

demanding more than human courage to expect the Canon to throw away at one fell swoop all the incredible things in the Bible, however great may be the demand made by them upon our credulity. We can only hope that, when he has revised his work, and has determined to fully carry out his own dicta as to defining every term he uses and demanding sufficient evidence for every occurrence placed before him for belief, he may see that *no* miracle can be sufficiently attested (unless, it may be, one that happens to himself); and that the same reasoning that induces him to reject the story of Jonah must inevitably lead him to reject the story of Jesus. We ought, perhaps, to be "thankful for small mercies" when we find a distinguished dignitary of the Church of England willing to abandon not only the literal inspiration of the Bible, but the stories of the Tower of Babel, of Balaam's ass, of Joshua ordering the sun to stand still, of Jonah being swallowed by the whale, etc., etc., even if he does still defend the miracles without an expressed belief in which his bread and butter would disappear.

"DISHONORABLE TO DIE IN THE LAST DITCH."

Finally, Canon Farrar puts into this shape his conclusions as to the outcome of the Higher Criticism and the duty of intelligent, honest and honorable inquirers:

"First, nothing can prevent the acceptance of the general principles of criticism, because nothing can finally retard the linear progress of truth and knowledge; second, the things which cannot be spoken will remain; third, it is a dishonorable and faithless position to be the last defenders of traditional prejudices which have been disproved by thorough and fearless investigation."

Of the first section of this declaration we need only say that all men who have freed themselves from the nightmares of superstition must of necessity accept it; and of the last, it is a question for the Canon himself to decide how far he subjects himself to his own condemnation. It is unfair to classify as "dishonorable and faithless" men who "die in the last ditch" in defence of dogmas they have been trained to regard as of supreme importance, because to other men those dogmas appear to have been "disproved by thorough and fearless investigation." The "charity which thinketh no evil" should have saved the Canon from so sweeping a denunciation, even if a regard for his own position—as defending dogmas utterly wanting scientific evidence—did not dictate a more modest and charitable conclusion. The "things which cannot be spoken" must certainly remain where they are, so far as we at present can see. If, by and by, we are blessed with keener insight and greater powers of speech, we may follow the Canon into a field which seems "void and without form." We are glad to stand beside him while he keeps on solid ground, and rejects the follies that he disproves; he can hardly expect us to follow him when he "fights in the last ditch" for those things that others have disproved.

J. S. E.

(A Pa)

The
is unqi
has sou
of mor
Spencer
he says

"My c
the objec
happines
proximate
thing to h
generalize
more than
Morality
mine how
beneficial.
sary conse
of Moral S
kinds of a
unhappine
duct; and
misery. . .
tions of a
race certai
are the res
they have
of utility, c
have been
accumulati
responding
experiences
The ex
Spencer
human r
groups of
fact bears