

ging the question to say that we know all the laws of the universe, and to deny the existence of a power, the present efficacy of which is attested by millions of intelligent men, because we do not with our physical senses perceive it operating in the manner in which it is said by otherwise creditable witnesses to have operated in the past? More than this: the scientific opponents of miracles are in a dilemma; for here is a strange inconsistency. They refuse to accept miracles because they have no experience of anything of the kind. They allow that no one has witnessed the evolution of life from dead matter, or the development of one well-defined species into another, yet they confidently assert that both of these phenomena at one time did take place and are perhaps even now in process throughout the whole extent of the globe. They believe in these miracles, more incredible than the change of water into blood or into wine—than any miracle of healing or restoring an inanimate body to life; though, by their own confession, they are incapable of demonstration; and dare to be guilty of the bigoted inconsistency of denying Christians the liberty of belief claimed by a pagan philosophy. The incredibility of miracles is not demonstrated, the adversaries being judges.

There are other instances of scientific objection to Scripture, in which the rival scientists destroy one another like the famous Kilkenny cats. One of these is the belief of many students of the school of physical ethnology in what they term the multiplicity of protoplasts. This dangerous looking expression means that mankind, so far from being of one blood as the Bible teaches, descended from some half-dozen or more pairs of progenitors, the original Caucasians, Mongolians, Negroes, Malays, Americans, Papuans, etc. For this school of ethnology holds that these varieties, as we term them, of the one species, man, present such strongly marked differences as to make it certain that they are distinct species. We can only answer that many of the best zoologists hold the distinction unproved; and otherwise refer the ethnologist to Mr. Darwin and his school. If the latter can derive the Caucasian from an anthropoid ape, he can find little difficulty in bringing the same Caucasian from the Negro or the Australian. Let them fight it out, each on his own ground, and when they have settled the matter let the survivor turn his attention to Scripture. We have no fear that a single hair of them will survive the contest.

Attempts have been made to prove the same doctrine on the side of philology. These are especially interesting to an inhabitant of this continent, inasmuch as the American languages have borne the burden of proof. It has been said that they exhibit no affinity to any tongues of the Old World, either in their grammatical construction or in their vocabularies. The American languages, says a high authority, are neither Aryan, Semitic nor Ugro Altaic; they are American. In other words, there was a special commencement of human speech upon this continent. But this is mere assertion. There are languages in Asia, Europe, and even in Africa, whose essential grammatical features are of the same character as those which distinguish the American Indian's mode of expression. Hundreds of lists, great and small, have been drawn up, containing comparative tables of American and Asiatic words that exhibit indisputable proofs of relationship between them. Everything tends to show that the Aryan, Semitic and Turanian (including American) families of language have not only grown up side by side, but have had a common origin. The speech of the apostle Paul at Athens has not therefore been refuted—"God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

