

except as Socinianism which also drops the old name. The nomenclature and methods of attack are changed but the enemy is the same.

That was pre-eminently the age of reason, when it was thought that there was nothing higher or truer than the five senses of man and his intellect. The supreme effort then was to eliminate everything from religion that transcended the compass of reason. What refused to yield to this test, and to become luminous, simple, and satisfactory to the carnal mind was rejected. Theologians and unbelievers were largely at one in this decision. The preaching of that day was deeply permeated with rationalism. It dwelt upon mere morality, cold abstractions, metaphysical subtleties, and doubtful casuistry, and left out the saving message of the gospel. This was true in a large degree of the writings and sermons of Hooker, Chillingworth, Taylor, Cadworth and others. The enemies of the truth then, as now, received no small help and comfort from those who professed to be its friends and defenders.

Lord Herbert's special mission was to displace Christianity, or render it unnecessary by emphasizing natural religion which he condensed to five points, namely, belief in the existence of God, the obligation to worship Him, the cultivation of piety or virtue, forgiveness solely on the ground of repentance, and, finally, rewards and punishments in the future state. The doctrines of the Trinity, of the Divinity and Incarnation of the Son of God, the atonement, the Holy Spirit and everything distinctively Christian were carefully excluded from this creed.

One cannot help feeling that this was very much in line with the demands of the present day. Abbreviated creeds are now emphatically called for, as if truth were not worth being formulated and held at any great length. Liberty is craved to believe less than heretofore, and to hold even the little that is accepted with the utmost uncertainty. Practically the "Higher Criticism" aims at giving us an expurgated Bible with very many parts left out which we have been accustomed to believe. To be a doubter, in the estimation of many, is to be an honest man, and to hold truth, especially a biblical doctrine, with unmistakable strength of conviction, is to be a hypocrite or an ignorant dogmatist and obstructionist trying to stop the progress of knowledge. The determination appears to be to enlarge the human and minimise the Divine element in the Bible. But what is the practical effect of this view? The more it prevails the less reliable and authoritative the book becomes. The Lord's Word within its pages is diminished. God speaks little and man much, and thus the probability if not the absolute certainty of error in its contents is indefinitely increased. The Lord's voice ceases altogether to be heard in many parts of it and they contain nothing but the fallible utterances of man.

According to Principal Grant it is a dangerously erroneous view to make Inspiration "cover every subject referred to in the Bible, such as geography, geology, astronomy, history, antiquities, as well as the revelation of the