

ern science of biblical criticism. We have got a new view of the religious history of mankind, the result of the equally modern science of comparative religion.

Faith has to adjust itself to the new situation in all three respects. Till it has done so it must have an uncomfortable suspicion of being out of date and incompatible with the present condition of knowledge. For its own comfort and confirmation it has to ask and answer these questions: Is Christ's idea of God as a Father, and of man as His son, contradicted or confirmed by the evolutionary theory? Can the critical view of the Old Testament literature be held compatibly with the recognition of Israel as a people having a special vocation within the sphere of religion, and of the Hebrew Scriptures as giving us a reliable account of that people's history and its religious significance? Can the idea of Israel as an elect people be held compatibly with a just view of the religions of other peoples, her contemporaries, and of the character of God as One who is good to all, and whose tender mercies are over all His works? Finally, as Jesus Christ is the central object of trust and reverence for every Christian, and the true Light of the world, and ultimate authority in religion, all questions relating to the Christian origins become of supreme concern for the present-day apologist. Can Jesus be known? was He the Christ? did He rise from the dead? with what right did the primitive Church worship Him as Lord? Here, as also in connection with the election of Israel, faith has to reckon with something besides criticism or impartial historical investigation, even with a *naturalistic philosophy* which assumes that there can be no breach of continuity in any sphere, no miracle, physical or moral, not even a sinless man, that all religions alike are naturally evolved, and that all men, Jesus not excepted, are the product of their time; possibly greater than all who went before, but not unsurpassable by those who come after.

In dealing with the first of the foregoing questions, which takes us into the speculative or philosophical sphere of thought, the apologist has to reckon with present-day *agnosticism*. In meeting that formidable foe he has not so much to prove *that* God is, but rather to make out that we have means of knowing to a certain extent *what* God is. The agnostics, as represented by Herbert Spencer in England, and John Fiske in America, do not call in question the existence of a great unknown something to which may be given the name of God. What they doubt is the possibility of ascribing attributes to God on any valid, verifiable grounds. You may know that God is; you may not know what He is, whether—*e.g.*, as the Scriptures teach, He be "good," or "just," "the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." The present-day apologist has to adapt himself to this attitude, and, instead of wasting his time on the proof that a God of some sort exists, to concentrate his attention and strength on the proof that God is knowable; or, to put the matter otherwise, that the Christian idea of God as a Father, to whom man stands in the rela-