the delight of

contrives, and volution. The of specialized at to represent fromment, and Phil., ii. 394). either using abodied spirit it to be both

organism by t is that the he fittest sur-

ent, but it is 2).

infinitely inon the other ably finite in

is not what and, going a g good who, out of the th such proevitably be es for whose here can be ese not imogo beyond an external are obliged that is dia-

which are is neither

of the first

more nor less unthinkable than the pseud-idea 'circular-triangle.' As Spinoza somewhere says, 'Determinatio negatio est'—to define God is to deny him; and such being the case, what can be more irrational than to insist upon thought and volition, phenomena only known to exist within quite narrow limitations, as the very nature and essence of the Infinite Deity' (p. 408-9).

How evident that Mr. Fiske's "Divine Power," as he occasionally ventures to characterize the "unknowable," without goodness, without personality, without intelligence, can never be an object of interest to the religious worshiper! Anticipating the obvious criticisms, Mr. Fiske says that "it will doubtless be urged that such religion is too abstract, too coldly scientific, to have any general influence upon action, and can therefore be of no practical value. . . . . And it will, moreover, be asserted, with vehemence, that in place of a father whom men can love and venerate, we are giving them a mere philosophical formula, calling for no warmer feeling than calm, intellectual assent. Granting that our doctrine is philosophically the reverse of Atheism, it will be urged that here extremes meet, and that an infinite and therefore unknowable God is practically equivalent to no God at all " (p. 468-9).

In reply to this criticism, Mr. Fiske reminds his readers that "the early Christians were called Atheists by their pagan adversaries;" that "as we proceed to take away, one by one, the attributes which limit deity and enable it to be classified, we seem, no doubt, to be destroying it altogether; "yet "the symbolization of deity indicated by the profoundest scientific analysis of to-day is as practically real as the symbolization which has resulted from the attempts of antiquity to perform such an analysis, and is in every way more satisfactory alike to head and heart "(p. 469).

This reply cannot be satisfactory to either the careful thinker or the religious devotee. There was no logical or verbal propriety in calling the early Christians Atheists, because they recognized in God that which is the very essence of Theism, personality and intelligence, and the contemplation of which as the cause of phenomena was the beginning of Theism; but the terminal phase of stripping deity of anthropomorphic qualities does not simply purify and refine the conception of deity, but divests it of its essential nature, that with which it originated, upon which it is based, and without which prayer, praise, and adoration to God were a mere farce. And it may be added that no amount of scientific culture will ever prepare the people for, or induce them to accept, the "unknow-