

is equivalent to the *knowledge* of God!" If we can agree upon a definition of knowledge, the editor will perhaps agree that there need be no more discussion. What is knowledge? Science, as he tells us, is real knowledge—knowledge that can be proved. He devotes some passages to the consideration of the limitations of science, but it is not at all necessary to follow him in this; for if it be true, as he says, that where science "has removed a veil, it has only been to show more impenetrable darkness beyond," it is abundantly clear that the field of science is co-extensive with the knowableness of things, and that what she has not illumined is really unknown. Science, indeed, comprises all knowledge and methods of obtaining knowledge; and if there be any real knowledge of God, such knowledge must necessarily be scientific knowledge.

It is undoubtedly true that large numbers of persons have had experiences which they very devoutly designate as real, blessed, sanctifying knowledge of God, and so on; and, accepting once more the editor's definition—that "God is love"—I see no reason to doubt them. The wonderful organization we know as a human being presents many problems, in the investigation of which science is as yet only taking the first weak steps. But to classify such feelings and entirely subjective experiences as "knowledge" is simply misusing words. If "God is love," or some such phrase, be accepted as sufficiently elucidative, well and good; but if God be an entity, a Being, a living person with a mind, capable of doing things in our universe, then we are justified in demanding, not only some better definition of him, but also some substantial evidence of the reality of the supposed "knowledge" of him.

But I very seriously object to this description of God as "love." Just look at what has occurred in this world even during the last year, and then ask if the almighty ruler of such a world can by any stretch of imagination be called a god of love? Think of the millions who have gone to unpitied graves by famine, pestilence, sword, earthquake, and the thousand and one accidents that terminate in a more or less violent fashion the miserable lives of unhappy mankind, and then ask, Where shall we find the love of this almighty Being? As Tennyson says—

"Were there a God, as you say,  
His love would have power over hell till it utterly vanished away....  
But the God of Love and of Hell together they cannot be thought."

Read "evii" for "hell," and the conclusion must be the same.

I most emphatically protest against the editor's apotheosis of ignorance. It may be true, as he says, that "some of the most truly religious men and women have had but little brain!" We have, indeed, been told that Christianity was intended for babes and sucklings, and to confound the learned and wise. But I think it utterly false to say that "science has at present been the reverse of helpful;" nor can I believe that, if true religion "require a cultivated intellect,

is the v  
a total mi  
learn to  
good? V  
How, ther

I do no  
cepting "  
task before  
morality.

that the ob  
question is

wicked ma  
fulcrum tha  
the differen  
scientific e  
Ethics teach  
knowledge  
enforce wha  
of some sup

Now, I su  
knowledge.

given circum

knowledge:

moral or rel

or through c

than a slave.

do the right,

only be mora

said to be mo

editor says, t

out, let us as

church? Th

taught by tho

eries. And,

Protestant Re

men led the v

An intelligent

inquiry, abneg

conscience.

It is childis

out of hand, a