: "Thank you for nothing, Messrs. Agnostics. You have not left any corner for our precious religion. Better speak out as honest atheists. The universal law of mind is that it can only feel normally as it sees intelligently. Where there is no logical ground for credence, there should be no source for feeling."

In truth, they let me keep my religion at the price of turning fool!

II.—THE DEFECTIVE LOGIC OF THE RATIONALISTIC CRITICS.

By REV. A. J. F. BEHREND, D.D., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

RATIONALISM is a word of very vague meaning. It is used as a term of reproach, and as a badge of superiority. In philosophy, it is employed with more precision than it is in theology. In the science