

AYMAN.

or even enough means to lay the foundation; 4th. Science is shutting out revelation by proving that after all, really, there is a sad lack of talent exhibited in the structure of the universe, in some parts no wisdom nor even a show of design, in fact there is much muddlement in God's plans generally and Mr. Huxley or Mr. Tyndal could vastly improve upon the work of creation; 5th. "Evolution will shortly be the creed of the world" and all existing cosmogonies will give place to one to be expressed in the profound formula of Topsy "Spects I growed"; 6th. "Now-a-days in any book by a learned man, who feels himself at liberty to say what he really thinks, you will find the miracles abandoned"; 7th. The rule of Mr. Disraeli has put back the clock of humanity to the pre-Christian time, as is proved by certain pictures of the Zulu war in the *Graphic*!

All these heterogeneous propositions are set forth with such an air of oracular wisdom as is well calculated to do terrible havoc amongst young men. Sowing the Devil's seed of scepticism under the pretence of a mere literary disquisition is about as bad a piece of work as any man can take up. Professor Smith passes for a Christian, what then does he mean by casting doubts upon the immortality of the soul and by insinuating that learned men who are honest abandon miracles? What good purpose can be served by telling Churchmen they cannot be honest if they agree to differ, to live in peace? What sense is there in hashing up with literary spices the silly criticisms of speculative Atheists, criticisms which imply that the critic is divinely wise even if God is not? If the Professor has any light to throw on these high questions we will bask in it, but the retailing stale materialism, setting men together by the ears, suggesting doubts to young minds, leading them into a jungle of scepticism and leaving them there, covering up atheistic thoughts by a coruscation of literary fireworks, is work reflecting no honor upon one who owes all his culture, his literary fame and status to a Christian University. No wonder that the organ of the infidels of America has quoted the article in question, and with a chuckle claims Mr. Goldwin Smith as a disciple of Ingels!

We should like to know the Professor's position, he seem to us trying to be a moral counter-part of the Colossus of Rhodes, resting one foot on Revelation and one on Infidelity—a position as untenable as the attempt to assume it is dishonorable. We will now turn to examine two of his dogmatic statements. He writes, "In almost any book now-a-days by a learned man who feels himself at liberty to say what he really thinks, you will find the miracles abandoned." This is startling if true, but more startling, because so very false, false in fact, false in suggestion, false in tone to literary instincts and to gentlemanlike feeling. Pray who are the "learned men" who are known by Mr. Smith to have written books and not abandoned miracles, simply because they were not at liberty to say what they really think? To what Father Confessor did these scamps reveal their deceit? Is it credible that any "learned man" exists "now-a-days" who is such a fool as to confess such rascality as Mr. Smith implies? If the suppression of his real thoughts is a secret, by any learned man where did Prof. Smith get his news from? We tell him plainly the character is a work of "evolution", it has come out of his own inner consciousness or morbid imagination. Literary men will read this covert sneer at the honesty of Christian authorship with indignation, Christians will be apt to see in it proof that at any rate one writer is under a "moral interreg-

num", and will conclude that scepticism at any rate has bad manners. But if all "learned men" now-a-days, who in their books "say what they think," have abandoned miracles, as Mr. Smith affirms, then all the learned apologists of Christianity "now-a-days" are hypocrites, and all the great writers of Christendom according to Prof. Smith are a pack of clever liars!

His logical process seems to be thus: "Almost every learned man who says what he thinks abandons miracles, A. is learned and defends miracles, therefore he does not say what he thinks"; or thus, "Almost all learned men abandon miracles, B. stands by them, therefore B. is not learned,"—this is quite up to Evolutionistic logic, its style in fact.

Mr. Goldwin Smith owes it to his order, his reputation, his honor to declare, 1st. Who is writing books accepting miracles against his convictions, for whoever knows such an author shares his guilt by shielding it; 2nd. What books are alluded to by Mr. S., books written by learned men accepting miracles which they really discredit, for whoever knows of such works shares their dishonesty by concealing it. But the proof of miracles is an easy task compared with the solution of these questions, and a learned man writing books contrary to his thoughts would be a living testimony to the miraculous.

