

earthly life will last for "many years." He believes in his power to "eat, drink and be merry" in these many years. "Soul, thou has much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry." What a large and firm faith is here, and in things as to which he could have no certain evidence, and how completely this faith dominates his life and acts as his religion.

The eminent English biologist, Prof. Huxley, is not usually accused of being burdened with overmuch faith, yet in a recent article in the "Agnostic Annual," a publication which is probably not in the libraries of many Presbyterian students, he affirms his belief in the possibility of miracles and even lectures some agnostics on their want of faith in this regard. He looks on the matter, of course, merely in the light of natural possibility:—"I am unaware of anything that has a right to the title of an 'impossibility' except a contradiction in terms. There are impossibilities logical, but none natural. A 'round square,' a 'present past,' 'two parallel lines that intersect,' are impossibilities, because the ideas denoted by the predicates, round, present, intersect, are contradictory of the ideas denoted by the subjects, square, past, parallel. But walking on water, or turning water into wine, or procreation without male intervention, or raising the dead, are plainly not 'impossibilities' in this sense. In the affirmation that a man walked upon water the idea of the subject is not contradictory of that in the predicate. Naturalists are familiar with insects which walk on water, and imagination has no more difficulty in putting a man in place of the insect than it has in giving a man some of the attributes of a bird and making an angel of him; or in ascribing to him the ascensive tendencies of a balloon, as the 'levitationists' do. Undoubtedly, there are very strong physical and biological arguments for thinking it extremely improbable that a man could be supported on the surface of water as the insect is; or that his organisation could be compatible with the possession and use of wings; or that he could rise through the air without mechanical aid. . . . But it is sufficiently obvious, not only that we are at the beginning of our knowledge of nature, instead of having arrived at the end of it, but that the limitations of our faculties are such that we never can be in a position to set bounds to the possibilities of nature. The same considerations apply to the other examples of supposed miraculous events. The change of water into wine undoubtedly implies a contradiction, and is assuredly 'impossible,' if we are permitted to assume that the 'elementary bodies' of the chemists are now and for ever immutable. Not only, however,