Intimately connected with the question of the unity of the race is that of the antiquity of man. Here we meet with the archaeologist and the historian who place man's advent upon the scene of this earth at from ten thousand to hundreds of thousands of years ago. The Bible on the contrary stops short at some six or seven thousand years from our date. Which is right? The archaeologist, delving beneath gravel beds and exploring the floors of ancient caves, brings up in some cases flint implements, in others actual human remains, that were found lying side by side with the bones of long extinct animals. Referring to the geologist, we learn that the deposits in which the remains have been found, judging from present rates of deposition, must be ten, or twenty, or a hundred thousand years old. He works at his ages of iron and bronze and stones both polished and rough, and arrives at the same result. He studies the gradual progress of culture as set forth by Sir John Lubbock and Mr. Tylor, with the aid of anthropology, philology and imagination, and finds confirmation there. What can we say to all this? We can answer that the elastic theorem which stretches from ten thousand to half a million of years is not proved nor is it provable. In the first place, some of the most famous stone implements, such as those from the Brixham Cavern, are not stone implements at all, but very ugly unwrought pieces of natural flint, which might be as old as the Laurentian rocks for all that the Bible archaeologist cares. In regard to other objects and remains it is far from certain that their original position was that in which they have been found. This would be evident in the case of a modern cent falling into a fissure in the rock of which the Montreal mountain is composed, but not so much so were the object deposited a bone or a flint arrow head. As for extinct animal remains, mammoths in a high state of preservation have been found on the surface of the ground lodged in Siberian ice. The natives cut the flesh from the bones for food and probably left a knife or two in the vicinity of the carcass without thereby establishing the contemporaneousness of knife and mammoth. The geologist judges, however, of the age of the beds whether of gravel or stalagmite in which remains have been found, by the analogy of present rates of deposition. Nothing can be more unreasonable, for circumstances make all the difference in rates of deposit. Many a tiny stream of to-day is the remains of a great river that once filled the valley at the bottom of which its feeble waters flow. To assert that the present rate of the deposition of soil is the measure of all such deposition in the past would be to libel nature with a reputation for monotony that might well fill the hearts of weather prophets with joy. Bronze, iron, and stone ages also have fallen into bad hands of late, for Dr. Schliemann, the excavator of ancient Troy, found a well defined stratum of the stone age sandwiched in between two

of the bronze. Properly speaking the stone implements should have been very much—many thousands of years—older than the bronze, but in this case history repudiated the charge of uniformity or monotony and dared to be unscientific. Principal Dawson has drawn attention to the fact that a large part of the American continent is in the stone period still, and has also compared the ancient human remains found in the caves of Belgium, France and Germany with those of the typical aborigines of this continent. On philological and historical grounds I cannot doubt that his physical and archaeological comparisons are just, and that a race once occupied the whole of western Europe identical with and probably the ancestors of our American Indians. Finally, what right have Sir John Lubbock and his colleagues in this field to assert that man gradually rose into civilization from a state of extreme barbarism. The ancient Britons and Germans were barbarians but always of a wonderfully higher type than the South Sea Islander or the American Indian; of the Barbarian Greek and Roman we know nothing; and in Egypt and Babylonia, no traces of barbarism have yet been found. The Bible record leaves us to infer that the postdiluvian period, which is that of true history, commenced with civilization of a respectable order. Agriculture and vine culture, the use of domestic animals, brick-making and metal working, music and poetry, all were known, with many arts beside; and there is nothing on the most ancient monuments to disprove it, but everything in its favour. There are also many traces in all parts of the savage and semi-civilized world of lost arts and a decayed civilization. Development has sometimes been backward.

The archaeologist has not proved his point, nor does the historian fare any better. China and India have long been given up by him as hopeless allies, and the nations on the Tigris and Euphrates have unfortunately for him fallen into the hands of Bible loving or at least truth loving students, who cannot place their rise much before 2000 B.C.; but Egypt, the land of the Sphinx, gives him a riddle, "how old am I?" and he answers, "your first King Menes reigned between 4000 and 5000 years B.C., or over 6000 years ago." But the Sphinx so far from submitting to its doom like that of Oedipus, retains the placid smile that kept the mystery in the days of Joseph and Moses and answers never a word. Since the time of Champollion, at the commencement of this century to the present, the land of the Pyramids has been ransacked from Syene to the Mediterranean; unnumbered inscriptions have been deciphered, but none answer the question, "How old art thou?" Why then do Bunsen and Lepsius and others tell us that Egyptian monarchy began 4000 years B.C. Because they were sceptical enough to doubt the Bible with all its truthfulness, and credulous enough to believe the fragments of a chronological list written by Manetho, an Egyptian priest in the third century B.C. There is not another title of evidence, beyond the assumptions of archaeologists on points of culture, than that of Manetho's list for placing the beginning of Egyptian history at the Hebrew date of man's creation. Accordingly Mr. Poole, Sir Gardner Wilkinson and other more cautious and reasonable scholars, found no difficulty in adapting all the statements of monumental and other authorities to a period of little more than 2000 years B.C. There can be little doubt that when Egyptian darkness is removed Egypt's long chronology will not be among the things demonstrated. So far it is not.

