

them on the foe, the day would be his. But,—for there always is a but—he has to take into account the difference between his eagle eye and the slow motions of large bodies of struggling humanity, whom no amount of discipline can transform into clock-work and whose longest step out on the march is limited to thirty-six inches. Alike in his opinion concerning Canada's near destiny, and in his judgment of the Old Testament Scriptures, Goldwin Smith betrays the distinction between the theoretical general and the Wellington or the Wolseley who knows of what achievements flesh and blood men are capable.

The writer does not feel himself called upon, by any estimate of his own fitness, or dogmatic claim to sit in judgment, to volunteer his opinion of the public utterances of distinguished thinkers. Dr. Goldwin Smith's theological article has fallen under the eyes of several of his most thoughtful students, and it is at their request that he has undertaken to give his personal opinion of its teaching. The article in question is entitled "Christianity's Millstone," and appears, over the signature of Goldwin Smith, in the December number of the *North American Review*. Setting out from the renunciation made by Professor Bonney at the Norwich Church Congress, of his faith in the historical character of the earliest records of the Old Testament, the author proceeds to a complete surrender of each and every claim asserted for the inspiration of that venerable and unique series of documents. The proverb *in medio tutissimus ibis* he peremptorily rejects, largely, it appears, because of its critical difficulties, which should hardly have weight in the mind of a born critic. He sees no *via media* between the unreasoning dogmatism of the verbal inspirationists who vouch for the divine origin of every jot and tittle of the original text, and the utter negation of that special divinity by which the Old Testament is differentiated from other products of human genius. To this conclusion, which must weigh seriously on the minds of all who desire that their faith should rest upon a scientific as well as upon an experimental basis, the author has been led by many considerations.

One of these considerations is respect for the authority of certain advanced theologians, such as Professor Bonney already named, and the authors of *Lux Mundi*, and to them may be added the higher critics, with some anti-biblical geologists, ethnologists and Egyptologists. Other considerations are the geocentric cosmology of the Bible, its local and exclusive character, its errors and contradictions in statements of fact, its mythical nature arising from the late production of its so-called history, its immoral teaching and vindictive expression as compared with the New Testament, and its prodigies or miracles. This is a very formidable arraignment of what the learned author regards as the millstone about the neck of Chris-