By a recent English mail we have two letters, one from a "Broad" the other from an "Evangelical" clergyman, both highly learned men who see much of the world and read widely current literature, domestic and foreign. The former writes thus: "There is now a wide spread reaction against the gross materialistic notions which have been abroad so long, men are sick of speculations, science has spent its best forces against the spiritual with the result of intensifying religious convictions, widening Church sympathies, and discrediting party agitations. The Church was never so strong in numbers, in zeal, in the whole-hearted devotion of the laity." The other writes: "Modern Science is largely a game of guessing, one day the shout goes up that the secret of Creation is found, next day this is forgotten in the excitement of a more sensational theory, something new is all the craze, now it is some absurd trifle of a discovery which makes as much noise as though it were the launching of an idea threatening to revolutionise Science and abolish all religions—then this bubble bursts, and we stand gaping for the next trick of the savants." Now both these witnesses are in the very centre of the best intellectual life of England, they speak from personal observation, and we submit that their testimony reveals Mr. Goldwin Smith's prophecies to be mere random guesses. We also object to this statement by Mr. S., "Evolution is for ever to be the creed of the world." Well, well, as "Evolution" has to destroy Christianity first we will wait for that being done before giving an opinion as to its chances with the other antagonists which it must first slay before it rules the world!

Evolution makes the universe a still more difficult problem to solve the existence of and presents scientific and logical and experimental difficulties which are just now baffling its friends who are being told very bluntly on all hands that they can see no further into millstones than other people.

The Evolutionists seem to us like a tribe of ants whose nest is on the brink of the Niagara chasm which they wish to bridge, who having built up tiny chips and dust to form a microscopic pier then call on the world to witness that they have bridged the terrible chasm,

simply because the mist obscures the other shore! Between the first stage of Evolution and the Non-existent a gulf yawns which can only be bridged by an act of Creation by an Almighty Creator, Despite, therefore, the new prophet the creed of the world is and will be for evermore: "In the beginning God made the Heavens and the Earth."

Mr. Goldwin Smith is an open enemy of our Church, he has publicly avowed his sympathy with Methodism, Sectism and their allies in our camp. We ask them to reflect upon his views and do not shrink from saying that such covert infidelity as Mr. S. indulges in comes by natural "Evolution" out of that so-called "liberality", which would be more truthfully dubbed the license of indifference. We are thankful that the Church Catholic gets only sneers from a writer, however brilliant his style, who insinuates that a learned Christian author is probably false to his convictions who gives currency to the blasphemy which asserts that the Universe shows neither wisdom nor design, and who proclaims his unhesitating belief that the Atheistic theory of self-existent matter capable of self-evolution into all visible phenomena, will ere long unseat the Father of mankind from the throne of Humanity, leaving the world without divine law and divine control to sink into the darkness of moral chaos. Prof. Smith is like a child who seeing the tide rising dreads another deluge. The tide of infidelity rose so high a century ago that sceptics, Prophets of the Goldwin Smith School, thought to see the Cross submerged. The dark stream receded, it is still flowing but yet is very far below the high water mark of the early Georgian era. Professor Smith watching these shallow tidal streams tells us that a universal moral deluge is high at hand. It is a childish dream. A moral interregnum implies the death of the king of the kingdom, over that kingdom waves the sceptre of the Eternal King.

A RARE CHANCE OF DOING GOOD TO THE CHURCH.

SOME thousands of people in Canada and elsewhere have read with much interest and benefit the pamphlet entitled, *Disclosures of concealed and increasing Romanism in the Doctrine and Practice of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, Reformed Episcopal, and other Protestant Denominations*. It is written in answer to those who charge the church of England with being Romish in doctrine and practice, and who are accustomed to assert that "there is but a paper wall between it and the Church of Rome." Yet the pamphlet displays little or nothing of the ill temper which so often distinguishes and disgraces works of religious controversy. On the contrary it is written rather in a pleasing, charitable, and even jocular style, and with a simplicity of language easily understood by the ordinary reader. The disclosures consist of an array of stubborn facts which have never yet in a single instance been nullified. The work has been reviewed, criticised, and, as might be expected, been somewhat roughly handled by some of the leading denominational and secular news papers; but the facts remain untouched and the argument unanswerable. The nature of the argument is of the same kind as employed by our Saviour in the words—"first cast out the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." The tendency of the pamphlet is to a better mutual understanding and greater degree of charity among professed Christians. It leads the various religious denomi-