

être et descendent dans l'intimité de leur nature spirituelle, ils découvrent le même autel, récitent la même prière, aspirent à la même fin." In other words, amid all the variety of dogma and ritual, the moral basis of all religions is held to be in its main outlines the same. This condition is supported by an examination of the moral system of the principal religions of Europe, Asia, and Northern Africa; but the omission of all reference to the religion of savage tribes seriously detracts from the value of the book. The author has no difficulty in producing a great deal of evidence in support of his theory; but it would be equally easy, by dwelling on differences rather than on resemblances, and by taking a survey which included the whole world, to defend a precisely opposite view. The evidence of the International Congresses of Religion, to which the author devotes a chapter, is not worth much, for those who attend such congresses are generally biased in favor of the "moral unity" view. The book is an able piece of special pleading, but a more exhaustive, and above all, a wider survey is necessary for the substantiation of the author's conclusion.

London, England.

J. B. PAYNE.

THE ETHICAL APPROACH TO THEISM. By G. F. Barbour, D.Phil. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1913. Pp. vi, 115.

Dr. Barbour's book is concise and clear, and contains as much as many larger apologies. On the other hand, there is no attempt to work out the metaphysics underlying his argument. He rejects any pantheism, and also agrees with Hume's attack on the common theistic arguments from the world as effect to God as cause. But he avails himself of Mr. Bradley's doctrine of degrees of reality, to select attributes for the chief reality: in morality we are acquainted with a high degree of reality in such a way that we can say that the innermost being of the world is good.

Unfortunately, Dr. Barbour gives no metaphysical justification for this use of Mr. Bradley as a theistic coöperator,—nothing to show that this conception is possible apart from an Absolutist position, no hint as to what he means by 'reality.' Nor does he make an attempt at all to meet the usual and very obvious objections to any ethical metaphysics. Lastly, how the conclusion that the innermost being of the world is good, leads

to a unique personal God, and then to Christianity, is left altogether untouched.

The second half of the book treats of "Aristotle and Christian Theism," and will be of interest to believers in that religion.

Trinity College, Cambridge, England.

R. SMITH.

THE CONCEPT OF SIN. By F. R. Tennant, D. D., B.Sc. Cambridge University Press, 1912. Pp. ii, 282.

This book seems just an exercise in "Christian Ethics," and has little interest for the pure philosopher. There is a discussion (Ch. III) in which Dr. Tennant holds that the term 'ethical' should be restricted to voluntary action, and that any wider appreciation is 'aesthetic': there is certainly need here for a much fuller analysis, and recent work on value is quite ignored. The psychological part of the book (Ch. V chiefly) is traditional: indeed Dr. Tennant,—and many will agree with him,—seemingly regards certain philosophers, whom he quotes constantly, as being of equal authority with the Bible.

Chapter VI touches on the Freedom of the Will. Dr. Tennant discards determinism, and declares for a 'self-determination' which will save the future from being as fixed as the past. He holds that all determinists, perhaps, should be associationists. Here, again, there seems to be too meager an analysis, and an inadequate recognition of certain important positions in philosophy.

In one of his appendices (Note B), Dr. Tennant discusses the "Explanation of Sin," taking in principle what may be called a commonsense position. But the real problem of evil which must occur in any theism, is left well alone: a solitary sentence, it is true, tells us that God is responsible for the possibility of sin, man for its actuality, a remark plainly leaving untouched any difficulty in principle.

Trinity College, Cambridge, England.

R. SMITH.

EVOLUTION AND THE NEED OF ATONEMENT. By Stewart A. McDowall, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1912. Pp. xvi, 155.

This book is written to ease the difficulty of aligning the central tenet of Christianity with the belief in evolution. First