Sir John Lubbock's primitive man and Dr. Lepsius' missing original inhabitant of the Nile valley, who could not polish a flint and knew nothing of metals of any kind, who built no houses, cultivated no land, and were as innocent of flocks and herds as of clothing, had however wonderful poetical genius, according to the modern schools of mythologists. The theology of the peoples of the ancient world, their descriptions of the gods and their history, which constitute mythology, are said by many ancient writers to be corrupted history; and this is borne out by the nomenclature of the peoples themselves, by the circumstantiality of the stories and by their intimate connection with undoubted historic facts. But the modern mythologist affirms that Herodotus and all the other historians who held this view were credulous innocents, given to old wives' fables. Mythology is solar and nature worship. If you take up such a book as "Cox's Aryan Mythology," you will be surprised to find what wonderfully poetic geniuses the savages were; what powers of abstraction, of delicate distinction, they possessed; how pleasing their fancy, how lively their imagination; what wealth of illustration, what accuracy of knowledge, what rage for personification, what ability to create a nomenclature distinguished them. Is it proved? No, but if you are determined to find the sun and moon, the winds and clouds, sunrise and sunset, storm and zephyr, in the story of a god, you will have little difficulty in doing so. A recent writer has distinguished himself by turning the Mosaic history into myth, and finding in Abraham, Sarah and Isaac, personifications of sun, moon and I know not what beside, which the early Hebrews were in the habit of modifying. The rage for myths and legends gave Strauss' life of Christ to the world, and made German commentators rationalize the story of Elijah's fire-accepted sacrifice into an ancient discovery of petroleum, and Jonah's three days in the fish into a similar term of drinking in a tavern, known to German students' song books as the Black Whale of Ascalon. Here again, we have a mere theory utterly unsupported by any evidence, and which is not even capable of accounting for a tithe of the phenomena which mythology presents.

It is an easy step from the study of mythology, the theology of the Pagan, to the comparative study of religions. Professor Max Muller found the world greatly divided in its religious belief, as it is in point of language. But as the philologist traces many tongues back to a common origin, so the professor seeks to find a common platform on which all religions may stand. There is no harm in this, because a religion would not be such unless it had some features in common with other religions. But Max Muller goes beyond this, and makes classifications without understanding the nature of what he classifies. Physical forces, life, and human power are classed by Herbert Spencer and others under the one name—force, and are supposed to be so co-ordinate in

kind that the one may be resolved into the other. So the student of religions has too often forgotten to look for life and power—spiritual power—in religions; he has put into the same class that hydra-headed doll, Brahminism, the living man-child, Judaism, the mechanical automaton, Romanism, and the fixed lay figure of Mahomet. He finds in the present day a full-grown man, Christianity, who is the development not of the living child, Judaism, alone, but of a piece of Sculpture called Greek philosophy, of a painting denominated Buddhism, of a written description termed the Zend Avesta. This is not scientific. The banker will not accept a piece of metal because it is round and is said somewhere to pass for money; he looks to it that the Queen's head be there, stamped upon good gold or silver. Whose image and superscription appears upon the old false religions and their modern representatives? Not God's, that shines forth from Judaism and Christianity, but that of Confucius, of Buddha, of Zoroaster, of Plato, of Mahomet, in other words of man; and the metal is like the die, of the earth, earthy. Are these religions divine revelations? Professor Muller says no, and affirms the same of Christianity. There is no divine revelation save in the soul of man is his dictum—there only is God revealed. He might as well write a comparative history of sea serpents, describing and classifying all that the human imagination has ever pictured to itself and call that science; for they also are revealed only in the soul of man. Religious attempts, failures, imitations, impostures are not religious in the true sense, and should never be classed in the same category with the power of God. The science of religion has failed to show cause for thus classifying them, and the Bible still stands alone.

