

verted by popular use would be to surrender our sword and shield, and confine and pester ourselves in a very small pinfold. The word *apologia* and the *thing* it represents are not only fragrant with antiquity and bright with the triumphs of the gospel, but they are sanctioned by the Holy Ghost and incorporated into the inspired history of the apostolic church.

Not Justin Martyr, but Paul, was the first Christian *apologist* to whom the name was applied. He claims the title, and constantly did the thing which it signifies. Standing on the castle stairs in Jerusalem he says: "Men, brethren and fathers, hear ye my *defence* (*απολογία*) which I now make unto you" (Acts xxii. 1). Writing to the Philippians, he tells them that both in his bonds and in his *defence* (*απολογία*) and confirmation of the gospel, they are partakers of his grace (Phil. i. 7). And again (v. 17): "I am *set* for the *defence* of the gospel. *εις απολογιαν του ευαγγελιου.*) *Apologetic* is therefore not only a good ecclesiastical, but a good scripture word, and, in both its historic and its scripture sense, it includes any and every defence of the gospel.

A striking example of the confusion and self-contradiction resulting from a failure to recognize these simple facts is found in the first article in this symposium. Bishop Cox says: "Surely after 1,800 years of the gospel working among mankind enlightening the world, and without a rival in human history accomplishing its *internal* triumphs over the sins and misery of sinful souls, we may proceed generally upon the principle that 'Christianity needs no apology.'"

Now, surely the learned and eloquent author does not mean that in this nineteenth century Christianity needs no *defence*; he does not mean, in the face of the fact that nine-tenths of the human race have never heard the gospel, that the *whole* world is enlightened; he does not mean to deny that in heathen lands Mohammedanism and Buddhism, and in Christian lands error and unbelief in a thousand forms, are, in fact, the rivals of Christianity; he does not mean that, even in our Christian congregations, there are none who are troubled with doubts, and need preaching like that which Paul gave to the Philippian Christians for the defence and confirmation of the gospel. He is himself an eminent *apologist*. In the very sentence we have quoted he gives us an admirable summary of one chief branch of Christian apologetics. One of the best books in defence of the gospel published in our day is Dr. Storrs' "Divine Origin of Christianity Indicated by its Historic Effects." In this book the eloquent author simply presents the proof of what the good bishop affirms. It is apologetic from beginning to end, and every chapter of it was first delivered in the pulpit to popular audiences. Did he do more harm than good by such preaching?

It will be answered, doubtless, that it is not against *such* apologetics in the pulpit that objection is made, but only against the