man cautious in admitting evidence. For myself I do not believe that there has ever been a revelation. As for a future life, every man must judge for himself between conflicting vague probabilities." The mental process is clear enough; the habit of scientific research made him cautious about admitting evidence—as to Christ, though not as to corals; doubt as to Christ naturally induced doubt as to Revelation; and doubt as to both rendered the question as to a future state one of extreme dubiety. At times Mr. Darwin's doubts took a different form. "The Universe," he wrote in 1881, "is not the result of chance,"-but the fact that man's brain was developed from that of a monkey rendered him doubtful whether his opinions were at all trustworthy on that subject—though, of course, on questions of science said brain was of infallible authority. reply to the Duke of Argyll's remark that his own volumes on "Earthworms and Orchids" made it clear that these things and their uses were "the effect and expression of mind," Mr. Darwin replied, "Well, that often comes over me with overwhelming force, but at other times," and he shook his head vaguely, "it seems to go away." It is obvious, of course, that Mr. Darwin was right when he said that he had never given much thought to science in relation to religion. It is not so obvious that Prof. Tyndall was correct in describing Mr. Darwin as "the most terrible of antagonists."

The summary of scientific confessions would, perhaps, be incomplete without at least a passing reference to Professor Huxley, whose Life has been so recently published. He was a great master of scientific data and demonstration. In point of industry, sincerity and ability he was conspicuous. But he posed also as a theologian, and no man was so little fitted for the office. The strictest of disciplinarians in the use of language for scientific purposes, he permitted himself and others the most loose and ineffective use of words in discussing theological questions. He was even fierce and vindictive in his defiant denials of the doctrine of immortality. But the careful reader of the Life will see that his mind was often hovering about that doctrine and half disposed at times in its direction. Thus, writing to Charles Kingsley in 1860, he uses these words: "I neither deny nor affirm the immortality of man. I see no reason for believing it; but, on the other hand, I have no means of disproving it." And again: "It is not half so wonderful as the conservation of force or the indestructibility of matter." Ideas like these kept agitating his mind; and like Darwin, whom we have quoted, he had moments of doubt and disquiet. Finally, in 1883, writing to Mr. John Morley (vol. 11, page 62) he says: "It is a curious thing that I find my dislike to the thought of extinction increasing as I get older and nearer the goal. flashes across me at all sorts of times with a sort of horror that in 1900 I shall probably know no more of what is going on than I did in 1800. I had sooner be in hell a good deal-at any rate in one of the upper circles, where the climate and company are not too trying. I wonder if you are plagued in this way?" The words have been much discussed, explained, defended and put aside by some as a mere bit of petulance. But they go to prove that the scientific dogmatist was not more sure of his negative position than were his scientific brethren, and that his last dying speech and confession, like theirs, was a confession of failure and confusion.

In discussing these eminent men and their teachings as to science in relation of Christian society, one is conscious that there is an undercurrent of ridicule in the discussion which is ever struggling to come to the surface. The mental attitude assumed by them—their confessions of ignorance and their assumption of authority, their claims for freedom of discussion, and their constant insolence towards Theology, their declarations as to the progress of science, and their admissions that everything is a mystery still; their sneers at Christian dogma as an ex-