

Regent Square ; but several of them had done duty long before. One seems quite familiar ; it is about Benaiah and the lion that he slew in a pit on a snowy day. Even to-day we can hear the lion roar as we heard him one Wednesday evening in McCrie-Roxburgh, 'Edinburgh. There is a great deal that is fine and fresh and fiery in these sermons, but woe be to the man who plagiarizes from them.

---

Elsewhere in this issue readers will find an article by Rev. Prof. Beattie on "The Materials of Apologetics." That article is a part of Dr. Beattie's inaugural lecture which, in pamphlet form, is now before us. We have re-read the entire paper and admire greatly its strength and systematic arrangement. We are not surprised to learn from intelligent Southerners that Prof. Beattie has already won the confidence and respect of the Southern Church.

But readers may judge for themselves of the lecture. They will find it consistent with the traditional positions of the Church, and moving with more or less of independence and originality along traditional apologetic lines. But for this very reason, owing probably to our "total depravity," we are bound to confess a little dissatisfaction. We have been waiting for a new apologetic, and for Dr. Beattie to fail us is something of a disappointment, and while musing the fire burned.

This is not the place in which to discuss the methodology of Apologetics, and none but a specialist should deal with it. But will no specialist leave the time-honoured, hard-beaten road? Must we always open with the Theistic Argument, *a priori* and *a posteriori*, or, as Dr. Beattie puts it, *psychical, causal and moral*? Should not Christian Apologetics be, first of all, *Christian*—Christocentric, not theocentric? starting with a Christ historically known, not with a God supernaturally revealed or metaphysically indispensable? the man Christ Jesus, a revealer, not God, the unseen, revealed? We are Christians, not theists. We believe in the Christ and His doctrine. It is His Person and His Doctrine that we are to defend. Is not the apologete's stand, then, by the Christ of history, the records of whose life and teaching are preserved in the New Testament? And is he not required to study and defend Christ's doctrine of God, of man, of the universe, and its philosophical presuppositions.

It does seem that such a course would vitilize apologetic. Without assuming the inspiration of the Gospels, a thing the apologete is not at liberty to do, but regarding them as, in the fiercest light of criticism, credible and historically trustworthy, the apologist could surely construct an argument not only vital, but powerful. By concentrating the Christian