

is above his. There are actual sophists and deceivers about us as much more capable than the most gifted man as that man is more capable than the child. Hence, let God leave the mass of men to their own powers, it is no virtue of theirs, however complete and shining, that would secure them from all errors of opinion.

But could not God be counted on *not* to leave a completely good man to the limitations of his nature and surroundings? Would He not step in with the supernatural to make good the deficiencies of the natural? Where is the promise that He will do so? There are glorious promises as to keeping and guiding the righteous—such imperfect righteous as belong to this world—but that these promises were never meant to guarantee freedom from mistake is shown by the fact that such freedom has never yet been secured to any man, however excellent. Moreover, on looking about us, we see that God does not always *proportion* just thinking to just doing, especially in common matters. Far from it. Good men are often much poorer thinkers on the lower ranges of thought than some bad men. Devout Christians are often seen managing their worldly affairs with less skill than others of less moral standing. Bad men sometimes make their way with greater success through the intricacies of learning and science than do the good. All of which goes to show that under the government of God correctness of opinion is not proportioned to moral goodness alone; and, consequently, that the good men might be perfect without immunity from mistake.

II. We are not responsible for all errors of *religious* opinion, even such as are of considerable importance.

That men are blamable for many of these errors is perfectly clear to all who believe in human responsibility at all. We can often trace the error to its sinful fountain without any trouble whatever. The spring is so near the surface! No doubt a perfectly sound character would go a very great way toward helping our vision in religious matters. A sound heart would be a great opener of the eyes toward all points of the compass, but especially toward the religious field. But would it *so* open them and clarify and empower them as to prevent all religious mistakes?

Is it thought that religious mistakes are more important than the secular; and that therefore we may presume that God has qualified us to avoid all of the one class, tho not all of the other?

Some religious errors are infinitely more important than any secular ones can be. But others are exceedingly trivial—about as trivial as one can well imagine. If any more trifling questions can be started than some of those discussed in the interest of religion by the old schoolmen and casuists, I have yet to hear of them. The proper breadth of the phylactery, the proper measure of anise and cummin, the proper size of the sacramental wafer, the nature of the forbidden fruit (whether an orange or an apple), the kind of wood of which the Cross was made—of what earthly consequence is it what conclusions