

work, Strauss attempts a sort of eclecticism of unbelief—combining the destructive criticism of Baur and the Tübingen school on the canon of Scripture, with all the objections raised by the physicists. The Darwinian theory especially delights him as “the first child of the true, though as yet clandestine, union of science and philosophy.” It is possible that Mr. Darwin would not thank him for some of the conclusions he has drawn from the evolution theory. Certainly Helmholtz has misrepresented the actual position of the English naturalist, when he claims that he has eliminated the notion of design from the idea of creation. Darwin certainly does not “show how the adaptation of structure in organisms may be effected without any interference of intelligence, by the blind operation of law.” In strictness he cannot be said to “show” anything but an hypothesis, unsupported by fact. He cannot show that any *species*,—we do not say *variety*—has been originated within the memory of man. His theory may be true, but it is not proved, and remains, therefore, an hypothesis. Much less has he shown that the creation of species may be effected by “the blind operation of law;” for having gone backward as far as his inventive faculty can reach, he is compelled to beg some atoms or molecules from the “Intelligence” the German philosopher ignores. If, then, the original matter came from the hand of a “conscious” and intelligent Absolute; why, even supposing the Darwinian theory to be true, may He not have ordered and ruled the genesis of all the species that have arisen since earth emerged from chaos? It would not be difficult to show that there is nothing in the development theory of itself to alarm the orthodox; it is only when its advocates, as Mr. Darwin in his “Descent of Man,” transcend the limits of scientific investigation, that they become enemies to philosophy, ethics and religion. The attempt to leap the chasm between plant and animal life, instinct and reason, and more especially the effort to reduce the moral sense of man to a development of animal affections, are of this nature. Mr. Darwin has taken this false step and made shipwreck of his method. The Curtius of physical science, he has leaped into the abyss without saving the citadel.

We have made these remarks on the attitude of modern science towards religion, because it will save us some space in the brief outline we propose to give of the papers on Scepticism at the late conference of the Evangelical Alliance. It is scarcely possible to classify these essays; we shall, therefore, indicate briefly the line of argument taken in each, with a synopsis of such remarks as were made upon it. Prof. Stanley Leathes, of King's College, London, confined himself to the evidence of fulfilled

prophecy as it is deducible from the history of the Jews. There was nothing novel in his treatment of the subject, except perhaps his reply to the parallel attempted to be drawn by Prof. Müller between the development of Buddhism from Brahminism and that of Christianity from Judaism.

The next paper, which, in all respects, was the most solid contribution to the literature of the Conference, was read by Dr. Theodor Christlieb, Professor of Theology at Bonn. It traversed, in fact, the entire subject of modern infidelity, systematically and conscientiously, suggesting modes of encountering it in all its phases. It would be impossible to give an outline of this learned and exhaustive paper. When we state that the tendencies of scepticism were divided into three heads—Unchristian Philosophy, Destructive Historical Criticism and Anti-Miraculous Natural Science; that each of these was separately treated with the accurate learning we have learned to expect from German scholarship; and further, that the apologetic was applied not merely to the systems themselves, but to their influence on individual, social and national life, our readers will have some idea of an essay which occupied three hours in the reading. Dr. Christlieb approached the subject with perfect candour. Fervent as his faith in Christianity is, he did not fail to rebuke extravagant dogmatic views, especially those sometimes entertained upon Inspiration. Let us quote a few words on this topic; they will suffice to show the sincerity and honesty of an able apologist of the faith: “The very limits of our canon are not an ordinance by Divine right, inasmuch as no prophet ever declared the list of inspired Old Testament writings closed in the name of God, and no apostle superintended the collection of the New Testament books.” He then suggests the argument that the same Spirit who inspired the Scripture ordered their collection so that they might make a complete and compact whole. He admits the existence of a human element—consents to a reverent criticism, not merely extending “to texts, and translations, but also to a searching comparison of the different types of doctrine (e. g. Pauline, Johannine, &c.) and of the various ethnographical, historical and other data,” &c. Should such a criticism discover errors, the Professor applies the words of Luther: “If there be found a strife in Scripture and the same cannot be settled, let it alone; it is of little moment, so that it runneth not counter to the articles of our faith.” To these articles Dr. Christlieb clings with unflinching tenacity; though he protests against insupportable assumptions and disingenuous devices in defence of the truth. The paper read at New York may well claim the attention of Christian readers; it is, however, we believe, only an abridgment of a more sys-