

identical or similar, in which cases judicious grouping would have lost nothing and gained something. No doubt the author would remind us, that for a class of students reiteration is not ungrateful. True enough, but other readers are also to be considered and when one meets the same point three or four times, as actually happens, within two pages he feels inclined to use a pencil. Another fault of style is frequent calling of attention to the grave importance or very special significance of the point in hand, after the manner of an exhorter.

Having said so much it is a great pleasure to be able to add that for the most part the literary style is of a high order. It is clear, forceful and dignified, frequently eloquent and quite generally attractive. The theological and philosophical views are sound and profound along with remarkably clear statement. When science comes into view it is correctly handled. There is no fear, no shyness, no evasion in view of the adversaries.

One must not forget, either that the critic's task is easy when he turns to the side of locating defects in what has been laboriously constructed. Dr. Beattie has undertaken a gigantic labor in which he has achieved a success which calls for high appreciation. No student of Apologetics will be able to omit this from his furnishing.

W. O. CARVER.

Christian Faith in an Age of Science.

By William North Rice, Professor of Geology in Wesleyan University.
A. C. Armstrong & Son. New York. 1903.

The recent writers on Christian evidences may be roughly classified in a two-fold way: first, those who with a strong conviction of the truth of Christianity seek to interpret science accordingly; and second, those with a strong conviction of the truth of science who seek to interpret Christianity accordingly. The author of the above work belongs to the latter of these classes. Of course the nearest things in daily experience and thought

hold sway in the consciousness as a rule. As a teacher of science it is natural that Professor Rice should be chiefly preoccupied with his science, even in defending Christianity. This must not be taken to mean that Christianity is slighted by the author. He seeks indeed to defend it, miracles and all. And yet after saying that science and its interests dominate the consciousness of the writer one is tempted to change the statement and say it is a philosophic conception which rules there. The argument of this book reaches Christianity only in an indirect way. It concludes first from science to monism in philosophy, and then from monism to Christianity; or rather it attempts to show how Christianity may rest on a monistic basis. I do not mean that this is formally adopted as the method of the book but only that it is implicit in all the discussion. Yet even here Professor North sometimes seems to waver. He says: "It seems unmistakable that the tendency of biological thought in general and of evolutionary thought in particular, at the present time is towards monism" (p.276). Then he adds: "The present tendency towards monism may be simply an example of the crude and premature philosophizing which results from the dominance in thought of a new idea as yet imperfectly comprehended." Again in the same paragraph with the above sentences is this: "We cannot feel that faith in duty and in immortality rests upon a very secure foundation if it can rest only on a dualistic philosophy." As a matter of fact, however, everywhere the reasoning proceeds on the monistic hypothesis, though not always consistently (as on page 303). The monism recognizes the personality of God, and of course insists continually on the divine immanence, and equally excludes the divine transcendence. In illustration of the above method of Professor Rice note the following.

Evolution he tells us can give us not the slightest hint as to the origin of life. But if we are to choose between

the view that life has its origin in a continuous system of evolution, and the view that it is out of relation to all known facts the scientific mind can hardly hesitate to choose the former (p. 251). The author inveighs much against the idea of "the carpenter God," which, by the way, is held by very few thinkers now. Dr. Rice thinks that God as immanent in nature is the sufficient explanation of every fact whether the process can be traced or not.

So also of the immortality of the soul. Professor Rice says: "Nor is faith in immortality dependent upon a dualistic conception of human nature" (p. 279). Then he uses the speculation of Tait and Stewart in "The Unseen Universe" as to a possible substance more tenuous than ether even which may serve as a basis for the resurrection body.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is the discussion of law in nature. He employs some rather striking illustrations from mathematics with the view of showing that these laws as formulated by science are but approximations to truth. Outlying isolated phenomena apparently unrelated to law must often be taken into account, the law modified and sometimes materially changed to allow for these phenomena. In discussing miracles it is clear to the reader that the tendency of the writer's view is to the inclusion of miracles within law in some such sense as "outlying isolated phenomena," which must be taken into account in any adequate statement of law. They were included, so to speak, in God's plan of the world. Professor Rice does not hesitate to accept many of the miracles of the Bible, but he does not accept quite all even of the New Testament. He argues at length for the resurrection of Jesus and very properly considers it the crucial miracle of the New Testament records. But even here, as indicating how ardently the author desires to find in the principle of the divine immanence a sufficient reason for everything

he says the resurrection of Jesus truly understood may have been as "natural an event" as the failure of other men to rise (p. 336).

In discussing inspiration also he employs this language: "The truth of the divine immanence well nigh makes void the distinction of natural and supernatural in the activities of God in the physical universe" (p. 388).

Enough has been said to indicate the general standpoint of this book. The author has done good service in declaring that his Christian faith can still live side by side with his scientific convictions. But it is to be questioned whether the monistic bond with which he has sought to unite the two will permanently hold. The divine transcendence receives no recognition, although numerous facts are cited which, properly understood, would have required this. The thoughtful reader will not feel that the Christian facts have been really harmonized with the author's philosophic theory. It is difficult to find any one philosophic principle which can be made to account for all the facts of Christianity and of science, unless it be in the Christian theistic view of a personal God both immanent and transcendent, one who dwells in nature and at the same time rises above it. The title of Professor Rice's book is really a misnomer. A stronger apologetic could have been constructed by the scientific method, that is to say, by presenting the Christian facts and the evidence for them in an adequate manner, with the further evidence to show that the foundations of science are no more secure. A philosophy which is adequate to explain all the facts in both realms is doubtless important and will in due time win the general consent. But meantime a Christianity economized in the interest of a somewhat dubious philosophic principle is not likely to prove permanently satisfactory.

E. Y. MULLINS.