

one's theme. The competent expounder of the faith is he who puts his thesis in the clearest light, and in terms that shut out misconstruction. I think that this is what Christian doctrine asks from us far more than defense. Let it have judicious and discriminating statement, and it will never be driven from the field.

The counsels which I would venture to give to "the man in the pulpit" may be arranged as follows :

1. *Avoid all scorn, impatience and menace.*

Be very sparing of sarcasm which hardens the heart. Do not pooh-pooh objections, which may seem trivial to you, but are not so to differently constituted minds. Disdain mere jibes and tricks of controversy. And allow time for the counteraction of skepticism, which, because it is mixed up with a little pinch of self-assertion, gives way slowly, reluctantly. In meekness instruct those that oppose themselves. Above all, do not threaten those whom you cannot persuade. It is, beyond all things, indispensable that every man should be true to his honest conviction, and should, at whatever cost, preserve his mental integrity. In fact, no real good can come of attempts to coerce the judgment and to force religious belief under menace of consequences. In some cases, this may have the effect of overbearing hesitation and smothering doubt, but in others it will irritate and harden. And no one can pretend that a mind which permits itself to be concussed or frightened into a profession of faith renders any genuine homage to truth.

2. *Explain the nature of the proof of which religious truth is capable.*

Show the important difference between moral evidence, which is appropriate to religion, and scientific demonstration, which is not. When skeptics demand a demonstration of the existence of God, or of the utility of prayer, let it be made clear that they are asking for the wrong kind of proof—the kind that does not apply.

I have never been much impressed or alarmed by the allegation that many adepts in the physical sciences are skeptics. Such men are worthy of all honor in their own department, but have no special qualification for determining questions of moral probability. Indeed, the method of investigation and proof, appropriate to their line of study, rather unfit them for pronouncing on things unseen.

It seems to me that the men whose mental training is most favorable for weighing the credibility of historic witnesses and documents, and the sufficiency of moral evidence, are the eminent jurists of Christendom; and, so far as I know, these have been, and now are, almost without exception, convinced of the Divine authority of the New Testament. They may not all be good men; but they see that the weight of appropriate evidence is for the Christian cause. In England this is a conspicuous fact. Some of our scientists doubt, but our great judges do not.

It is demanded that our religion, if true, should put itself beyond