

fore assembled. Captain Francis Petrie, the honorary secretary, read the report, showing that the number of home, colonial and American members and associates now reached twelve hundred. Lord Grimthorpe; Sir William Dawson, K.C.M.G., F.R.S.; Sir W. Warington Smyth, F.R.S.; Sir Monier Williams, F.R.S.; Sir Joseph Fayrer, K.S.I., F.R.S.; Sir J. Risdon Bennett, F.R.S.; Professors Max Müller, F.R.S., Maspero, F.R.S., Hull, F.R.S., McKenny Hughes, and Cowall, of Cambridge; Tristram, Leitner, Rhys Davids and numerous others, had contributed to the papers read during the session in furtherance of the Institute's work of investigating all philosophical and scientific questions, including those bearing upon the truth of revelation, and its journal has now been made more valuable than ever.

The president, in his address, said the highest aim of physical science was, as far as might be possible, to refer observed phenomena to their proximate causes. He by no means said that this was the immediate, or even necessarily the ultimate, object of every physical investigation. Sometimes their object was to investigate facts, or to co-ordinate known facts and endeavour to discover empirical laws. These were useful as far as they went, and might ultimately lead to the formation of theories, which, in the end, should stand the test of what he might call cross-examination by nature that we became impressed with the conviction of their truth. Sometimes their object was the determination of numerical constants, with a view, it might be, to the practical application of science to the wants of life. In scientific investigation they endeavoured to ascend from observed phenomena to their proximate causes. But when they had arrived at these, the question presented itself, Could we, in a similar manner, regard these causes, in turn, as themselves the consequence of some cause stretching still further back in the chain of causation till a time well on in the past? Science conducted us to a void which she could not further fill. It was on other grounds that we were led to believe in a Being who was the Author of Nature. The subject-matter of scientific study was not at least directly theistic, and there had been a few instances of eminent scientists who not merely reject Christianity, but apparently did not as yet believe in the being of a God. The religious man, on the other hand, who knew little or nothing of science, was in the habit of contemplating the order of nature, not merely as the work of God, but in very great measure as His direct work. But when we got beyond the region of what was familiarly known, still more when we got outside the limits of well-ascertained scientific conclusions, and entered a region at a still debatable ground, when men of science were attempting to push forward, and were framing hypotheses with a view to the ultimate establishment of a theory in case those hypotheses

should stand the test of thorough examination, a man such as he had supposed might feel as if the scientists who were attempting to explore it were treading on holy ground; and he might mentally charge them with irreverence, perhaps he might openly speak of them in a manner which implied that he attributed to them an intention of opposing revealed religion. The primary object of the establishment of the Institute was to examine questions as to which there was a *prima facie* appearance of conflict between the conclusions of science and the teachings of religion. Scientific investigation was eminently truthful. The investigator might be wrong, but it did not follow that he was other than truth loving. If on some subjects which we deemed of the highest importance he did not agree with us, let us, remembering our own imperfections both of understanding and of practice, bear in mind that caution of the apostle, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth." The Institute fully recognised that between Science, rightly understood, and Revelation, rightly understood, there was no opposition; if an apparent discrepancy should arise, we have no right, on principle, to exclude either in favour of the other; for however firmly convinced we might be of the truth of Revelation, we must admit our liability to err as to the extent or interpretation of what is revealed; and however strong the scientific evidence in favour of a theory might be, we must admit that we are dealing with evidence which in its nature is probable only, and it is conceivable that wider scientific knowledge might lead us to alter our opinion. Again, it was impossible for the bulk of our populations to weigh the evidence of what are stated to be the conclusions of science, they take them on trust; and if scientific conjectures are represented to them as the conclusions of science they are predisposed, knowing what science had done, to accept them as true. It is quite possible a stumblingblock might thus be placed in the way of religious belief, for though the fundamental idea of the unity of truth involved, as an axiom, the absence of antagonism between true science and Revelation, yet we had no such guarantee respecting scientific conjecture. As dangers arose from a separation of science from Revelation, and an ignoring of one of the two modes of arriving at truth, these dangers were best guarded against by recognizing both as coming, in different ways, from the Author of our being.

BALTIMORE has about 300 churches, chapels and synagogues. As to communicants, the Roman Catholic Church stands first, the Methodist second, the Lutheran third, the Baptist fourth, the Presbyterian fifth, and the Jewish sixth. The population of the city is about 410,000. Of this, 120,000 is Roman Catholic, 210,000 Protestant, and 80,000 unevangelized.