

around us, the Book of Nature, and yet which, in truth, is a book written in plainest lines in every page, should, since they both have come from the same great source, be rather attributed to a lack of skill in those who attempt to read them ; since if we accept the statement that the Bible is the word of God, and the other statement, which is equally true, that there is an overruling force which controls the phenomena of Nature, in accordance with certain fixed and, in some cases at least, well known laws, the interpretation of such phenomena should, if correct, agree in their essentials even though viewed from different standpoints.

The term Agnostic, which now-a-days one frequently hears, has of late years assumed considerable prominence, and possibly more than it really deserves. The derivation of the word is from the Greek, and literally means one without knowledge. In its ordinary acceptation, however, it is held to signify one without definite knowledge of the Creator or God, or of the plan of creation. If we take the word in the broad and natural sense it has no meaning at all as applied to mankind, since every one is supposed to possess at least a certain amount of information, while no one is held to be perfect in every branch of knowledge.

If, on the other hand, we limit its meaning to those who have a lack of knowledge of the fundamental truths of theology, we, as Christians, must also, even from our own standpoint, to say nothing of that of the scientist, properly so called, acknowledge ourselves worthy the title in certain respects, since many of the accepted tenets of Christian belief are articles of faith only, and are not susceptible of actual demonstration. Though we may claim we have a clear conception of the plan of Creation according to the scheme laid down in Genesis, the exceeding terseness of the scheme as there presented is such that we know that it cannot be taken in its literal sense, and the theologian is indebted to the scientist for the presentation of more light upon a question which has produced much unnecessary, and often unseemly, controversy. When such uncertainty exists, therefore, it does not, to many, seem the wisest course that anyone should dogmatically assert any particular line of doctrine, and claim for himself infallibility in its interpretation, especially when the data given are confessedly so imperfect. It is, therefore, easily seen that this term *agnostic* is one exceed-