

canon of Scripture, and supplies the answer: 'The Church has so decided,' which he concludes to be rank popery, or at least to lead to it.

Instead, therefore, of accepting as the ground of moral obligation the divine authority of those Scriptures which have been handed down from the earliest times as the miraculously authenticated Word of God, which carry their own attestation to all who obey their teachings, which the free criticism of the most learned Biblical scholars of successive generations abundantly confirm, and which the virulent antagonism of hostile critics has never been able to confute or invalidate—instead of accepting this bulwark of truth as the final ground of appeal, Mr. Roy asserts that "all questions must rest ultimately on the trustworthiness of our mental and moral nature." We should believe that God is love, therefore, not because Jesus says so, but because "we instinctively feel that He must be what we should be were we perfect, that is, love." And in attestation of this feeling the noble sentiment of Euripides is quoted: "I do not think that any one of the gods is bad."

But "the trustworthiness of the mental and moral nature" of the Greek poets did not prevent them from constructing a mythology which represented the gods as viler than the vilest men; and Greek philosophy calmly ignored, or in its last development of skeptical Pyrrhonism, insolently defied them. In the Hindoo mythology, Seeva, the destroyer, the embodiment of cruelty and hate, is worshipped with obscene and bloody rites as the most powerful manifestation of the great Brahma. All paganisms are cruel and vile. The dark places of the earth, where the knowledge of the true God, as revealed in His Word, is not, are full of the habitations of cruelty. It is only where the light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ has dispelled this darkness that the minds of God's disobedient and prodigal children can

rise to a true conception of His character as the Father of infinite compassion, who so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son for its redemption.

If the Scriptures, or, in other words, God's revealed will, be not an ultimate ground of moral obligation, what is the ground of obligation of, for instance, the religious observance of the Sabbath? Will the "trustworthiness of our mental and moral nature" guide us in this respect? We know of no adequate and authoritative obligation to this duty save the revealed will of God.

With a good deal of what we cannot help thinking is misplaced sympathy, Mr. Roy asks, "Is it any wonder that the professors [of our schools of theology] go to their homes feeling that the men who break stones upon the streets are happier than those whose position demands of them the stultification of their own intelligence and the stifling of the rising spirit of inquiry in their pupils?" We are not aware that this alleged stultification, and the consequent feeling so confidently inferred, exists. On the contrary, we are certain that our professors of theology would repudiate with indignation both the one and the other, and only Christian forbearance would prevent their resentment of the gratuitous insult conveyed by the groundless allegation. They rejoice in the privilege of instructing those eager minds that shall be the future religious teachers of our Church and country in the sublimest of all sciences, the science of God and of His dealings with the race. There may be mysteries in theology, it is true. Clouds and darkness are about God's throne. Who can find out the Almighty unto perfection? But are there no mysteries in the realm of nature as well as in the sphere of spiritual truth? Are there no wonders in the universe around us? Who can tell, for instance, how dead inorganic matter become change-