Such are some of the waves that dash towards the bulwarks of Christianity, and that are shattered to spray by the outlying rocks of true science long before they reach its walls. The difference between these systems and that of the Bible is, that, while they fail to prove their positions, the Word of the Lord is tried, is capable of proof, has stood the severest tests. It matters not whether Moses wrote Deuteronomy, David all the Psalms attributed to him, or Ezra the book of Chronicles. These facts of authorship do not affect the truthfulness or the inspiration of the books themselves. We have not time for even a hasty survey of the Christian evidences. These however prove the Bible true *externally* by all the historical and other facts which can be confirmed or refuted by the independent testimony of profane documents. The *internal* evidence is found in its sublimity, simplicity, candour, consistency, morality, and progressive development. The Bible is found true *experimentally*, as the power of God for regenerating the soul and beautifying the moral world, as the very fountain head of all that is free and enlightened, noble and good in this nineteenth century of the world's civilization. Ask a tithe of its evidence on behalf of any of the theorems which men suppose themselves to have demonstrated in opposition to its teaching, and not one will stand the test. Is there a science into whose field it enters that can convict it of any error, save that of popular statement, if we who make such statements every day dare call it an error. It has only one theorem, "that the holy, sin-hating and sin-punishing God is in Christ reconciling the sinful world unto Himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses." Is it not proved? Proved in history and miracle, in prophecy and ritual, in the lives made sublime by faith and the outbreathing of pious souls, it is on every page; and, turning to experience, let science so called put me in such a position that I cannot from lack of knowledge refute its charges, I may still hold fast by its truth and power in the spirit of him who, born blind, could say, "Whether this man (book) be a sinner I know not; one thing I know that whereas I was blind now I see."

Yet after all there are Christians and devout people too, who, condemning the speculations and hasty conclusions of scientific men, virtually condemn themselves. What positiveness, what bigotry have distinguished many students of unfulfilled prophecy. Even now there is a wild theory in existence that has the sanction of newspapers and respectable Christians, and even some ministers of the gospel, which has not a rag of proof to cover its irrational nakedness. I allude to the doctrine that the British people are the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel. All trustworthy history, indeed every fragment even of tradition, denies it. Ethnology, dealing with races of mankind and their migrations, will have nothing to do with it. Philology holds up its hands in horror at the outrage the theory perpetrates upon all known laws of language, outravelling the wildest Darwinian developments. But the theorist says we do not care for science; we have proofs in the Bible. The reverent student of the Bible is, as I have already said, a student more or less of science. Scientific men may go astray and so may theologians, many of them, yet science and theology exist notwithstanding; and as lovers of truth we dare no more ignore the one than the other. As for Bible proof—there is none. It is all speculation. Mr. Hine has a theory that he borrowed from a much more intelligent man, Mr. Wilson, and with this theory he manages to make a certain collection of prophecies, square or appear to agree to the minds of the credulous. This is no test of truth. The theories of Darwin, Huxley and others agree with or account for facts in nature, but, as I have already more than once observed, fifty other theories might do the same. Judged by its moral and spiritual effects the theory is as unworthy of the Divine Word as it is untrue, for nothing but an anti-Christian spirit of exclusiveness and spiritual pride can arise from its reception into the mind, always too prone to desert wholesome and saving truth for profitless speculation.

We must give a reason for the faith that is in us, and that must be a valid scientific reason. All our science, including our theology, must rest upon proof, not upon prejudice, feeling, custom or anything that is unscientific. Thus we acquire a right to enter upon a consideration of the proofs put forward by others in support of what they profess honestly to believe, and to record our decision in regard to any theory as proved or unproved. Prove all things—say the Scriptures—hold fast that which is good. This does not mean that we are called upon to investigate every theory under heaven, but, in regard to all things that we seek to entertain, let us