

confused by their pseudo-philosophy, that truth and error alternately exhibit themselves throughout his entire book, and he seems to have no settled opinions remaining. It seems almost impossible that the same writer who acknowledges the authority of Scripture as a revelation from God to His creatures of His will, as Professor Drummond, in a general sense, undoubtedly does, could have penned such a sentence as this: "There is a sense of solidity about a Law of Nature which belongs to nothing else in the world. Here, at last, amid all that is shifting, is one thing sure; one thing outside ourselves, unbiassed, unprejudiced, uninfluenced by like or dislike, by doubt or fear; one thing that holds on its way to me eternally, incorruptible and undefiled."

If this language means anything, it means that the Bible as a revelation from God is not solid enough to rest upon; that it must be buttressed by something outside, which Mr. Drummond calls a Law of Nature!

I have already noticed the extravagant language in which Professor Drummond attributes conscious moral actions to plants and animals of low type; but in his chapter on Classification, he proceeds to still greater extremes. Thus, on page 392, in speak-