

Theology on the *Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

VOL. XI.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

evidences of its prowess, its arts, its culture, and its civilization. We cannot yet say how far any of these have flowed into new channels, or moulded and affected any subsequent peoples, or whether its works perished with it. One thing we do know, that with all that the Hittites possessed in advance of their less cultured contemporaries, their religion, which seems to have been in no wise endemic, but appropriated from the worst features of Babylonian, Phœnician, and latterly Egyptian idolatry, included the most immoral and licentious cult of Astaroth and Baal worship, and brought down on them the vengeance of heaven. To us by far the most important results of the researches set forth in this volume, and for which all Christendom owes a debt to Dr. Wright, is the proof from Egyptian and Assyrian records, and from Hittite monuments, that in every single instance in which the nation is mentioned in Scripture, we have now contemporary and incontrovertible side-evidence from independent authorities, of the perfect harmony of every allusion in Holy Writ with the existing condition of the political world at that period.

H. B. TRISTRAM.



ART. VI.—"NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD."

IT is an ungracious task to attempt a criticism of any effort made by one who manifestly desires to maintain the truth, or to say one word to discourage the enthusiasm with which such an effort has been received by the Christian world. But we know that error is never so dangerous as when it is floated, if I may so speak, by truth. There are many statements made which, if they stood alone, would startle the Christian reader; but which, if found in the midst of a great deal of admirable matter, attract but little attention, and are allowed to pass without discussion.

I believe this to be the case with that exceedingly interesting book, "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." I am not in the least surprised at the enthusiasm with which that book has been received. It is written in a most agreeable style. It contains a discussion of one of the most engrossing subjects of the day—viz., the connection between Science and Christianity; and it abounds in most interesting and profitable illustrations, derived from the analogy of scientific theory with spiritual life. In the chapter on "Biogenesis," the writer makes most powerful use of the truth established by science, that life cannot be produced except from life. And in the six chapters

which he specifies as being of a practical character—viz., "Degeneration," "Growth," "Mortification," "Conformity to Type," "Semi-parasitism," and "Parasitism," he brings out in a very interesting manner most important practical lessons, which Christians would do well to lay very seriously to heart. If the book is intended to convince scientific men of the truth of the Gospel, those chapters appear to me completely beside the mark; but if they are intended for the instruction and edification of believers, they contain, beyond all doubt, a very attractive contribution to the experimental literature of the day.

Having said so much in favour of the book, it may seem an ungracious thing to state objections; and those who have read it with both interest and profit may very naturally be unwilling to have their enjoyment disturbed by any notice of the unsatisfactory character of some of the principles from which the practical instruction is derived, and still more of the great fundamental theory on which the whole is founded. But still, if there is error, it ought to be known; and if there are dangerous principles taught in it, the greater the attractiveness of the book, the greater the importance of their exposure.

Now, there are some things taught in this book against which, I believe, the Christian man should be prepared to make his most determined protest.

(1) One of these is "the evolution hypothesis." This runs throughout the book; and if there were the slightest doubt of this being the case, the author has completely removed it on p. 400, when he describes "the evolution hypothesis" as "the greatest of modern scientific doctrines," and in his last chapter (p. 404), in which he describes his work as an "attempt to incorporate the spiritual kingdom in the scheme of evolution." There can be no doubt, therefore, that the "evolution hypothesis" is accepted by him as a truth; and we need not go far to be convinced that it is made the basis of some of his most powerful passages.

Thus, in accordance with his evolution theory, he ascribes to animals both the choice of their place in life, and their adaptation to the sphere which they have decided on choosing. Thus moles are described as having chosen to live underground; and their physical structure is said to have been changed in conformity with their choice. In p. 110 he tells us as a scientific fact, that "there are certain burrowing animals—the mole, for instance—which have taken to spending their lives beneath the surface of the ground, and nature has taken revenge on them in a thoroughly natural way—she has closed their eyes." So, in his very entertaining account of the hermit-crab, which lives in the cast-off shell of

another fish, the author informs us that "there is no doubt that the habit is an acquired one"—that "the hermit-crab was not always an hermit-crab;" and that "it is clear, from the whole structure of the animal, that it has allowed itself to undergo severe degeneration."

