

mony with natural order and law. What was evident in Egypt is not in subversion or suspension of Natural forces, but rather a supernatural sublimation of those very forces. The drift and purpose of our argument is therefore apologetic, not rationalistic. It is not to destroy or dilute the faith, but to defend the faith.

I.

WHAT THEN IS A MIRACLE ?

As everybody knows, the question of miracles is an ancient and still thickly-trodden battle-field, and no doubt here upon this field we discover the exact line where the sharp knife-edge of scientific observation and assumption meets the unyielding claim of Scriptural testimony and Christian faith. We say scientific *assumption*, for something of assumption certainly often intrudes into scientific conclusions. Neither assumption nor presumption are confined to the theologians. There is an invisible gnome in the laboratory of our scientific friends, who manages to slip in to the midst of their careful deductions, a quite incalculable amount of *guessing*. This little supra-scientific wizard we may name by various names. In happy cases we may call him imagination or intuition, or inspiration; in unhappy cases, we must give to him the name of Prejudice, Bias, Fantasy, but in either instance whether he suggests a truth or induces error, he is non-scientific; he is outside of the retort, not in it; he hovers above the crucible and behind the lens, and adds his potent magic drop, unseen, to the scientific residuum, and does it so deftly and so infallibly, that despite the protests of our scientific brethren, we must really often insist upon our word, "assumption" in defining their methods and determining the intellectual value of their conclusions.

Calling attention then in passing to this slight alloy in the afore-said scientific blade, there is no doubt that where it strikes and cuts upon us, is at the point of alleged miraculous historic events.

But the force of its stroke is mainly due to our own lack of skill. It is due to two things; first to the fact that we have foolishly abandoned a Theistic ground as the basis of argument about miracles; and secondly to the fact that we have defined miracle itself so abominably.

The question of miracles for us as Theists is not, as we often put it, how to reconcile miracles with Natural Law, for God is ruled out of an issue so stated at the start, and we are at the mercy of our adversaries. Stating the question in this way is half or wholly to abandon the theistic ground, and hand our shield to our enemy. The real question is, and we should insist on putting it so, how to reconcile *God in miracle with God in nature*.

A man wastes his breath in reasoning about miracles with an Atheist or an Agnostic. Some real and valid Theism must be admitted on both sides, before the issue of miracles can even be set up on a fair intellectual field. Nor is it just to say in reply on the other side,