

has shown itself to be of wonderful potency. It puts a new life into Philosophy, Science and History, and to its laws religion must now be made to conform. No right-minded man can deny the immense value of the theory, and no student can afford to belittle its claims. But when we come to apply it to Christianity and to man's spiritual life there are certain crucial points which the Conference not only failed to make clear, but on some occasions seemed carefully to avoid.

If Development is all that its enthusiastic supporters claim for it, and if Christianity *must* be made to conform to its method and laws as some philosophers and critics hold,—How, we would like to ask, is Christ to be explained? Was *He* a simple development of Jewish life? This question was raised at the Conference but it was not answered. Further,—was Christianity a simple development of Judaism? Is it possible that the most exclusive people and religion on earth could develop into the most universal man and the most universal religion without the intervention or interference of some external element not contained in the previously existing series of conditions? Further, still,—Is the new life a simple development of the old life of man's heart? When the soul is born again must we not postulate an external force or power which as a principle of life enters the soul that up to that point was spiritually dead? In other words, can the theory of Development, as a force acting in existing conditions *alone*, explain Christ, Christianity, and the Christian life? And if it cannot, does it explain them at all, or if at all, more than inadequately?

If we cannot explain these facts without resorting to the idea of an intervening act of God, are we warranted in looking at the Christian records as being purely explicable on the laws of Development? Some critics, who seem to many goodly people to hold more strongly to the development theory than they do to the word of God, have no hesitancy in carrying out and cutting up the Scriptures in order to make them tally with the theory. But this is not the course which scientists take with God's revelation of Himself in the Book of Nature. Development is the best working theory to explain nature, but when a fact comes along that the theory cannot explain, the scientist does not straightway dump that fact overboard or call it an interpolation. The Development theory does not offer a satisfactory explanation of man's mental and moral nature, still no one dreams of throwing mind and morality over on that account. The spleen we heard at the Conference had no known use; in other words, it does not conform to the law of development, but it would be a very serious undertaking on that account to attempt to blot it out of existence in the human economy. So in the Old and New Testaments we

may do well to take the more conservative position and not be too ready to reject this, and that, and the other fact, simply because we cannot make it fall in line with the theory.

Time and study and sanctified research will bring all things to pass; and in the meantime while we welcome light, let us not be too eager to receive what is new until fair and solid tests have established its truth.

CONSERVATIVE.

THE PHILOSOPHIC STUDENT AGAIN.

I'm a cold blooded horror, I am

So I am.

A materialistical clam,

—atical clam;

The Levana-ites swear,

I'm a brute! I'm a bear!

I'm a heartlessly icy nonentity! There!

And they curl up their sweet little nose in the air,

Their pretty, collective nose in the air,

As they tell with a vin-

Dictive toss of the chin,

How they'd cut

Me eternally dead if they but

Could know,

Could with approximate certainty know,

My title and pedigree; verily so

Funny is everything here below,

In this vale of continual woe.

Nevertheless I still hold with profound conviction to the belief which was expressed in concrete form in a previous article, viz: That rational love should not be confounded with animal passion, but should be controlled, subjected to comparative and analytic criticism, and only entertained in so far as it contributes to the attainment of a rational ideal. Such a view is naturally repulsive to many, indeed we may say to the majority. The ignorant man despises and hates education; the abandoned sinner despises and hates the elevating influences of the Sunday School, the Conversat., and the Rainbow Tea; similarly the being who habitually yields to the impulses of passion will ultimately shrink from the calm reasoning of true philosophy. Particularly may this be expected from women. Under the present unfortunate and unbalanced system of society, women have been nurtured and educated into a total misconception of their relation to those who according to nature, reason, and scripture are their natural lords; they have been encouraged to desert the true position assigned them in the Garden of Eden and confirmed by the Apostle Paul; and empty traditions of the age of chivalry, dreams of certain imaginary rights of women, and the sentiment and homage of generations of infatuated men, have rendered the whole sex peculiarly incapable of judging what is for their own good. It is pitiable and almost discouraging to note how this folly has been and is still encouraged by those who ought to know better. The calmer voice of reason has been from time to time heard, but seldom indeed has it been heeded. How cunningly