Now all this, though very entertaining, is mere imagination. It is not science, but theory. Neither Mr. Drummond nor Mr. Darwin has the least evidence for such a statement. They do not know that the moles were once living above ground, and then, as a united family, changed their habits, and lived altogether below. They do not know that the hermit-crab ever possessed the organs which Mr. Drummond says it has lost. They do not know, even according to the evolution hypothesis, that the moles are not becoming anxious to enjoy the light, and gradually forming eyes for themselves, in order that they may give up burrowing and walk about the fields in the sunshine. Mr. Drummond does not know that the hermit-crab is a degenerate descendant of the common crab, any more than he knows that the common crab is not the descendant of some ambitious and pugnacious hermit, who preferred a soldier's life to the peaceful repose of literary leisure. As it is the usual hypothesis of evolutionists, that the more complex organization arises out of the inferior, Mr. Drummond would be more consistent with his own principles if he were to maintain that the hermit was the ancestor of the common crab. But he has not the slightest evidence for either one theory or the other, or the slightest proof of any kind whatever that the moles, the fish, and the crabs were not created as they are by the skilful hand of God Himself, and carefully adapted by Him to the life which He intended them to live.

So far, indeed, does he carry this evolution theory, that he applies it even to plants, and describes them as having purposes of their own, and modifying their structure in order to secure their attainment. In p. 392 he says: "Certain organisms in one kingdom assume, for purposes of their own, the outward form of organisms belonging to another. This curious hypocrisy is practised both by plants and animals, the object being to secure some personal advantage, usually safety, which would be denied were the organism always to play its part in nature in *propria persona*."

This is not the only passage in which Mr. Drummond connects evolution with moral, or rather, immoral principles. He actually says of the *sacculina* (p. 344): "It shrunk from the struggle of life, and beginning probably by seeking shelter from its host, went on to demand its food; and so, falling from bad to worse, became in time an entire dependant. In

the eyes of nature this was a twofold crime. It was, first, a disregard of evolution; and second, which is practically the same thing, an evasion of the great law of work." All this may be intended for no more than an attempt at witty writing; but whether it be or not, one thing is perfectly clear—namely, that he ascribes both the position and structure both of the plant and the animal to its own immoral conduct, and completely sets aside all those complex adaptations by the hand of God in which, with the most wonderful skill, He has perfectly adapted every part of every plant and every animal to the sphere for which He has created it.

But I grieve to say that Mr. Drummond goes farther still. It is sometimes argued that the doctrine of evolution does not deny creation, and, in cautious hands, I believe that this may be true; for I quite admit that to create a germ which should have the power of evolving itself, according to its own selection, into any one of the countless organizations abounding through the world, and that before it had ever seen any one of them, would have been quite as great an act of creative omnipotence as to have created all these organisms by unlimited creative skill. It would be perfectly possible, therefore, on the evolution theory, to believe reverently in the creation of such a germ. But how does the germ itself come into existence? That is the question. Is it the result of some atoms that evolved themselves into the germ? or was it created? To this question the answer in Holy Scripture is decisive. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." But this answer Mr. Drummond virtually contradicts; and I grieve to say that he takes up precisely the position of the Secularists, and says, without the slightest qualification (p. 297), "*Ex nihilo nihil*—nothing can be made out of nothing. Matter is *uncreatable* and indestructible; Nature and man can only form and transform." Now we all agree that there is no natural process by which man can make anything out of nothing; but we do not on that account believe that matter is "*uncreatable*," for we believe it to be included in the "*all things*" of Scripture, when it says: "He created all things by Jesus Christ."

(2) It is in perfect harmony with this that Mr. Drummond appears to ascribe the present continuous creation to life rather than to God.

