

Second Lecture simply confirm the proof offered by the first of his insufficient preparation for the discussion on which he has ventured? I have reason to believe that this question has already been decided, in a sense not favorable to the Right-reverend Lecturer, by those whose studies fit them to pronounce a prompt judgment upon it; but there are others who frankly confess that a little guidance in such matters is helpful to them; and it is for their benefit that I go over the ground in the following pages, everywhere inviting, and doing all I can to facilitate, the fullest investigation of any statements I may make.

Apart, however, from the critical examination of the "Second Lecture on Agnosticism" now before us, I hope to be able, before I close, to say some words in confirmation of the general views which I ventured to put forward in my first pamphlet, and which have been vigorously attacked in several orthodox quarters.

The learned Lecturer does not approve of the suggestion contained in my previous pamphlet, that instead of seeking a quarrel with modern thinkers on the ground of Agnosticism, he should do it on the ground of their rejection of the miraculous. In making the suggestion, however, I was governed by very practical considerations. I knew that an issue could much more readily be joined on the latter ground than on the former. Comparatively few men of science are pronounced agnostics, while very many avow more or less plainly their disbelief in miracles. As regards the belief in God there is a general desire, on the part of those who profess their inability to arrive at it by scientific processes, to exempt it from criticism. In this matter at least men of science are not aggressive; and I felt that in combating them upon this point the Lecturer was not making the best use of his dialectical resources. Moreover I knew that, in