

and invariable effects following from constant mechanical causes. But evolution has to do with living forms, and these are, *ex hypothesi*; infinitely variable. Granting that protoplasm is chemically the same in the germ cell of a man and of a fish, of an elephant, of a worm, of an oak tree, of an eagle, of a palm, this only makes it all the more certain that a presiding mind directs and shapes the very different results, since these embryos indistinguishable from each other under the highest powers of the microscope, or when analysed by the chemist with all the appliances of his laboratory, in one case develop into a man, in another into a fish, or an elephant, or a worm, or an oak tree, or an eagle, or a palm. But if we admit that a Supreme mind is behind the network of nature, directing and controlling her forces, we shall recognize that a miracle is only an instance of the same control charged with a more manifest purpose. The will of God, acting on brute matter and compelling its obedience, is not different in kind from the will of man energizing through the material organisms of the body; and the one is no more than the other a violation or suspension of physical law. If the processes by which the loaves were multiplied, or by which Lazarus was restored to life, were laid bare, a man of science might be able to correlate it with the partially revealed processes which are daily going on in the laboratory of nature. In short, scientific objection to miracles, if we are to use language with strict accuracy, there can be none; and men of science themselves, who are not wedded to a foregone conclusion, are foremost in making the admission. Dr. Carpenter, for example, in his assault on miracles, on the ground of "fallacies of testimony," makes the following admission: "I am not conscious of any such scientific prepossession against miracles as would prevent me from accepting them as facts, if trustworthy evidence of their reality could be adduced. The question with me, therefore, is simply: Have we any adequate historical ground for the belief that such a departure has ever taken place."

Since, then, it is admitted that there can be no antecedent objection to miracles upon scientific grounds, we must admit that miracles are possible. Let us now go a step farther and inquire, are they probable? And here I would use the same

argument as in my third lecture of this series, wherein we considered the probability of God revealing Himself to mankind. It is the highest degree improbable that the Creator of the Universe should reveal Himself beyond what He has done in nature, unless there were some very adequate cause for such revelation, just as it is the highest degree improbable that the Dominion Government should send us shiploads of provisions and clothing free of charge in our present condition. But just as we should expect the Government to send us aid if we were in a starving and penniless condition, through some calamity, such as a fire like that which destroyed St. John's a few years ago—so we expect God, whom we believe to be benevolent and loving, to reveal Himself to us, since it is evident that the world is not in its natural state. "Disorder—destitution is as plainly written upon the face of society and upon the moral state of the individual man as order is upon the face of nature. Sin is here! Whoever ignores this tragic, tremendous fact can have no approach to a true reading of the state of the world. Its blighting touch, its circean breath, its destroying hand, are everywhere upon the body, upon the soul, upon society, upon the world itself. It has broken the harmony and unity of the world. It has violated the integrity of nature. It has made awful discord in the anthem of creation."

I hold then that an interposition in favor of mankind would be in the highest degree reasonable. It would be a denial of Himself if God did not intervene. But this intervention, in what ever way made would of necessity be miraculous. It would be a manifestation of God for a special purpose, and in a special form. I have shown satisfactorily I think, that Jesus Christ is such a revelation. But He was not a Messiah, such as the Jews expected. They looked for one who would deliver their land and free them from their conquerors. But instead thereof He spoke of a spiritual kingdom and told of heavenly promises. And as men looked upon Him they wanted to know where were his credentials. "What sign showest thou?" What dost thou wish?

But, you say, were not His character and His teaching enough? Nay, they might be for us, but not for them. In those early