In his chapter on "Conformity to Type," there is a very interesting account of protoplasms, or the germs from which each living organism springs. It is stated that the protoplasms of all living creatures are so much alike as to be undistinguishable by any known tests. Then follows (p. 290) a most remarkable passage from Huxley:

Strange possibilities lie dormant in that semi-fluid globule. Let a moderate supply of warmth reach its watery cradle, and the plastic matter undergoes changes so rapid and yet so purposeful in their succession, that one can only compare them to those operated by a skilled modeller upon a formless lump of clay. As with an invisible trowel the mass is divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller portions, until it is reduced to an aggregation of granules not too large to build withal the finest fabrics of the nascent organism. And then it is as if a delicate finger traced out the line to be occupied by the spinal column, and moulded the contour of the body . . . in so artistic a way, that, after watching the process hour by hour, one is almost involuntarily possessed by the notion that some more subtle aid to vision than an achromatic would show the hidden artist, with his plan before him, striving with skilful manipulation to perfect his work.

Who, then, is this artist? The author fully acknowledges (p. 303) that the Artist of spiritual life is the Lord Jesus Christ; but who is the artist that constructs the varied forms of nature? His answer is given on (p. 292), "The Artist who operates upon matter in this subtle way, and carries out this law, is Life." Life, then, is supposed to be invested with the powers of design, arrangement, and construction. Against this we should urge no objection, if by "Life," was intended the creating Person who is described in Holy Scripture as "The Life." But the author renders any such application of his words impossible, for he adds, "There are a great many different kinds of life. If one might give the broader meaning to the words of the Apostle: 'All life is not the same life. There is one kind of life of men, another life of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.' There is the Life, or the Artist, or the Potter who segments the worm, the potter who forms the dog, the potter who moulds the man." Oh! why did not Mr. Drummond, as a Christian advocate, take Huxley at his word, and tell us at once of the great Artificer? Why did he not tell him that we know that invisible Designer? Why did he not remind him of the Scripture, "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men?" And why did he not remind him of the truly philosophical words in the Book of Ecclesiastes, "As thou knowest not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child; even so thou knowest not the works of God *Who maketh all*"?

(3) He appears to teach that there is no future life for any but those who are in union with the Lord Jesus Christ. I say "appears to teach" because he does not make the statement in so many words, and I am well aware that it is not right to hold a writer responsible for the conclusions which appear to follow from his premisses. I will therefore simply state his argument, and leave it to the reader to decide how far I am right in my conclusion. His first point is that "Science meets the entire conception of immortality, with a direct negative" (p. 222) and in

support of this assertion he gives various quotations. From Büchner: "Unprejudiced philosophy is compelled to reject the idea of an individual immortality, and of a personal continuance after death." From Vogt: "Physiology decides definitely and categorically against individual immortality, as against any special existence of the soul." From Mr. Graham: "Such is the argument of science, seemingly decisive against a future life." And afterwards (p. 235) he adds a quotation from Reuss with apparent approval, in which the probability of a future resurrection is denied, as well as the indestructibility of the soul. "In fact, it can dispense both with the philosophical thesis of the immateriality or indestructibility of the human soul, and with the theological thesis of a miraculous corporeal reconstruction of our person, theses the first of which is altogether foreign to the religion of the Bible, and the second absolutely opposed to reason."

Mr. Drummond then proceeds to show what in his mind is the true theory of eternal life, and he describes it as consisting in a perfect correspondence with a perfect environment, or, to adopt his own words, "A correspondence which can never break with an environment which can never change." From this he concludes that if man is to inherit eternal life, he must "cultivate a correspondence with the eternal," after which he shows what he means by the eternal, and by the correspondence with it. "This incarnation is God making Himself accessible to human thought—God opening to man the possibility of correspondence through Jesus Christ. And this correspondence, and this environment, are those I seek. He Himself assures me 'This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.'" According to this passage, it appears perfectly plain that the environment is the Lord Jesus Christ, and the correspondence the knowledge of Him. Where this correspondence exists we are taught that there is eternal life, and that the only effect of death is the separation of the correspondences which are temporal from those which are eternal, or "the abandonment of the non-eternal elements." Such, as far as I can understand it, is the argument of the chapter on Eternal Life; and though I would not presume to affirm that such was the intention of the author, it does appear to me to be perfectly clear that the whole argument is based on the idea that for all those who are not in the enjoyment of this correspondence, or this union with the Lord Jesus Christ, there is no future of the soul, no resurrection, no coming judgment, and, in short, no existence after death. I should be exceedingly sorry to misrepresent the teaching of any writer, especially of one who I believe has written his book in the real desire of maintaining

