

and deepest knowledge we possess; nay, it is a knowledge to which all specific kinds are but tributaries; a knowledge which is always increasing, but whose increase itself perpetually serves to show that the Being whom we contemplate has no limits in space or time.

It appears, then, that our conclusion that no definition is possible arises, not as assumed from ignorance, but from knowledge of God. Even if it were not possible to know, we might still know *of* God. Even though we should never know God in Himself, that does not prevent us knowing Him in His works. Even if knowledge were defined as comprehension, shutting out apprehension altogether; even if we had no knowledge of God at all, that fact would not in the least justify the atheist's position. For it is not a question of knowledge only—it is also one of belief. Are we not all familiar with the truth that there are often reasonable grounds for believing where there are no means of knowing? The fact is, the greater part of all that passes for scientific knowledge is only scientific belief. So long, then, as we have grounds for belief in God, the absence of knowledge, were it a fact, as atheists wrongly suppose it to be, would afford no reason for Atheism. We conclude, therefore, that the demand for a definition of God is one which is as contrary to reason as it is revolting to reverence.

Definition is, however, always necessary where some uncertainty exists as to the sense intended. We have thought it well to give two or three examples, asking our readers to extend, at their leisure, the list for themselves. It is desirable to notice in passing, that many words employed in this controversy have departed, more or less, from their original or proper meaning. In some cases it is now hopeless to recall them within the limits their derivation suggests; in others, the effort, in the interests of exact thought, may well be made; and in every instance it ought to be clear which of the meanings we intend. The first example we give is the word Infidelity. Originally, it meant unfaithfulness, and had no reference whatever to scepticism or doubt. On the contrary, it rather implied obligation or duty recognised by conscience,