

tures, we believed the Professor alluded when he spoke of the marvellous flexibility of the Hebrew language, but which on a more careful perusal we find he has entirely omitted—viz., the innumerable changes and periods contended for by geologists, being at least possibly admitted in the first three verses of Genesis. Of course, the whole force of the Professor's argument is neutralized when in bringing forward his circumstantial evidence in support of his theory, he fails to show that no other hypothesis can account for the circumstances.

The philosophy of the professor is also found to be defective, especially when he says, that to allege the universe to have been created, is virtually to declare that there was a time "when the relations of cause and effect were not fixed and definite"—"as if," says Dr. Taylor, "there could be any more definite relation as cause and effect, than that between the creator and the creature." But one of the most extraordinary statements ever made since the days of Hume, by any man claiming to know anything about science, is the following from Professor Huxley:—"Every candid thinker will admit that there may be a world in which two and two do not make four, and in which two straight lines do not inclose a space." Had such a statement been made by an ignorant peasant, it might have suggested the quotation:—"Odi profanum vulgus." As it is, it may be classed with Hume's argument to prove the falsehood of the axioms in geometry; unless it be, as Dr. Taylor supposes, that the Professor intends to assert the absolute impossibility of creation "in the most offensive way," and "with the most cynical of sneers." He introduces it in this way:—"Though we are quite clear about the constancy of nature at the present time . . . it by no means follows necessarily that we are justified in expanding the generalization into the past, and in denying absolutely that there may have been a time when events did not follow a fixed order, when the relations of cause and effect were not fixed and definite, and when external agencies did not intervene in the general order of nature. Cautious men will admit that such a change in the order of nature may have been possible, just as every candid thinker will admit that there may be a world where two and two do not make four, etc."

Mr. Huxley's admission that the forms of species are persistent, and that there is little or nothing in the geologic records that sustains his position; and his assumption that there are defects in the records, and that in these gaps will be found the missing links in the process of evolution—these are amply sufficient to overturn nearly the whole of his hypothesis. All that is needed for this purpose is to quote the Professor's own words. He says:—"We have an awkward habit; no, I won't call it that, for it is a valuable habit—of reasoning, so that we believe nothing unless there is evidence for it; and we have a way of looking upon belief which is not based on evidence, not only as il-

logical, but immoral." Let the Professor only apply this principle to his own theory, and the illusion vanishes at once.

Another of Mr. Huxley's statements is so extraordinary that as Dr. Taylor remarks, "he can only stand by and admire the marvellous effrontery with which it is made." He affirms that evolution stands upon the same basis as the Copernican theory of the motions of the heavenly bodies! If so, we have a perfect right to ask the Professor to give us specimens of one species passing into another at the present day, just as we have hourly, daily, and yearly evidence of the truth of the Copernican theory, and in accordance with which mathematical calculations are made as to further occurrences.

For several reasons, Professor Huxley's lectures are worthy of an attentive perusal. The style is his own, and as beautiful as ever. The lectures will form a famous exercise in the science of logic; for they contain as many fallacies as can well be congregated within the same space. In an unusual degree, they furnish their own antidote; so that he who thoroughly digests the whole of them, will hardly go astray. And perhaps more than all, they show the mistake of an exclusive attention to physical science, when the "humanities" are neglected, and a sound mathematical training is almost entirely ignored. It is a remarkable fact, and one which must be recognized in the "science" of the future, that recent mathematical calculations incontestably prove that the earth is not so old as the evolution theory would require it to be.

BIBLE CLASSES.

We call attention to a paper on this subject, kindly forwarded to us by the Lord Bishop of Niagara, and which we insert on another page. It is a subject which cannot be too much considered, as it is of the first importance that a religious training should be given to our young people when they have grown up to an age at which they usually leave the Sunday School. The instructions imparted in these classes, while it by no means neglects that contained in the Catechism, should embrace a wider range of theological teaching than can be given to the ordinary Sunday scholar; and should include notices of history, civil as well as ecclesiastical, which is referred to in Holy Scripture, or which might be brought to illustrate its principles, or show the fulfilment of its prophecies. In fact all history as well as all the sciences are either referred to, or may be adduced in illustration of that comprehensive Book we call the Bible. The Book of Common Prayer, its origin and history, will also furnish an abundance of subjects, both useful and interesting, for these classes. We shall be glad to receive and publish contributions on the subject, of a somewhat similar character to those kindly furnished on the subject of Parochial Missions by our esteemed correspondent the Rev. H. L. Yewens. Where

there are no Young Men's Associations in connection with the church, and no Parochial Guilds, the Bible Class ought to be carefully attended to.

THE CAUSES AND INFLUENCE OF UNBELIEF.

It is difficult to imagine a more important subject for a Church Congress to discuss than this; and, therefore, we can well understand the great interest it excited at the recent gathering in Plymouth. Some able papers were prepared upon it, and an interesting discussion took place in reference to them. There can be no greater evidence of the extent of unbelief among those to whom Divine Revelation is brought than the immense multitude of schisms, heresies, sects and denominations that have sprung up in connection with Christianity. For what is the cause of heresy but unbelief in the truth of God, as that truth has been revealed by Him, taught by those whom He has sent to teach it, and held by the Church from the beginning? Whence arises schism, positive and actual division in the Church, which is the body of Christ, but from want of faith in the authorities He Himself has constituted and sent forth expressly to govern and to guide that body? And what is the reason that every ridiculous freak of the imagination in the present day is dignified with the name of "science," provided only that it appears to militate against some Scripture statement—but from the extensive prevalence of the unbelief, which busies itself in ever seeking out new modes of "departing from the living God."

The first paper on this subject was read at the Congress by the Dean of Manchester. He thought the causes of unbelief were chiefly four. Among the foremost, he would put the poverty of spiritual life in many who hold the truth. He thought men who profess to receive truths so glorious and sublime as God incarnate dying for the salvation of men, that the Divine Son is ever present with His church to maintain the union between Himself and His faithful members, and that God the Holy Ghost dwells in every Christian—if they really believe these things, must show some indication thereof in their lives; for their doctrines, if true, must be of overwhelming importance and have a visible and marked influence. But when those who profess to accept these things as from God are found not to differ perceptibly in their lives from the Heathen, the inference is that all infidels are not included in the number who question our religion; and the influence of such inconsistent professors of Christianity must be fearfully bad upon such as are glad, rather than otherwise, if they can find an excuse for disregarding what in their hearts they dislike.

The second cause he finds in the diversities of religious belief and of teaching. The various differences and the gross exaggeration of minute points of divergence, as though the sum and substance of all that is important to man,