the truth. I should be only too glad, therefore, to believe that in the passages just quoted, he is stating the opinions of others, without adopting them as his own. But he does not say so in the book, and, however greatly he may disapprove of the words which he quotes, he never gives to his readers the slightest intimation of his disapproval. So far, indeed, is he from expressing any disagreement, that he appears to maintain that the only way of meeting the assertion that there is no future existence after death, is by the assertion that there is an eternal life for those who are brought into a new life through a never-dying union with a never-dying Saviour, an argument which certainly appears to teach that for the rest of mankind there is no future state at all. Thus he appears to go even beyond those who deny what they call "natural immortality," for he seems to deny all existence after death, either natural or supernatural, to all those who are not alive in Christ Jesus their Saviour. To all who are not in the enjoyment of this new life the author appears to refer when he says, "Emotion, volition, thought itself, are functions of the brain. When the brain is impaired, they are impaired. When the brain is not, they are not. Everything ceases with the dissolution of the material fabric; muscular activity and mental activity perish alike" (p. 222). How he reconciles this with the language of Scripture I am at a loss to discover.

(4) But these things are, as it were, on the surface, and none of them are essential to either the object or the principle of the book. But both object and principle are of such a character as I cannot but think ought, if carefully studied, to occasion the gravest anxiety in those whose desire it is to be established in the truth.

That the author himself is in great perplexity respecting the spiritual world is clear from his language. In p. 6, he describes the natural world as "a cosmos," as if it were in order; but the spiritual kingdom as "a chaos," as if it were nothing but confusion. And in p. 26, he states distinctly "the spiritual world as it stands is full of perplexity. One can escape doubt only by escaping thought. With regard to many important articles of religion, perhaps the best and wisest course open to a doubter is simple credulity." These passages may serve to explain his object. That object is, to establish a faith on "a scientific basis" (p. 14), to satisfy "the scientific demand of the age." And if we desire to know what that demand is, we may find it explained in p. 26: "The old ground of faith, Authority, is given up; the new, Science, has not yet taken its place. Men did not require to see truth before; they only needed to believe it. Truth, therefore, had not been put by Theology in a seeing form—which, however,

was its original form. But now they ask to see it." But what is meant by thus seeing? How is it to be done? No one supposes that we can look into the spiritual world, and there see what is invisible; but the theory of this book is that the natural laws are the same as the spiritual, and therefore exhibit the true character of spiritual life. It is maintained that the two classes of law are not related by analogy, but are the same; that there is only one set of laws for the material and spiritual world, and that these same laws govern both kingdoms. "The position we have been led to take up is not that the spiritual laws are analogous to the natural laws, but that they are the same laws. It is not a question of analogy, but of identity." And again: "The natural laws, as the laws of continuity might well warn us, do not stop with the visible, and then give place to a new set of laws bearing a strong similitude to them. The laws of the invisible are the same laws, projections of the natural—not supernatural Laws which at one end, as it were, may be dealing with matter; at the other end, with spirit" (p. 11). From this we may learn what it is that we are to see. We are to see in science the physical, or visible, or material end of any law; and from seeing that we are to know the spiritual and invisible. It is one law that governs both kingdoms; and if we see one end, we may know the other, and so have a scientific basis of faith.

Now, I venture to maintain that this theory is both unscientific and unscriptural; that it can land us in nothing but utter uncertainty; and, above all, that we do not require it for the confirmation of the faith.

It is unscientific, for science teaches us that in nature there are great departments of knowledge, distinct from each other, and governed by distinct laws. There are laws relating to matter; laws relating to life; and laws relating to morals; and these are distinct from each other. A person learned in physical science may be able to explain the laws of gravitation, light, and electricity; but know nothing, and be able to learn nothing, from all his scientific knowledge of the nature of life, or of the power of the will over his own hand. It would be just as reasonable, or as scientific, to maintain that every good mathematician must be a good classical scholar, or that every electrician must be well versed in moral philosophy, as to maintain that an acquaintance with the laws of matter can give an insight into the laws of spiritual life.

