

themselves as radical or fundamental? And is this a true or tenable position? Is it possible for an idolater, a polygamist, a materialist, a deist, a pantheist, a theosophist, a worshipper of Brahm or Buddha, or of his own ancestors, to have real concord with one who holds all idol worship to be sin, polygamy to be a perversion of marriage and the panderer of an unhallowed lust, and that he who denies the Son of God denies the Father also?

Charity is not laxity. It covers a multitude of sins, but it is not to become a mantle of snow, concealing a fatal crevasse. Let us, as Augustine said, cultivate "unity in essentials, liberty in non-essentials, and in all things charity;" but, without unity on the essentials, liberty becomes lawlessness and looseness, and charity another name for the carelessness that compromises with error and is indifferent even to vital distinctions. John was the "apostle of love," yet his pen wrote: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of Antichrist" against which the New Testament thunders perpetual warning. Even the apostle of love would have made a poor president of such a "Parliament;" he was too intolerant; for he protests, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him 'Godspeed,' for he that biddeth him 'Godspeed' is partaker of his evil deeds" (1 John 4:3; 3 John 10).

It was that same Paul who drew that sublime portrait of charity that still stands unrivalled in God's gallery, who asks, "What concord hath Christ with Belial? what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" And this same Paul enjoins: "Be not ye unequally yoked together with unbelievers" (2 Cor. 6:14-16).

Forbearance with errorists and evil-doers must not degenerate into toleration of their error or evil-doing. With cordial concession of the poetic beauties, moral truths, and even lofty models found in the false "religions" of the world, we must still insist that the unique charm and claim of Christianity are found in this, that it gives us the only infallible *Book*; the only perfect *Personality*, and the only *Saving Bond* between the sinner and his Saviour. What is religion but, as the word hints, the *binding back* of the alienated soul to God; and what other religion ever wrought such reconciliation! and yet what is any religion without salvation? There may be room for comparison and competition among ethical systems and humanitarian theories; but there is "none other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved," but that of Jesus. And, as a fact, no other religion has ever yet answered the question, "What must I do to be saved?" This defect is so radical that to gloss it over is to daub a falling wall with untempered mortar.

It is vain to pretend that the divergences between Christianity and other faiths are not radical. Mrs. Besant's definition of theosophy makes