

involved in the extreme form of the evolution theory. But look at another example—the very prevalent disbelief in miracles. According to some, miracles are impossible, for the laws of nature are immutable—inexorable—and cannot be changed or suspended; and according to others, miracles, if not impossible, are at least incredible—no amount of evidence can warrant us in believing that they ever did happen. Now, what we wish to show here is, that no one, really believing in the existence of a personal God who keeps the heavenly bodies in their places, who is the author of all the beauty and grandeur of the universe, and “in whom we live, move, and have our being,” will ever dare to deny that He may not at any time, for some wise purpose, act in a manner different from what appears to us to be His uniform method. To hear some people talk of the “reign of law,” the “immutability of law,” &c., one would think that God was subject to something superior to, and independent of, Himself, and any attempt on His part to interfere with the order of nature would be a thing intolerable. But, when we consider that these laws are not things independent of God, and, in fact, have no meaning whatever unless we understand by them the uniform and regular method in which He, who is the source of all power, operates in the universe, then all ground for disbelief in miracles is removed. Nay, further, we contend that such supernatural interventions are not only possible, but highly probable, for when we think of the deep necessities of fallen human nature, if we allow the existence of a God of wisdom and goodness, it is just what we might expect that He should in some miraculous way make known His will to man. Belief in a personal God makes all clear regarding the credibility of miracles. We might show that the same thing is true

regar
a co

Th
the l
error
all t
when
Mill
tual
as th
in th
is av
like
the m
their
in th
beca

In
mys
ion
phil
True
mea
athe
seen
the
with
and
liste
may
prea
pow