

wondrous combination of beauty and utility in nature the manifestations of a Divine purpose and a Divine arrangement, not a whit the less because the process of its development is natural and extends through an almost inconceivably long period of time."

IV. The fourth argument we produce for the belief in the existence of a God is that from the moral nature of man. The other arguments only indirectly prove that the Creator of the universe is a moral Being; this one establishes it. Man is a free agent. He has the great prerogative of choice. He is largely a self-determining being. He believes himself free. He feels his accountability for his choice. He acknowledges his responsibility as a moral being. He holds his fellow men similarly responsible and similarly free. How is conscience to be accounted for? Who has not heard its voice, "Thou hast done well - thou hast done ill?" Man must stand face to face with this mysterious guest - escape from him he cannot. Who has placed this conscience within him, this tribunal before which he must appear in spite of himself? Can it be the family, society, education? No, for conscience is often opposed to that which is approved of at home, to that which occurs in society, to that which education teaches. The atheistic evolutionist tells us that the universe in its primitive condition contained nothing whatever but matter, force and motion; but how could conscience, or freedom, or consciousness have been developed from any of these? We infer therefore that he who has originated the moral nature of man must himself be a moral being and a free agent; and that every moral attribute that exists in man has a higher counterpart in God. "This conclusion says a recent writer" we shall continue to accept, notwithstanding all the sneers of a popular school of philosophy that such a belief is nothing better than anthropomorphism i. e. that "such a God is one of our own creation. It will be sufficient to reply to philosophers of this class, that there is not a single conception in their philosophy that is not open to a similar objection. When such philosophers object that to attribute the moral attributes of man to God is nothing better than the deification of man; we reply that our mode of reasoning is correct, because man is made

in the image of God. If man is made after the image of God, to ascribe to Him the attributes of personality, holiness, justice, benevolence and truth, is not to project man into God, but to attribute to God that which originally existed in Him and in the image of which he has created man."

III. IS A REVELATION FROM GOD IMPROBABLE?

In our last lecture we brought forward four arguments in favor of a belief in a personal God. The first of these was from the general consent of mankind—every nation, tribe and tongue confesses a supreme Deity, and even if (as some affirm) there have been found people who do not acknowledge a God, yet they are at the best but very rare exceptions, which only prove the rule. The second argument was from effect to cause. It is an axiom of thought, —a self-evident truth—that every effect must have a cause. No law is more universal than this; its validity is at once recognized. And since an infinite succession of causes cannot be conceived of as possible, we infer that all finite causes must have originated in a *first cause*, which must have been itself uncaused. This *first Cause* we designate God. The third argument was from design, first seen in the order of the universe, and then in its adaptations. The things of this world are not thrown together haphazard, but are arranged in a marvellous beauty and order which implies that it is all the result of intelligence, since it could not possibly have originated in unconscious and unintelligent forces. And the fourth argument was from the moral nature of man, which could not be from natural selection, or of purely physical evolution, with no personal Being behind that evolution; it could not have originated in matter, force or motion; than which the universe in its primitive condition contained naught else according to the atheistic evolutionists. So when we consider the personality of man, his freedom, his conscience, his religious nature, his spiritual aspirations, his innate preception and approval of the true, the beautiful, the good, we conclude that there must be a Being who is free and pure and good; a personal being who is spiritual and moral, from whom man has received his spiritual and moral nature.

Each of these arguments, considered by itself, affords reasonable evidence that