But still more is it unscriptural. It is a grand mistake to affirm that believers have given up faith in authority; for our Lord "spake as one that had authority," and it is on the authority of His Word that we peacefully trust. Nothing can

be clearer than that this is the teaching of Scripture. Our Lord had no need to argue like Socrates; but it was enough for Him to say, "Verily, verily, I say unto you." So St. Paul, that deep thinker, was not ashamed to acknowledge his dependence on Divine communication, when he quoted Isaiah in the words, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God has prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, and deep things of God." We do not, therefore, join in the demand for something we can see, but we would rather live "as seeing Him Who is invisible." We are not in the least afraid of fearlessly testing by all admitted laws of evidence, the evidence for the Divine authority of revelation; but, having done so, we accept the authority of the Divine, and do not forget the words of our Saviour, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." If Agnostics reject that authority, and demand something that they can see, we are sorry for them, but we cannot help it. We cannot leave our own sure ground to meet them half-way. We believe that the great blessings of the spiritual life are well known by the happy experience of those to whom that life is given; but we do not believe that they can be discovered by any investigations in physical science, or by the extension of physical laws into the spiritual world, for we are taught by authority to believe that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Again, these principles will land us in miserable uncertainty. For what is this certainty that is to supplement the uncertainties of the authority of Divine revelation? Mr. Drummond has given us some specimens, such as the assertions that the moles chose to go and live underground, and the hermit crabs gave up their natural habits and chose to inhabit shells. Are these, I ask, facts more certain than the authority of Scripture? He has also written some beautiful things about life, and surely on a subject of such vital importance we may look for this much-vaunted certainty of science. If there is any subject respecting which we require certainty it is surely eternal life; and with the vast future looming before us, we may justly crave for something respecting life on which we may rely. But taking this book as our guide, what certainty on this subject do we gain from science?

To begin with, Mr. Drummond frankly admits the undoubted truth that science cannot define life:

Indeed, what natural life is remains unknown, and the word "life" still wanders through science without a definition (p. 87).

And again :

We have seen that the spiritual life is an endowment from the spiritual world, and that the living Spirit of Christ dwells in the Christian. But now the gulf yawns black before us. What more does science know of life? Nothing. It knows nothing further about its origin in detail. It knows nothing about its ultimate nature. It cannot even define it. There is a helplessness in scientific books here, and a continual confession of it, which to thoughtful minds is almost touching" (p. 91).

And again :

No definition of life, indeed, that has yet appeared can be said to be even approximately correct. Its mysterious quality evades us; and we have to be content with outward characteristics and accompaniments, leaving the thing itself an unsolved riddle (p. 146).

Such passages do not lead us to expect a very strong scientific basis of faith on the subject of our eternal life. But in p. 147 we find a definition of life by Mr. Herbert Spencer. According to his definition, life is "the definite combination of heterogeneous changes, both simultaneous and successive, in correspondence with internal co-existences and sequences;" or more shortly, "the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations." I greatly doubt whether either of these definitions will contribute much to our certainty. I certainly should be very sorry if there were nothing better than them on which our faith could rest. Nor is the need supplied by the still shorter definition, "Correspondence with his environment." But Mr. Herbert Spencer has gone further, and attempted to define spiritual life; and Mr. Drummond has boldly followed him.

The chapter on "Eternal Life" opens with the words (p. 203): "One of the most startling achievements of recent science is a definition of eternal life. To the religious mind this is a contribution of immense moment. For 1,800 years only one definition of life eternal was before the world, now there are two." And again: "In the interests of religion, practical and evidential, this second and scientific definition of eternal life is to be hailed as an announcement of commanding interest." What then is this wonderful discovery, this great announcement, that has lain hid for 1,800 centuries, and has at length been brought to light by Mr. Spencer? The author says: "The exact terms of Mr. H. Spencer's definition may now be given. . . . Perfect correspondence would be perfect life. Were there no changes in the environment but such as the organism had adapted changes to meet, and were it never to fail in the efficiency with which to meet them, there would be eternal existence and eternal knowledge." On this definition the author founds a very interesting argument, to show that the eternal life promised to us in our Lord Jesus Christ completely satisfies all the conditions required by Mr. Spencer's

