

definition of nature, this definition must be discarded. Indeed, the Professor seems to have thought it too far-reaching, for he immediately limits it to "phenomena presented to experience." Now, as there are myriads of phenomena in the universe which never have been, and never will be, presented to our experience, "that which is" falls far short of that which is. But while in one breath he thus limits "that which is," in the next he extends it to that which is not, but shall be hereafter—"events to come." It will be readily imagined that definitions of this kind will not much aid philosophic thought. Prebendary Reynolds says that "nature means all that exists in time; all that has being in space, material and immaterial; all that we can obtain knowledge of by means of our senses; the outwardness and inwardness of things." This definition is perilously like that of Professor Huxley; for what difference is there between all that exists in time and space and "all that is"? Prebendary Reynolds would be the last to frame any definition of nature that should include God; yet this does, for God most certainly exists in time and space. He may fill both, but He exists in both. Again, if nature includes both the material and immaterial, what is meant by stating that it is "all that we can obtain knowledge of by means of our senses"? Elsewhere the Prebendary speaks of "knowledge of ourselves and of nature." If we be a part of nature, how can there be "ourselves and nature"? A better illustration of this prevalent confusion of thought could scarcely be found than in the title of that deservedly popular work, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. The meaning of this phrase it would not be easy to conjecture. There seems to be a notion that the spiritual world is not natural; because, if it be natural, natural law must, of course, prevail there; and yet it must be natural, as natural law is there. It is all very perplexing, and almost enough to cause one to give up the unnatural study in despair. And yet, a definition free from all ambiguity, and not committing to any Theistic statement, seems feasible. For example, let it be "all that is, *minus* God." Those who believe in God would thus express the totality of all being by "God and nature," and