

and assumptions which formerly challenged the progress of the free spirit of man. If we are too timid to follow the banner which Luther unfurled, we are "yet in our sins," but God will march on in the thought and life of others, and He will be found of those who sought Him not.

Let us remember then that we do not belong to the unreasoning age of scholasticism. We are moderns. We must approach the religious problems of our time from the implicit standpoint of the Reformation, which condemns as unreal and unmeaning everything that refuses to enter vitally into man's inward life and being. By that principle of Freedom which has been consciously taken up in the literature and philosophy of the modern world, we must judge all things. It is not of our choice. We cannot do otherwise.

But what, it may be asked, has all this to do with the plain and seemingly definite questions of "Conservative?" It has just this much to do with them that our attitude towards all presuppositions, theological, scientific, psychological, is no longer scholastic and dogmatic, but philosophical. We no longer say, "Your theory must account for my abstract propositions, or I will not accept it." In other words "Conservative" would not ask the questions he does if he had made his own the thought which was the secret inspiration of the Reformers, and which has been moulding society ever since. That is one thing, then, our true attitude as contrasted with the scholastic attitude towards the problems of theology.

Let us remember another thing—that science has a limited province, but that within that province its reign is absolute. Obviously, then, neither philosophy nor theology has any concern about questions on which science alone can speak with authority. It is but cheaply honouring Christianity when we in the slightest way antagonize it to the conclusions of science. Let us hold to this truth. What then about Christ? This about Him, that He was the outcome not of Hebrew life but of all life, and that He has made man so vividly conscious of His destiny that all things will yet be subdued by that idea, and human society become not "earthly" but "heavenly." It is true that the theory of development does not formulate propositions about the Person of Christ, but it teaches us to *find* Christ in history and in the human heart.

Neither, when we understand the idealistic view of the world do we ask the question, "how does 'development' explain the 'Christian life,'" which "Conservative" identifies with the "new birth?" If the "new birth" were what he supposes it to be, a literal rising from the dead, then we could understand the reason for resorting to an "external force" for an explanation of the process, though we might fail to see any more than ingenuity in such a device.

The truth is that the world is not split into two. There is but one world, and it is God's world. We cannot free ourselves from God. We are separated unto Him, as Paul says of himself, from our mother's womb, and through our sin and the accompanying discipline He will finally be revealed consciously in us.

In the enthusiasm of the moment, and with the feeling of new possession, we are apt to press the metaphor implied in the phrase "new birth" too far, and break the life of the individual into irreconcilable fragments.

But the subject after conversion is the same as before it, though he is now consciously a co-worker with God, and endeavours henceforth that the Divine Life "may flow through his deeds and make them pure."

We conclude this long article, then, by again pointing out that we must approach theological problems in a reverent and critical way. It takes a long time to understand that human life cannot be split up into sections, between which impassable gulfs are fixed. The abstract method of studying theology has long been in vogue and we have occasional instances of it still in the class-room, and in some of our "Sunday Afternoon Addresses," but any one whose heart has responded at all to the teaching of history, to the utterances of the great men of our own country, men like Browning, Carlyle, Emerson and Wordsworth; any one who understands the meaning of modern philosophy, which is God's best gift to man for the true appreciation of Christianity, knows that abstract theology is doomed and that it must give place to a theology built on the moral nature of man, and which will truly be "bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh."

* * *

One, of many good suggestions from the committee appointed to make recommendations concerning the functions of the Arts Society, is that no student who has not paid his fee during the years he has attended college be appointed to an office in the Arts Society, in "The Ancient and Venerable Concursus," or have his expenses paid by the Society, in case of his having been appointed a delegate. This is a step in the right direction. We would like to see the rule extended to athletics, that no man, not having paid his fee and playing on any college team, have his expenses paid out of the general fund, unless the committee appointing such a one have first received permission from the Executive. It is difficult to conceive of a greater exhibition of nerve than that displayed by a man who refusing to pay his Arts fee, yet "sponges" on his fellow-students by using advantages they have supported. Daily, one may see students in the Reading Room using papers and periodicals, towards the