

man believes. When I assert that grass grows, the sun rises, all men die, I do not use the language of science, but I affirm facts which no scientific nomenclature can make more certain.

There seems to underlie much of Arnold's writing, the notion that for knowledge to be *partial*, is the same thing as for it to be *unreal* and *uncertain*. No object in the physical universe is known fully; does it follow that we do not know their existence? I am very far from knowing fully the brother with whom I have lived from childhood; does it follow that my knowledge of his existence, acts and character is unreal?

And, although we cannot know the Almighty perfectly, we can know the meaning of certain definite Bible statements respecting him. When it teaches that he is just, kind, true, holy, or when it proclaims him the living God, its language conveys as clear and definite ideas as when it applies similar terms to men. And it is not honest and fair interpretation, which regards the language as fixed and certain when spoken of men, and *fluid* when applied to God.

2. It is assumed that the existence of a personal God cannot be *certainly known, or verified*; that, "for science, God is simply the stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being." (Page 61.)

In reply to this assumption, we may say, that the existence of God is a fact which has verified itself to mankind, in the only way in which a truth of the order to which it belongs, can be expected to make itself known. God has never submitted himself to the inspection of our senses, "but the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead."

"No science," says Hooker, "doth make known the principles on which it buildeth." The existence of God is a fact, from which and not to which we reason. In other words, it is known *intuitively*. The knowledge of it is due to our constitution, and not to any process of reasoning. Made as we are, and placed where we are, the conviction springs up of its own accord, without the intervention of proof.