

sciences of nature, the rupture between the religious and secular consciousness to which Plato and Aristotle first called attention has continued to become more severe. Men, it is true—the majority of them at least—have not ceased to respond to the

“Sweet strange mystery,
Of what beyond these things may lie,
And yet remain unseen ;”

yet they are far from denying what Prof. Caird calls “the broken harmony of the spiritual life.” In many minds the conflict between the scientific and the religious consciousness seems never to arise. When it does arise, the only course open inevitably seems to involve the surrender, “either of his intellectual honesty, or of that higher consciousness which alone makes life worth living.” It is just here that the existence of philosophy is justifiable. Its supreme task has ever been, and is now more than ever before, the reconciliation of man to himself.

Philosophy has been named the mother of the sciences ; and only by slow degrees did there come to be separate sciences. Now it is their fashion to dispute her supremacy, yet she must not forego what is her privilege and her duty—that of being their critic, and therein their inspiration. *Divide et impera* is the motto of science, and the scientific specialist, finding a hypothesis suited to the explanation of the phenomena which he examines, is under the continual temptation of making use of it as a measuring line of all existence. The task of philosophy is to examine into the hypothesis made use of, and to understand it—see it in its relation to the whole of things. This becomes embodied in a system which in its turn gradually becomes the mental possession—the common belief and life of men. As Browning in another connection says, “it dies, revives, goes to work in the world.” Philosophy is thus the synthesis of science, but through a higher medium than the sciences themselves explicitly recognize. The science specialist will regard philosophy as a greater superstition than religion, and religion often looks upon it as a disease worse than science, and, as they say, without the practical value of the latter. Philosophy must let both have their way, and continue its task, with neither the hopelessness of the one, nor the indifference of the other—the criticism of science, and the explication of religion. Intellectual or moral progress in the nation, as in the individual, is possible