definition. Against that argument I have nothing to say; and I value it as a very interesting demonstration, that what we believe of eternal life is not at variance with the definition of the biologist. But my point is, that there is an utter uncertainty in the scientific conclusions respecting life. We are sometimes told that science can supply no definition of life at all. Then we are presented with Mr. H. Spencer's definitions, first of life, and then of eternal life, till we seem to be stranded in a chaos rather than landed in a cosmos. We find no scientific certainty on which we can rest as a basis for faith on the subject of life; and we are thankful to fall back on the words of revelation, "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Think of going to an anxious inquirer, and endeavouring to cheer his heart by the announcement of Mr. Spencer's great achievements; and by assuring him that Mr. Spencer has at length discovered that life is "the definite combination of heterogeneous changes, both simultaneous and successive, in correspondence with external correspondences and sequences." Is this, I ask, the certainty of science that is to keep the soul at peace in its great conflict with sin and death? Is this the "cosmos" that is to remodel the "chaos" of revelation? Are these the scientific facts that are to form a parallel authority to that of Scripture? Is this the certainty on which we are to live and die? Is it for this that we are to give up our undivided trust in the authority of God? And are we so dissatisfied with the authoritative testimony that we must seek to support it by the conjectures of the accomplished naturalist, or the speculations of the agnostic philosopher?

No; thanks be to God, we have no such need. Our theology is not, as Mr. Drummond says it is, "in a state of flux." His may be, but ours is not. We know Whom we have believed, and why we have believed Him. We are not unable to give a reason for the hope that is in us. We delight in science; and believing that it is the same Mind Who created nature and revealed truth, we have not the slightest fear of collision. We are persuaded that the works of God, and the Word of God, are from the same author; that creation and inspiration are the products of the same Divine Will. We delight, therefore, in the study of them both. We are fully persuaded that whenever real Scriptural knowledge is brought into contact with real scientific facts there will be harmony; and we know perfectly well that there are never-ending analogies, of the most beautiful character, between the natural and spiritual world. But there we stop. We do not believe that the laws of the natural world are the same as those of the spiritual world, so we believe that the two must be kept

distinct—the natural; not invading the spiritual, nor the spiritual the natural, and keeping them distinct; while in the study of nature we rejoice to follow Huxley, and Tindall, and Darwin in the examination of facts, in the study of Divine grace we delight to submit ourselves to the revelation by the Author of grace, and reverently to say, "We believe God, that it shall be as it was told unto us."

Having said so much against the book, I must have the satisfaction of adding that I believe it has been written by a Christian man for Christian purposes; and that the object has been, not to attack the truth, but to uphold it. I believe that the author's own mind has been bewildered by his admiration for Mr. Darwin and Mr. Spencer; and that, under the influence of that admiration, he has been led into the terrible mistake of supposing that Agnosticism can be reconciled with Christianity. I trust that a deeper acquaintance with both subjects will convince him of their irreconcilable antagonism, and lead him in calm, peaceful, trusting faith to employ his great power in upholding for the future the all-sufficiency of the *authority of God!*

EDWARD HOARE.

Review.

The Relations between Religion and Science. The Bampton Lectures for 1884. By the Right Rev. FREDERICK Lord Bishop of EXETER. Macmillan and Co.

IT is with feelings of deep responsibility that I undertake a review¹ of Bishop Temple's new work for three reasons: (1) It is rare, indeed, for any volume of Bampton Lectures to fall beneath a very high standard; and in my opinion this is, to say the least, fully up to the average in power, originality, and earnestness. (2) The subject chosen by the writer is one singularly difficult to treat wisely, and this difficulty is as much felt by his present critic as it could have been by the lecturer. (3) If the value of the book and the difficulty of its subject make a review no easy task, the position of the author as a Father in God, honoured and beloved in his diocese, is not likely to decrease the sense of responsibility in the reviewer.

I approach the task, however, with a lighter heart, because I think

¹ I must apologize to the reader that the review is after all only a fragment. Before I commenced the actual work of criticism it seemed to me that I should have only to summarize and enforce what had given me, in the main, real pleasure and profit to read. But as soon as I began the review, I found the work grew under my hands, there was so much to quote and so much to discuss. And it speedily became apparent that in the space allotted to me, I must content myself with discussing root principles as expounded in the first two lectures.