

more certain than that, both morally and intellectually, and physically, he can, and he often does, sink from a higher to a lower level. This is true of man, both collectively and individually—of men and of societies of men. Some regions of the world are strewn with the monuments of civilizations which have passed away. Rude and barbarous tribes stare with wonder on the remains of temples, of which they cannot conceive the purpose, and of cities which are the dens of wild beasts.”—(*The Duke of Argyll's Primeval Man*, p. 156.) Respecting the Ancient Egyptians, M. Renouf writes: “It is incontestably true that the sublimest portions of the Egyptian religion are not the comparatively late results of a process of development, or elimination from the grosser. The sublimest portions are demonstrably ancient, and the last stage of the Egyptian religion, that known to the Greek and Latin writers, was by far the grossest and most corrupt.”—(*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 119.)

Here, then, we find in the religious world a state of things precisely similar to that which arrested the attention of Grant Allen in the natural world, and we see not how—if we adopt the hypothesis that the present is the product of a natural evolution from the past—we can escape a conclusion similar to that to which Allen comes, viz.: “That, contrary to the general belief, evolution in religion does not by any means always or necessarily result in progress and improvement. Nay, the real fact is, that by far the greater number of the existing religions of the world are degenerate types—products of retrogression, rather than of any upward development;” and the further conclusion seems inevitable—that the true starting-point of the evolution of religion is to be sought, not in the no-religion of the Fugeans, or the first glimmerings of fetishism of the Digger Indians, but somewhere about halfway between that and the fully developed Christianity of Great Britain and America. And then the perplexing question comes up, How did primeval man come into the possession of a half-developed Christianity?

The hypothesis of a purely natural development of religion in this form—and incontrovertible facts shut us up to its acceptance in this form, if we accept it at all—will hardly please such critics as Dr. Toy. Certain it is, it can no longer be used for the purpose of getting rid of a primeval revelation from God to man.

II.—SYMPOSIUM ON THE “NEW THEOLOGY.”

WHAT ARE ITS ESSENTIAL FEATURES? IS IT BETTER THAN THE OLD?

NO. V.

BY REV. J. B. HEARD, OF ENGLAND.

AUTHOR OF “OLD AND NEW THEOLOGY,” “TRIPARTITE NATURE OF MAN,” ETC.

“THE new chemistry has displaced the old. The New Theology is fighting for its life; and now comes the new political economy, and