

contemporary evidence to Muhammad's miracles. His reply, translated literally, was: "First, contemporary evidence is not always nor necessarily true. Second, later evidence is not always nor necessarily false. Third, when Abu Bacr collected the Suras and collated the Qúrán, he had it proclaimed through all the country, and no one arose to challenge its accuracy. Fourth, much of the gospels and of the Old Testament history could not, from the necessity of the case, have been written *without some interval* between the occurrence of the event and the record, and it seems to be a question as to what interval will invalidate testimony."

As to the objection to Muhammad splitting the moon because there was no reference to such an occurrence in the literature of the Bactrian and other neighboring nations, he thought that of no greater force than the objection against the miracle of Joshua stopping the sun, as lacking any contemporaneous evidence in the literature of the Hindus and Chinese.

That man was not a Christian "inquirer," but he was sincere, and unsettled in his faith in Islam, and regretted having trained his children as Muhammadans. He represents a class of Moslem controversialists daily met with by the missionaries in the bazaar and village itineraries. It appears providential, that simultaneously with the geographical extension of Christianity through the modern mission to the ends of the earth, the modern "critics" should have compelled Christian scholars to re-examine, re-formulate Christian doctrine, and re-expound our noble Scriptures, ready for presentation to all classes of minds to be met with in all the world; and, amidst our splendid later resources for research, to forge in the fires of controversy the very weapons needed by missionaries of the Protestant propaganda in Moslem

and heathen lands. The defense of herself against the "reviewers" has made the Church unwittingly furnish herself with the burnished weapons for aggressive warfare in the ends of the earth. But the vast Brahman, Buddhist, and nature-worshipping communities of the world do not have this critical faculty developed, nor are they likely to have it till, further on, Christianity shall create it. Miracles are to these communities only wonder-works, matched any day by the traditional stories of their gods, or by their current exploits. No man who understands ethnic aptitudes would be likely to approach these peoples on this side. The internal evidence which Christianity furnishes is what is forceful among these peoples; combined with that which is always impressive to an Asiatic, the material development of the Christian civilization which is alleged to be the immediate result or product of the Christian religion. He has firm faith that your religion is good for you, but is of no avail for him, because he believes in ethnic revelations. But when, coming to the Christian Scriptures, he finds a *prophetic description of himself*, his pains, his problems, his unrest, his soul-aspirations, his longings for some hopeful glimpse into the future, he comes into touch with something that necessarily suggests that the book must have had an author who knew *him*. As it proposes to give him soul-rest, and tells him the "whence" and the "whither" of himself, he is led to test; and when, so far as he tests the Word, he finds it to fit, as key to lock, to all the exercises of his soul, he is drawn to it and convinced by it without knowing, or caring to know, anything about its external evidences. The great bulk of the heathen world, from philosophic Brahman, and meditative Buddhist to Indian spirit-worshiper, and African and Oceanic fetish devotee, is in just this case. The