

Now if we look at European thought as a whole, and do not lose ourselves in the particular sequences which such thought has exhibited in separate schools and countries, we make what to some may be a startling discovery—viz., that many, if not the whole, of the arguments which have been lucidly put forward on the religious problem by philosophical thinkers in this country during the last generation had already been used, or at least suggested, by French thinkers in the earlier part of the nineteenth century. That the impression they then made was purely national and did not attain to European importance is explained by various circumstances. One of these was similar to that just mentioned in connection with Mr Mallock's writings :

long list of writings analysed and discussed by Prof. Caldecott takes no notice of Mallock. In fact, philosophy of Religion was still, at the end of the nineteenth century, somewhat in the same position as philosophy of Nature was in the beginning. At that time the only thinker who went to natural philosophy itself in order to build up a philosophy of nature was Fries. Not to speak of the Idealists, even Herbart, the leader in "exact" philosophy, had a very imperfect knowledge of the principles of scientific research. And it was not till Lotze that a professional student of the mechanical and biological sciences, an expert in the handling of their methods, undertook to deal with the problems involved in scientific as well as religious thought. Since his time a number of philosophers, especially in Germany, have come from the ranks of scientific experts, and have met with increasing attention and appreciation. The names

of Helmholtz, du Bois Reymond, Kirchhoff, Wundt, Ostwald, Mach, and Haeckel, and their writings, are now familiar to students of philosophy. Yet the same fair treatment is not, in general, awarded to thinkers who come from the opposite region of human thought which we may term the religious, or with Mr Balfour, the theological. Whereas professional students of nature are not any longer considered to be, as such, disqualified to treat philosophical problems, many thinkers with distinct religious convictions are looked upon with suspicion and as intruders in the domain of pure thought. The dread of the scientific bias has disappeared, but not, in the same degree, that of the theological bias ; and we meet still with a discussion of religious questions by philosophers who, so far as one can learn, occupy no definite religious position whatever, nor take any part in the religious work of human society.