

tematic treatise—"Modern Doubts on Christian Faith,"—a translation of which is being published by the Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh.

Dr. Cairns, of Berwick, was the author of another paper on the subject of Infidelity. There was nothing original in his division of the phases of unbelief—subjective and objective in character, or depending in each case upon moral or intellectual causes of doubt. His exposition of the "scandals" or stumbling-blocks caused by the Church itself, either in doctrine or practice, and his suggestions for remodeling Christian evidences, were fresh and pointed. Dr. Warren, of Boston University, gave a sketch of American Infidelity. It was interesting historically, but tintured a little too strongly with the *odium theologicum*. Geographical sketches were given of the three who bore the name of the sceptical apostle, "Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Cooper and Thomas Paine," and thence down by Priestly and Owen to Theodore Parker and Emerson. Dr. Washburn followed on "Reason and Faith,"—the one apprehending intellectual, the other spiritual truth; reason being barren opinion, faith being "reason knit with affection and conscience." Differing from Dr. Warren, he contended that American Unitarianism was the result of the prevailing dogmatism of New England. As Neander declared of German unbelief, so in America it arose from "dead orthodoxy"—a natural reaction from scholastic divinities.

The Theory of Development was ably treated by Dr. McCosh, of Princeton, the well-known author of "Christianity and Positivism." His mode of handling the subject under the figure of a temple divided into great halls—the religious and scientific—was well wrought out. Of the principal objections to Darwinism as a cosmogony we have already spoken—they are fully, though not extravagantly, stated in this paper. One brief extract we venture to quote for the benefit of those who denounce evolution without investigating its claims:—"It is useless to tell the younger naturalists that there is no truth in the doctrine of development; for they know there is truth, which is not to be set aside by denunciation. Religious philosophers might be more profitably employed in showing them the religious aspects of the doctrine, and some would be grateful to any who would help them to keep their old faith in God and the Bible with their faith in science."

An animated discussion arose on this subject. Dr. Brown, "a missionary of forty years' standing," declared that all he knew in regard to the vegetable kingdom was in accordance with the theory of development. Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, some-

what warmly demanded to know whether Dr. Brown meant that God was electricity or some other unintelligible force? He could not stand there and hear men talk about development without telling what development was. Dr. Brown very sensibly said that he believed in the creation of the world by the Almighty, as asserted in the Shorter Catechism, but he did not see that that prevented him from believing that development was the mode of God's action.

Principal Dawson, of McGill University, Montreal, read a paper on "Primitive Man and Revelation." Dr. Dawson contends that the modern theory of the antiquity of man is founded upon exaggeration and mistake; that even if we accept the skeletons recently found as those of the primitive race of mankind, the admission overthrows the "Simian" origin of the race, because they are highly developed in the cephalic region, and, therefore, are existing proofs of the truth of the Scripture narrative. We are glad to learn that Principal Dawson is about to submit his researches on this subject to the public.

In a subsequent discussion on Darwinism, Dr. Dawson was "catechised" on Darwinism. Dr. Hodge could not let the matter rest; hence the Principal was compelled to mount the platform and state the commonplace fact, that evolution, up to a certain point, is not anti-Christian, but that after that point it becomes so. Dr. Hodge urged that Darwinism, as he understood it, "excludes God; excludes intelligence from everything."

Dr. Dawson's reply, though tinged with characteristic dislike to the development school, is worth quoting:—"I think Darwin would not admit so much as has been said, and yet I believe his doctrine leads to that conclusion. The Darwinian theory takes hold of the production of varieties. Our doctrine is that these varieties are the action of external nature upon the species. As regards the varieties, Darwin is well enough; but as regards species, I don't believe in it, because it comes in contact with the Bible. The Darwinian theory, I believe, is this: That species have come into existence by natural selection, arising in the struggle of one species with another for existence, and the survival of the fittest in that struggle. It is not science at all—only a bad philosophy."

Here we are compelled to take abrupt leave of the New York Conference. We trust, however, that we have given a glimpse of its proceedings sufficiently clear to tempt our readers to a better acquaintance with the subjects discussed, when the complete record is published.